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## APPENDIXA

## Basis of Cost

## Appendix A

## Part 1: Estimated Project Construction Costs

| City of | Escanaba 2023 DWSRF Project Plan Costing : ANH 3/14/2023 | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | V1 |  | 12 | W | 3 |  | $\sqrt{4}$ | W | 15 |  | W6 |  | 7 | W |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | South W Improv | ater Tank vements | 2nd Ave N ( 11 | 18th to 19th St | N 11th St (2nd | to 3rd Ave N) | S 17th St (Ludin Ave | ngton St to 2nd <br> S) | S2nd St (Ludin | ngton ST to 1st <br> S) | 2nd Ave S(s | 8th to 9th st) | 5 sth St 2 2nd | to 3 rid Ave s) | 574. 5 t (2ndt | to 3rd Ave S) | S 6 th St 2nd | to 3 rid Ave S) | S 12th st (3rd | to 5th Ave S) | Ogden Al |
| Item | Description | Price | Unit | No. of Units | cost | No. of Units | Cost | No. of Units | cost | No. of Units | cost | No. of Units | cost | No. of Units | cost | No. of Units | cost | No. of Units | cost | No. of Units | Cost | No. of Units | cost | No. of Units |
| Ceneral |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101 | M obilization, General Conditions, Bonds \& Insurance (5\% of Total Construction Cost) | 5\% |  |  | \$ 28,760 |  | 14,223 |  | \$ 29,960 |  | \$ 39,690 |  | \$ 17,779 |  | \$ 25,939 |  | \$ 31,385 |  | \$ 28,121 |  | \$ 22,409 |  | \$ 64,656 |  |
| 102 | Environmental Mitigation, Traffic Control, Etc. (2.5\% of Total Construction Cost) | 2.5\% |  |  | \$ 14,380 |  | \$ 7,112 |  | \$ 14,980 |  | \$ 19,845 |  | 8,890 |  | \$ 12,970 |  | \$ 15,693 |  | \$ 14,061 |  | \$ 11,205 |  | \$ 32,328 |  |
|  |  |  |  | otal | 43,140 | Total | 21,335 | Total | 44,941 | Total | 59,534 | Total | 26,669 | Total | 38,909 | Total | 47,078 | Total | 42,182 | Total | 33,614 | Total | 96,984 | Total |
| Restora |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 201 | $3^{3}$ " Tpe ${ }^{\text {E }}$ E HMA Pavement Replacement FFulf Width of 24'w, Exceet Eili Ave 40'w) | \$27 | 5r | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ | 0 |
| 202 | $12^{\prime \prime}$ Gravel Base in Type 'E'Pavement Areas FFull Width of 24'w, Except Eli Ave 40'w) | \$27 | 5 S | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 |
| 203 |  | \$42 | LF | 613 | \$ 25,725 | 441 | \$ 18,522 | 613 | \$ 25,725 | 1,103 | \$ 46,305 | 551 | \$ 23,153 | 551 | \$ 23,153 | 637 | \$ 26.754 | 637 | \$ 26.754 | 637 | \$ 26,754 | 1,286 | \$ 54,023 | 1,838 |
| 204 | ${ }^{12}{ }^{12}$ 'Gravel Base in Type ' $A$ ' Pavement Areas (Half width-Trench Only) | \$15 | $\stackrel{\text { LF }}{ }$ | 613 | \$ 9,188 | ${ }^{441}$ | \$ 6,615 | 613 | 9,188 | 1,103 | \$ 16,538 | 551 | 8,269 | 551 | 8,269 | 637 | 9,555 | 637 | 9,555 | 637 | 9,555 | 1,286 | \$ 19,294 | 1,838 |
| 205 | 3" Type 'B' HMA Pavement Replacement (3" Trench Plus 1.5" Full Width Cap) | \$79 | ${ }^{\text {LF }}$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ | 0 |
| 206 |  | \$17 | ${ }^{\text {LF }}$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
| 207 | $12^{12}$ Gravel Surface Replaement (15'W) | \$30 | $5{ }^{\text {S }}$ | 0 | \$ - | 0 | 5 - | 0 | \$ - | , |  | 0 |  | 0 | \$ - | 0 |  | , |  | , |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 208 | Pavement Marking | 51 | LF | 613 | \$ 613 | 441 | 441 | 613 | 613 | 1,103 | 1,103 | 551 | 551 | 551 | 551 | 637 | 637 | 637 | 637 | 637 | 637 | 1,286 | 1,286 | 1,838 |
| 209 | Curb and Gutter Replacement (both sides) | \$25 | LF | 1,225 | \$ 30,625 | 882 | \$ 22,050 | 1,225 | \$ 30,625 | 2,205 | \$ 55,125 | 1,103 | \$ 27,563 | 1,103 | \$ 27,563 | 1,274 | \$ 31,850 | 1,274 | \$ 31,850 | 1,274 | \$ 31,850 | ${ }_{2,573}^{2,53}$ | \$ 64,313 | 3,675 |
| 210 | Curb and Gutter Removal (both sides) | \$8 | LF | 1,225 | \$ 9,800 | 882 | \$ 7,056 | 1,225 | 9,800 | 2,205 | \$ 17,640 | 1,103 | 8.820 | 1,103 | \$ 8,820 | 1,274 | \$ 10,192 | 1,274 | \$ 10,192 | 1,274 | \$ 10,192 | 2.573 | \$ 20,580 | 3,675 |
| 211 | Pipe \& 2-36" Catch Basins with 30' Lead every 400') | \$20,500 | EA | 10 | \$ 205,000 | 1 | 22,601 | 2 | \$ 31,391 | 3 | \$ 56,503 | 1 | \$ 28,252 | 1 | \$ 28,252 | 2 | \$ 32,646 | 2 | 32,646 | 2 | \$ 32,646 | 3 | \$ 65,920 | 5 |
| 212 | $6^{\prime \prime}$ Concrete Driveway Replacement (every $8000^{\prime}$, <br> 105y) | \$60 | 5 | 8 | 459 | 6 | 331 | 8 | 459 | 14 | 827 | 7 | 413 | 7 | 413 | 8 | 478 | 8 | 478 | 8 | 478 | 16 | \$ 965 | 23 |
| 213 | ${ }^{3}$ " Bituminous Driveway Replacement (every 300', <br> 10sy) | \$45 | 5 S | 20 | 919 | 15 | 662 | 20 | 919 | 37 | \$ 1,654 | 18 | 827 | 18 | 827 | 21 | 956 | 21 | 956 | 21 | 956 | 43 | \$ 1,929 | 61 |
| 214 | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Concrete S Sidewalk 5 ( 5 w ) | \$8 | SF | 6,125 | \$ 49,000 | 4.410 | \$ 35,280 | 6,125 | 49,000 | 11,025 | 88,200 | 5,513 | \$ 44,100 | 5,513 | 44,100 | 6,370 | \$ 50,960 | 6,370 | 50,960 | 6,370 | \$ 50,960 | 12,863 | 102,900 | 18,375 |
| 215 | $\int_{200^{\prime}}^{6^{\prime \prime} \text { Concerete sidewalk at Dive Crossings (every }}$ | \$12 | SF | 230 | 2,756 | 165 | 1,985 | 230 | 2,756 | 413 | 4,961 | 207 | 2,481 | 207 | 2,481 | 239 | 2,867 | 239 | 2,867 | 239 | 2,867 | 482 | 5,788 | 689 |
| 216 |  | \$20 | SF | 153 | 3,063 | 110 | \$ 2,205 | 153 | 3,063 | 276 | 5,513 | 138 | 2,756 | 138 | 2,756 | 159 | 3,185 | 159 | 3,185 | 159 | 3,185 | 322 | 6,431 | 459 |
| 217 | Adjust txisting Casting before Final Paving (2 ea @ <br> 400') | \$390 | EA | 3 | 1,194 | 2 | 860 | 3 | 1,194 | 6 | 2,150 | 3 | 1,075 | 3 | 1,075 | 3 | 1,242 | 3 | 1,242 | 3 | 1,242 | 6 | \$ 2,508 | 9 |
| 218 | Miscellaneous Topsoil, Seed \& Mulch/ Sod | \$8 | LF | 613 | 4,900 | 441 | 3,528 | 613 | 4,900 | 1,103 | 8,820 | 551 | 4,410 | 551 | 4,410 | 637 | 5,096 | 637 | 5,096 | 637 | 5,096 | 1,286 | \$ 10,290 | 1,838 |
| 219 | Grave Shoulder Replacement ( $6^{\prime \prime}$ d , , ' ${ }^{\prime}$ w) | \$5 | LF | 0 | S | 0 | 5 | 0 | $5 \quad$. | 0 | $5 \quad$. | 0 | $5 \quad$. | , | $5 \quad$. | 0 | ¢ | O | 5 . | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ - | 0 |
| 220 | Excess Cut, (15\% of Pipe LF) | \$3 | LF | 92 | ${ }^{\text {5 }}$ + 2898 | 66 | ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | 92 | ${ }^{5} \quad 289$ | 165 |  | 83 | ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | 83 |  | 96 |  | 96 | 5 301 <br>   | 96 |  | 193 |  | 276 |
|  |  |  |  | Total | \$ 343,531 | Total | \$ 122,343 | Total | \$ 169,921 | Total | \$ 305,858 | Total | \$ 152,929 | Total | \$ 152,929 | Total | \$ 176,718 | Total | \$ 176,718 | Total | \$ 176,718 | Total | 356,835 | Total |
| Water R | Eelated litems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 301 | Granular Fill Over W ater M ain (5\% of Trench | \$25 | LF | 25 | \$ 625 | 18 | 450 | 25 | 625 | 45 | 1,125 | 23 | 563 | 23 | 563 | 26 | 650 | 26 | 650 | 26 | 650 | 53 | 1,313 | 75 |
| 302 | $12^{12+7 t r e n c h ~ U n d e r c u t ~ a n d ~ S t o n e ~ R e f i l l ~ f o r ~ W a t e r ~}$ Main (25\% of TL) | \$12 | ${ }^{\text {LF }}$ | 125 | \$ 1,496 | 90 | \$ 1,077 | 125 | \$ 1,496 | 225 | 2,692 | 113 | 1,346 | 113 | 1,346 | 130 | 1,556 | 130 | 1,556 | 130 | \$ 1,556 | 263 | 3,41 | 375 |
| 303 | $16^{\prime \prime}$ cl 350 D W Water Main | \$220 | LF | 500 | \$ 110,000 | 0 | \$ . | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | \$ . | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| 304 |  | \$200 $\$ 180$ | $\frac{\mathrm{LF}}{\mathrm{LF}}$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | 5 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 306 |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢180 }}{ } \stackrel{1}{\text { ¢180 }}$ | $\stackrel{\text { LF }}{ }$ | 0 | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ : | 360 | $\$$ ¢ | 500 | \$ 80,000 | 900 | $\$$  <br> $\$$ 144,000 | 450 | ${ }^{\text {S }}$ \$ 72,000 | 450 | \$ 72,000 | 520 | 83,200 | 520 | \$ 83,200 | 520 | \$ 83,200 | 1,050 | 168,000 | 1,500 |
| 307 | $6^{6 " C l} 330$ D W Water M ain $30^{\circ}$ Hydrant Leads $\alpha$ | \$150 | LF | 113 | \$ 16,875 | 81 | \$ 12,150 | 113 | \$ 16,875 | 203 | \$ 30,375 | 101 | \$ 15,188 | 101 | 15,188 | 117 | \$ 17,50 | 117 | \$ 17,500 | 117 | \$ 17,50 | 236 | \$ 35,438 | 338 |
| 308 | $8^{\text {² }}$ to $100^{\prime \prime}$ Gate Valve and Box (4Ea.@ $400^{\prime}$ ) | \$2,750 | EA | 0 | \$ . | 4 | \$ 9,900 | 5 | \$ 13,750 | 9 | 24,750 | 5 | \$ 12,375 | 5 | \$ 5 12,375 | 5 | \$ 14,300 | 5 | \$ 514,300 | 5 | \$ 14,300 | 11 | \$ 28,875 | 15 |
| 309 | $12^{\prime \prime}$ to $16^{\prime \prime}$ Gate Vave and Box ( 4 ea.@ 400 $^{\circ}$ ) | \$5,000 | EA | 5 | \$ 30,000 | 0 | \$ | 0 | 5. | 0 | \$ | 0 |  | 0 | \$ |  | 5 . | 0 | \$ |  | 5 . | 0 |  |  |
| 310 | Hydrant Assembly Every 400') | \$8,000 | EA | 1 | \$ 10,000 | 1 | 7,200 | 1 | 10,000 | 2 | 18,000 | 1 | 9,000 | 1 | 9,000 | 1 | \$ 10,400 | 1 | 10,400 | 1 | 10,400 | 3 | 21,000 | 4 |
| 311 | Dewatering (15\% of Water Main) | 55 | LF | 75 | \$ 375 | 54 | \$ 270 | 75 | 375 | 135 | 675 | 68 | \$ 338 | 68 | \$ 338 | 78 | \$ 390 | 78 | \$ 390 | 78 | \$ 390 | 158 | 788 | 225 |
| 312 | Connect to Exisiting Water Main (2 Ea @ 400) | \$3,500 | EA | 3 | \$ 8,750 | 2 | \$ 6,300 | 3 | 8,750 | 5 | \$ 15,750 | 2 | 7,875 | 2 | \$ 7,875 | 3 | \$ 9,100 | 3 | \$ 9,100 | 3 | 9,100 | 5 | 18,375 | 8 |
| 313 | Lead Serice Line Replacement | \$16,000 | EA | 3 | \$ 48,000 | 4 | \$ 64,000 | 18 | 288,000 | 15 | \$ 240,000 | 5 | \$ 80,000 | 15 | \$ 240,000 | 19 | \$ 304,000 | 15 | 240,000 | 8 | 128,000 | 40 | 640,000 | 25 |
| 314 | Uutily Location Investigation (1 Ea. @ 1,000) | \$1,000 | EA | 1 | \$ 1,000 | 0 | 5 |  | 1,000 | 1 | 1,000 | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 1 | \$ 1,000 | 1 | 1,000 | 1 | \$ 1,000 | 1 | 1,000 | 2 |
| 315 | Rock or Boulder Excavation (2\% of Total Water Co | 2.0\% |  |  | \$ 4,542 |  | \$ 3,179 |  | 8,417 |  | 9,567 |  | 3,974 |  | \$ 7,174 |  | ${ }^{5}$ \% 8,843 |  | \$ 7,563 |  | \$ 5,323 |  | 18,359 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total | \$ 231,663 | Total | \$ 162,126 | Total | 429,288 | Total | 487,935 | Total | \$ 202,657 | Total | \$ 365,857 | Total | \$ 450,988 | Total | \$ 385,708 | Total | \$ 271,468 | Total | 936,287 | Total |
| Totalco | nsturction Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General |  |  |  |  | \$ 43,140 |  | \$ 21,335 |  | \$ 44,941 |  | \$ 59,534 |  | \$ 26,669 |  | \$ 38,909 |  | \$ 47,078 |  | \$ 42,182 |  | \$ 33,614 |  | \$ 96,984 |  |
| Restorat |  |  |  |  | \$ 343,531 |  | \$ 122,343 |  | \$ 169,921 |  | \$ 300,858 |  | \$ 152,929 |  | \$ 152,929 |  | \$ 176,718 |  | \$ 176,718 |  | \$ 176,718 |  | \$ 356,835 |  |
| Water <br> Tota |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll}\$ 162,126 \\ \$ & 305,900\end{array}$ |  | $\$ 429,288$ $\$ 64200$ |  | [ 4887,935 |  | \$ 202,657 |  | [ 3655887 |  | \$ 450,988 |  | \$ 385,778 |  | \$ 271,468 |  | \$ 936,287 |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  | \$ 618,400 |  | \$ 305,900 |  | \$ 644,200 |  | \$ 853,400 |  | \$ 382,300 |  | \$ 557,700 |  | \$ 674,800 |  | \$ 604,700 |  | \$ 481,900 |  | \$ 1,390,200 |  |


| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { versions } \end{array}$ | Escanaba 2023 DWSRF Project Plan Costing s: ANH3/14/2023 | orities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | L1 |  | 12 | Wi |  | V1 | 14 |  | 15 |  | 16 | v1 |  | vis | 18 |  | 19 |  | 20 |  |  | 121 |
|  |  |  |  | 74t to 4th 5 st | s11th St (5ih | to 6th ave S) | S 10th St (5th | Ave S to Lake re Dr) | s sth St Sth to | to 6th Ave S) | 6thave S(59 | Sth to 10th Sti | 8ithave S 516 |  | 10th Ave S (S 1 Shore | 15th St to Lake re Dr) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { S 4th St (Ogder } \\ & \text { Shore } \end{aligned}$ | Ave to Lake <br> e Dr) | 54ih St (13tto | to 2nd Ave | 2nd Ave N( $\mathrm{S}^{\text {a }}$ | 114h to | to 134, 5it | $\underset{\substack{\text { 2nd Ave N } \\ \text { Stephen }}}{\text { a }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \text { (N 16th to } \\ & \text { ason Ave) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Hem | Description | Price | Unit | cost | No. of Units | cost | No. of Units | cost | No. of Units | Cost | No. of Units | Cost | No. of Units | cost | No. of Units | cost | No. of Units | Cost | No. of Units | Cost | No. of Units |  | Cost | No. of Units | Cost |
| Genera |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101 | M obilization, General Conditions, Bonds \& | 5\% |  | 66,166 |  | 26,700 |  | 86,613 |  | 25,064 |  | 21,859 |  | 16,367 |  | 87,539 |  | 15,441 |  | \$ 17,378 |  |  | 34,404 |  | 16,866 |
| 102 | Environmental Mitigation, Traffic Control, Etc. (2.5\% of Total Construction Cost) | 2.5\% |  | \$ 33,083 |  | 13,350 |  | \$ 43,307 |  | 12,532 |  | 10,930 |  | 8,184 |  | 43,770 |  | 7,721 |  | 8,689 |  |  | 17,202 |  | 8,433 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ 99,250 | Total | \$ 40,051 | Total | \$ 129,920 | Total | \$ 37,597 | Total | \$ 32,789 | Total | \$ 24,551 | Total | \$ 131,309 | Total | \$ 23,162 | Total | \$ 26,066 | Total |  | 51,607 | Total | \$ 25,299 |
| Restora |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 201 | $3^{3 "}$ Type 'E' HMA Pavement Replacement (Full Width of 24 'w, Except Eli Ave $40^{\prime} \mathrm{w}$ | \$27 | Sr | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ |  | 0 | \$ |
| 202 | 12" Gravel Base in Type 'E'P Pavement Areas Full Width of $24^{\prime}$ w, Except Eli Ave $40^{\circ} \mathrm{w}$ ) | \$27 | SY | \$ | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ |  | 0 | \$ |
| 203 | $3^{3 "}$ Type 'A' HMA A Pavement Replacement Half Width-Trench Only) | \$42 | LF | \$ 77,175 | 582 | 24,439 | 2,266 | 95,183 | 613 | \$ 25,725 | 551 | \$ 23,153 | 429 | 18,008 | 2,205 | \$ 92,610 | 490 | \$ 20,580 | 502 | \$ 21,095 | 956 |  | 40,131 | 515 | 21,609 |
| 204 | ${ }^{12 \text { " }}$ Gravel Base in Type 'A' Pavement Areas (Half width-Trench Only) | \$15 | LF | \$ 27,563 | 582 | 8,728 | 2,266 | \$ 33,994 | 613 | 9,188 | 551 | 8,269 | 429 | 6,431 | 2,205 | \$ 33,075 | 490 | \$ 7.350 | 502 | \$ 7.534 | 956 |  | 14,333 | 515 | 7,718 |
| 205 | $3^{\prime \prime}$ Type ' $\mathrm{B}^{\prime}$ ' HMA Pavement Replacement ( $3^{\prime \prime}$ Trench Plus 1.5" Full Width Cap) | \$79 | LF | \$ | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ |  | 0 | \$ |
| 206 | $12^{12}$ " Gravel Base in Type B ' Pavement Areas (Trench Only) | \$17 | LF | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ |  | 0 | \$ |
| 207 | $12^{12}$ Gravel Sufface Replaement (15 ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{W}$ ) | \$30 | 5 |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | , | 5 | 0 | \$ - | 0 |  | 0 | \$ |  | 0 | 5 - |
| 208 | Pavement Marking | \$1 | LF | \$ 1,838 | 582 | 582 | 2,266 | 2,266 | 613 | 613 | 551 | \$ 551 | 429 | 429 | 2,205 | \$ 2,205 | 490 | 490 | 502 | 502 | 956 | 5 | 956 | 515 | 515 |
| 209 | Curb and Sutter Replacement (both sides) | \$25 |  | \$ 91,875 | 1,164 | \$ 29,094 | 4,533 | \$ 113,313 | 1,225 | \$ 30,625 | 1,103 | \$ 27,563 | 858 | \$ 21,438 | 4,410 | \$ 110,250 | 980 | \$ 24,500 | 1,005 | \$ 25,113 | 1,911 |  |  | 1,029 |  |
| 210 | Curb and Gutter Removal (both sidess | ${ }_{5} 5$ | LF | \$ 29,400 | 1,164 | 9,310 | 4,533 | \$ 36,260 | 1,225 | \$ 9,800 | 1,103 | 8,820 | 858 | \$ 6,860 | 4,410 | \$ 35,280 | 980 | 7.880 | 1,005 | 8,036 | 1,911 |  | 15,288 | 1,029 | 8,232 |
| 211 | Pipe \& 2-36" Catch Basins with 30' Lead every ${ }^{\circ} 0^{\circ}$ | \$20,500 | EA | \$ 94,172 | 1 | 29,821 | 6 | \$ 116,145 | 2 | \$ 31,391 | 1 | \$ 28,252 | 1 | \$ 21,973 | 6 | \$ 113,006 | 1 | \$ 25,113 | 1 | \$ 25,740 | 2 | \$ | 48,969 | 1 | 26,368 |
| 212 | $6^{\prime \prime}$ Concrete Driveway Replacement (every 800 ', 105y) | \$60 | $5{ }^{\text {S }}$ | 1,37 | 7 | 436 | 28 | 1,700 | 8 | 459 | 7 | 413 | 5 | 322 | 28 | 1,654 | 6 | 368 | 6 | 377 | 12 | \$ | 717 | 6 | 386 |
| 213 | ${ }^{3}$ "B Btuminuus Driveway Replacement tevery $300^{\prime}$, <br> 105y) | \$45 | SY | \$ 2,756 | 19 | 873 | 76 | \$ 3,399 | 20 | 919 | 18 | 827 | 14 | 643 | 74 | 3,308 | 16 | 735 | 17 | 753 | 32 | \$ | 1,433 | 17 | 772 |
| 214 | $4^{\text {che }}$ Concrete Sidewalk ( 5 'w | ${ }_{5} 9$ | SF | \$ 147,000 | 5,819 | \$ 46,550 | 22,663 | \$ 181,300 | 6,125 | \$ 49,000 | 5,513 | \$ 44,100 | 4,288 | \$ 34,300 | 22,050 | \$ 176,400 | 4,900 | \$ 39,200 | 5,023 | \$ 40,180 | 9,555 | \$ | 76,440 | 5,145 | \$ 41,160 |
| 215 | 6" Concrete Sidewalk at Drive Crossings (every | \$12 | SF | \$ 8,269 | 218 | 2,618 | 850 | \$ 10,198 | 230 | 2,756 | 207 | 2,481 | 161 | 1,929 | 827 | 9,923 | 184 | 2,205 | 188 | 2,260 | 358 | \$ | 4,300 | 193 | 2,315 |
| 216 |  | \$20 | SF | 9,188 | 145 | 2,909 | 567 | \$ 11,331 | 153 | 3,063 | 138 | 2,756 | 107 | 2,144 | 551 | 11,025 | 123 | 2,450 | 126 | 2,511 | 239 | \$ | 4,778 | 129 | 2,573 |
| 217 | Adjust Existing Casting before Final Paving (2 ea @ 400') | \$390 | EA | 3,583 | 3 | 1,135 | 11 | 4,419 | 3 | 1,94 | 3 | 1,075 | 2 | 836 | 11 | 4,300 | 2 | 956 | 3 | 979 | 5 | \$ | 1,863 | 3 | 1,003 |
| 218 | Miscellaneous Topsoil, Seed \& Mulch/ Sod Restoration | \$8 |  | 14,700 | 582 | 4,655 | 2,266 | \$ 18,130 | 613 | 4,900 | 551 | 4,410 | 429 | 3,430 | 2,205 | \$ 17,640 | 490 | 3,920 | 502 | 4,018 | 956 | \$ | 7,644 | 515 | 4,116 |
| 219 | Gravel Shoulder Replacement ( $6 \mathrm{c}^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{d}, 2^{\prime} \mathrm{w}$ ) | \$5 | LF | 5 | 0 | $5 \quad$. | 0 | $5 \quad$. | 0 | $5 \quad$. | 0 | $5 \quad$. | 0 | $5 \quad$. | 0 | $5 \quad$. | 0 | $5 \quad$. | 0 | $5 \quad$. | 0 | S |  | 0 | $5 \quad$. |
| 220 | Exess Cut, (15\% of Pipe LF) | \$3 |  | \$ 868 | 87 |  | 340 | 1,071 | 92 | \$ 288 | 83 | \$ 260 | 64 |  | 331 | \$ 1,042 | 74 |  | 75 | \$ 2337 | 143 |  |  | 77 |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ 509,764 | Total | \$ 161,425 | Total | \$ 628,709 | Total | \$ 169,921 | Total | \$ 152,929 | Total | \$ 118,945 | Total | \$ 611,717 | Total | \$ 135,937 | Total | \$ 139,335 | Total |  | 265,077 | Total | 142,734 |
| Water | elated litems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 301 | Granular Fill Over Water M ain (5\% of Trench Length) | \$25 | LF | \$ 1,875 | 24 | 594 | 93 | \$ 2,313 | 25 | \$ 625 | 23 | \$ 563 | 18 | 438 | 90 | 2,250 | 20 | 500 | 21 | \$ 513 | 39 | \$ | 975 | 21 | 525 |
| 302 | 12" Trench Undercut and Stone Refill for Water M ain ( $25 \%$ of TL) | \$12 | ${ }^{\text {LF }}$ | 4,487 | 119 | \$ 1,421 | 463 | \$ 5,534 | 125 | \$ 1,496 | 113 | \$ 1,346 | 88 | 1,047 | 450 | 5,385 | 100 | 1,97 | 103 | 1,226 | 195 | \$ | 2,333 | 105 | 1,256 |
| 303 | $16^{\prime \prime}$ Cl 350 O Water Main | 5220 | LF | \$ | 0 | 5. | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ | 0 | 5 . | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5. | 0 | \$ |  | 0 | \$ |
| 304 | $12^{\text {" C L } 350 \text { D W Water Main }}$ | 5200 | LF | 5 | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | 5 - | 0 | \$ | 0 | S | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ | O | \$ | 0 | \$ |  | 0 | 5 |
| 305 306 | ${ }^{10^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{Cl} 350 \mathrm{O} \text { Water Main }}$ | \$180 |  | \$ 240.000 | 475 | $\begin{array}{ll}\$ & - \\ \$ & 76,000\end{array}$ | ${ }_{18}{ }^{0}$ |  | 50 |  | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ |  | ${ }_{3} 0$ |  | 1.800 |  | 40 |  | 410 |  | ${ }_{780}$ | \$ |  | 420 | \$ 67.200 |
| 306 |  | \$160 | LF | \$ 240,000 | 475 | \$ 76,000 | 1,850 | \$ 296,000 | 500 | \$ 80,000 | 450 | \$ 72,000 | 350 | \$ 56,000 | 1,800 | \$ 288,000 | 400 | \$ 64,000 | 410 | ${ }^{\text {S }}$ \% 65,600 | 780 |  | 124,800 | 420 | \$ 67,200 |
| 307 |  | \$150 | LF | \$ 50,625 | 107 | \$ 16,031 | 416 | \$ 62,438 | 113 | \$ 16,875 | 101 | \$ ${ }^{\text {S }}$ [12,188 | 79 | \$ 11,813 | 405 | \$ 60,750 | 90 | \$ 13,500 | 92 | \$ 13,838 | 176 | \$ | 26,325 | 95 | \$ 14,175 |
| 308 |  | \$2,750 | EA | \$ 41,250 | 5 | \$ 13,063 | 19 | \$ 50,875 | 5 | \$ 13,750 | 5 | \$ 12,375 | 4 | \$ 9,625 | 18 | \$ 49,500 | 4 | \$ 11,000 | 4 | \$ 11,275 | 8 | S | 21,450 | 4 | \$ 11,550 |
| 309 | $12^{\prime \prime}$ to $16^{\prime \prime}$ Gate Vave and Box ( 4 ea.@ 400) | 56,000 | EA | 5 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 5 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| 310 | Hydrant Assembly Every 400) | \$8,000 | EA | \$ 30,000 | 1 | 9,500 | 5 | 37,000 | 1 | \$ 10,000 | 1 | 9,000 | 1 | 7,000 | 5 | \$ 36,000 | 1 | 8,000 | 1 | 8,200 | 2 | 5 |  | 1 | 8,400 |
| 311 | Dewatering (15\% of Water Main) | \$5 | LF | 1,125 | 71 | 356 | 278 | 1,388 | 75 | 375 | 68 | \$ 338 | 53 | 263 | 270 | \$ 1,350 | 60 | 300 | 62 | 308 | 117 | \$ | 585 | 63 | \$ 315 |
| 312 | Connect to Exising Water Main (2 Ea @ 400) | \$3,500 | EA | \$ 26,250 | 2 | 8,313 | 9 | \$ 32,375 | 3 | \$ 8,750 | 2 | \$ 7,875 |  | 6,125 | 9 | \$ 31,500 | 2 | \$ 7,000 | 2 | \$ 7,175 |  |  | 13,650 | 2 | \$ 7,350 |
| 313 | Lead Serice Line Replacement | \$16,000 | EA | \$ 400,000 | 15 | 240,000 | 37 | \$ 592,000 | 12 | \$ 192,000 | 10 | \$ 160,000 | 7 | \$ 112,000 | 40 | \$ 640,000 | 4 | 64,000 | 6 | \$ 96,000 | 13 |  | 208,000 | 5 | 80,000 |
| 314 | Utility Location Investigation (1 Ee. @ 1,000') | \$1,000 | EA | \$ 2,000 | 0 | \$ | 2 | \$ 2,000 | 1 | \$ 1,000 | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - | 2 | \$ 2,000 | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ - | 1 | \$ | 1,000 | 0 | \$ - |
| 315 | Rock or Boulder Excavation $12 \%$ of Total Water Cos | 2.0\% |  | \$ 15,952 |  | \$ 7,306 |  | $\$ \quad 21,638$ |  | \$ 6,497 |  | \$ $\quad 5,574$ |  | \$ 4,086 |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \$ \quad 22,335 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | [ 3 3,300 |  | \$ 4,083 |  |  |  |  | $\$ \quad 3,815$ |
|  |  |  |  | \$ 813,564 | Total | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \$ 372,583 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total | \$ 1,103,560 | Total | \$ 331,368 | Total | \$ 284,257 | Total | \$ 208,396 | Total | \$ 1,139,069 | Total | \$ 122,87 | Total | \$ 208,217 | Total |  | 423,013 | Total | \$ 194,587 |
| Total Construction Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General |  |  |  | \$ 99,250 |  | \$ 40,051 |  | \$ 129,920 |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \$ \quad 37,597 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | \$ 32,789 |  | \$ 24,551 |  | \$ 131,309 |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \$ \quad 23,162 \mid \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \$ \quad 26,066 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | \$ 25,299 |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 509,764$ $\$ 813,564$ |  | $\$ 161,425$ <br> $\$ 372,583$ |  | \$ 628,709 <br> $\$ 1,103,500$ |  | $\$$ 169,921 <br> $\$$ 331,368 <br>  5, |  | $\$$ 152,929 <br>  284,257 |  | $\$$ 118,945 <br> $\$$ 208,396 |  | [ 611,717 |  | $\$$ 135,937 <br> $\$$ 172,887 |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \$ & 139,335 \\ \hline \$ & 208,217 \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 265,077 \\ \hline 423,013 \end{array}$ |  | \$ <br> $\mathbf{1 4 2 , 7 3 4}$ <br> 5049587 |
| Total |  |  |  | \$ $1,422,600$ |  | \$ 574,100 |  | \$ $\$ 1,862,200$ |  | \$ 538,900 |  | \$ 4770,000 |  | \$ ${ }^{\text {S }}$ 351,900 |  | \$ $\$ 1,882,100$ |  |  |  | \$ 378,700 |  | \$ | 739,700 |  | \$ ${ }^{\text {S }}$ |


| City of Escanaba 2023 DWSRF Project Plan Costing Priorities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | V22 |  | V23 |  |  |  | Additional ISTR |  |
|  |  |  |  | Buck ln Loop |  | N 30 th 5 St (Danforth R R to toCollege Ave) |  | Us2 Coridor |  | Additional LSRs |  |
| Item | Description | Price | Unit | No. of Units | Cost | No. of Units | cost | No. of Units | cost | No. of Units | cost |
| General |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101 | Mobilization, General Conditions, Bonds \& | 5\% |  |  | 126,524 |  | 53,379 |  | 256,148 |  | 360,00 |
| 102 | Environmental Mitigation, Traffic Control, Etc. (2.5\% of Total Construction Cost) | 2.5\% |  |  | \$ 63,262 |  | \$ 26,690 |  | \$ 128,074 |  | 180,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total | 189,785 | Total | 80,069 | Total | \$ 384,222 | Total | 54,000 |
| Restoration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 201 | [3" 7 Type ' $E$ ' HMA Pavement Replacement (Full Width of $24^{\prime} \mathrm{w}$, Except Eli Ave $40^{\prime} \mathrm{w}$ ) | \$27 | SY | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ . |
| 202 | 12" Gravel Basei in Type 'EP Pavement Areas Full Width of $24^{\prime} \mathrm{w}$ Except EII Ave $40^{\prime} \mathrm{w}$ ) | \$27 | sr | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . |
| 203 | $3^{3}$ "Type ' $A$ 'HAL RA Pavement Reppacement (Half Width-Trench Only) | \$42 | LF | 4,533 | \$ 190,365 | 2,940 | \$ 123,480 | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . |
| 204 |  width-Trench Only) | \$15 | LF | 4,533 | \$ 67,988 | 2,940 | \$ 44,100 | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ |
| 205 |  | \$79 | LF | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ |
| 206 | $12^{\prime \prime}$ Gravel Base in Type 18 ' Pavement Areas (Trench Only) | \$17 | LF | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ |
| 207 | $12^{12}$ Gravel Surface Replaement (15' ${ }^{\text {W }}$ ) | \$30 | 5 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ |
| 208 | Pavement Marking | \$1 | LF | 4,533 | \$ 4,533 | 2,940 | \$ 2,940 | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ |
| 209 | Curb and Gutter Replacement (both sides) | \$25 | LF | 9,065 | \$ 226,625 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 0 |  |
| 210 | Curb and Gutter Removal (both sides) | 58 | LF | 9,065 | \$ 72,520 | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ |
| 211 | Pipe \& 2-36" Catch Basins with $30^{\prime}$ Lead every ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | \$20,500 | EA | 11 | \$ 233,291 | 7 | \$ 150,675 | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ . |
| 212 | $6^{\prime \prime}$ Concrete Driveway Replacement (every 800', 105y) | \$60 | $5{ }^{\text {S }}$ | 57 | \$ 3,399 | 0 |  | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ . |
| 213 | $3^{3 \prime}$ Bituminous Driveway Replacement (every $300^{\prime}$, <br> 105y) | \$45 | 5 | 151 | \$ 6,799 | 98 | 4,410 | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ |
| 214 | $4^{\text {che concrete Sidewalk }\left(5^{\prime} \mathrm{w}\right)}$ | 98 | SF | 45,325 | \$ 362,600 | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ |
| 215 | ${ }^{6 "}$ Concrete sidewalk at Drive Crossings (every $200^{\prime}$ @ $5^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}$ | \$12 | SF | 1,700 | \$ 20,396 | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ |
| 216 | 6" Concrete ADA Ramps w/ Iron Warning Plate (every 400' @100sf) | \$20 | SF | 1,133 | \$ 22,663 | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ |
| 217 | Adjust Existing Casting before Final Paving (2 ea @ 400') | \$390 | EA | 23 | \$ 8.838 | 15 | 5,733 | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ . |
| 218 | Miscellaneous Topsoil, Seed \& Mulch / Sod Restoration | \$8 | LF | 4,533 | \$ 36,260 | 2,940 | \$ 23,520 | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ |
| 220 | Gravel Shoulder Replacement (6"d $6^{2}$ ' W) | \$5 | LF | 0 | \$ - | 2,940 | \$ 14,700 | 0 | \$ | 0 | 5 |
|  | Exeess cut, (15\%\% of Pipe LF) | \$3 | LF | 680 | \$ 2,142 | 441 | 1,389 | 0 | 5 . | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total | \$ $1,257,417$ | Total | \$ 370,947 | Total | \$ . | Total | \$ |
| Water Related ltems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 301 | Granular Fill Over Water Main (5\% of Trench Lenoth) | \$25 | ${ }^{\text {LF }}$ | 185 | \$ 4,625 | 120 | \$ 3,000 | 685 | \$ 17,125 | 0 | \$ |
| 302 | 12" Trench Undercut and Stone Refill for Water Main ( $25 \%$ of TL) | \$12 | LF | 925 | \$ 11,068 | 600 | \$ 7,179 | 3,425 | \$ 40,983 | 0 | \$ |
| 303 | $16^{\prime \prime}$ cl 350 D Water Main | \$220 | LF | 0 | \$ |  | \$ . | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ |
| 304 | $12^{\prime \prime}$ C L 350 D Water Main | 5200 | LF | 3,700 | \$ 740,000 | 0 |  | 1,700 | \$ 340,000 | 0 | \$ |
| 305 | $10^{\text {c C C } 350 \mathrm{Ol} \text { Water Main }}$ | 5180 | LF | 0 |  | 2,400 | \$ 432,000 | 2,000 | \$ 360,000 | 0 | \$ . |
| 306 | $8^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{CL} 350 \mathrm{DI}$ Water M M | \$160 | LF | 0 | \$ . | 0 | \$ | 10,000 | \$ 1,600,000 | 0 | \$ |
| 307 | $6^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{CL} 350$ DI Water M ain (30' Hydrant Leads \& Connection to Existing Main) | \$150 | LF | 833 | \$ 124,875 | 540 | \$ 81,000 | 3,083 | \$ 462,375 | 0 | \$ . |
| 308 |  | \$2,750 | EA | 0 | \$ | 24 | \$ 66,000 | 120 | \$ 330,000 |  | \$ |
| 309 | $12^{\prime \prime}$ to $16^{\prime \prime}$ Gate Valve and Box ( 4 ea.@ 400) | 56,000 | EA | 37 | \$ 222,000 | 0 | 5. | 17 | \$ 102,000 |  | \$ |
| 310 | Hydrant Assembly Every 400') | \$8,000 | EA | 9 | \$ 74,000 | 6 | \$ 48,000 | 34 | \$ 274,000 |  | \$ . |
| 311 | Dewatering (15\% of Water Main) | \$5 | LF | 555 | \$ 2,775 | 360 | \$ 1,800 | 2,055 | \$ 10,275 | - | \$ |
| 312 | Connecto E Existing Water Main (2 Ea @ 400) | \$3,500 | EA | 19 | \$ 64,750 | 12 | \$ 42,000 | 69 | \$ 239,750 | 0 | 5 - |
| 313 | Lead Serice Line Replacement | \$16,000 | EA | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 77 | \$ 1,232,000 | 450 | \$ 7,200,000 |
| 314 | Utility Location Investigation (1 Ea.@ 1,000) | \$1,000 | EA | 4 | 4,000 | 2 | \$ 2,000 | 14 | \$ 14,000 | 0 | \$ |
| 315 | Rock or Boulder Excavation (2\% of Total Water Co | 2.0\% |  |  | \$ 24,962 |  | \$ 13,660 |  | \$ 100,450 |  | \$ |
|  |  |  |  | Total | \$ 1,273,055 | Total | \$ 696,639 | Total | \$ 5,122,958 | Total | \$ 7,200,000 |
| Total Construction Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General |  |  |  |  | \$ 189,785 |  | \$ 80,069 |  | \$ 384,222 |  | \$ 540,000 |
| Restoration |  |  |  |  | \$ 1,257,477 |  | \$ 300,997 |  | \$ |  | \$ |
| Water |  |  |  |  | \$ 1,273,055 |  | \$ 699,639 |  | \$ 5,122,958 |  | \$ 7,200,000 <br> 7770000 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | \$ 2,720,300 |  | \$ 1,147,700 |  | \$ 5,507,200 |  | \$ 7,740,000 |

