



Senate Fiscal Agency  
P. O. Box 30036  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7536

BILL



ANALYSIS

Telephone: (517) 373-5383  
Fax: (517) 373-1986

Senate Bill 1052 (Substitute S-1 as reported by the Committee of the Whole)  
Sponsor: Senator Tom Casperson  
Committee: Natural Resources, Environment and Great Lakes

### **CONTENT**

The bill would amend Parts 303 (Wetlands Protection) and 325 (Great Lakes Submerged Lands) of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act to eliminate a requirement that a person obtain a permit under Part 303 or 325 for the mowing or removal of vegetation between the ordinary high-water mark and the water's edge.

The bill provides that the following activities would not be subject to regulation under Part 303 or 325 by the State or a local unit of government:

- Leveling of sand, removal of vegetation, grooming of soil, or removal of debris, in an area of unconsolidated material predominantly composed of sand, rock, or pebbles, located between the ordinary high-water mark and the water's edge.
- Mowing of vegetation between the ordinary high-water mark and the water's edge.

The exemption from regulation would not apply to unpatented overflowed lands, made lands, or Lake St. Clair bottomlands belonging to or held in trust by the State.

The bill also would repeal a section that required the DEQ Director to designate two areas of Great Lakes shoreline where vegetation mowing and removal were allowed without a permit under Parts 303 and 325 for a limited time.

MCL 324.30301 et al.

Legislative Analyst: Julie Cassidy

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

The bill would have an indeterminate impact on the State's finances. The bill would eliminate the regulation of removing or mowing vegetation and leveling of sand on beaches under Parts 303 and 325 of the Act. Currently, riparian land owners must obtain a permit for those activities on beaches and pay a \$50 fee to do so. Under the bill, riparian land owners would no longer have to obtain this permit, so the DEQ would lose the revenue associated with these fees. Since the DEQ would no longer be processing this type of permit, there would be savings associated with the bill as well. It is not clear whether the amount of fee revenue lost would be greater or less than the savings associated with no longer processing the permits, so the fiscal impact of the bill is indeterminate.

Date Completed: 5-22-12

Fiscal Analyst: Josh Sefton