

DRAFT

Summary Minutes

**Scoping Team Meeting
Boardman River Dams Disposition Study
University Center- Room 211
Tuesday, May 8, 2008
4:00 pm- 6:00 pm**

1. The meeting was called to order at approximately 4:10 pm. Members/ guests in attendance included Jim Pawloski; Susanne Biteman; Sandra Sroonian; Jim Schramm; Mark Johnson; Ron Alpers; Peter Albers; Todd Kalish; Steve Largent; Rob Beardsley; Tom Wertz; and Nobert Tutlis. Joining by conference call were Donald Tilton, Charles Peterson and Michael Donahue.
2. Tom Wertz opened the meeting by welcoming all participants. He noted that he had recently been elected chair of the Scoping Team and is looking forward to working with all members in addressing the team's important task. He indicated that he would be chairing future meetings but Mike Donahue would continue with the services he has been providing including agenda development, preparation of minutes and technical support.
3. Tom Wertz asked Mike Donahue to review the agenda. Donahue noted that key items included a status report on the Engineering and Feasibility Study; plans to post the seven dams disposition items on the project web site to promote review and comment; start up efforts for new consultant team task order; status report on special topics for upcoming BRDC meetings; and discussion of alternate approaches to the preparation and presentation for the project final report. membership:
4. Mike Donahue reviewed actions resulting from the last meeting, including development and approval of a Scoping Team mission statement and language for a new consultant team task order to provide for additional economics work (i.e., cost estimates for various dams disposition alternatives) as well as preparation of two detailed fact sheets on dams disposition alternatives.
5. Tom Wertz presented the minutes of the previous Scoping Team meeting for review and approval. Ron Alpers asked why Mike Donahue had used the term "dam removal" several times during the previous Scoping Team meeting. Donahue explained that he uses the term only in the context of the numerous dams disposition alternatives (selected by the BRDC) that involve dam removal. With respect to the overall study, he noted that the term "dams disposition" is appropriate because all possible alternatives (including retain/ repair and modify) are being considered. As Technical Coordinator for the project, Donahue added that he has no vested interest in any particular outcome other than a fair, open,

objective and science- based process. Following this discussion, the minutes were approved as presented.

6. Don Tilton provided an update on the current status of the Engineering and Feasibility Study. He stated that the cultural impacts report has been completed and sent to the Project Coordinator. The engineering report is behind schedule due to data needs and should be completed by the end of May. Socio-economic work by a subconsultant is on schedule and a draft is expected in the next three weeks. In response to a question by Ron Alpers, Tilton indicated that the paddlers' survey was never intended to be comprehensive; the purpose is to get an idea of the type, location and frequency of paddling activity. A limited number of surveys have been returned to date. In response to a question from Tom Wertz, Tilton indicated that this data/ information will be included in the consultant's report in detail, and additional efforts will be made to gather data.
7. Mike Donahue and Don Tilton discussed plans to post information on the seven dams disposition alternatives on the project web site. Donahue explained that the intent is to stimulate discussion within the BRDC membership and larger community. All interested parties will be encouraged to share their opinions on the various alternatives; provide data and information for prospective consideration in developing the dams disposition analyses; and/ or contribute other thoughts that will help focus the community on dams disposition alternatives. Tilton committed to working with Donahue on this over the coming month, and providing the Scoping Team with draft posting information for review and approval at the June Scoping Team meeting.
8. Don Tilton discussed start- up efforts associated with the recently approved task order. Members of the consultant team are now reviewing the various dams disposition options (i.e., repair/ retain, modify, remove) in the interest of securing general estimates of the costs associated with each of the various dams. In addition, all data and information assembled to date is being considered as the fact sheets for two of the several options are prepared in detail. The fact sheet content will be organized in such a way as to be responsive to the "100 questions" identified in the Request for Qualifications document the BRDC prepared prior to consultant selection. Draft material will be available for the June meeting of the Scoping Team.

Charles Peterson asked whether Tilton was using any information from past Gannet and Fleming, and Meade and Hunt reports. Tilton indicated that these reports had been reviewed, along with a report prepared by STS. At Peterson's request, Tilton agreed to provide him with names and contact information from individuals with relevant individuals from those firms.

9. Scoping Team members reviewed their recommendations for special topics at BRDC meetings through the end of the calendar year. The April BRDC meeting session, which focused on various prospective modifications to the dams, was well received and informative. Fish passage will be the focus of the May meeting,

and the June meeting will focus on prospects for hydropower production. Sandra Sroonian and Charles Peterson are working on this session. Subsequent meetings will focus on socio- economic impacts of alternatives including recreation impacts; sedimentation issues; and financial sustainability with regard to long term costs of the various alternatives. Members then offered feedback on the “modifications” session, and several favorable comments were received. It was noted that “fish passage” is a topic of great interest, and a special May 13 meeting (sponsored by Trout Unlimited) was being held in the Traverse City area to discuss this issue, along with a possible statewide symposium later in the year. Susanne Biteman and Tom Wertz both spoke to the importance of balanced presentations on all upcoming topics. Donahue added that brevity is important, given that the primary objective of these presentations is to receive questions and comments from the BRDC membership.

10. Tom Wertz introduced a topic relating to the process for “wrapping up” the Engineering and Feasibility Study and presenting recommendations to the City and County regarding disposition of the dams. He noted that the study will conclude by the end of the calendar year, and it is now timely for the Scoping Team to give some thought to the format, content and presentation of the final report. Charles Peterson indicated that it was important to review the Settlement Agreement and ensure that the study is responsive to it. Todd Kalish indicated that the City and County are expecting a written report that incorporates all the data, information and analysis conducted, as well as the input from the BRDC membership and other interested parties. He indicated that the BRDC report will first be presented to the Implementation Team, which is ultimately responsible for the recommendations to the City and the County.

Charles Peterson and Steve Largent spoke to the importance of documenting past, current and potential funding sources for incorporation in to the report as an addendum, and that the budgetary aspects of the study are clearly and concisely presented. Donahue mentioned that Jim Galloway at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers- Detroit has suggested that the BRDC consider using a decision-making tool the Corps has developed for assistance with selection of preferred dams disposition alternatives. Donahue will follow up with him. Donahue also agreed to prepare a document that presents a detailed task and activity timeline for the remaining elements of the Engineering and Feasibility Study process. This will be presented to the Scoping Team for consideration at its next meeting.

11. Tom Wertz noted that Charles Peterson had requested an additional agenda item requesting that the Scoping Team review the MDEQ draw down level of Boardman Pond given concerns over the method of maintaining the required level without significant variations. Peterson indicated that this issue was now a “moot point” and the issue has been resolved to his satisfaction.
12. Members evaluated the Scoping Team meeting process. Susanne Biteman suggested that action items from the previous meeting do not need to be reviewed,

as members will have that information in the meeting minutes. Other comments indicated a good level of satisfaction with meeting content and approach.

13. Tom Wertz noted that the next meeting of the Scoping Team should address, among others, the approach and schedule for study wrap-up; the selection and scheduling of special topics for BRDC meetings (following the hydropower session); another Task Order for the consultant team to complete the balance of the dams disposition fact sheets and complete the Engineering and Feasibility Study report; and the potential application of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's decision making tool for dams disposition alternatives selection.

14. Hearing no further business, Tom Wertz adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:45 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael J. Donahue, Ph.D.

Technical Coordinator

May 27, 2008