## Appendix A

## Part 2: Lead Service Line Replacement Cost Estimates - 2022 Bid Summary



## Appendix A

## Part 3: Operating Budget

## CITY OF ESCANABA, MICHIGAN

Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Fund Net Position
Proprietary Funds
For the Year Ended June 30, 2022

| Operating revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Charges for services | \$ | 14,600,423 | \$ | 3,351,190 | \$ | 4,554,870 |
| Provisions for self-insurance |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Other revenue |  | 98,260 |  | 18,922 |  | 20,409 |
| Total operating revenues |  | 14,698,683 |  | 3,370,112 |  | 4,575,279 |
| Operating expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Production |  | 9,462,706 |  | - |  | - |
| Personnel services |  | 877,666 |  | 804,285 |  | 732,339 |
| Overhead |  | 1,028,664 |  | 230,156 |  | 240,911 |
| Fuel |  |  |  | 1,084 |  | 1,849 |
| Contracted services |  | 118,411 |  | 135,942 |  | 270,532 |
| Insurance |  | 264,470 |  | 86,825 |  | 42,658 |
| Dues and training |  | 120,948 |  | 3,575 |  | 9,635 |
| Sales and promotion |  | 223,856 |  | 785 |  | 6,270 |
| Repairs and maintenance |  | 59,187 |  | 76,056 |  | 385,546 |
| Claims |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment rental |  | 7,402 |  | 33,117 |  | 32,540 |
| Depreciation/amortization |  | 758,783 |  | 298,837 |  | 527,961 |
| Supplies |  | 18,156 |  | 100,460 |  | 184,776 |
| Bad debt |  | 3,177 |  | 724 |  | 992 |
| Other |  | 61,347 |  | 5,013 |  | 14,018 |
| Total operating expenses |  | 13,004,773 |  | 1,776,859 |  | 2,450,027 |
| Operating income (loss) |  | 1,693,910 |  | 1,593,253 |  | 2,125,252 |
| Nonoperating revenues (expenses) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gain (loss) on sale of capital assets |  | (13) |  | - |  | - |
| Investment loss |  | $(476,048)$ |  | $(29,925)$ |  | $(163,795)$ |
| Interest expense |  | - |  | $(184,240)$ |  | $(61,617)$ |
| Total nonoperating revenues (expenses) |  | $(476,061)$ |  | $(214,165)$ |  | $(225,412)$ |
| Income (loss) before capital contributions \& transfers |  | 1,217,849 |  | 1,379,088 |  | 1,899,840 |
| Capital contributions |  | - |  | - |  | 670,867 |
| Income (loss) before transfers |  | 1,217,849 |  | 1,379,088 |  | 2,570,707 |
| Transfers in |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Transfers out |  | $(765,790)$ |  | - |  | - |
| Change in net position |  | 452,059 |  | 1,379,088 |  | 2,570,707 |
| Net position, beginning of year |  | 18,518,774 |  | 7,868,377 |  | 11,483,766 |
| Net position, end of year | \$ | 18,970,833 | \$ | 9,247,465 | \$ | 14,054,473 |

## Appendix A

## Part 4: Bond Schedule



## APPENDIXB

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

## Appendix B

## Part 1: Overburdened Community Form

## MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT, GREAT LAKES, AND ENERGY

## OVERBURDENED AND SIGNIFICANTLY OVERBURDENED COMMUNITY STATUS DETERMINATION WORKSHEET

The following data is required from each State Revolving Fund (SRF) applicant requesting a determination for overburdened and significantly overburdened community status.

The most recent census and tax data are available in a searchable table on EGLE's State Revolving Fund - Overburdened Community Definition and Scoring Criteria Development webpage along with an excel worksheet to help determine blended Median Annual Household Income (MAHI) and blended taxable value per capita for regional systems. The MAHI and taxable value per capita table will be used to make all FY24 determinations. Applicants are encouraged to visit this page prior to completing this form to see if they qualify based on MAHI (blended MAHI if applicable) or taxable value per capita (blended taxable value per capita if applicable) alone. If so, they only need to fill out lines 1 and 2 of this form, electronically sign it on page 2, and submit.

Alternately, if the applicant's MAHI or blended MAHI is above the state average - $\$ 63,498$ for FY24 - they cannot be determined as being overburdened or significantly overburdened for FY24 funding and should not complete or turn in this form.

For applicants whose MAHI or blended MAHI is below $\$ 63,498$ but do not automatically qualify based on MAHI or taxable value per capita alone, please complete the entire form and return to:

Mark Conradi
conradim@michigan.gov

## Name of Applicant

City of Escanába
Please check the box indicating which funding source this determination is for:
DWSRF


CWSRF $\square$

1. Is this a regional system? A regional system refers to any system that serves more than one municipality (cities, townships, and/or villages)

Yes
No


If yes, refer to the instructions at the end of this form to complete calculations for a blended MAHI and blended taxable value per capita. Additionally, page 3 of this form will also need to be completed.
2. Median Annual Household Income from table on the overburdened webpage (blended if applicable)
\$36,902
3. Taxable Value Per Capita from table on the overburdened webpage (blended if applicable) \$25,551
4. Total amount of anticipated debt for the proposed project (amount of loan requested for FY24 loan)
\$19,850,000
5. Annual payments on the existing debt for the system
$\$ 475,000$ - Does not include debt for SRF projects in progress
6. Total operation, maintenance, and replacement expenses (OM\&R) for the system on an annual basis
\$1,922,066
7. Number of residential equivalent users (REUs) in the system

8,141

* (James MeNe: ( ) hereby certify that the information in this form is complete, true, and correct to the best of my knowledge.


For determinations made using anticipated debt, a final determination will be made based upon the awarded loan amount and not the anticipated amount provided on this form.

## Regional System Breakdown (If applicable)

Name of municipality Percentage of flow
City of Escanaba 98.04\%

Name of municipality
Wells Township
Name of municipality
Percentage of flow
1.96\%

Percentage of flow

Name of municipality
Percentage of flow

Name of municipality
Percentage of flow

Name of municipality
Percentage of flow

Name of municipality

Name of municipality
Percentage of flow

Name of municipality
Percentage of flow

Name of municipality
Percentage of flow

Name of municipality
Percentage of flow

Percentage of flow

Name of municipality
Percentage of flow

Name of municipality
Percentage of flow

Name of municipality

Name of municipality
Percentage of flow

Percentage of flow

If more spaces are needed, please include them in the email along with this submission. Percentages of flow must add up to $100 \%$.
Michigan.gov/EGLE

## OVERBURDENED AND SIGNIFICANTLY OVERBURDENED COMMUNITY STATUS INSTRUCTIONS AND GUIDANCE

The following instructions provide guidance to fill out the overburdened and significantly overburdened determination community status worksheet. Systems across the state use many types of methods for billing and some include items that others do not. The purpose of the determination is to put all systems on a level playing field by breaking down system debt, expenses, and number of customers in the same manner. The instructions address each question in the order they are presented on the worksheet.

## 1. Regional systems (if applicable) - Blended MAHI and taxable value per capita calculations

The definition of overburdened and significantly overburdened communities first requires "(a) Users within the area served by a proposed drinking water project, sewage treatment works project, or stormwater treatment project are directly assessed for the costs of construction." That means that the calculations need to be based on who is paying for the proposed SRF loan.

For systems that serve more than one municipal entity a blended MAHI and taxable value per capita calculation must be completed. Page 3 of the worksheet includes spaces for a system to list all the municipalities (cities, townships, and/or villages) and the percentage of flow they provide to the system. The flow percentages should be based on the most recent data available.

The reason flow is used is because most systems add debt costs to customers' bills and those are determined by flow. In rare cases there might be municipal agreements that vary slightly from this method and those will require the applicant to contact EGLE and provide the data separate from this worksheet. EGLE will take each municipality's MAHI and taxable value per capita and multiply it by the percentage of flow and then add them all together to come up with the blended number to be used in the determination (e.g., (municipality A MAHI * flow) + (municipality B MAHI * flow) + (municipality C MAHI * flow = Blended MAHI for the system)). The same formula will be repeated swapping out taxable value per capita for MAHI to determine a blended taxable value per capita.

The most recent census and tax data are available in a searchable table on EGLE's State Revolving Fund - Overburdened Community Definition and Scoring Criteria Development webpage. This table will be used to make all FY24 determinations. Use the excel FY24 Overburdened Calculation Template also located on the State Revolving Fund - Overburdened Community Definition and Scoring Criteria Development webpage. Tab 1 titled, "Blended MAHI and TVPC calcs" will allow the applicant to input the names of the municipalities, their percentage of flow, the MAHI for each found in the table listed above, and the taxable value per capita for each in the table listed above, to calculate a blended MAHI and blended taxable value per capita of the regional system. If the blended MAHI is above $\$ 63,498$ the project cannot qualify for overburdened or significantly overburdened status and the rest of the form should not be filled out or turned in.

## 2. Median Annual Household Income

Use the "Fiscal Year 2024 Overburdened Median Annual Household Income (MAHI) and Taxable Values List for SRF Projects; the State of Michigan MAHI is $\$ 63,498$ for FY24 Projects" searchable table located on the State Revolving Fund - Overburdened Community Definition and Scoring Criteria Development webpage. Search for the system's MAHI and enter it. If the

MAHI is above $\$ 63,498$ the project cannot qualify for overburdened or significantly overburdened status and the rest of the form should not be filled out or turned in.

For regional systems that serve more than on municipality (cities, townships, and/or villages), refer to the instructions for regional systems in step 1 if you have not already completed calculating a blended MAHI for the system. Once the blended MAHI is determined, enter it on line 2 of the worksheet.

## 3. Taxable Value Per Capita

This data is found in the same location as the MAHI data and was likely already entered by the applicant while completing line 2. If not, repeat the directions for step 2 and enter the taxable value per capita from the table.

For regional systems that serve more than on municipality (cities, townships, and/or villages), refer to the instructions for regional systems in step 1 if you have not already completed calculating a blended taxable value per capita for the system. Once the blended taxable value per capita is determined, enter it on line 3 of the worksheet.

## 4. Total amount of anticipated debt for the proposed project

Fill in the total amount of the proposed loan for the project requesting State Revolving Loan financing in FY24.

EGLE will amortize this amount to determine a yearly cost to the applicant. The excel FY24 Overburdened Calculation Template, also located on the State Revolving Fund - Overburdened Community Definition and Scoring Criteria Development webpage, has this calculation built in so the applicant only needs to enter full FY24 the loan amount when completing that as well.

Note that this loan amount is an estimate and often changes after project plans are submitted and bids come in. EGLE will run this determination again prior to finalizing the Project Priority List (PPL). Changes in the loan amount can sometimes change an applicant's status from overburdened to not or vice versa if the initial calculation is close to the $1 \%$ MAHI threshold.

Thus, if a system is determined to be overburdened or not based on annual user costs being greater than $1 \%$ of system's MAHI vs being determined overburdened by MAHI or state taxable value per capita alone, a loan amount will be provided to the applicant that provides the cutoff loan value to either gain or lose overburdened status.

## 5. Annual Payments on the existing debt of the system

Fill in the yearly total of any current debt payments for the system. If coming in for a CWSRF project only include debt payments for the wastewater system and if coming in for a DWSRF project only include debt payments for the drinking water system.

In a regional system the additional debt payments of connected systems may be added if the connected systems are included in the blended MAHI and taxable value per capita calculations and there is no double-counting. For example, if a regional treatment system is coming in for the loan, a connected collection system could add any additional annual debt costs that the
collection system passes onto its customers after paying all debt and expenses to the regional treatment system. This is to account for the fact that the MAHI and state taxable values are being blended so the annual debt payments of the regional system can be blended as well to determine the average user cost of the regional system.

## 6. Total operation, maintenance, and replacement (OM\&R) expenses for the system on an annual basis

As with the annul debt payments, the amount listed here should include only wastewater OM\&R for CWSRF loans and only drinking water OM\&R for DWSRF loans. If the accounting is combined split the costs as accurately as possible.

The OM\&R costs should reflect all annual expenses for the system that are recovered annually through rates. This means that if a community makes an annual contribution of $\$ 50,000$ a year to a capital improvement fund, they could add that number to the yearly $O M \& R$ costs. If they have accumulated $\$ 250,000$ in that account and plan on using all in the calendar year they are applying for the loan, they cannot claim that amount as it is not a yearly expense; only the $\$ 50,000$ is. This is also true for depreciation expenses with no cash value or yearly contribution. They cannot be included.

In a regional system the additional OM\&R expenses of connected systems may be added if the connected systems are included in the blended MAHI and taxable value per capita calculations, there is no double-counting, and the expenses follow the same OM\&R rules listed above. For example, if a regional treatment system is coming in for the loan, a connected collection system could add any additional annual OM\&R costs that the collection system passes onto its customers after paying all debt and expenses to the regional treatment system. This is to account for the fact that the MAHI and state taxable values are being blended so the annual OM\&R expenses of the regional system can be blended as well to determine the average user cost of the regional system.

## 7. Number of residential equivalent users (REUs) in the system

REUs refer to number of standard household hookups in a system. In a bedroom community, with little to no commercial or industrial customers, this number clear. However, most systems have a combination of customer types. The purpose of this form is to determine the average bill for a typical residential customer to determine if it is high enough to pose a burden on the ratepayer.

There are two standard ways of determining REUs: meter size and average flow.

## - Meter size

This is the preferred method as it eliminates most variables that using flow may have. To determine the number of REUs in a system take all the systems' meters and convert them down to $5 / 8^{\text {ths }}$-inch or $3 / 4$-inch (whichever is the system's standard residential size). Use the capacity of the pipe to convert down (e.g., a 2-inch meter would be equivalent to about 8 , $5 / 8^{\text {ths }}$-inch meters, a 4 -inch meter would be equivalent to about $25,5 / 8^{\text {ths }}$-inch meters, etc.). The resulting number of equivalent $5 / 8^{\text {ths }}$-inch or $3 / 4$-inch meters would be the number of REUs in the system.

- Average flow

The average flow method requires the system to determine the average yearly flow for a typical residential household (i.e., a $5 / 8^{\text {ths }}$-inch or $3 / 4$-inch connection). The system takes the most recent yearly flow data of the entire system and divides by the average household usage number to come up with the number of REUs.

EGLE will look at the numbers provided and may have questions based on the population size vs number of REUs. EGLE will reach out and ask to see the calculations in some instances. Applicants are encouraged to include an excel sheet with these calculations along with the submittal of this form to reduce any back-and-forth communications.

## Signature

A typed name and accompanying electronic signature are required for the form to be accepted. If this section is left blank the form will be returned to the sender and not reviewed until it has been signed and sent back.

## Final Determination

If the system's MAHI or blended MAHI (if applicable) is over the state average - $\$ 63,498$ for FY24 - it cannot be determined as being overburdened or significantly overburdened for FY24 funding.

EGLE will take the information provided on this form and enter it into the FY24 Overburdened Calculation Template spreadsheet to calculate the average yearly cost per REU. If a community or system is not determined to be overburdened or significantly overburdened based on MAHI or taxable value per capita alone, this calculation will determine if the costs are greater than $1 \%$ of the system's MAHI.

The FY24 Overburdened Calculation Template spreadsheet with the calculations and final determination will be sent to the applicant after the review has been completed by EGLE. A blank version is available on the State Revolving Fund - Overburdened Community Definition and Scoring Criteria Development webpage. Ideally the applicant has already completed the calculations using the instructions above prior to submitting. If the applicant completes the worksheet and determines they do not qualify for overburdened status it is requested that they do not submit the completed worksheet unless they have questions. The applicant's preliminary findings using the FY24 Overburdened Calculation Template are not official until they have been reviewed by EGLE as discrepancies and/or questions about some of the numbers may arise. However, EGLE is providing the template to allow applicants to have a good idea of how the determination will result prior to hearing back officially from EGLE.

Please contact Mark Conradi (conradim@michigan.gov) with any questions on the completion of the form.

