

**DRAFT**  
**Summary Minutes**

**Scoping Team Meeting**  
**Boardman River Dams Disposition Study**  
**University Center- Room 212**  
**Thursday, June 12, 2008**  
**4:00 pm- 6:00 pm**

---

1. The meeting was called to order by Chair Tom Wertz at approximately 4:10 pm. Members and guests in attendance included Mark Johnson, Tom Wertz, Pete Zirnheldt, Jack Murray, Suzanne Biteman, Matt Heiman, Sandra Sroonian (via speakerphone), Jim Schramm, Troy Naperala, Charles Peterson, Pete Alpers, Mike Donahue, Jim Galloway (via speakerphone) and Don Tilton (via speakerphone.)
2. Tom Wertz welcomed all attendees to the meeting. He indicated that he was pleased to be part of this committee and, in the interest of ensuring that its work was as effective as possible, he encouraged everyone to give him feedback.
3. Tom Wertz called for approval of the minutes of the May Scoping Team meeting. Charles Peterson requested that item #8, second paragraph, be amended to clarify that he had asked Don Tilton whether there had been direct contact with individuals from Mead and Hunt regarding past studies on the Boardman dams. Don Tilton indicated that had not been direct contact. The membership then unanimously adopted the minutes, as amended.
4. Don Tilton provided an update on the work of the consultant team. Tilton reported that the socio-economic report had been completed and is receiving “finishing touches.” An initial fact sheet focusing on retaining and repairing all dams has been completed and is undergoing internal review. A Freedom of Information Act request provided access to additional sediment data. He will summarize the review and provide it to the BRDC for the record.
5. Scoping Team members critiqued the special session at the last BRDC meeting (i.e., fish passage) in the interest of assessing what worked well, what did not, and how upcoming special sessions might be more effective. Sandra Sroonian indicated that she had been contacted by several individuals who thought the session was biased, and that the “generalities” in the presentation did not provide sufficient documentation. Matt Heiman agreed and indicated that he had several questions and concerns he wanted to approach the speaker with. Suzanne Biteman indicated that she was disappointed in the presentation; it was too lengthy and ineffective, departing from the desired approach and consisting of “experts debating experts.” She also indicated that Don Tilton should have had a more central facilitation role to ensure that the session would add value to the

Engineering and Feasibility Study process and the associated development of fact sheets for the various dams disposition alternatives. Charles Peterson observed that one hour isn't sufficient for these sessions, and debate can help highlight key issues. Suzanne Biteman indicated that the Communications Team had discussed the question of adequate time and did not have an interest in extending the length of BRDC meetings. Mike Donahue indicated that the web site could be used more effectively in advance of meetings to educate BRDC members on the issues and provide additional background to make the special sessions more meaningful. It was ultimately agreed that future special sessions would continue to be limited to one hour, strive for objectivity, and feature formal presentations of 15-20 minutes, with the balance of the session a well-facilitated dialogue designed to help shape and advance the Engineering and Feasibility Study and the fact sheets.

6. Scoping Team members then focused on upcoming special sessions, the next of which will address the potential for hydropower production. Charles Peterson spoke to the need for education, and suggested that there should be three speakers that would not speak directly to the Boardman dams, but would focus more generally on the current/ emerging energy crisis and the importance of developing alternative energy. Once the BRDC was better informed of these issues, a second session could possibly be organized to address issues specific to the Boardman dams. Matt Heiman stated that there was no need for generalizations, and that BRDC members are most interested in issues specific to the fate of the dams. Sandra Sroonian indicated that her vision for the sessions would entail a focus on the Boardman dams, and include one speaker addressing the FERC re-licensing process, a second speaker focusing on the history of hydropower production at the dams, and a third speaker focusing on the prospects for re-instating hydropower production. Matt Heiman remarked that Charles Peterson's proposed approach would be too advocacy-oriented and not focus sufficiently on issues specific to the Boardman dams. Jim Schramm suggested that the focus of the session should be on whether hydropower production should be "in the picture" if the dams remain. Pete Zirnheldt indicated that it was important to balance all uses of the river, of which hydropower is but one use. Pete Alpers recommended that the session take a "pros and cons" approach. Pete Zirnheldt, along with multiple other members, noted that the economics of hydropower production is a critically important consideration and should be addressed during the special session.

The members ultimately agreed that a panel of three individuals should be organized to speak to the history of hydropower production at the Boardman dams, the nature of the FERC re-licensing process, and the potential for producing hydropower as one of the alternative futures for the Boardman dams. Sandra Sroonian agreed to work with Charles Peterson in lining up session speakers, with the intent to have the session finalized by the end of the week.

7. The Scoping Team re-confirmed that sedimentation should be the topic of the special session at the July BRDC meeting. It was agreed that Steve Largent

should be invited to lead development of the session and overall approach, given his expertise in this topical area.

8. The Scoping Team agreed that socio-economic considerations should be the topic for the August BRDC meeting. Tom Wertz volunteered to help coordinate development of the session and selection of panelists. He indicated that he would like Don Tilton to facilitate the session to ensure that critical questions/ issues are raised and addressed.
9. The overall approach to fact sheet development was discussed in detail. Don Tilton suggested that the Scoping Team consider reducing the number of dams disposition alternatives receiving a detailed focus from seven to three as a means to focus limited time and resources on those alternatives most likely to receive serious consideration by the BRDC and larger community. Extended discussion followed, with various members expressing concern over narrowing the focus of the investigation given that the BRDC had already completed a lengthy and detailed process concluding that seven alternative futures should receive detailed analysis. Suzanne Biteman referenced earlier Scoping Team conversations where the consultant team indicated that data and information from some fact sheets would be readily transferable to others.

It was decided that the consultant team should prepare the seven fact sheets to the greatest level of detail possible, and the Scoping Team will subsequently work with the consultant team and the BRDC to determine the merits of further narrowing down the number of alternatives for in-depth analysis.

10. Mike Donahue spoke to the content of a Task and Activity Timeline he drafted at the request of the Scoping Team at its last meeting. The intent of the document is to succinctly summarize key tasks (and associated completion dates) that will see the project to a successful conclusion over the balance of the calendar year. He reviewed the timeline (handout), noting that the sequence of the special sessions at the BRDC meetings needed to be adjusted per Scoping Team decisions. He invited members to carefully review the document and offer comments in the interest of finalizing it as principal guidance for the project.
11. Charles Peterson was invited to present an additional agenda items that he had requested just prior to the meeting, entailing a request that the Scoping Team become involved in reviewing, editing and revising a recent draft consultant team report, as well as in establishing parameters for future report production to ensure accuracy and value added. In light of the length of the meeting, he decided to defer this item for possible future attention at a Scoping Team meeting.
12. Mike Donahue noted that Jim Galloway had been invited to discuss the prospective application of a Corps decision- making tool (IWR Plan) to the dams disposition selection process. Due to the length of the meeting, however, Galloway was unable to stay on the line to do so. It was agreed that he would be invited to make a presentation on this topic at a future Scoping Team meeting.

Don Tilton noted that he planned to integrate some aspects of IWR Plan into the fact sheet development process. Mike Donahue noted that Jim Galloway had prepared a one page overview that had been distributed to the Scoping Team membership.

13. Under “other business”, Mark Johnson noted that FERC had recently received an application to operate the dams for hydropower production purposes. Charles Peterson confirmed this.
14. Hearing no further business, Tom Wertz adjourned the meeting at approximately 6:20 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael J. Donahue, Ph.D.  
Technical Coordinator

Vice President, Water Resources  
and Environmental Services  
URS Corporation

June 23, 2008