

**Boardman River Dams Committee
Implementation Team
Meeting Minutes
December 12, 2006; 6:00 - 7:30PM**

Boardman River Dams Committee Statement of Purpose:

“To engage all interests in assessing and recommending the fate of the dams on the main stem of the Boardman River based upon a thorough analysis of options, including long and short-term economic, social, environmental, aesthetic, transportation and ecological impacts upon the community, individuals and riparian owners.”

Attendees:

Robin Beardsley, Stewart Cogswell, Beverly Cuthbert, Brett Fessell, Burr Fisher (by phone), Carol Groves, Kyle Kruger, Meral Jackson, Jennifer Jay, Todd Kalish, Joe Kaltenbach, Richard Lewis, Chris Maxbauer, Jim McIntyre, Jack Murray, Troy Naperala, Glenn Neihardt, Katherine Neihardt, John Nelson, Amy Packard, Scott Parker, Jim Pawloski, Linda Racine, Gabe Schneider, Jim Schram, Mike Slater, Sandra Sroonian, Wayne Swallow, Don Tilton, John Wyrwas, Peter Zirnelt

Please refer to the meeting agenda and supporting documents which were reviewed at this meeting. Minutes, agendas, and supporting documents are located on the website: <http://www.theboardman.org>

I. Introductions

Todd Kalish began the meeting with intro’s all around, and announced that five IT team members were present, with a sixth participating via phone. Todd briefly reviewed the overall framework and organizational structure of the BRDC, thanking everyone for their continued involvement. Todd pointed out that this is a very unique project and that it is critical to be as creative in our thinking as possible to create the most effective and innovative process possible. Todd also announced that there will be training and leadership workshop opportunities offered in January. Everyone is encouraged to attend. Specific information will be forthcoming.

II. Scope of Work Team report; decision item

Troy Naperala of URS and Peter Zirnelt, interested citizen, discussed the Scoping Team’s evaluation process, results, and recommendation. Troy reviewed the extensive efforts and considerable research that has culminated in the following recommendations and the final contract, and stated that the team, with their diverse backgrounds, worked as a very cohesive group. The Scope of Work document and supporting materials are available on the website:

Troy stated the following:

1. All issues have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Scoping Team
2. IT and Finance will work closely to secure funding
3. ECT will provide guidance regarding funding and grant writing
4. ECT will rely on existing data to move forward
5. The Scoping Team and Finance will be key in establishing Work Order’s
6. Project coordinator will be involved in the process

Discussion: What is our current budget balance? Is there money on the horizon? BRDC currently has \$325,000 in hand. There are grants pending, and the Finance Team is pursuing all funding options. What will it cost to implement this contract? Signing the contract is a commitment to the process, not to spending the highest estimated cost of study. Discussion followed regarding the range of funding, factors, and existing data. The Work Order process is set up to work with study priorities and available funding. Concerns were expressed regarding the lack of funding in hand, and a lively and spirited discussion followed. A question was asked regarding the 170 % overhead rate stated in the contract.

The rate is a federally audited contract rate and is in the standard range. Is the Scoping Team driving the Work Order system? Yes, and the Scoping Team is flexible in its membership. It may be time for a team transformation to include a broader membership. If the IT ratify's the contract and begins the Work Order system, what happens first and who decides? ECT will focus on identifying existing conditions, need to catalog and assess studies and data that currently exist. They will then make specific recommendations as to what more is needed. Work Order's will show on spreadsheets. Who is the signatory to the draft contract? NMC is the only entity that can enter into a contract, as they are the fiscal agent. An addition will be made to the contract to reflect the approval of the IT Chair as to form.

The IT then proceeded to a thumb check, resulting in 4 thumbs up and 2 sideways, reaching consensus on the contract. Congratulations were offered to ECT and huge thanks given to all who have worked so tirelessly to get to this point, especially the Scoping Team members: Steve Largent, Grand Traverse Conservation District; Mark Johnson, CRA; Robin Beardsley, Interested Citizen; Sarah Johnston, Property Owner – Boardman Pond; Kevin McElyea, Grand Traverse County Drain Commissioner; Peter Zirnhelt, Interested Citizen; Jack Murray, Interested Citizen, Jim Pawloski, MDEQ; Thomas Wertz, Interested Citizen; and Facilitation Team Support, Michael Donahue, URS Corp.

III. Boardman Pond report; decision/discussion item

Todd Kalish provided an overview of the potential drawdown of the Boardman Pond.

Discussion: Has the TCLP Board reached a maintenance agreement with the County? Not yet, but there are extension options with FERC. There is optimism that an agreement will be reached, and that the TCLP will continue to maintain and operate the Boardman Dam until a final agreement is reached. If the drawdown happens, what happens with the bottomlands? Todd made the suggestion that the BRDC commit to fully supporting the maintenances of the bottomlands. The BRDC should continue to support the river, regardless of the decision made regarding the dams. Fundraising and in-kind donations will need to be addressed. If the pond is lowered and the mudflats do not revegetate, then what? If the pond owners wanted it, the BRDC could work to make reseeding happen. Is there a timeframe for the drawdown? This would be prescribed by the permit/DEQ. This could take several months. If the DEQ or FERC dictates, the process must begin. There could be limits and restrictions to the level of the drawdown...certainly fish spawning, etc. would be taken into consideration. The owner of the dam (County) must agree to permit. The DEQ can require the drawdown but "we" must apply for the permit? Yes, the owner (County) must reduce the risk, which requires a drawdown, which requires a permit. The permit process allows for public input. Anyone affected by the drawdown can request a public meeting. Since the drawdown does not have to be permanent, what happens if there is damage caused by refilling? There should not be any damage. Some ponds are routinely drawn down and refilled annually as a form of management. There can be some benefits to the drawdown/flood process, notably in sediment management. What are the chances of dam repair? All options will be explored in the Engineering and Feasibility Study. The drawdown buys some time, as a drawdown would be required to fix the dam. Should the BRDC be involved in a proactive stance regarding the drawdown? Yes, this would provide more community involvement which would be good in the permit process.

Follow-up action: This issue will become an agenda item for the January 23rd meeting. In the meantime, Todd will survey BRDC conservation organization members to get feedback from them.

IIII. General comments from everybody regarding the Content/Process/Relationships of the meeting

Todd asked the membership for frank and honest evaluation of the meeting. Feedback was very positive: "Very good meeting!", "Big step forward", "One of our best meetings ever", "It's working!", "Very frank and honest", "Many voices heard"

Next meeting: January 23rd, 2007, Civic Center, 6 pm
NOTE NEW LOCATION OF BRDC MEETINGS!

Meeting Adjourned: 7:30 p.m.

Submitted: December 13, 2006
Jennifer Jay, Project Coordinator
Phone: 231-995-2617
Email: jjay@nmc.edu