If you need this information in an alternate format, contact EGLE-Accessibility@Michigan.gov or call 800-662-9278.
EGLE does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, religion, age, national origin, color, marital status, disability, political beliefs, height, weight, genetic information, or sexual orientation in the administration of any of its programs or activities, and prohibits intimidation and retaliation, as required by applicable laws and regulations. Questions or concerns should be directed to the Nondiscrimination Compliance Coordinator at EGLENondiscriminationCC@Michigan.gov or 517-249-0906.
This form and its contents are subject to the Freedom of Information Act and may be released to the public.

|  | Regionalsy | stems Blended | MAH and TVPGeqalc | ations |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Name of Municipality | Percentage of Fiow (Total must $=100$ ) | Traxable Vảlúé Per Capita (TVPC) | Household Income (MAHI) | TVPC Percentage (automatically calculated) | MAHI Rèrcentage (Automatically calculated) |
| City of Escanaba | 98.04\% | \$25,387 | \$36,173 | \$24,889 | \$35,464 |
| Wells Township | 1.96\% | \$33,731 | \$73,385 | \$661 | \$1,438 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0, |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 |
| $\text { Total }{ }_{\text {irat }} \text {. }$ | - |  |  | Wex. Blended TVPC |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



| 52. We Overburdened and Significantly Overburdened Calculation Worksheet |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. Median Annual Household Income (blended if necessary) $\square$ |  |  |  |
| 3. Taxable Value Per Capita (blended if necessary) | E |  |  |
| 4. Amount of anicipated debt - FY24 SRF Ioan only $\square$ |  |  |  |
| Terms | 20 |  |  |
| Rate | 2.75\% |  |  |
| New Annual debt from SRF loan | \$1,303,584 |  |  |
| 5. Annual Payments on existing debt 5 |  |  |  |
| 6. Total OM\&R | 53. 51922066 |  |  |
| 7. Number of REUs |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost | \$3,700,650 |  |  |
| Annual User Cost | \$455 |  |  |
| MAHI Threshold \$ amount | \$369 |  | Restutis |
| 125\% of Federa! Poverty MAHI | \$37,500 | Significantly Overburdened | F"YES |
| Lowest 10\% TVPC | \$15,170 | Significantly Overburdened | N0) |
| Lowest 20\% TVPC | \$22,920 | Overburdened without calculation needed | NCO |
| Michigan MAHI | \$63,498 | Overburdened with calculation | YES ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ \% |

## Appendix B

## Part 2: Water Main Replacement List

| Priority | Label | Install Year | Material | Sre | length (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Priority 1 | W1 | 1/1/1968 | CAS | 12" | 79 |
| Priority 1 | W1 | 1/1/1968 | CAS | 12" | 26 |
| Priority 1 | W1 | 1/1/1968 | CAS | 12" | 32 |
| Priority 1 | W1 | 1/1/1968 | CAS | 12" | 249 |
| Priority 1 | W2 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | 4" | 279 |
| Priority 1 | W3 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | 4" | 468 |
| Priority 1 | W5 | 1/1/1880 | DIP | 8" | 205 |
| Priority 1 | W5 | 1/1/1974 | DIP | $8{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 186 |
| Priority 1 | W6 | 1/1/1956 | CAS | 8" | 381 |
| Priority 1 | W8 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | 4" | 56 |
| Priority 1 | W8 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | $6{ }^{1}$ | 391 |
| Priority 1 | W9 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | $4{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 448 |
| Priority 1 | W12 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | 4" | 396 |
| Priority 1 | W13 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | 8" | 375 |
| Priority 1 | W13 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | 8" | 383 |
| Priority 1 | W13 | 1/1/1960 | CAS | 8" | 56 |
| Priority 1 | W13 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | $6{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 382 |
| Priority 1 | W13 | 1/1/1960 | CAS | 8" | 175 |
| Priority 1 | W13 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | $6{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 462 |
| Priority 1 | W15 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | $6{ }^{1}$ | 81 |
| Priority 1 | W15 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | $6{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 324 |
| Priority 1 | W16 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | $6{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 343 |
| Priority 1 | W19 | NEW LOOP | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Priority 1 | W20 | NEW LOOP | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Priority 1 | W21 | NEW LOOP | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Priority 2 | V4 | 1/1/1967 | CAS | 4" | 48 |
| Priority 2 | V4 | 1/1/1967 | CAS | 4" | 169 |
| Priority 2 | V4 | 1/1/1967 | CAS | 4" | 192 |
| Priority 2 | V4 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | 4" | 376 |
| Priority 2 | V4 | 1/1/1958 | CAS | 4" | 81 |
| Priority 2 | V7 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | 4" | 55 |
| Priority 2 | V7 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | $4{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 434 |
| Priority 2 | V10 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | 4" | 562 |
| Priority 2 | V10 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | 4" | 397 |
| Priority 2 | V11 | 1/1/1960 | CAS | $4{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 994 |
| Priority 2 | V11 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | 4" | 57 |
| Priority 2 | V11 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | 4" | 163 |
| Priority 2 | V11 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | 4" | 226 |
| Priority 2 | V14 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | $6{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 453 |
| Priority 2 | V22 | NEW LOOP | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Priority 2 | V17 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | $4{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 1148 |
| Priority 2 | V17 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | 4" | 241 |
| Priority 2 | V17 | 1/1/1880 | CAS | 4" | 381 |
| Priority 2 | V18 | 1/1/1960 | CAS | $6{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 389 |
| Priority2 | V23 | NEW LOOP | N/A | N/A | N/A |

## Appendix B

## Part 3: Approval of Source Water Protection Plan

State of Michigan

## LANSING

RICK SNYDER GOVERNOR

May 9, 2011

Mr. James O'Toole
City of Escanaba
410 Ludington Street
Escanaba, Michigan 49829
Dear Mr. O'Toole:
Congratulations! The City of Escanaba Surface Water Intake Protection Plan is approved.

We commend you on your efforts and encourage you to keep the program viable by updating it as changes occur within the intake protection area. If you have any questions or need assistance implementing the program, please contact Mr. Jason Berndt, Environmental Quality Analyst, Drinking Water and Environmental Health Section, Resource Management Division, at 517-241-4796; or Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), P.O. Box 30241, Lansing, Michigan 48909-77741, and he would be happy to assist you.

Again, congratulations on the approval of your program.
Sincerely,


Carrie Monosmith, Chief
Drinking Water and Environmental Health Section
Resource Management Division
517-241-2853
cc: Mr. Donald French, City of Escanaba
Mr. Paul Seegert, Michigan Rural Water Association
Mr. Richard Benzie, P.E., DEQ
Mr. Scott Swenor, P.E., DEQ
Mr. Wayne Kukuk, DEQ

## APPENDIX C

## Environmental Information and Correspondence

## Appendix C

## Part 0: Typical Submittal Package

# PROJECT SUMMARY 

For Environmental Reviews

# CITY OF ECANABA, MICHIGAN WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS (DWRF PROJECT PLAN) 

March 2020

## Administrative

The City of Escanaba, Michigan has contracted with C2AE Engineers of Escanaba to prepare an EGLE DWRF Program Project Plan. The purpose of the Project Plan is to evaluate needs and recommend alternatives for improvements to the Escanaba Water Distribution System.

## Project Planning Area

Project planning concentrates on the existing Escanaba water distribution system within the City limits (township, range, and section: $38 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 06,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 01,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 02,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 07$, 39N $22 \mathrm{~W} 18,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 19,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 29$, 39 N 22 W 30 , 39 N 22 W 31 , 39 N 22 W 32 , 39 N 23 W $12,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 13,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 14,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 24,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 25$, and 39 N 23 W 36 ). The City is located in Delta County near the south end of Michigan's Upper Peninsula.

## Existing Facilities

The City of Escanaba's water system is sourced from Lake Michigan and is treated at the Cityowned 8.0 MGD Water Treatment Plant. The City also owns a 1,000,000 gallon concrete storage tank, two 500,000 gallon elevated storage tanks, and 100 miles of 4-to-16 inch distribution main. The service area includes a small portion of users in Wells Township.

The City has owned and operated the municipal system since its inception in the 1870s. The present Water Treatment Plant was constructed and upgraded over years with major projects in 1950, 1972, 1996, 2002, 2008, and 2010. Much of the City's distribution system dates back to the original construction in the early 1880s.

## Need for the Project

Reliable operation of water distribution lines within the City of Escanaba's utility systems are imperative to protect the health and safety of the City's citizens and visitors. Deficient water mains can waste treated water and permit contamination of treated drinking water. Unplanned failures and downtime during repairs affects the ability of the distribution system to safely and adequately serve the system users. Traditional lead and galvanized components may expose users to unsafe levels of exposure.

The original water pipes and structures are at least 140 years old. Pipe and joint materials are not up to modern standards. Leaking joints, structural problems, and capacity issues require increasing operation, maintenance, and repair expenditures.

The circumstances unique to this DWRF application are because the State of Michigan recently changed its lead and copper drinking water rules to require water service material identification and
possible replacement. The City must afford replacement costs for lead impacted service lines on privately owned property.

## Alternatives Considered

Cost effectiveness of treatment and distribution alternatives has been an ongoing evaluation. Based on the cost effectiveness analysis and long term desires of the City, this DWRF application will be focused on improvements to the existing water distribution system and replacements of service lines.

- No Action - continued use of existing system as is, in violation of Lead and Copper Rule
- Optimize Performance of Existing Facilities - Minimize new construction with direct replacement of distribution lines and services, maintaining current water source.


## Recommended Alternative

The current recommended alternative, pending environmental and other evaluations, is to upgrade the existing water distribution system, including individual service lines. Water main replacement is cost effective, and replacement of lead impacted galvanized service leads is required by law. This includes the following improvements:

- Replacement of lead and galvanized service lines
- Replacement of undersized water main, pipes, and valves


## Anticipated Schedule

The initial project is scheduled for submission of a EGLE Project Plan in 2020 with construction in 2021 through 2025.


Figure 1: Location Map


## Appendix C

## Part 1: Air Quality

March 20, 2020

Ed Lancaster, Air Quality Division
1504 W. Washington Street
Marquette, MI 49855

Re: City of Escanaba, Michigan
Delta County
Water Distribution System Improvements
To Evaluate Needs and Recommend Alternatives for Improvements
Environmental Review and Evaluation

Dear Mr. Lancaster,

On behalf of the City of Escanaba, Delta County, we are requesting review and comment of plans for improvements to their existing water distribution system.

The City of Escanaba is preparing an EGLE DWRF Program Project Plan to evaluate needs and recommended alternatives for improvements to the water distribution system. The project location spans across the following townships, ranges, and sections: $38 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 06,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 01,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 02,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 07,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 18,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 19,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 29,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W}$ $30,39 N 22 W 31,39 N 22 W 32,39 N 23 W 12,39 N 23 W 13,39 N 23 W 14,39 N 23 W 24,39 N 23 W 25$, and $39 N 23 W 36$.

We have enclosed a Project Summary and Location Maps. We are requesting your review and comment. Comments received within 30 days will allow them to be incorporated into the project plan prior to the preparation of the final DWRF Project Plan.

Comments can be mailed to our Escanaba office or emailed to ashley.hendricks@c2ae.com.

Sincerely,
C2AE



Ashley N. Hendricks, E.I.T.

Enclosure
cc: 20-0023 File B-10

From:
Sent:
To:
Cc:
Subject:

Lancaster, Edward (EGLE) [LANCASTERE1@michigan.gov](mailto:LANCASTERE1@michigan.gov)
Tuesday, April 7, 2020 3:55 PM
Hendricks, Ashley
Bruestle, Sydney (EGLE)
Escanaba water distribution system

Ashley,
Thanks for the opportunity to review the plans for the City of Escanaba's improvement to their existing waster distribution system.

Based on the description in your letter, dated March 20, 2020, the main source of concern from an air quality perspective would be any fugitive dust that may be produced during construction activities. Fugitive dust emissions are regulated, in part, by the State of Michigan Air Pollution Control Rule 901, which reads as follows:

Rule 901 Air contaminant or water vapor, when prohibited.
Notwithstanding the provisions of any other commission rule, a person shall not cause or permit the emission of an air contaminant or water vapor in quantities that cause, alone or in reaction with other contaminants, either of the following:
a) Injurious effects to human health or safety, animal life, plant life of significant economic value, or property.
b) Unreasonable interference with the comfortable enjoyment of life and property.

The use of water or other dust suppressants may be required to control fugitive dust on the work site and prevent violations of Rule 901.

In addition, if applicable, the demolition of a regulated structure is also subject to the asbestos NESHAP National Emission Standards for Asbestos Air Pollution Control Rule 942. A thorough inspection for asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) must be conducted and all friable materials must be properly removed and landfilled prior to starting demolition activities. If ACMs in amounts greater than the threshold amounts are removed, a Notification of Intent to Renovate/Demolish must be submitted for the renovation activities. Even if no ACMs are found, a Notification of Intent to Renovate/Demolish must be submitted for the demolition activities.

Please feel free to contact me, if you have any questions.
Sincerely,
Ed Lancaster
District Supervisor
Air Quality Division/Marquette District Office
Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy
906-250-5124
Lancastere1@michigan.gov

## 1. Air Quality

The MDEQ was contacted to review and comment on the potential direct or indirect air pollutant emissions impact that would result from the construction or operation of the proposed project. Fugitive dust emissions on the worksite are a potential during construction. If this would become an issue, dust suppressants will be used to control the fugitive dust to prevent violations of Rule 901.

## Appendix C

## Part 2: Archaeological and Historic Resources

From: Hendricks, Ashley
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 1:40 PM
To: 'SHPOresearch@michigan.gov'
Cc: Pionk, Darren
Subject:
Attachments:
SHPO Research Request for City of Escanaba DWRF (200023)
Escanaba_DWRF_QuadMap_01.pdf; Escanaba_DWRF_QuadMap_02.pdf

The City of Escanaba, Michigan has contracted with C2AE to prepare an EGLE DWRF Program Project Plan. The purpose of the project will be to make improvements on their existing water distribution system and replace lead water services in the City of Escanaba, Delta County. A list of the township, range, and sections can be found below. Please refer to attached USGS Quadrangle Maps of Escanaba showing research area. Are there relevant files available for us to view, and if so, can we request a research appointment?

Township, Range, and sections: 38N 22W 06, 38N 23W 01, 38N 23W 02, 39N 22W 07, 39N 22W 18, 39N 22W 19, 39N 22W 29, 39N 22W 30, 39N 22W 31, 39N 22W 32, 39N 23W 12, 39N 23W 13, 39N 23W 14, 39N 23W 24, 39N 23W 25, and 39N 23 W 36

Thank you,

Ashley Hendricks, EIT
Civil Engineer

C2AE
architecture | engineering
1211 Ludington Street
Escanaba, MI 49829
O: 906.217.1014

Infrastructure that enables, Architecture that empowers.
www.c2ae.com | Facebook | Linkedln




From:
MSF-SHPOResearch [MSF-SHPOResearch@michigan.gov](mailto:MSF-SHPOResearch@michigan.gov)
Sent:
Friday, March 6, 2020 5:12 PM
To:
Hendricks, Ashley
Subject:
Re: SHPO Research Request for City of Escanaba DWRF (200023)
Attachments:

## MICHIGAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FILE (Escanaba).pdf; Escanaba Quad.png;

 Gladstone Quad.pngA couple sites have come up in the TRS you have provided. Site files and quad scans are included (the sites are numbered and marked in pencil). Site locations are not to be shown to members of the public. If you have any questions moving forward - contact our staff archaeologist, Stacy Tchorzynski.

Thank you
From: Hendricks, Ashley [ashley.hendricks@C2AE.COM](mailto:ashley.hendricks@C2AE.COM)
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 1:39 PM
To: MSF-SHPOResearch [MSF-SHPOResearch@michigan.gov](mailto:MSF-SHPOResearch@michigan.gov)
Cc: Pionk, Darren [darren.pionk@c2ae.com](mailto:darren.pionk@c2ae.com)
Subject: SHPO Research Request for City of Escanaba DWRF (200023)
The City of Escanaba, Michigan has contracted with C2AE to prepare an EGLE DWRF Program Project Plan. The purpose of the project will be to make improvements on their existing water distribution system and replace lead water services in the City of Escanaba, Delta County. A list of the township, range, and sections can be found below. Please refer to attached USGS Quadrangle Maps of Escanaba showing research area. Are there relevant files available for us to view, and if so, can we request a research appointment?

Township, Range, and sections: 38N 22W 06, 38N 23W 01, 38N 23W 02, 39N 22W 07, 39N 22W 18, 39N 22W 19, 39N 22W 29, 39N 22W 30, 39N 22W 31, 39N 22W 32, 39N 23W 12, 39N 23W 13, 39N 23W 14, 39N 23W 24, 39N 23W 25, and 39N 23W 36

Thank you,
Ashley Hendricks, EIT
Civil Engineer
C2AE
architecture \| engineering
1211 Ludington Street
Escanaba, MI 49829
O: 906.217.1014
Infrastructure that enables, Architecture that empowers.
www.c2ae.com | Facebook | Linkedln

March 20, 2020

State Historic Preservation Office
Michigan Economic Development Corporation
300 N. Washington Square
Lansing, MI 48913

## Re: City of Escanaba, Michigan <br> Delta County <br> Water Distribution System Improvements <br> To Evaluate Needs and Recommend Alternatives for Improvements Environmental Review and Evaluation

Dear Mr. or Ms.,

On behalf of the City of Escanaba, Delta County, we are requesting review and comment of plans for improvements to their existing water distribution system.

The City of Escanaba is preparing an EGLE DWRF Program Project Plan to evaluate needs and recommended alternatives for improvements to the water distribution system. The project location spans across the following townships, ranges, and sections: $38 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 06,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 01,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 02,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 07,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 18,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 19,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 29,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W}$ $30,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 31,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 32,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 12,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 13,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 14,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 24,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 25$, and 39 N 23 W 36.

We have enclosed a Section 106 Review Application, Project Summary, Location Maps, APE photos, and previous correspondence from SHPO. We are requesting your review and comment.

Comments can be mailed to our Escanaba office or emailed to ashley.hendricks@c2ae.com.


Enclosure
cc: 20-0023 File B-10

## State Historic Preservation Office <br> Application for Section 106 Review

| SHPO Use Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square \mathrm{IN}$ | Received Date | 1 | 1 | Log In Date | 1 | 1 |
| OUT | Response Date | 1 | 1 | Log Out Date | 1 | 1 |
|  | Sent Date | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |

Submit one copy for each project for which review is requested. This application is required. Please type. Applications must be complete for review to begin. Incomplete applications will be sent back to the applicant without comment. Send only the information and attachments requested on this application. Materials submitted for review cannot be returned. Due to limited resources we are unable to accept this application electronically.

