

Boardman River Dams Committee Meeting
Tuesday, January 22, 2008
Grand Traverse County Civic Center

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.”

Attendance: Tom Allerton, Landa Alpers, Ron Alpers, Peter Albers, Robin Beardsley, Susanne Biteman, Bill Bitzinger, Mark Breederland, Chris Buday, Bruce Carpenter, Eric Clone, Beverly Cuthbert, John Dyksterhouse, Joe Elliott, Michael Estes, Brett Fessell, Ed Flees, Margaret Forgione, Ken Gregory, James Grant, Jim Harvey, Meral Jackson, Jennifer Jay, Mark Johnson, Jim Johnston, Todd Kalish, Joe Kaltenbach, Bob Kaufman, Bill Lane, Steve Largent, Mark Lewis, Richard Lewis, Ed Martel, Ann Martin, Adrian Meli, Jack Murray, Amy Packard, Scott Parker, Carl Platz, Tom Rozich, Bill Scharf, Gabe Schneider, Jim Schramm (via phone), Jim Selegean, Sandra Sroonian, Don Tilton, Thomas Wertz, Rick Westerhof, Sharon Wise, John Wyrwas

I. Introductions

II. Review of Agenda

III. Approve or Amend November Minutes

November minutes approved as written.

IV. Review of BRDC Operating Structure- Todd Kalish

Todd reviewed the BRDC decision making process, emphasizing that this is a groundbreaking public process with great transferability to other communities looking at managing shared natural resources. Todd referred to the BRDC flowchart, included in each agenda packet and available via the website.

V. ECT Update – Scott Parker

Scott began by directing those in attendance to the progress tracking schedule contained in the meeting packets. ECT has completed all funded and requested tasks to date. The Preliminary Engineering Evaluation of the Dam Structures is available in print at tonight’s meeting, and is also accessible on the website. The Preliminary Engineering Evaluation of the Dam Structures was a joint effort with the USACE to collect all existing data. The evaluation is intended to establish baseline conditions for each of the dams. Union Street Dam: The City has maintained the dam well. There does not appear to be any hindrance to any alternative due to this dam’s condition. Sabin Dam: The structure is good and has been maintained well. Boardman Dam: The DEQ has determined that the spillway capacity is inadequate, and that improvements or replacement will be necessary. Suggestions from ECT toward that end include modifying the existing spillway, leaving the pond at current lower levels, exploring ways to lower the head to less than 40’, or lower the crest of the spillway to reduce flood level requirement. Further exploration will be required to establish baseline for future alternatives. Brown Bridge: There are concerns regarding seepage on the right embankment and cracking evident in the powerhouse structure. The City has begun a more detailed evaluation. Brown Bridge will also require further evaluation for the establishment of a baseline.

Discussion: Ed Martel states that the Boardman emergency spillway was bisected by a road, and that in an existing deed to the city, it is stated that the road commission is to “maintain clogged spillway and clean culvert or lose right of way”. Mr. Martel has questions regarding the deed along with fluctuations in water levels. Scott responds that existing data used to establish baseline must satisfy regulatory authorities and meet current standards. All alternatives are considered. Have ECT engineers confirmed DEQ findings/rulings? The baseline data must be reviewed and approved by DEQ. Will the Engineering study give estimated costs for infrastructure repair? Yes. Each step defines next step. Recommendations will be made on next

steps and costs will be identified. It will be compiled by the end of 2008. Why did the pond water level raise almost 7 feet? It's likely a combination of heavy snow, early snow melt and decreased capacity in flow stock.

VI. **Army Corps of Engineers, Sediment Update – Jim Selegean**

The full United States Army Corps of Engineers Sediment Transport Presentation is available on the web site or by request. Captured in these minutes are discussion and questions during and after the presentation. Jim Selegean is a hydrolic engineer charged with examining the impact on sediment for each alternative. Three main areas of consideration are bank erosion, agricultural sediments (not much present), logging activities, which along with construction contribute to sediment delivery. On the way downstream, sediment is stored in point bars. Behind the dams, the sediment hits backwater and deposits in the delta. Eventually the delta moves into the impoundment and grows over time. The goal is to measure pre-dam topography and compare to current levels to produce sediment volume. Sediment concerns include potential short-term harm to downstream reaches, erosion or accretion (build-up), detriment to fish habitats, and increase in flooding. Discussion: Is the Keystone Dam washout evident in the sediment? Yes, sand is carried to middle of the pond where strata measures big events. In 1961, the Keystone dam gave out. One can look upstream of the Boardman to see 40 year adjustments. Will sediment effect operation of the dam? Will it move? Are there contaminants in the sediment? In dam removal situations, 10-30% of the sediment gets remobilized. The Corps will examine. The Boardman held in '61, and we've had 8 to 10 major rain events since then. How do you measure impacts? Mary Weidel is working on flood flow models in the Corps office. How does the impact of all that's gone on effect a possible decision to save the dam and raise water levels? Don Tilton of ECT pointed out that the vegetation zones are key to understanding what happens if the water comes back up. Current situation is not negatively affecting habitat and fish. The wetlands are becoming densely vegetated, which is great for fish and amphibians. There is a nice deep channel through the delta. The bank structure is intact. Can the 10-30% sediment mobilization be mitigated? A channel could be mechanically cut through, water could be brought down and the side slopes stabilized. What happens as the water levels fluctuate? Vegetation and small species can handle inundation of 6 months without negative impact. Major fluctuations can disturb the banks.

