

**Draft Summary Minutes  
Scoping Team Meeting  
Boardman River Dams Study**

October 23, 2007  
2:30 pm - 4:30 pm

First Floor Conference Room  
Bay View Professional Office Building  
Traverse City, MI

---

1. Mike Donahue called the meeting to order at approximately 2:40 pm. Members in attendance included Jim Pawloski, Pete Zirnheld, Jack Murray, Tom Wertz, Mark Johnson, Steve Largent and Matt Heimann. Guests included Scott Parker (ECT) and Troy Naperala (URS Corp.).
2. Mike Donahue welcomed Matt Heimann to the team, one of three new members. Mike Donahue advised that other new members unable to attend are Sandra Sroonian and Susanne Biteman. A round of self introductions followed.
3. The draft agenda was reviewed and approved, with one addition by Steve Largent. He indicated that the Bottomlands Committee has begun to examine “alternative futures” for the system, with a special focus on Boardman dam and pond. The committee will be coordinating its efforts with the Scoping Team, and will share data, information and ideas that can be considered as the Scoping Team and consultants continue to refine the “alternative futures” fact sheets.
4. Mike Donahue and Scott Parker introduced the latest version of the “alternative futures” fact sheets, noting that ten such sheets have been developed for illustrative purposes. These and other fact sheets will be posted on the project web site to encourage stakeholder review and comment, and will be refined on an ongoing basis. Donahue explained that the consultant team will be responsible for populating these fact sheets with objective data and information on environmental, economic, social and cultural implications of each alternative.

Scoping Team members discussed the draft fact sheets in some detail. Suggestions included the following:

- The descriptions must be clear, concise and objective.
- The Scoping Team needs to “winnow through” the many options to focus on a subset that it most likely to be of interest to the Boardman River Dams Committee (BRDC.) The web site will be an effective mechanism to do this.
- It is essential that all interested parties be encouraged to weigh in on these various alternatives.
- An explicit process and timeline for narrowing down the number of alternatives must be established to ensure that resources can be used efficiently and effectively. This should be done via BRDC meetings and the web site, and by clearly explaining the process and publicizing a firm date for input to be received. After

that date, the Scoping Team will take all comments into consideration, and develop/ propose the “short list” of alternatives to receive detailed assessment.

- A single matrix presenting all possible alternatives and directing the reader to the specific fact sheet or sheets discussing a particular alternative, should be developed, perhaps including a “wall size” version that could be displayed at BRDC meetings.

Scoping Team members also provided Scott Parker with a series of specific comments that he will promptly incorporate on the fact sheets.

5. A revised draft of the “evaluation procedures” document was presented. This document presents the process to be followed (likely in late 2008) when soliciting preferences on the alternatives from the BRDC and larger community of interested individuals. Revisions reflected comments by the Scoping Team at its last meeting. Scoping Team members approved the document, and agreed to present it to the BRDC as a “working document” to provide general guidance as the process moves toward the evaluation phase.
6. Scoping Team members reviewed and discussed a draft “RFQ Matrix” that presents the approximately 100 questions identified in the Request for Proposals document. The questions are organized around the key categories of environmental, economic, social and cultural, and are accompanied by several columns providing the reader with details on how each question is being addressed (i.e., relevant Scope of Work section, status, lead project partner, funding source.) The consultant team, per its contract, is considering all such questions over the course of the Engineering and Feasibility study.

The Scoping Team approved the document and agreed that it should be completed by the consultant team and made available to the BRDC and other interested parties via posting on the web site.

7. The Scoping Team discussed the importance of setting priorities for the allocation/ use of funds for the duration of the project. Three specific suggestions were received:
  - Economic cost of the various alternatives
  - Cultural investigations (primarily via literature research and analysis) as a means to assess alternatives and narrow down the list of viable ones
  - Focus on the “no action” alternative to obtain a better understanding of costs, including those associated with ongoing maintenance and related costs
8. The new grant tracking form was briefly reviewed, and the Scoping Team agreed that it would be very helpful for current/ future fundraising efforts. Several suggested revisions were offered, and Mike Donahue agreed to work with the Project team to address them.

Discussion of the present status of fundraising followed, and Mike Donahue identified the various initiatives in place to approach state, federal and foundation funding sources. This is a critical time, given remaining data, information and analysis needs, and the fact that dams disposition findings and preferences need to be presented to the City and County in the next 14 months. The Project Team is leading this effort with assistance from various volunteers. In addition, the consultant team will be increasing its efforts in

this area, as fundraising is an important element of its Engineering and Feasibility Study contract.

9. The Scoping Team discussed the longer –term aspects of the overall project and, in particular, the prospective future role of the BRDC (and its various subcommittees) once the evaluation process is completed and consultant team findings and stakeholder preferences are presented to the City and the County. It was agreed that some form of institutional arrangement needs to be maintained over the long term, both to assist in implementing decisions that the City and County make, and to help “transition” the project from a focus on dams to larger watershed stewardship considerations. Specific comments included the following:

- There may be a need to advocate for a millage, depending upon the City and County decisions, and the BRDC or similar entity would be useful for that purpose.
- The dam disposition decisions need to be kept at the forefront of the local political process, and some form of advocacy activity will be important.
- The BRDC should approach the City and County in the coming months and explicitly request their input on the type of role/ functions that BRDC (and its subcommittees) might play after the disposition decisions are made and efforts move into a next phase.
- Given its broad focus and forward- looking emphasis, the Scoping Team should initiate dialogue with the City and County and offer its own observations/ recommendations relative to next phase, once decisions on the fate of the dams are made. In the meantime the Communication Team may offer to periodically update the City Commission and County Board on the progress of recommendations leading up to the disposition of the dams.
- The “Sustainability Project” will be a key mechanism in making the transition from the current dams disposition effort into a future broader focus on watershed sustainability and stewardship.
- A strong and viable Great Lakes Water Studies Institute is critical to the current project as well as future watershed stewardship activities.
- The Settlement Agreement should be “revisited” to ensure a full understanding of the process and timeline associated with the dams disposition process.

10. Mike Donahue reported that he, and Mark Johnson, would be making a presentation to the Conservation Resource Alliance (CRA) Board of Directors later that evening (Mike is a Board member.) The presentation will focus on the dams project and opportunities for continued/ additional CRA involvement. Troy Naperala will present the Scoping team report at the BRDC meeting, assisted by Steve Largent.

11. Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Mike Donahue,  
Technical Coordinator  
October 24, 2007