## I. GENERAL INFORMATION

THIS IS A NEW SUBMITTAL
THIS IS MORE INFORMATION RELATING TO ER\#
a. Project Name: City of Escanaba, Water Distribution System Improvements
b. Project Address (if available): Multiple streets city-wide
c. Municipal Unit: City of Escanaba County: Delta
d. Federal Agency, Contact Name and Mailing Address (If you do not know the federal agency involved in your project please contact the party requiring you to apply for Section 106 review, not the SHPO, for this information.): EPA/EGLE DWRF Program, Project Manager, Valerie White, 517-284-5420
e. State Agency (if applicable), Contact Name and Mailing Address: EGLE DWRF Program, Valerie White, 517-284-5420
f. Consultant or Applicant Contact Information (if applicable) including mailing address: CONSULANT: C2AE, Attn. Ashley Hendricks, 1211 Ludington Street, Escanaba, MI 49829, ashley.hendricks@c2ae.com, 906-2339360 APPLICANT: City of Escanaba, Attn: Jeff Lampi, Superintendent, 1900 Willow Creek Road, Escanaba, MI 49829, jlampi@escanaba.org, 906-786-1301

## II. GROUND DISTURBING ACTIVITY (INCLUDING EXCAVATION, GRADING, TREE REMOVALS, UTILITY INSTALLATION, ETC.)

 DOES THIS PROJECT INVOLVE GROUND-DISTURBING ACTIVITY? $\boxtimes$ YES $\square$ NO (If no, proceed to section III.)Precise project location map (preferably USGS 7.5 min Quad with quad name, date, and location) with previously recorded archaeological sites visible (this site information is available to qualified archaeologists at the SHPO Office) Portions, photocopies of portions, and electronic USGS maps are acceptable as long as the location is clearly marked.
a. USGS Quad Map Name: Escanaba Quadrangle and Gladstone Quandrangle
b. Township: var. Range: var. Section: var.
c. Site plan showing limits of proposed excavation. Description of width, length and depth of proposed ground disturbing activity: The trench dimensions for the water main will approximately be $14^{\prime}$ wide by $8^{\prime}$ deep
d. Previous land use and disturbances: The City of Escanaba utilities were originally constructed in the 1880s. Irregular patching and modifications have occurrred.
e. Current land use and conditions: Land use is residential and commercial, with some industry adjacent.
f. Did you check the State Archaeological Site Files located at the SHPO? $\boxtimes$ YES $\square$ NO

## III. PROJECT WORK DESCRIPTION AND AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS (APE) Note: Every project has an APE.

a. Provide a detailed written description of the project (plans, specifications, Environmental Impact Statements (EIS), Environmental Assessments (EA), etc. cannot be substituted for the written description): See attached project summary
b. Provide a localized map indicating the location of the project; road names must be included and legible.
c. On the above-mentioned map, identify the APE.
d. Provide a written description of the APE (physical, visual, auditory, and sociocultural), the steps taken to identify the APE, and the justification for the boundaries chosen. The APE is the entire area along the route. The construction of this project will effect transportation and residences along the route by disrupting traffic along the roadways and into driveways. After construction the only effect will be the few hydrants that will be visible.

## IV. IDENTIFICATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

a. List and date all properties 50 years of age or older located in the APE. The Section 106 Above-Ground Resources inventory form is the preferred format for providing this information and a completed form should be included as an attachment to this application. If the property is located within a National Register eligible, listed or local district it is only necessary to identify the district: Most of the buildings in the City are over 50 years old. The only impact on them will be that they will be within the visual distance of construction.
b. Describe the steps taken to identify whether or not any historic properties exist in the APE and include the level of effort made to carry out such steps: Reviewed the Register of Historic Places wesbite and did not find any near the vicinity of the APE. Contacted SHPO for a preliminary investigation on whether there are applicable files for fruther research; their response is attached on the last pages of this application. The previously recorded archaeological sites provided by SHPO are not in the APE of this project.
c. Based on the information contained in "b", please choose one:Historic Properties Present in the APE
No Historic Properties Present in the APE
d. Describe the condition, previous disturbance to, and history of any historic properties located in the APE: The older buildings in the City of Escanaba fall within water distribution and wastewater collection service areas with most street right-of-ways previously disturbed for those utility installations.

## V. PHOTOGRAPHS

## Note: All photographs must be keyed to a localized map.

a. Provide photographs of the site itself.
b. Provide photographs of all properties 50 years of age or older located in the APE (faxed or photocopied photographs are not acceptable).

## VI. DETERMINATION OF EFFECT

Note: you must provide a statement explaining/justifying your determination.
Include statement as an attachment if necessary.
$\measuredangle$ No historic properties affected based on [36 CFR $\S 800.4(\mathrm{~d})(1)]$, please provide the basis for this determination.

No Adverse Effect [36 CFR § 800.5(b)] on historic properties, explain why the criteria of adverse effect, 36 CFR Part 800.5(a)(1), were found not applicable.

Adverse Effect [36 CFR § 800.5(d)(2)] on historic properties, explain why the criteria of adverse effect, [36 CFR Part 800.5(a)(1)], were found applicable.

Please print and mail completed form and required information to:
State Historic Preservation Office, Cultural Resources Management Section Michigan Economic Development Corporation
300 North Washington Square, Lansing, MI 48913


## City of Escanaba DWRF Project Plan <br> Water Distribution System Improvements SHPO 106 Application - Area of Potential Effects Photos

1. $\mathrm{N} 30^{\text {th }}$ Street and $27^{\text {th }}$ Ave N , looking north

2. $\mathrm{N} 19^{\text {th }}$ Ave and N Lincoln Rd, looking south

3. Co Rd 426 and $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave N , looking south

4. $15^{\text {th }}$ Ave N and $\mathrm{N} 16^{\text {th }}$ St, looking west

5. $15^{\text {th }}$ Ave N and N Lincoln Rd, looking south


Image capture: Jul 2018 © 2020 Google
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6. Sheridan Rd and $13^{\text {th }}$ Ave N , looking south


Image capture: Oct 2008 © 2020 Google
7. $14^{\text {th }}$ Ave N and $\mathrm{N} 23^{\text {rd }}$ St, looking east

8. N Lincoln Rd and $12^{\text {th }}$ Ave N , looking north

9. $13^{\text {th }}$ Ave N and $\mathrm{N} 18^{\text {th }}$ St, looking east

10. $11^{\text {th }}$ Ave N and Sheridan Rd, looking west

11. $10^{\text {th }}$ Ave N and Stephenson Ave, looking north

12. $9^{\text {th }}$ Ave N and N Lincoln Rd, looking east

13. $7^{\text {th }}$ Ave N and $\mathrm{N} 19^{\text {th }}$ St, looking east
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14. Stephenson Ave and $7^{\text {th }}$ Ave $N$, looking north


Image capture: Oct 2008 Q 2020 Google
15. Stephenson Ave and $4^{\text {th }}$ Ave $N$, looking south

16. $4^{\text {th }}$ Ave N and $\mathrm{N} 20^{\text {th }}$ St, looking north


Image capture: Oct 2008 © 2020 Google
17. Ludington St and $N 6^{\text {th }}$ St, looking south


Image capture: Oct 2008 Q 2020 Google
18. $\mathrm{N} 10^{\text {th }}$ St and Ludington St , looking south

19. $\mathrm{N} 14^{\text {th }}$ St and Ludington St, looking south

20. Stephenson Ave and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave $N$, looking west

21. S Lincoln Rd and Ludington St, looking south
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22. $\mathrm{N} 26^{\text {th }}$ St and Ludington St, looking east

23. Ludington St and $N$ 19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ St, looking east

24. $1^{\text {st }}$ Ave S and $\mathrm{N} 15^{\text {th }}$ St, looking east


Image capture: Oct 2008 Q 2020 Google
25. Ludington St and $N 12^{\text {th }}$ St, looking east

26. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave $S$ and $S 11^{\text {th }}$ St, looking west

27. $S 8^{\text {th }}$ St and Ludington St, looking north

28. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave $S$ and $S 5^{\text {th }}$ St, looking east


Image capture: Oct 2008 © 2020 Google
29. Lake Shore Dr and $1^{\text {st }}$ Ave S, looking west
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30. S $3^{\text {rd }}$ St and Ogden Ave S, looking north

31. $S 5^{\text {th }}$ St and Ogden Ave S, looking north
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32. Ogden Ave $S$ and $S 7^{\text {th }}$ St, looking north

33. Lake Shore Dr and S Bay St, looking south
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34. $\mathrm{S} 10^{\text {th }}$ St and $5^{\text {th }}$ Ave S , looking west

35. S $12^{\text {th }}$ St and $4^{\text {th }}$ Ave S , looking south


City of Escanaba DWRF
March 26, 2020
Page 19
36. S $14^{\text {th }}$ St and $3^{\text {rd }}$ Ave S , looking east


Image capture: Oct 2008 © 2020 Google
37. S $17^{\text {th }}$ St and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave $S$, looking north
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38. Willow Creek Rd and $8^{\text {th }}$ Ave S , looking south

39. S $30^{\text {th }}$ St and $5^{\text {th }}$ Ave S , looking north

40. $5^{\text {th }}$ Ave $S$ and $S$ Lincoln Rd, looking west

41. $8^{\text {th }}$ Ave S and $\mathrm{S} 20^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$, looking west

42. $5^{\text {th }}$ Ave $S$ and $S 16^{\text {th }}$ St, looking west

43. $S 17^{\text {th }}$ St and $8^{\text {th }}$ Ave $S$, looking east
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44. $6^{\text {th }}$ Ave S and S $14^{\text {th }}$ St, looking west


Image capture: Oct 2008 © 2020 Google
45. $7^{\text {th }}$ Ave S and S $11^{\text {th }}$ St, looking north

46. Lake Shore Dr and $10^{\text {th }}$ Ave S , looking west

47. $\mathrm{S} 13^{\text {th }}$ St $10^{\text {th }}$ Ave S , looking south
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48. S $15^{\text {th }}$ St and $10^{\text {th }}$ Ave S, looking north


Image capture: Oct 2008 © 2020 Google
49. Lake Shore $\operatorname{Dr}$ and $13^{\text {th }}$ Ave S, looking north

50. S $15^{\text {th }}$ St and $16^{\text {th }}$ Ave S, looking north

51. Lake Shore Dr and $18^{\text {th }}$ Ave $S$, looking north

52. Lake Shore Dr and $22^{\text {nd }}$ Ave S, looking south

53. S $21^{\text {st }}$ St and $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave S, looking south

54. $18^{\text {th }}$ Ave S and $\mathrm{S} 21^{\text {st }}$ St, looking east

55. S Lincoln Ave and $14^{\text {th }}$ Ave $S$, looking north

56. $23^{\text {rd }}$ Ave $S$ and $S 22^{\text {nd }}$ St, looking east

57. S Lincoln Rd and Lake Shore Dr, looking south

58. M35 and Airport Dr, looking south

59. $14^{\text {th }}$ Ave $S$ and $S 30^{\text {th }}$ St, looking north
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60. Willow Creek Rd looking north


From:
Sent:
To:
Cc:
Subject:

Grennell, Brian (LEO) [GrennellB@michigan.gov](mailto:GrennellB@michigan.gov)
Monday, April 20, 2020 11:33 AM
Hendricks, Ashley
Cain, David; Pionk, Darren; MSF-SHPOResearch
RE: Escanaba DWRF SHPO Status (200023)

It appears that we received it on 4/6 (ER20-619). We will try to complete a review within the 30 day response period, but under the current circumstances, I can't guarantee it.

Brian G. Grennell
Cultural Resource Management Coordinator
State Historic Preservation Office
Michigan Economic Development Corporation
300 N. Washington Square | Lansing, MI 48913
Direct Phone (517) 335-2721
Grennellb@michigan.gov www.michigan.gov/shpo
In accordance with Gov. Gretchen Whitmer and the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services' recommendations designed to help prevent the spread of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19), the Michigan Economic Development Corporation and the State Historic Preservation Office will be closed for research appointments beginning March 17th.

The state is taking proactive steps to mitigate the spread of COVID-19 in Michigan, and we are approaching all of our operations with public health and safety as our top priority. We apologize for any inconvenience and will reach out with additional communications as we learn more. We appreciate your understanding and cooperation in reducing the coronavirus risk to Michigan residents.

For current and up-to-date information regarding the Coronavirus visit http://www.Michigan.gov/Coronavirus or http://www.CDC.gov/Coronavirus.

SHPO Staff will work to complete research requests via email but please understand that some files are not digitally accessible and in some cases it will be necessary to wait for the office to reopen to complete you research. Staff will continue to keep this email updated. We appreciate your patience.

From: MSF-SHPOResearch [MSF-SHPOResearch@michigan.gov](mailto:MSF-SHPOResearch@michigan.gov)
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2020 10:29 AM
To: Grennell, Brian (LEO) [GrennellB@michigan.gov](mailto:GrennellB@michigan.gov)
Subject: FW: Escanaba DWRF SHPO Status (200023)

## Katie Kolokithas

Survey Coordinator
State Historic Preservation Office
Michigan Economic Development Corporation
300 N. Washington Square | Lansing, MI 48913
Office: 517.335.9840 | Desk: 517.241.6062

This message contains information which may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the intended recipient (or authorized to receive this message for the intended recipient), you may not use, copy, disseminate or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received the message in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail, and delete the message. Thank you very much

From: Hendricks, Ashley [ashley.hendricks@C2AE.COM](mailto:ashley.hendricks@C2AE.COM)
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2020 10:24 AM
To: MSF-SHPOResearch [MSF-SHPOResearch@michigan.gov](mailto:MSF-SHPOResearch@michigan.gov)
Cc: Cain, David [david.cain@C2AE.COM](mailto:david.cain@C2AE.COM); Pionk, Darren [darren.pionk@c2ae.com](mailto:darren.pionk@c2ae.com)
Subject: Escanaba DWRF SHPO Status (200023)
Good Morning,
I received initial correspondence for the City of Escanaba's DWRF Project on March 6, 2020 from Stacy Tchorzynski at SHPO with the sites near the TRS; upon reviewing these sites it was found that none of them were within the project area. On March $26^{\text {th }}$, I submitted a SHPO Section 106 Application for this project via hardcopy in the mail. From what I understand, you guys are unable to meet the 30 -day turn around with the Stay Home order. However, I wanted to confirm you guys have received this application and also wanted to check on when it is expected that this application will be reviewed.

Thank you,
Ashley Hendricks, EIT
Civil Engineer

## C2AE

architecture | engineering
1211 Ludington Street
Escanaba, MI 49829
O: 906.217.1014
M: 920.562.9158

## Infrastructure that enables, Architecture that empowers.

www.c2ae.com | Facebook | Linkedln
In response to COVID-19, C2AE's staff is continuing to provide fully integrated services from the safety of our homes using a robust telecommunication system and following our clients' established protocols. We remain committed to serving our clients and working with our contracting and vendor partners. We wish you good health in this period of uncertainty.

## 2. Archaeological and Historical Resources

An application was submitted to SHPO on March $26^{\text {th }}$ and received by SHPO on April 6, 2020 (refer to correspondence on previous two pages). Under the circumstances of the Stay at Home Order and the Covid-19 virus, the response from SHPO may be delayed. Responses will be included when they are received.

May 11, 2020

```
SONYA T BUTLER
MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT GREAT LAKES AND ENERGY
P O BOX }3081
LANSING MI 48909
```

RE: ER20-619 City of Escanaba Water Distribution System Improvements, T38N, R22W, T38N,
R23W, T39N, R22W, T39N, R23W, City of Escanaba, Delta County (EPA)

Dear Ms. Butler:

Under the authority of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, we have reviewed the above-referenced undertaking. Based on the information provided for our review, it is the opinion of the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) that the proposed undertaking will have no adverse effect [ 36 CFR § 800.5(b)] on historic properties within the area of potential effects for the above-cited undertaking
provided the following condition is met:

- If landscape changes or tree removals are to occur as part of this project, information (plans, maps, photos, addresses, historical information, etc.) regarding locations where mature trees (larger than 6 inches in diameter) will be removed or other landscape changes may occur will be submitted to the SHPO for review, comment and meaningful consultation.

If you concur, the accompanying form must be signed by an agency official with legal authority to act on behalf of the agency [ 36 CFR § 800.2(a)]. Please return the signed original to us. Please note that the Section 106 review process will not be complete and the EPA's responsibility to comply with 36 CFR § 800.4, "Identification of historic properties," and 36 CFR § 800.5, "Assessment of adverse effects," will not be fulfilled until we have received this letter with the original signature of the agency official. If the agency official disagrees with this condition, then consultation with this office shall be reopened per 36 CFR § 800.5(a).

We remind you that federal agency officials or their delegated authorities are required to involve the public in a manner that reflects the nature and complexity of the undertaking and its effects on historic properties per 36 CFR § $800.2(\mathrm{~d})$. The National Historic Preservation Act also requires that federal agencies consult with any Indian tribe and/or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) that attach religious and cultural significance to historic properties that may be affected by the agency's undertakings per 36 CFR § 800.2 (c)(2)(ii).

The State Historic Preservation Office is not the office of record for this undertaking. You are therefore asked to maintain a copy of this letter with your environmental review record for this undertaking. If the scope of work changes in any way, or if artifacts or bones are discovered, please notify this office immediately.

If you have any questions, please contact Brian G. Grennell, Cultural Resource Management Coordinator, at 517-335-2721 or by email at GrennellB@michigan.gov. Please reference our project number in all communication with this office regarding this undertaking. Thank you for this opportunity to review and comment, and for your cooperation.

Sincerely,


Martha MacFarlane Faes
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

MMF:SAT:BGG

Enclosure(s)
copy: Jeff Lampi, City of Escanaba Ashley Hendricks, C2AE

GRETCHEN WHITMER GOVERNOR

State of Michigan<br>MICHIGAN STRATEGIC FUND State Historic Preservation Office

MARK A. BURTON PRESIDENT

May 11, 2020
SONVATBGTICD City of Escanaba, MI


-LANSNNGMT-48909

## RE: ACCEPTANCE LETTER

ER20-619 City of Escanaba Water Distribution System Improvements, T38N, R22W, T38N, R23W, T39N, R22W, T39N, R23W, City of Escanaba, Delta County (EPA)

We have received comments from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) regarding the above-cited undertaking at the location noted above. We intend to follow the conditions as specified by the SHPO.


Date: $x \operatorname{lo} 12-2,20$

Printed name and title of agency official: $x$ Patrick 5 Jordan

## Appendix C

## Part 3: Tribal Historic Preservation Officers

March 20, 2020

Melissa Wiatrolik, THPO
Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians
7500 Odawa Cir.
Harbor Springs, MI 49740

## Re: City of Escanaba, Michigan

Delta County
Water Distribution System Improvements
To Evaluate Needs and Recommend Alternatives for Improvements Environmental Review and Evaluation

Dear Ms. Wiatrolik,
On behalf of the City of Escanaba, Delta County, we are requesting review and comment of plans for improvements to their existing water distribution system.

The City of Escanaba is preparing an EGLE DWRF Program Project Plan to evaluate needs and recommended alternatives for improvements to the water distribution system. The project location spans across the following townships, ranges, and sections: 38 N ' $22 \mathrm{~W} 06,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 01,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 02,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 07,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 18,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 19,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 29,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W}$ $30,39 N 22 W 31,39 N 22 W 32,39 N 23 W 12,39 N 23 W 13,39 N 23 W 14,39 N 23 W 24,39 N 23 W 25$, and $39 N 23 W 36$.