VII. **Army Corps of Engineers – Carl Platz**

Carl was pleased to announce that an omnibus bill was signed in December, earmarking \$936,000 in funding for 8 active GLFER projects. The BRDC will receive at least \$175,000 in funding, available perhaps as early as February. USACE will work closely with ECT to best utilize the funding, with the aim to identify environmental objectives, support hydrology and establish conceptual design of alternatives. Discussion: Can the hydraulics model either confirm the original maximum precipitation event/maximum flood requirements or reexamine spillway issue? We certainly hope so, although analysis is not specific to the spillway.

VIII. **Scoping Team Update and Recommendations –Mike Donahue**

The team met December 19. Minutes are included in the agenda packet. The team is tracking the overall progress of the Engineering and Feasibility Study, focusing on additional task orders of the Scoping Team and initiating the process of presenting alternatives. Mike requested that the committee look at the five bullets on the Scoping Team report, and the Scope of Work included in the packet. Question: Part of the Scope of Work was to analyze the current condition of the dams. Does the Boardman Dam meet all standards except the DEQ's spillway capacity? Mike pointed out that task 3 of the 5 in the current Scope of Work is for the engineering analysis of the Boardman Dam. That engineering analysis is ongoing. The alternatives analysis will be completed in 2008. Mike then asked for approval to complete the 5 tasks discussed at a price of \$80,000. There were no objections and the Scope of Work was approved by consensus, however, Robert Kaufman, attorney, stated for the record that his clients attendance at this meeting should not be construed as them having a standing on this issue. Mike asked that the committee refer to the Scoping Team recommendation to the BRDC, and the specific action contained in the agenda packet. 81 options have been identified from

detailed analysis of engineering, societal, environmental etc. criteria. The existing data analysis is nearing completion, and the focus will be on evaluating alternative futures. A subset of alternatives will be determined to establish a list of six – eight to begin the process. Our challenge is to identify which 6-8 are most viable, would generate the most information for consideration, and still leave a broad range. To do this, each committee member is asked to review the suggested list of 6 against the original 81 options. Determine whether you'd like to add to, delete from or otherwise modify that list. Selecting just 6 does not eliminate the potential evaluation of other options, but does provide a solid starting point for analysis. Discussion: How do we make comments? By email, phone, mail or blog to Jennifer Jay by February 15th at 5:00 PM. What about the interest in a whitewater option? Mike suggests that all should develop creative suggestions that could become additional option for further exploration.

- IX. **Bottomlands Management/Property Owners Issues Team update – Steve Largent** The Bottomlands/Property Owners Issues Teams met on January 16th to discuss, among other things, fluctuating water levels and issues at Boardman Pond. Complete meeting minutes are included in the meeting packet. Steve announced that Charles Peterson has purchased the power generating equipment currently contained in the Boardman and Sabin Dams, with the desire of producing power. Discussion: Would Mr. Peterson need to comply with FERC regulations? Yes. Does this take those dams out of consideration for any alternatives? No. Mr. Peterson purchased the equipment, not the dams. Would there be a permit process required for any alternative? Yes. New permits would need to be issued.
- X. **Communications Team Update – Sandra Sroonian** Sandra pointed out that the last Communications Team minutes are included in the agenda packet. With an eye on the clock, Sandra briefly mentioned that there is an Americorps volunteer helping the Communications Team approximately 16 hours per month. The current focus of the CT is to work with ECT to design a survey. The next CT meeting is February 13th, As always, all are welcome
- XI. **Finance and Fund Development Team Update – Mark Brederland and Update from City of Traverse City – Richard Lewis**
Mark has stepped forward to Chair the Finance Team, as Becky Ewing has taken a new position with Rotary Charities. Thanks Mark! Mark reports that there are \$360,000 in grant requests currently pending. *Discussion:* Is the city doing its own study of Brown Bridge? Richard Lewis replied that yes, they were, and that the results of that study would be made available to the BRDC. This action was prompted by the preliminary engineering report provided by the Corps that caused great concern. The city worked with ECT and the Corps to devise the scope of work for this and has contracted with STS Corporation to conduct the study and provide long and short term recommendations and costs for Brown Bridge and for Union Street. This carries an estimated \$60,000 price tag and a 6 month time frame. When was the last safety inspection done? In 1999, by the USACE. Does the city have Brown Bridge on the table for possible power generation? Yes, but the generating equipment is very old.
- XII. **General Q&A – ALL** *Unanswered questions generated during the course of the meeting or at this time will be sent on to the appropriate Task Team or the full BRDC for inclusion in their next agenda, as determined by the full BRDC*
Does the level of the bay dictate the level of the river with or without the dams? To some extent. If the lake comes up, it would effect river up to Union Street but it wouldn't effect the Boardman. Is there a date established for the next Scoping Team/Bottomlands meeting? Not yet. Watch the website.
- XIII. **Call for agenda items for February meeting and meeting evaluation – ALL**
 1. ECT update
 2. Team reports
 3. Dr. Bryan Burroughs, Fisheries report
 4. Recommendation from Scoping Team regarding list of alternatives
- XIV. **Meeting adjourned at 8pm.**