

**DRAFT**

**Summary Minutes**

**Scoping Team Meeting  
Boardman River Dams Disposition Study**

Civic Center  
Wednesday, February 20, 2008  
4:00- 5:30 pm

---

1. Mike Donahue called the meeting to order at approximately 4:10 pm. Scoping Team members in attendance included Mark Johnson, Tom Wertz, Rob Beardsley, Jack Murray, Sandra Sroonian, Steve Largent and Matt Heiman. Guests included Todd Kalish (MDNR), Don Tilton (ECT) and Robin Johnson (Grand Traverse Conservation District.)
2. Todd Kalish discussed and clarified process issues as they relate to the BRDC, the Implementation Team and the various committees. (He provided a handout to attendees for this purpose.) He also asked that the Scoping Team prepare and submit a mission statement and goals, as has been requested of other teams/committees. Donahue agreed to draft a statement for Scoping Team review and approval.
3. Donahue noted that the focus of the meeting was on a single topic: developing a recommendation regarding dams disposition options that merit special focus for the balance of the Engineering and Feasibility Study. This recommendation will be shaped on the basis of a survey of BRDC members and the larger community that was conducted over the past month. The recommendation will be presented to the BRDC for review and approval at its February 26 meeting. Donahue also noted that all Scoping Team members are encouraged to stay for a joint meeting with the Bottomlands Committee, to be held immediately after the conclusion of the Scoping Team meeting. The purpose of that meeting is to “develop a comprehensive list of Bottomland disposition options that complement existing disposition options for Boardman Dam.” These options will then be presented to the Scoping Team for prospective incorporation into the analysis of selected dams disposition options.

4. Results of the survey were presented. Of the 95 respondents, approximately 80% approved the detailed analysis of six of the 81 dams disposition options, as suggested by the Scoping Team (Alternatives 1, 25, 41, 43, 79, 80). In addition, a total of 31 other alternatives were suggested; all but a few of these received just one vote. Alternatives receiving three or more votes included 7, 52 and 81.
5. Scoping Team members then engaged in extended open discussion about survey results and prospective elements of a recommendation to the BRDC. Highlights include the following:
  - Don Tilton observed that detailed analysis (i.e., environmental, economic, social, cultural) of the six alternatives originally suggested by the Scoping Team will yield a wealth of data and information that can help citizens make informed decisions about a much larger range of the alternatives. Tom Wertz agreed, and noted that a compelling reason- and defined set of criteria- would be needed to expand the list, based upon survey outcomes. Matt Heiman concurred with this.
  - Steve Largent, along with multiple other members, talked about the importance of understanding what “modification” actually entails, and suggested that a list of modification options be developed, for illustrative purposes, to help BRDC members understand the full range of alternatives available.
  - Rob Beardsley noted that cost considerations were a critically important factor in the decision making process and need to be highlighted in preparation of the fact sheets. Don Tilton agreed and noted that the City has commissioned work that will yield estimates on repairs to Brown Bridge to bring it up to MDEQ standards.
  - Tom Wertz also recommended that the additional dimension of “time” be considered in the alternatives analysis process. He explained that some alternatives may be implemented in a relatively short period, while others could take many years.
  - Rob Beardsley suggested that special sessions at BRDC meetings- or separate “stand alone” meetings- be organized in the coming months to focus specifically on the various alternatives selected for detailed analysis. Others agreed, also suggesting that the meetings might be organized on a topical basis (e.g., fish passage options; recreational options.)

6. Scoping Team members then methodically reviewed the three additional alternatives that received three or more votes during the survey process. It was noted that these three were closely related to alternatives already suggested by the Scoping Team. After extended discussion, it was agreed to add alternative 81 to the original list of six, given strong interest in looking at modification options for Union Street Dam. This would result in a recommendation that the BRDC approve detailed analysis of the following alternatives:
  1. Retain/ repair all dams
  25. Remove Sabin and Boardman, retain/ rep. Union St. and Brown Bridge
  41. Modify all dams
  43. Remove Sabin, retain/ rep. Union St., modify Boardman and Brown Bridge
  79. Retain/ repair Union Street, remove all others
  80. Remove all dams
  81. Modify Union St., remove all others
  
7. The Scoping Team further agreed that the following points should be emphasized in the recommendation to be presented to the BRDC:
  - Outcomes of the options analysis should be presented in the form of fact sheets that present data/ information on the environmental, economic, social and cultural implications of each option, consistent with questions developed by the BRDC and incorporated into the Request for Qualifications document;
  - The consultant team should be provided with outcomes of the public survey (and all associated comments) for use as guidance in undertaking the analysis;
  - The term “modify” should be clearly defined, and a descriptive inventory of modification alternatives be prepared to provide additional guidance for the analysis; and
  - Although the primary focus will be on several alternatives for detailed analysis, all 81 possible options should remain “in play” for the duration of the project to ensure that the BRDC and the larger community have access to the full range of options when identifying a “preferred” future for the Boardman River system.

8. Donahue indicated that a draft recommendation would be prepared within the next day for Scoping Team review and approval prior to distribution to the BRDC for action on February 26. He also noted that consideration would be given to the date/ time for the next Scoping Team meeting and members would be notified promptly.
9. Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:30 pm, at which time the joint meeting with the Bottomlands Committee began.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael J. Donahue, Ph.D.  
Technical Coordinator

URS Corporation

March 5, 2008