We have enclosed a Project Summary and Location Maps. We are requesting your review and comment. Comments received within 30 days will allow them to be incorporated into the project plan prior to the preparation of the final DWRF Project Plan.

Comments can be mailed to our Escanaba office or emailed to ashley.hendricks@c2ae.com.
Sincerely,
C2AE
Ashley N. Hendricks, E.I.J.


Enclosure
cc: 20-0023 File B-10

March 20, 2020

Daisy McGeshick, THPO
P.O. Box 249

Watersmeet, MI 49969

## Re: City of Escanaba, Michigan <br> Delta County <br> Water Distribution System Improvements <br> To Evaluate Needs and Recommend Alternatives for Improvements <br> Environmental Review and Evaluation

Dear Ms. McGeshick,
On behalf of the City of Escanaba, Delta County, we are requesting review and comment of plans for improvements to their existing water distribution system.

The City of Escanaba is preparing an EGLE DWRF Program Project Plan to evaluate needs and recommended alternatives for improvements to the water distribution system. The project location spans across the following townships, ranges, and sections: $38 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 06,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 01,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 02,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 07,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 18,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 19,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 29,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W}$ 30, 39N 22W 31, 39N 22W 32, 39N 23W 12, 39N 23W 13, 39N $23 W$ 14, 39N 23W 24, 39N 23W 25, and 39N $23 W 36$.

We have enclosed a Project Summary and Location Maps. We are requesting your review and comment. Comments received within 30 days will allow them to be incorporated into the project plan prior to the preparation of the final DWRF Project Plan.

Comments can be mailed to our Escanaba office or emailed to ashley.hendricks@c2ae.com.
Sincerely,


Ashley N. Hendricks, E.l|T.


Enclosure
cc: 20-0023 File B-10

March 20, 2020

Earl Meshigaud, Hannahville Indian Community
N-14911 Hannahville B1 Rd.
Wilson, MI 49896

## Re: City of Escanaba, Michigan

Delta County
Water Distribution System Improvements
To Evaluate Needs and Recommend Alternatives for Improvements
Environmental Review and Evaluation

Dear Mr. Meshigaud,
On behalf of the City of Escanaba, Delta County, we are requesting review and comment of plans for improvements to their existing water distribution system.

The City of Escanaba is preparing an EGLE DWRF Program Project Plan to evaluate needs and recommended alternatives for improvements to the water distribution system. The project location spans across the following townships, ranges, and sections: $38 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 06,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 01,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 02,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 07,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 18,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 19,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 29,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W}$ $30,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 31,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 32,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 12,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 13,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 14,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 24,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 25$, and 39 N 23 W 36.

We have enclosed a Project Summary and Location Maps. We are requesting your review and comment. Comments received within 30 days will allow them to be incorporated into the project plan prior to the preparation of the final DWRF Project Plan.

Comments can be mailed to our Escanaba office or emailed to ashlev.hendricks@c2ae.com.
Sincerely,


Enclosure
cc: 20-0023 File B-10

March 20, 2020

Bay Mills Indian Community
Paula Carrick, THPO
12140 W. Lakeshore Drive
Brimley, MI 49715

## Re: City of Escanaba, Michigan

Delta County
Water Distribution System Improvements
To Evaluate Needs and Recommend Alternatives for Improvements Environmental Review and Evaluation

Dear Ms. Carrick,
On behalf of the City of Escanaba, Delta County, we are requesting review and comment of plans for improvements to their existing water distribution system.

The City of Escanaba is preparing an EGLE DWRF Program Project Plan to evaluate needs and recommended alternatives for improvements to the water distribution system. The project location spans across the following townships, ranges, and sections: $38 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 06,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 01,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 02,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 07,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 18,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 19,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 29,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W}$ $30,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 31,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 32,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 12,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 13,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 14,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 24,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 25$, and 39 N 23 W 36.

We have enclosed a Project Summary and Location Maps. We are requesting your review and comment. Comments received within 30 days will allow them to be incorporated into the project plan prior to the preparation of the final DWRF Project Plan.

Comments can be mailed to our Escanaba office or emailed to ashlev.hendricks@c2ae.com.
Sincerely,


Enclosure
cc: 20-0023 File B-10

March 20, 2020

Colleen Medicine, Cultural Repatriation Specialist
523 Ashmun St.
Sault Ste Marie, MI 49783

## Re: City of Escanaba, Michigan <br> Delta County <br> Water Distribution System Improvements <br> To Evaluate Needs and Recommend Alternatives for Improvements <br> Environmental Review and Evaluation

Dear Ms. Medicine,
On behalf of the City of Escanaba, Delta County, we are requesting review and comment of plans for improvements to their existing water distribution system.

The City of Escanaba is preparing an EGLE DWRF Program Project Plan to evaluate needs and recommended alternatives for improvements to the water distribution system. The project location spans across the following townships, ranges, and sections: $38 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 06,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 01,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 02,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 07,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 18,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 19,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 29,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W}$ 30, 39N 22W 31, 39N 22W 32, 39N 23W 12, 39N 23W 13, 39N 23W 14, 39N 23W 24, 39N 23W 25, and 39N $23 W 36$.

We have enclosed a Project Summary and Location Maps. We are requesting your review and comment. Comments received within 30 days will allow them to be incorporated into the project plan prior to the preparation of the final DWRF Project Plan.

Comments can be mailed to our Escanaba office or emailed to ashlev.hendricks@c2ae.com.
Sincerely, C2AE

Ashley N. Hendricks, E.I.T.

cc: 20-0023 File B-10

## Appendix C

## Part 4: Facility Discharge Permits SEE APPENDIX B

## 4. Facility Discharge Permit

The proposed project does not require a NPDES Permit.

## Appendix C

## Part 5: Farmland and Open Space Preservation

1211 Ludington St.
Escanaba, MI 49829
0: 906.233 .9360
www.c2ae.com
March 20, 2020

MI Department of Agriculture \& Rural Development
Farmland Preservation Program
Envrionmental Stewardship Division
PO BOX 30499
Lansing, MI 48909

## Re: City of Escanaba, Michigan

Delta County
Water Distribution System Improvements
To Evaluate Needs and Recommend Alternatives for Improvements
Environmental Review and Evaluation

Dear Mr. or Ms.,
On behalf of the City of Escanaba, Delta County, we are requesting review and comment of plans for improvements to their existing water distribution system.

The City of Escanaba is preparing an EGLE DWRF Program Project Plan to evaluate needs and recommended alternatives for improvements to the water distribution system. The project location spans across the following townships, ranges, and sections: $38 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 06,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 01,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 02,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 07,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 18,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 19,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 29,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W}$ 30, 39N $22 \mathrm{~W} 31,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 32$, 39N 23W 12, 39N 23W 13, 39N 23 W 14 , 39N $23 \mathrm{~W} 24,39 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 25$, and 39 N 23 W 36.

We have enclosed a Project Summary and Location Maps. We are requesting your review and comment. Comments received within 30 days will allow them to be incorporated into the project plan prior to the preparation of the final DWRF Project Plan.

Comments can be mailed to our Escanaba office or emailed to ashley.hendricks@c2ae.com.
Sincerely,
C2AE


Enclosure
cc: 20-0023 File B-10

March 20, 2020

## Farmland Preservation Program

USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service
3001 Coolidge Road, Suite 250
East Lansing, MI 48823-6362

## Re: City of Escanaba, Michigan

Delta County
Water Distribution System Improvements
To Evaluate Needs and Recommend Alternatives for Improvements Environmental Review and Evaluation

Dear Mr. or Ms.,

On behalf of the City of Escanaba, Delta County, we are requesting review and comment of plans for improvements to their existing water distribution system.

The City of Escanaba is preparing an EGLE DWRF Program Project Plan to evaluate needs and recommended alternatives for improvements to the water distribution system. The project location spans across the following townships, ranges, and sections: $38 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 06,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 01,38 \mathrm{~N} 23 \mathrm{~W} 02,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 07,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 18,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 19,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W} 29,39 \mathrm{~N} 22 \mathrm{~W}$ $30,39 N 22 W 31,39 N 22 W 32,39 N 23 W 12,39 N 23 W 13,39 N 23 W 14,39 N 23 W 24,39 N 23 W 25$, and $39 N 23 W 36$.

We have enclosed a Project Summary and Location Maps. We are requesting your review and comment. Comments received within 30 days will allow them to be incorporated into the project plan prior to the preparation of the final DWRF Project Plan.

Comments can be mailed to our Escanaba office or emailed to ashley.hendricks@c2ae.com.
Sincerely,


## Enclosure

cc: 20-0023 File B-10

From:
Sent:
To:
Cc:
Subject:
Attachments:

Hendricks, Ashley
Tuesday, March 24, 2020 11:08 AM
'Rosek, Martin - NRCS, East Lansing, MI'
Skinner, Lorrie (CTR) - NRCS, East Lansing, MI; Pionk, Darren; Cain, David
RE: Escanaba Water Distribution Improvements
200023_200324_EscanabaDWRF_WaterServiceReplacementLocs.pdf

Hi Marty,
We will be replacing existing water service lines (previously disturbed areas) that are outside the right-of-way. There are about 4,000 services are scattered throughout the City of Escanaba that need to be replaced. If the service cannot be replaced by directionally drilling, we would have to open trench (width of 10 feet). If we assume an average service length of 30 feet for about 4,000 services, this would come out to 28 acres total. None of these services are on farmland. I think the map with all the service replacement locations was with the letter I sent, but I have attached it to this email for reference. Please let us know if you have any further questions.

Thank you,
Ashley Hendricks, EIT
Civil Engineer
C2AE
architecture \| engineering
1211 Ludington Street
Escanaba, MI 49829
O: 906.217.1014
Infrastructure that enables, Architecture that empowers.
www.c2ae.com | Facebook | Linkedln

From: Rosek, Martin - NRCS, East Lansing, MI [mailto:martin.rosek@usda.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2020 10:34 AM
To: Hendricks, Ashley [ashley.hendricks@C2AE.COM](mailto:ashley.hendricks@C2AE.COM)
Cc: Skinner, Lorrie (CTR) - NRCS, East Lansing, MI [lorrie.skinner@usda.gov](mailto:lorrie.skinner@usda.gov)
Subject: Escanaba Water Distribution Improvements
Ashley,
I just received the Escanaba Water Distribution Improvements Plan. In order to complete my review of this proposed project, I need to know if any of the improvements are outside the existing road right-of way. If so, which ones, and were are they located, and how many acres are involved.

Thank you for this opportunity to review this project.
Marty
Martin J. Rosek, Ph.D.
State Soil Scientist
3001 Coolidge Road

## 5. Farmland and Open Space Preservation

A map of the Land Uses in the City of Escanaba from the 2016 Master Plan is on the following page. It is not anticipated that the proposed project would involve converting farmlands to nonagricultural uses.
Construction will be replacing water main or services in previously disturbed areas.


Map 22: City of Escanaba, Existing Land Uses

## Appendix C

## Part 6: Local Health Department

## 6. Health Department Permits

The proposed project does not involve the construction, alteration, extension, or replacement of onsite septic systems. Thus the local health department was not contacted.

## Appendix C

## Part 7: Lagoon Berm Permits NOT APPLICABLE

## 7. Lagoon Berm Permits

The proposed project will not impact a lagoon as defined where the berm encloses more than five acres. Thus the DEQ WRD Damstaff was not contacted.

## Appendix C

## Part 8: National Natural Landmarks

## 8. National Natural Landmarks

A list of national natural landmarks was reviewed, the following three designated National Natural Landmarks in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan were found:

1. Dukes Research Natural Area (Marquette County): 231 acres in the U.S. Forest Service Upper Peninsula Experimental Station, 22 miles southeast of Marquette near Maple Grove.
2. Porcupine Mountains (Gogebic and Ontonagon Counties): 47,761 acres on the southern shore of Lake Superior, 14 miles north of Wakefield.
3. Strangmoor Bog (Schoolcraft County): 9,700 acres within the Seney National Wildlife Refuge, 14 miles southwest of Seney.

None of which are near the vicinity of the project location.

## Appendix C

Part 9: Project Site Contamination

March 30, 2020

## Tom Flaminio

Brownfield Redevelopment, Marquette District Office
Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE)
1504 West Washington Street
Marquette, MI 49855

## Re: City of Escanaba, Michigan

Delta County
Water Distribution System Improvements
To Evaluate Needs and Recommend Alternatives for Improvements
Environmental Review and Evaluation

Dear Mr. Flaminio,
On behalf of the City of Escanaba, Delta County, we are requesting review and comment of plans for improvements to their existing water distribution system.

The City of Escanaba is preparing an EGLE DWRF Program Project Plan to evaluate needs and recommended alternatives for improvements to the water distribution system. The project location spans across the following townships, ranges, and sections: 38N 22W 06, 38N 23W 01, 38N 23W 02, 39N 22W 07, 39N 22W 18, 39N 22W 19, 39N 22W 29, 39N 22W 30, 39N 22 W 31, 39N 22W 32, 39N 23W 12, 39N 23W 13, 39N 23W 14, 39N 23W 24, 39N 23W 25, and 39N $23 W 36$.

We have enclosed a Project Summary and Location Maps. We are requesting your review and comment. Comments received within 30 days will allow them to be incorporated into the project plan prior to the preparation of the final DWRF Project Plan.

Comments can be mailed to our Escanaba office or emailed to ashley.hendricks@c2ae.com.
Sincerely,
C2AE

Ashley N. Hendricks, E.I.T.

Enclosure
cc: 20-0023 File B-10

## 9. Project Site Contamination

The EGLE Environmental Mapper was used to examine for potential areas with contamination. The possible and/or confirmed contamination sites and sites with underground storage tanks (116 sites) are shown in the map below and listed in the following tables attached. When individual projects are designed contaminated areas will be avoided via utility routing where possible. When construction may infringe on impacted areas, a FOIA request for these sites will be made, EGLE permitting will be pursued if appropriate, and mitigation and safety measures will be required by contractor via construction documents:

Compliance with all applicable health and safety regulations, use of properly trained personnel in accordance with OSHA requirements, preparation of a Site Health and Safety Plan in accordance with OSHA requirements, monitoring of hydrocarbon levels in the work area, proper material segregation, storage and backfill of affected soils, and use of hydrocarbon resistant gaskets (Nitrile or Viton) on the utility being installed.

## EGLE

## Environmental Mapper

Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy


Open Part 201 Sites

|  | Site Name | Address | City | Zip Code | County | Source | Pollutants | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21000001 | Bay de Noc Oil <br> Company - Escanaba | 2715 South Lincoln Road | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | Gasoline Service Station | Benzene; Ethylbenzene; Xylenes | 45.715608 | -87.079615 |
| 21000002 | Chicago and Northwestern RNDHS | 1st Avenue North | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | null | Diesel fuel | 45.747862 | -87.05802 |
| 21000006 | Escanaba Highway Garage | Ist Ave North, 800 Block | Escanaba | -0- | Delta | General Government | Na; Salt | 45.746586 | -87.058178 |
| 21000018 | South Ninth St VIg of Wells | 6344 US 2 | Wells | 49894 | Delta | Petroleum Products | Benzene; Ethylbenzene; MTBE; Toluene; Xylenes; trans-1,2 DCE | 45.776364 | -87.078706 |
| 21000021 | Amoco Terminal Escanaba | 2230 20th Avenue North | Escanaba | 48829 | Delta | Petroleum Bulk Stations \& Term | Benzene; Ethylbenzene; MTBE; Toluene; Xylenes | 45.773389 | -87.078273 |
| 21000027 | Basic Marine Inc | 440 North 10th Street | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | Misc Repair Services | Ethylbenzene; Zn | 45.747861 | -87.057978 |
| 21000086 | Northern Motors Rebuilders SA | 800 1st Ave. <br> North | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | Transformers | null | 45.74704 | -87.058137 |
| 21000092 | NuWay Cleaners, Escanaba | 106 North 15th Street | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | null | PCE; TCE | 45.746164 | -87.0681099 |
| 21000111 | Escanaba Ore Dock Creosote | Escanaba Ore <br> Dock 1660 <br> Sheridan Avenue | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | Railroad <br> Transportation | Naphthalene; Coal tar | 45.766128 | -87.0644 |
| 21000116 | Klemm/Sem-Fuels AST Overfill | 2222 N 23rd <br> Street | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | null | null | 45.77486 | -87.078927 |
| 21000117 | Former Cloverland Manufacturing, Inc. | 2501 Danforth <br> Road | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | null | PCE; TCE | 45.768525 | -87.083559 |
| 21000120 | Stephenson Ave Bulk Plant | 514 Stephenson Avenue | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | Petroleum Bulk Stations \& Term | 1,2,4 TMB; Benzene; Ethylbenzene; Xylenes | 45.751277 | -87.070465 |
| 21000121 | Citgo Quick Food Mart | 102 N Lincoln Rd | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | null | null | 45.746313 | -87.079407 |
| 21000122 | Fleet Maintenance <br> (Act 381) | 1700 20th Avenue North | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | null | null | 45.772169 | -87.070735 |
| 21000124 | Escanaba Municipal Electric Utility | 2000 Power Plant Road | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | null | null | 45.77169 | -87.06394 |
| 21000127 | Former Delta County Sportsman's Club | 3000 32nd <br> Avenue North | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | null | Pb | 45.786672 | -87.091615 |
| 21000128 | Delta Plaza PCE Contamination | 301 North Lincoln Rd | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | null | null | 45.74791 | -87.08128 |
| 21000129 | Commercial Property 718 Stephenson Ave | 718 Stephenson Avenue | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | null | null | 45.75382 | -87.07162 |
| 21000506 | Caron Property | Street | Escanaba | null | Delta | null | null | 45.747084 | -87.0500457 |
| 21000536 | Coplan's Iron \& Metal | 1610 7th Avenue North | Escanaba | null | Delta | null | null | 45.755291 | -87.0704452 |

City of Escanaba

## Storage Tank Facilities

| Facility ID | Facility Name | Address | City | Zip Code | County | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3540 | United Parcel Service | 2129 N 23RD ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.773473 | -87.07975 |
| 5758 | ECO Fuels | 2300 Ludington St | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.745992 | -87.080185 |
| 9790 | Driftwood Mobil | 120 Stephenson Ave | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.74632 | -87.071227 |
| 10010 | Delta County Jail | 310 Ludington St | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.746497 | -87.051345 |
| 11645 | Escanaba Garage \& Strm | 2301 23RD AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.775179 | -87.079755 |
| 14658 | Bark River Culvert \& Equip. Co | 430 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.749899 | -87.079755 |
| 14709 | Delta County Airport | 3300 Airport Rd | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.718338 | -87.088715 |
| 18545 | Jacklin Steel Supply Co | 1701 N 26th St | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.767051 | -87.084939 |
| 36214 | First Bank, Upper Michigan N.a. | 2301 9TH AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.757193 | -87.078411 |
| 36450 | Tuff-kote Dinol Automotive Rust | 800 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.754974 | -87.076753 |
| 40792 | Escanaba Vortac | 3300 AIRPORT RD AIRPORT ENTRANCE RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.715915 | -87.088587 |
| 50000286 | Town \& Country Motors Inc | 2600 Ludington St | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.745868 | -87.082361 |
| 1224 | Escanaba Schools Garage | 2220 20TH AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.773504 | -87.075848 |
| 2312 | Hengesh Service Station | 1422 LUDINGTON ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.745961 | -87.068225 |
| 5464 | Former Jerrys Marathon | 2301 LUDINGTON ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.745478 | -87.080009 |
| 6791 | Purchasing Department | 120 N 8TH ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.746585 | -87.057692 |
| 12327 | Gas Station | 1325 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.76317 | -87.07736 |
| 12901 | Holiday Stationstore \#200 | 700 N Lincoln Rd | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.753968 | -87.076822 |
| 13558 | Gross Common Carrier, Inc | 1803 7TH AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.754743 | -87.073321 |
| 14461 | Chuck Dubord Automotive | 801 Stephenson Ave | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.755128 | -87.07202 |
| 15298 | Krist Food Mart \#5 | 102 N Lincoln Rd | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.746313 | -87.079407 |
| 15304 | Citgo Quick Food Mart | 2730 LAKE SHORE DR | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.777122 | -87.082277 |
| 18838 | The Store | 901 S LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.73528 | -87.079257 |
| 18839 | Dunlaps Service | 129 S 8TH ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.744782 | -87.057895 |


| Facility ID | Facility Name | Address | City | Zip Code | County | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35264 | Freudenberg/nok G.p. | 2803 DANFORTH RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.768841 | -87.08842 |
| 36464 | Dunlaps Service | 800 Ludington St | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.745849 | -87.058299 |
| 37194 | Lafaves Small Engine | 1507 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.765182 | -87.078309 |
| 38856 | Up Car Care | 536 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.751957 | -87.077422 |
| 38882 | Escanaba Taxi Co | 318 STEPHENSON <br> AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.748507 | -87.071302 |
| 50001036 | Esky Quick Lube, Inc | 626 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.753262 | -87.076671 |
| 50001620 | Harnishferger Corp | 2525 14TH AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.763553 | -87.087018 |
| 1042 | Northern Motor Co | 1419 LUDINGTON ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.74519813 | -87.06793793 |
| 3540 | United Parcel Service | 2129 N 23RD ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.773473 | -87.07975 |
| 3742 | Delta Sports Complex | 6645 N. 75 DR | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.740671 | -87.070457 |
| 5465 | Stropich Oil Co | 1325 Washington Ave | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.762948 | -87.076902 |
| 5474 | St. Anne Parish | 2230 8TH AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.735892 | -87.078178 |
| 5758 | ECO Fuels | 2300 Ludington St | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.745992 | -87.080185 |
| 9790 | Driftwood Mobil | 120 Stephenson Ave | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.74632 | -87.071227 |
| 11705 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Escanaba CO } \\ & \text { (M29120) } \end{aligned}$ | 1005 1ST AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.744077 | -87.061372 |
| 12901 | Holiday Stationstore \#200 | 700 N Lincoln Rd | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.753968 | -87.076822 |
| 15298 | Krist Food Mart \#5 | 102 N Lincoln Rd | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.746313 | -87.079407 |
| 17526 | Admiral Petroleum \#5790 | 720 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.754367 | -87.07659 |
| 18838 | The Store | 901 S LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.73528 | -87.079257 |
| 19558 | Amoco Oil Co | 2230 20TH AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.771902 | -87.076972 |
| 21478 | Immanuel Lutheran Church | 600 S Lincoln Rd | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.738412 | -87.080475 |
| 33282 | Harbor Tower | 110 Sth St | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.745112 | -87.053668 |
| 36134 | Fueling Station | 1711 SHERIDAN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.767397 | -87.069788 |
| 40742 | Visitors Hospital | 15198 Main St | Buchanan | 49107 | Berrien | 45.717898 | -87.09484 |
| 720 | Kmart \#9065 | 801 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.754974 | -87.077146 |
| 985 | State Bank Of Escanaba | 112 N 11th St | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.745943 | -87.062254 |
| 1224 | Escanaba Schools Garage | 2220 20TH AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.773504 | -87.075848 |


| Facility ID | Facility Name | Address | City | Zip Code | County | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1677 | Peninsula Beverage Co | 2800 29TH AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.783253 | -87.087787 |
| 1840 | Holy Cross Cemetery | HIGHWAY M-35 | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.714058 | -87.090403 |
| 2312 | Hengesh Service Station | 1422 LUDINGTON ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.745961 | -87.068225 |
| 2826 | Larrys Marathon | 200 N 12th St | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.74688 | -87.063744 |
| 2905 | Upper Peninsula State Fair | N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.760803 | -87.07944 |
| 2988 | Coyne Chevrolet Inc | 501 Stephenson Ave | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.751544 | -87.071676 |
| 3123 | E\&m Enterprises, Inc | 400 LUDINGTON ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.745841 | -87.052166 |
| 3782 | Farmers Supply \& Equip. Co Inc | 717 Stephenson Ave | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.745902 | -87.071928 |
| 4008 | Chicago \& Northwestern | PO BOX 395 | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.767068 | -87.06665 |
| 4101 | Jaeger Brothers, Inc | 2500 9TH AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.756265 | -87.083607 |
| 5273 | Escanaba Steam Laundry, Inc | 707 LUDINGTON ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.745572 | -87.056853 |
| 5464 | Former Jerrys Marathon | 2301 LUDINGTON ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.745478 | -87.080009 |
| 6791 | Purchasing Department | 120 N 8TH ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.746585 | -87.057692 |
| 8991 | Shoreline Battery Co | 1000 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.758344 | -87.07675 |
| 9311 | Upper Peninsula Concrete Pipe Co | 6480 US 2-41 | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.782025 | -87.08128 |
| 10009 | Miracle Shield Car Care Center | 1402 Ludington St | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.745858 | -87.067175 |
| 10010 | Delta County Jail | 310 Ludington St | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.746497 | -87.051345 |
| 11645 | Escanaba Garage \& Strm | 2301 23RD AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.775179 | -87.079755 |
| 12327 | Gas Station | 1325 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.76317 | -87.07736 |
| 12385 | Garceau Insurance | 823 LUDINGTON ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.745575 | -87.058527 |
| 13221 | Escanaba Station | 328 N 10TH ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.748387 | -87.06096 |
| 13272 | Holy Name Central Grade School | 409 S 22nd St | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.741898 | -87.077937 |
| 13398 | St Francis Hospital | 1018 S 13TH ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.734822 | -87.065699 |
| 13558 | Gross Common Carrier, Inc | 1803 7TH AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.754743 | -87.073321 |
| 14461 | Chuck Dubord Automotive | 801 Stephenson Ave | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.755128 | -87.07202 |
| 14650 | Lakeshore Warehouse Co | 2020 N 19TH ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.770416 | -87.074608 |
| 14658 | Bark River Culvert \& Equip. Co | 430 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.749899 | -87.079755 |
| 14709 | Delta County Airport | 3300 Airport Rd | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.718338 | -87.088715 |


| Facility ID | Facility Name | Address | City | Zip Code | County | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15163 | Emery Viau | 1920 20TH AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.772042 | -87.075282 |
| 15304 | Citgo Quick Food Mart | 2730 LAKE SHORE DR | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.777122 | -87.082277 |
| 16259 | Old Dnr Garage | 1126 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.759847 | -87.076751 |
| 16448 | Mead Corp (mead Garage) | 101 POOR FARM RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.771998 | -87.07245 |
| 18545 | Jacklin Steel Supply Co | 1701 N 26th St | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.767051 | -87.084939 |
| 18839 | Dunlaps Service | 129 S 8TH ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.744782 | -87.057895 |
| 19175 | P \& J Auto Sales | 622 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.753512 | -87.076757 |
| 19176 | Groos Auto Parts | 1636 LUDINGTON ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.74586 | -87.070485 |
| 19177 | Autoway Truck Stop | 1022 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.758569 | -87.07675 |
| 19362 | Clark Service Station | 823 LUDINGTON ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.745462 | -87.062515 |
| 19413 | Delta Service Center | 117 STEPHENSON AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.745991 | -87.071785 |
| 20305 | Independent Roofing \& Siding Co | 700 Stephenson Ave | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.753807 | -87.071273 |
| 33191 | St Francis Hospital | 3401 Ludington St | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.735128 | -87.066408 |
| 35264 | Freudenberg/nok G.p. | 2803 DANFORTH RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.768841 | -87.08842 |
| 35502 | Great Lakes Energy Sys Sales Sev | 1930 N Lincoln Rd | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.770424 | -87.080661 |
| 36214 | First Bank, Upper Michigan N.a. | 2301 9TH AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.757193 | -87.078411 |
| 36450 | Tuff-kote Dinol Automotive Rust | 800 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.754974 | -87.076753 |
| 36464 | Dunlaps Service | 800 Ludington St | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.745849 | -87.058299 |
| 36503 | Former Pearson Building | 2717 DANFORTH RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.769295 | -87.086607 |
| 36905 | Krist Oil Co | 514 Stephenson Ave | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.751627 | -87.071283 |
| 37194 | Lafaves Small Engine | 1507 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.765182 | -87.078309 |
| 37320 | Schleis Service Station | 2429 LUDINGTON ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.745594 | -87.080109 |
| 38409 | Hilltop Campers Inc | 2905 N Lincoln Rd | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.776593 | -87.08294 |
| 38653 | Gasman News Agency Inc | 511 1ST AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.746617 | -87.05389 |
| 38856 | Up Car Care | 536 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.751957 | -87.077422 |
| 38882 | Escanaba Taxi Co | 318 STEPHENSON AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.748507 | -87.071302 |
| 39021 | Escanaba Machine | 1700 LUDINGTON ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.745866 | -87.0718 |
| 39353 | Escanaba Machine Coowner | 1719 LUDINGTON ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.745589 | -87.071359 |


| Facility ID | Facility Name | Address | City | Zip Code | County | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40792 | Escanaba Vortac | 3300 AIRPORT RD AIRPORT ENTRANCE RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.715915 | -87.088587 |
| 50000286 | Town \& Country Motors Inc | 2600 Ludington St | Escanaba | 49829 | Delta | 45.745868 | -87.082361 |
| 50000986 | Gallagher Marine Construction Co | PO BOX 315 | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.77047 | -87.06365 |
| 50001036 | Esky Quick Lube, Inc | 626 N LINCOLN RD | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.753262 | -87.076671 |
| 50001620 | Harnishferger Corp | 2525 14TH AVE | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.763553 | -87.087018 |
| 50002405 | Degrand Oil Co | 616 N 16TH ST | ESCANABA | 49829 | Delta | 45.752582 | -87.069979 |

## Appendix C

## Part 10: Protected Plants and Animals

March 20, 2019

Michigan Natural Features Inventory
PO Box 13036
Lansing, MI 48901-3036

## Re: City of Escanaba, Michigan <br> Delta County <br> Water Distribution System Improvements <br> To Evaluate Needs and Recommend Alternatives for Improvements Environmental Review and Evaluation

Dear Mr. or Ms.,

On behalf of the City of Escanaba, Delta County, we are requesting review and comment of plans for improvements to their existing water distribution system.

The City of Escanaba is preparing an EGLE DWRF Program Project Plan to evaluate needs and recommended alternatives for improvements to the water distribution system. The project location spans across the following townships, ranges, and sections: 38N 22W 06, 38N 23W 01, 38N 23W 02, 39N 22W 07, 39N 22W 18, 39N 22W 19, 39N 22W 29, 39N 22W 30, 39N 22W 31, 39N 22W 32, 39N 23W 12, 39N 23W 13, 39N 23W 14, 39N 23W 24, 39N 23W 25, and 39N $23 W 36$.

We have enclosed a Project Summary and Location Maps. We are requesting your review and comment. Comments received within 30 days will allow them to be incorporated into the project plan prior to the preparation of the final DWRF Project Plan.

Comments can be mailed to our Escanaba office or emailed to ashley.hendricks@c2ae.com.
Sincerely,


Enclosure
cc: 20-0023 File B-10

# MICHIGAN STATE <br> university Extension 

March 20, 2020

Ashley Hendricks, EIT<br>Civil Engineer<br>C2AE<br>1211 Ludington Street<br>Escanaba, MI 49829

Rare Species Review - INVOICE \#:2579

|  |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| 2020 DWRF Project Plan | $\$ 340.00$ |
| City of Escanaba | Standard order |
| Delta County, MI |  |
| T38-39N R22-23W several sections |  |

*Please note: Prices will change as of October 1st.

## Payment Options:

MSU EXTENSION
Michigan Natural Features Inventory
P.O. Box 13036 Lansing, MI 48901

If you would like to pay with credit card you can go out to the MNFI web site and use MSU's secure credit card server. Under the Information Requests section you will see the Credit Card Payment heading, a link to this site is listed below. Please enter your own information and submit your payment accordingly. If you have any questions feel free to contact the MNFI staff person you have been working with

Link to credit card payment:
http://mnfi.anr.msu.edu/services/rare-species-review.cfm
If paying with check or money order, please make payable to Michigan State University. If needed, our Federal Identification Number is 38-6005984

Mail to: Michigan Natural Features Inventory
P.O. Box 13036

Lansing, MI 48901-3036

# MICHIGAN STATE <br> U N I VERS IT Y <br> Extension 

## Information Agreement

The Michigan Natural Features Inventory (MNFI) is a member of the Natural Heritage Program Network and is part of Michigan State University Extension. MNFI is an organlzation of professionals dedicated to the conservation of Michigan's special natural features. MNFI has the responsibility for inventorying and collecting information about the state's "elements of biological diversity". These data are used to guide conservation and land management activities throughout the state.

MNFI manages an ongoing and continuously updated information and research database. The database is proprletary and the most comprehensive single source of existing information on Michigan's endangered, threatened, or otherwise significant plant and animal species, natural plant communities, and other natural features. This database cannot provide a definitlve statement on the presence, absence, or condition of the natural features in any glven locality, since most sites have not been specifically or thoroughly surveyed. Furthermore, plant and animal populations and natural communities change with time. Therefore, the information services provided should not be regarded as a complete statement on the occurrence of special natural features of the area in question. In many cases the information may require the interpretation of a trained scientist.

The reciplent(s) of the information understand that state endangered and threatened species are protected under state law (Act 451 of 1994, the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, Part 365, Endangered Species Protection). Any questions, observations, new findings, violations or permitting of project activities should be conducted with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Division. Contact the Endangered Species Coordinator at (517) 284-6194. The recipient(s) of the information understand that federally endangered and threatened species are protected under federal law (Endangered Species Act of 1973). Any questions, observations, new findings, violations or permitting of project actlvities should be conducted with the U.S. Fish and Wildife Service in East Lansing. Their phone number Is (517) 351-2555. Recipients of the Information are responsible for ensuring the protection of protected species before project activities begin.

MNFI is a not-for-profit entity and fees for the data are turned back into database maintenance and program support. The costs for information can be obtained on our website MNFI.ANR.MSU.EDU under the services heading.

By acceptance of the information services made available through MNFI, the recipient understands that access to the information is provided for primary use only. MNFI requests that the user respect the confidential and sensitive nature of the information and restrict access to only those individuals requiring the information for the primary use. There should be no redistribution of the information. Distribution of information regarding locations of many rare species represents a threat to their protection. Additionally, since the information is constantly being updated MNFI requests that any information service provided by MNFI is destroyed upon completion of the primary use. This information should be considered valid for one year only.

The user should identify MNFI as information contributors on any map or publication using MNFI information, as follows: Michigan Natural Features Inventory. [Year]. Biotics 5 - Michlgan's Natural Herltage Database. Lansing, Michigan. (Accessed: Month Day, Year). Abbreviations are acceptable on maps if referenced in full on accompanying documents.

Rare Species Review \#2579-2020 DWRF Project Plan, City of Escanaba, Delta County, M1

MSU is an affirmative-action,
P.O. Box 13036 Lansing, MI 48901
(517) 284-6200
fax: (517) 373-9566
mnfi.anr.msu.edu
Michigan Natural Features Inventory

# <div class="inline-tabular"><table id="tabular" data-type="subtable">
<tbody>
<tr style="border-top: none !important; border-bottom: none !important;">
<td style="text-align: left; border-left: none !important; border-bottom-style: solid !important; border-bottom-width: 1px !important; border-top: none !important; width: auto; vertical-align: middle; ">MICHIGAN STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr style="border-top: none !important; border-bottom: none !important;">
<td style="text-align: left; border-left: none !important; border-bottom: none !important; border-top: none !important; width: auto; vertical-align: middle; ">UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
<table-markdown style="display: none">| MICHIGAN STATE |
| :--- |
| UNIVERSITY |</table-markdown></div>$|$ Extension 

Ms. Ashley Hendricks, EIT
March 26, 2020
C2AE
1211 Ludington Street
Escanaba, MI 49829
(906) 217-1014

## Re: Rare Species Review \#2579-2020 DWSRF application, City of Escanaba, Delta County, MI (T38-39N, R22-23W several sections).

Ms. Hendricks:

The location for the proposed project was checked against known localities for rare species and unique natural features, which are recorded in the Michigan Natural Features Inventory (MNFI) natural heritage database. This continuously updated database is a comprehensive source of existing data on Michigan's endangered, threatened, or otherwise significant plant and animal species, natural plant communities, and other natural features. Records in the database indicate that a qualified observer has documented the presence of special natural features. The absence of records in the database for a particular site may mean that the site has not been surveyed. The only way to obtain a definitive statement on the status of natural features is to have a competent biologist perform a complete field survey.

Under Act 451 of 1994, the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, Part 365, Endangered Species Protection, "a person shall not take, possess, transport, ...fish, plants, and wildlife indigenous to the state and determined to be endangered or threatened," unless first receiving an Endangered Species Permit from the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), Wildlife Division. Responsibility to protect endangered and threatened species is not limited to the lists below. Other species may be present that have not been recorded in the database.

At-risk species have been documented within 1.5 miles of the project site and it is possible that negative impacts will occur. Keep in mind that MNFI cannot fully evaluate this project without visiting the project site. MNFI offers several levels of Rare Species Reviews, including field surveys which I would be happy to discuss with you.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Sanders

Michael A. Sanders
Environmental Review Specialist/Zoologist
Michigan Natural Features Inventory

Comments for Rare Species Review \#2579: It is important to note that it is the applicant's responsibility to comply with both state and federal threatened and endangered species legislation. Therefore, if a state listed species occurs at a project site, and you think you need an endangered species permit please contact: Casey Reitz, Michigan DNR Wildlife Division, 517-284-6210, or ReitzC@michigan.gov. If a federally listed species is involved and, you think a permit is needed, please contact Carrie Tansy, Endangered Species Program, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, East Lansing office, 517-351-8375, or Carrie Tansy@fws.gov.

Please consult MNFI's Rare Species Explorer for additional information regarding the table below.

Special concern species and natural communities are not protected under endangered species legislation, but efforts should be taken to minimize any or all impacts. Species classified as special concern are species whose numbers are getting smaller in the state. If these species continue to decline they would be recommended for reclassification to threatened or endangered status.

Table 1: Occurrences of threatened \& endangered species within 1.5 miles of \#2579

| ELCAT | SNAME | SCOMNAME | USESA | SPROT | G_RANK | S_RANK | FIRSTOBS | LASTOBS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Animal | Sterna hirundo | Common tern |  | T | G5 | S2 | 1976 | $2007-06-08$ |
| Animal | Hydroprogne caspia | Caspian tern |  | T | G5 | S2 | 1996 | $1996-06-13$ |
| Animal | Sander canadensis | Sauger |  | T | G5 | S1 | $1970-04-15$ | $1972-05-18$ |
| Animal | Charadrius melodus | Piping plover | LE | E | G3 | S2 | $2006-06-21$ | $2008-06-22$ |
| Animal | Sterna hirundo | Common tern |  | T | G5 | S2 | $2006-06-21$ | $2007-06-05$ |
| Animal | Ixobrychus exilis | Least bittern |  | T | G4G5 | S3 | $2007-06-10$ | $2007-06-10$ |
| Animal | Coturnicops noveboracensis | Yellow rail |  | T | G4 | S2 | 2007-06-09 | $2007-06-09$ |

## Of concern:

No concerns with these listed species.
Table 2: Occurrences of special concern species \& natural communities within 1.5 miles of \#2579

| ELCAT | SNAME | SCOMNAME | USESA | SPROT | G_RANK | S_RANK | FIRSTOBS | LASTOBS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Animal | Pandion haliaetus | Osprey |  | SC | G5 | S4 | 2000-07-31 | 2007-06-06 |
| Animal | Botaurus lentiginosus | American bittern |  | SC | G5 | S3 | $2006-08-07$ | $2019-05-21$ |
| Animal | Cistothorus palustris | Marsh wren |  | SC | G5 | S3 | $2007-06-09$ | $2007-06-11$ |
| Animal | Nycticorax nycticorax | Black-crowned night- <br> heron |  | SC | G5 | S3 | 2009 | 2009 |
| Animal | Physella magnalacustris | Great Lakes physa |  | SC | G5 | SNR |  |  |
| Animal | Bombus terricola | Yellow banded bumble <br> bee |  | SC | G3G4 | SNR | 1958-06-29 | $1958-06-29$ |
| Animal | Haliaeetus leucocephalus | Bald eagle |  | SC | G5 | S4 | 2017 | 2017 |
| Animal | Haliaeetus leucocephalus | Bald eagle |  | SC | G5 | S4 | 2017 | 2017 |

## Of concern:

Osprey - the state special concern osprey (Pandion haliaetus) has been known to nest in Section 18 of T39NR22W. Ospreys are most found in forested regions near lakes, large rivers, and floodings. They will nest in snags, dead topped pines, tamaracks, and man-made platforms near bodies of water. They feed on fish caught in relatively clear rivers or lakes.

Management and Conservation: their past decline has been attributed to habitat loss, human intrusion, and chemical pollution. It is recommended that land altering activities not occur within 400 meters ( $1 / 4$ mile) of an active nest(s) during the nesting season (March 15 to August 31). Impacts will be minimized if work is avoided during the nesting season. If the landowner wishes to provide nesting habitat for osprey, leaving supercanopy trees, both dead and alive, which have strong wide branches high up in the canopy would be useful.

Bald eagle - the special concern bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) has been known to nest in Section 25 of T39NR23W. Bald eagle nests are usually located within $1 / 2$ - mile of water and at the top of tall, established trees. These birds prefer forested habitats adjacent to the shorelines of lakes, large rivers, floodings, and other bodies of water where prey is available throughout the breeding season which runs from mid-March through the end of June. Live trees are generally preferred over dead ones. In Michigan, eagles arrive on nesting territories between mid-February and mid-March. Nesting pairs are usually faithful to previous nesting sites. By October and November, immature bald eagles and most adults move southward, with many remaining in Michigan throughout the winter. Bald eagles are extremely sensitive to human activity during the first 12 weeks of the breeding season. Maintain a $1 / 4$ - mile buffer zone around the nest from mid-March through the end of June. Any maintenance and construction activities within the buffer zone should take place between August and February.

Effective August 8, 2007, the bald eagle in the lower 48 States was removed from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife (Federal Register Vol. 72, No. 130; July 9, 2007) but are still protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Lacey Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act: which prohibits anyone from "taking" bald eagles, including their parts, eggs or nests.

To help provide clarity on the management of bald eagles after delisting, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) published National Bald Eagle Management Guidelines in May 2007. These guidelines as well as other information regarding bald eagles can be viewed at the USFWS Midwest Bald Eagle page. The management guidelines were established to help people minimize harmful impacts, especially where they may constitute a "disturbance." A variety of human activities can potentially interfere with bald eagles, affecting their ability to forage, nest, roost, breed or raise young. A permit from USFWS is recommended if you are unable to minimize or prevent disturbance, injury of potential mortality of bald or golden eagles as a result of an otherwise lawful activity. For permit information in Michigan contact Ms. Carrie Tansy, USFWS East Lansing Field Office, 2651 Coolidge Road, East Lansing, MI 48823, Ph: 517-351-8375, Carrie Tansy@fws.gov

## Codes to accompany Tables:

## State Protection Status Code Definitions (SPROT)

E: Endangered
T: Threatened
SC: Special concern

## Federal Protection Status Code Definitions (USESA)

LE = listed endangered
LT = listed threatened
LELT = partly listed endangered and partly listed threatened
PDL = proposed delist
$E(S / A)=$ endangered based on similarities/appearance
PS = partial status (federally listed in only part of its range)
$C=$ species being considered for federal status

## Global Heritage Status Rank Definitions (GRANK)

The priority assigned by NatureServe's national office for data collection and protection based upon the element's status throughout its entire world-wide range. Criteria not based only on number of occurrences; other critical factors also apply. Note that ranks are frequently combined.
G1 = critically imperiled globally because of extreme rarity (5 or fewer occurrences range-wide or very few remaining individuals or acres) or because of some factor(s) making it especially vulnerable to extinction.
G2 = imperiled globally because of rarity ( 6 to 20 occurrences or few remaining individuals or acres) or because of some factor(s) making it very vulnerable to extinction throughout its range.
G3: Either very rare and local throughout its range or found locally (even abundantly at some of its locations) in a restricted range (e.g. a single western state, a physiographic region in the East) or because of other factor(s) making it vulnerable to extinction throughout its range; in terms of occurrences, in the range of 21 to 100.
G4: Apparently secure globally, though it may be quite rare in parts of its range, especially at the periphery.
G5: Demonstrably secure globally, though it may be quite rare in parts of its range, especially at the periphery.
Q: Taxonomy uncertain

## State Heritage Status Rank Definitions (SRANK)

The priority assigned by the Michigan Natural Features Inventory for data collection and protection based upon the element's status within the state. Criteria not based only on number of occurrences; other critical factors also apply. Note that ranks are frequently combined.
S1: Critically imperiled in the state because of extreme rarity (5 or fewer occurrences or very few remaining individuals or acres) or because of some factor(s) making it especially vulnerable to extirpation in the state.
S2: Imperiled in state because of rarity (6 to 20 occurrences or few remaining individuals or acres) or because of some factor(s) making it very vulnerable to extirpation from the state.
S3: Rare or uncommon in state (on the order of 21 to 100 occurrences).
S4 = apparently secure in state, with many occurrences.
S5 = demonstrably secure in state and essentially ineradicable under present conditions.
SX = apparently extirpated from state.

## Section 7 Comments for Rare Species Review \#2579

C2AE
2020 DWRF Project Plan
City of Escanaba
Delta County, MI
March 26, 2020

## For projects involving Federal funding or a Federal agency authorization

The following information is provided to assist you with Section 7 compliance of the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). The ESA directs all Federal agencies "to work to conserve endangered and threatened species. Section 7 of the ESA, called "Interagency Cooperation," is the means by which Federal agencies ensure their actions, including those they authorize or fund, do not jeopardize the existence of any listed species."

The project falls within the range of seven (7) federally listed species which have been identified by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to occur in Delta County, Michigan:

## Federally Endangered

Gray wolf - there appears to be suitable habitat within the 1.5 -mile search buffer. The gray wolf (Canis lupus) is the largest member of the Canid (dog) family, which includes coyotes, red fox and gray fox. Wolves have no specific habitat requirements, other than minimal disturbance from humans and a sufficiently large mammal prey base (primarily whitetailed deer but also snowshoe hare, beaver, and other mammals). Gray wolves require large extensive tracts of contiguous forests in which to range; home ranges are over $100 \mathrm{mi}^{2}$.

Management and Conservation: general management recommendations for the gray wolf include maintaining large areas of mature vegetation, maintaining a healthy prey base (primarily deer), and reducing probability of encounters with humans (settlements as well as roads). One of the greatest threats is an anti-wolf attitude by the general public based on erroneous beliefs. Education and outreach to increase public awareness and understanding of gray wolf ecology, behavior and management would enhance conservation efforts for this species.

Piping plover - there is a documented occurrence within the 1.5 -mile search buffer. In the Great Lakes region, the piping plover (Charadrius melodus) prefers to nest and forage on sparse or non-vegetated sand-pebble beaches, averaging 100 feet in width. Vegetative cover is usually less than $5 \%$. Associated bodies of water and interdunal wetlands enhance these areas by increasing food availability. Optimal foraging areas are especially crucial along Lake Superior, where shoreline and benthic invertebrate communities are known to be naturally sparse. Nests are generally placed in level areas between the water's edge and the first dune. While feeding, open shoreline is preferred to vegetated beach areas. Piping plovers begin arriving in mid- to late-April. The nesting season is under way by mid-May and lasts until mid-August. The nests are simple depressions in the sand and are difficult to see. This species is declining throughout the Midwest due to habitat destruction and disturbance. People walking on the beach may inadvertently destroy nests. Dogs on the beach can be especially dangerous for chicks and adults.

Management and Conservation: this species is declining throughout the Midwest due to habitat destruction and disturbance. The nests are simple depressions in the sand and are difficult to see. People walking on the beach may inadvertently destroy nests. Dogs on the beach can be especially dangerous for chicks and adults. Piping plovers are protected under the Federal Endangered Species Act and are very sensitive to human disturbance. Please avoid activity along the shoreline in this compartment between May and September.

## Federally Threatened

Northern long-eared bat - Northern long-eared bat (Myotis septentrionalis) numbers in the northeast US have decline Northern long-eared bat ( $M$. septentrionalis) numbers in the northeast US have declined up to 99 percent. Loss or degradation of summer habitat, wind turbines, disturbance to hibernacula, predation, and pesticides have contributed
to declines in Northern long-eared bat populations. However, no other threat has been as severe to the decline as White-nose Syndrome (WNS). WNS is a fungus that thrives in the cold, damp conditions in caves and mines where bats hibernate. The disease is believed to disrupt the hibernation cycle by causing bats to repeatedly awake thereby depleting vital energy reserves. This species was federally listed in May 2015 primarily due to the threat from WNS.

Although no known hibernacula or roost trees have been documented within 1.5 miles of the project area, this activity occurs within the designated WNS zone (i.e., within 150 miles of positive counties/districts impacted by WNS. In addition, there appears to be suitable habitat as well. The USFWS has prepared a dichotomous key to help determine if this action may cause prohibited take of this bat. Please consult the USFWS Endangered Species Page for more information.

Also called northern bat or northern myotis, this bat is distinguished from other Myotis species by its long ears. In Michigan, northern long-eared bats hibernate in abandoned mines and caves in the Upper Peninsula; they also commonly hibernate in the Tippy Dam spillway in Manistee County. This species is a regional migrant with migratory distance largely determined by locations of suitable hibernacula sites.

Northern long-eared bats typically roost and forage in forested areas. During the summer, these bats roost singly or in colonies underneath bark, in cavities or in crevices of both living and dead trees. Roost trees are selected based on the suitability to retain bark or provide cavities or crevices. Common roost trees in southern Lower Michigan include species of ash, elm and maple. Foraging occurs primarily in areas along woodland edges, woodland clearings and over small woodland ponds. Moths, beetles and small flies are common food items. Like all temperate bats this species typically produces only 1-2 young per year.

Management and Conservation: when there are no known roost trees or hibernacula in the project area, we encourage you to conduct tree-cutting activities and prescribed burns in forested areas during October 1 through March 31 when possible, but you are not required by the ESA to do so. When that is not possible, we encourage you to remove trees prior to June 1 or after July 31, as that will help to protect young bats that may be in forested areas but are not yet able to fly.

Red knot - there appears to be suitable habitat within the 1.5-mile search buffer. The red knot (Calidris canutus rufa) is one of the longest-distance migrants in the animal kingdom, flying some 18,000 miles annually between its breeding grounds in the Canadian Arctic to the wintering grounds at the southern-most tip of South America. Primarily occurring along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, small groups of this shorebird regularly use the interior of the United States such as the Great Lakes during the annual migration. The Great Lakes shorelines provide vital stopover habitat for resting and refueling during their long annual journey.
The largest concentration of rufa red knots is found in May in Delaware Bay, where the birds stop to gorge on the eggs of spawning horseshoe crabs; a spectacle attracting thousands of birdwatchers to the area. In just a few days, the birds nearly double their weight to prepare for the final leg of their long journey to the Arctic. This species may be especially vulnerable to climate change which affects coastal habitats due to rising sea levels.

Management and Conservation: applies to actions that occur along coastal areas during the Red Knot migratory window of MAY 1 - SEPTEMBER 30.

Canada Lynx - there appears to be suitable habitat within the 1.5 -mile search buffer. With its large paws and long hind legs, the Canada lynx (Lynx canadensis) is adapted to hunting its primary prey, the snowshoe hare (Lepus americanus). Lynx and hares are associated with moist, cool, boreal spruce-fir forests. Hares require forests with dense understories that provide food and cover, especially during periods of deep snow. Snowshoe hares comprise a majority of the lynx diet throughout its range. Lynx prey opportunistically on other small mammals, particularly red squirrels (Tamiasciurus hudsonicus), and birds, especially when hare numbers are low. Canada lynx experience widespread food shortages and many die of starvation or abandon home ranges to search for adequate prey.

Management and Conservation: any management that promotes snowshoe hare populations while retaining large blocks of conifers on the larger landscape will likely benefit this species. It is quite shy of humans, so areas of minimal
intrusion (roads, snowmobile trails, campsites, etc.) should be maintained. The species is still threatened by illegal poaching, natural population lows combined with continued human-induced mortality, mismanagement of mature coniferous forests, and incidental trapping.

Dwarf lake Iris - there appears to be suitable habitat within the 1.5-mile search buffer. Dwarf lake iris (Iris lacustris) usually occurs near Great Lakes shorelines on sand or in thin soils over calcareous gravel or bedrock. It tolerates full sun to nearly complete shade, but appears to flower best in semi-open edge or ecotonal habitats, typically amongst scattered trees or on shoreline forest margins where is occurs with northern white cedar (Thuja occidentalis) and balsam fir (Abies balsamea). Dwarf lake iris is almost invariably associated with northern white cedar, though spruce (principally white spruce, Picea glauca), balsam fir, and trembling aspen (Populus tremuloides) may also be present in the overstory. This species has demonstrated that under certain conditions it can readily spread into artificially cleared areas with dryish, calcareous substrates, where it may clone aggressively. This species usually flowers from mid-May to early June, depending on site exposure and annual weather variations. Each flower remains open approximately three days.

Management and Conservation: since Iris lacustris is largely restricted to the Great Lakes shores, it is highly vulnerable to ongoing shoreline development and intensive recreation. Fortunately, this species is a persistent and rather ecologically resilient plant, and can often withstand less-than-catastrophic disturbances (e.g. overstory removal, occasional trampling, shading). It is clearly sensitive to mechanical disturbance or removal of its substrate but can often recolonize small disturbed areas if it flourishes nearby.

Pitcher's thistle - there does not appear to be suitable habitat within 1.5 miles of the search buffer. Pitcher's thistle (Cirsium pitcheri) grows on the open and grassland sand dunes and along the shorelines of Lakes Michigan, Superior and Huron. It is occasionally found on lag gravel associated with dunes. It is mainly found in near-shore plant communities but can also grow in all non-forested areas of a dune system. This monocarpic (once-flowering) plant produces a rosette that will mature to flowering in 2-8 years, after which the plant dies. Seeds germinate in June, and most seedlings (rosettes) appear within 1-3 meters of parent plants. The taproot of this thistle, which can reach 2 m in length, enhances its ability to survive the often desiccating conditions of its dune habitat. Pitcher's thistle blooms from approximately late-June to early September. The blooms are pollinated by insects mainly bees; some thirty insect species have been observed visiting the blooms.

Management and Conservation: - Pitcher's thistle can be locally extirpated by destruction or major disturbance of its habitat (e.g. by shoreline development, vehicular or ORV traffic, heavy foot traffic and/or intensive recreation).

USFWS Section 7 Consultation Technical Assistance can be found at:

## https://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/section7/index.html

The website offers step-by-step instructions to guide you through the Section 7 consultation process with prepared templates for documenting "no effect." as well as requesting concurrence on "may affect, but not likely to adversely affect" determinations.

Please let us know if you have questions.

Mike Sanders<br>Environmental Review Specialist/Zoologist<br>Sander75@msu.edu<br>517-284-6215

## 10. Protected Plants and Animals

The MNFI found at-risk species documented within 1.5 miles of the project site; of concern was the Osprey and Bald Eagle. Disturbance to these species will be minimized. Water service replacements will be in previously disturbed areas; typically, either in paved or frequently mowed areas.

## 10. Protected Plants and Animals

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services technical assistance website on Section 7 Endangered Species Act Consultation was used to determine if the project will impact any federally listed species. According to the website, there may be the following endangered and/or threatened species present in Delta County: Canada Lynx, Gray Wolf, Northern Long-eared Bat, Piping Plover, Red Knot, Dwarf Lake Iris, and Pitcher's Thistle. There were no critical habitats found at the Action Area location. Also possibly present in Delta County includes the migratory birds: American Britten, Bald Eagle, Black Tern, Bobolink, Canada Warbler, Cape May Warbler, Dunlin, Least Bittern, Lesser Yellowlegs, Lesser Yellowlegs, Long-eared Owl, Marbled Godwit, Red-headed Woodpecker, Ruddy Turnstone, Rusty Blackbird, and Whimbrel. Furthermore, there are no refuge lands, fish hatcheries. Although there are wetlands within the IPAC area (the entire IPAC area is the City's water service area), no construction is anticipated to be near the wetlands.

The action area will be limited to already developed area (an area that is already paved or supports structures and the only vegetation is limited to frequently mowed grass or conventional landscaping). Therefore, this project will not affect suitable habitat for federally listed species. For these reasons, it can be concluded that the project will have "no effect" on listed species, their habitats, or proposed or designated critical habitat.

