

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

December 19, 2008
4:00- 6:30 pm
First Floor Conference Room
Bay View Professional Office Building
Traverse City, MI

1. The meeting was called to order at approximately 4:10 p.m. Members in attendance included Ron Beardsley, Tom Wertz, Jim Pawloski, Steve Largent, Susanne Biteman, Sandra Sroonian and Pete Zirnhelt. Also participating were Mike Donahue (Technical Coordinator) and Troy Naperala (URS Corporation) and, via speakerphone, Scott Parker and Don Tilton (ECT, Inc.)
2. Mike Donahue welcomed members and identified three primary objectives of the meeting: project update (progress, funding and current priorities); selection of dams disposition alternatives for recommended detailed analysis; and review of the draft Scope of Work for prospective new Task Orders.
3. Donahue reported that the Engineering and Feasibility Study (EFS) is on track to be completed in 2008, and the coming months will see the completion of the “existing conditions” analysis and detailed analysis of a subset of the dams disposition alternatives to be identified by the Scoping Team and recommended to the Boardman River Dams Committee (BRDC). He noted that \$100,000 in additional funds had recently been secured from Grand Traverse County, and the Michigan Department of Natural Resources had committed \$50,000. In addition, multiple proposals have been submitted to various funding sources and plans are underway or additional submittals in the coming months. Coupled with the “in-kind” contributions to EFS components (e.g., volunteer efforts of the BRDC, ongoing U.S. Army Corps of Engineers study), substantial progress is being made. Near term priorities are continued progress with the EFS (completing the socio-economic and cultural components for “existing conditions”) and initiating detailed analysis of selected disposition alternatives.
4. Scott Parker and Don Tilton presented an update on recent activities related to the EFS. A structural evaluation of the Brown Bridge and Boardman Dams has been completed in draft form and is presently under review by multiple parties; it will be finalized and presented to the BRDC by the end of December. A fisheries habitat report is now being finalized and will also soon be provided to the BRDC. A spreadsheet identifying the 81 dams disposition alternatives (i.e., retention/ repair, modification, removal) has been developed, and additional work on the dams disposition alternatives fact sheets has been accomplished. Preliminary drafts of a Scope of Work for additional work have been prepared. The consultant team now awaits BRDC action on these, and issuance of Task Orders.

5. Scott Parker and Don Tilton reviewed the alternatives spreadsheet and updated fact sheets provided to the Scoping Team. They also identified and discussed six alternatives that had been recommended for the purpose of public discussion. These alternatives are numbered 1,25,41,43,79 and 81 as found on the spreadsheet. These six alternatives were selected on the basis of several criteria, including the extent to which they 1) represent the range of options available to the BRDC; 2) would reveal data and information on environmental, economic, social and cultural implications; and 3) reflect the evolving interests of the BRDC as expressed at the monthly meetings. The intent is to stimulate thoughts and ideas within the BRDC, as that group will be responsible for additions and/ or deletions to the list.
6. Mike Donahue explained that the list, once approved by the Scoping Team, would be presented to the BRDC for review and comment over a three week period. Over that time, additions/ deletions would be entertained and a refined list of a manageable number of alternatives would be decided upon. The consultant team would then focus its efforts on a detailed analysis of their environmental, economic, social and cultural implications, with an emphasis on objective, quantifiable analysis drawing from all data and information collected over the course of the EFS. Following discussion, the Scoping Team agreed upon this approach, and the intent to present their recommended list to the BRDC for action at its January 22, 2008 meeting.
7. The Scoping Team had an extended discussion concerning the six suggested alternatives. They agreed that three such alternatives (i.e., retain/ repair all dams, modify all dams, remove all dams) were important to demonstrate the range of alternatives and associated implications. Extended discussion ensued over the other three suggested alternatives. The merits of expanding the list were discussed and debated at some length. It was ultimately agreed that the suggested list of six was acceptable, recognizing that the intent is to provide the BRDC with a list to stimulate thoughts and ideas and encourage any additions/ deletions.
8. The Scoping Team reviewed draft fact sheets for several of the alternatives. It was agreed that the overall format of the fact sheets (i.e., description, table, graphic and analysis) was appropriate. The description of each alternative needs to be sufficiently detailed to provide the reader with a clear understanding of what is proposed. The analysis must be rigorous, detailed, concisely- worded, fact- based, quantitative (where possible), adequately referenced and presented in an impartial, objective manner. The analysis must be responsive to the “100 questions” listed in the Request for Qualifications (RFQ). The Scoping Team also noted some minor errors/ inconsistencies in the fact sheets that need to be addressed. ECT agreed to make the changes to the fact sheets for the next BRDC meeting
9. Scott Parker reviewed draft Scope of Work language for tasks that would complete the “existing conditions” portion of the EFS and initiate the alternatives analysis. Following extended discussion, the Scoping Team members agreed that the draft material lacked sufficient detail to be readily incorporated into a Task Order. Scoping

Team members indicated that the following must be addressed: 1) specify the nature and content of each deliverable; 2) relate each deliverable to specific provisions in the overall project Scope of Work; 3) demonstrate that the deliverable is addressing relevant questions included in the RFQ; 4) list specific tasks and activities associated with each deliverable; 5) present a budget for each deliverable in sufficient detail to explain how funds are being used and how they will contribute to the product; and 6) present timelines indicating when draft materials would be available for BRDC review and when a final product would be available.

Specific comments on the various proposed Tasks were as follows:

Task One (Contaminated Sediment Evaluation). Scoping Team members questioned the need for this task, as some had the understanding that such an analysis had already been completed. ECT indicated that the sediment analysis that had been completed was a preliminary study and that additional data was required to accurately describe the sediment character in the impoundments. The consultant team was directed to investigate this, inform the Scoping Team of what has been done to date and, if additional work is necessary, present a rationale for it. This should include consultation with the Great Lakes Environmental Center.

Task Two (Cost Analysis of Required Dam Repair and Maintenance). Scoping Team members indicated that this analysis must generate cost estimates in sufficient detail to provide the BRDC and, ultimately the decision makers (City and County), with enough information to make informed judgments. The term “conceptual cost estimates” is unclear and should not be used. ECT indicated that the term conceptual cost estimate is meant to convey the idea that the cost estimate is a preliminary estimate due to the preliminary nature of the study. ECT agreed to modify the term to more accurately convey its meaning. Also, it was emphasized that the alternatives evaluation component of the EFS has a short time frame, and this task must yield definitive information for inclusion in the fact sheets. ECT agreed that the time frame of the study was important and that the schedule was such that the cost estimate would be available for inclusion in the fact sheets as they develop.

Task 3 (Cultural and Historic Considerations). Scoping Team members questioned why such a limited focus was being taken (i.e., reviewing documents from the State Historic Preservation Office) and why such an exercise would cost so much (\$5,000) for such a modest effort. ECT indicated that the historic component was an important part of the study because the historic status of the dams and buildings can have an influence on the alternatives to be considered. It was indicated that cultural and historic considerations also relate to the importance of the river system to the community, and the proposed document review would not satisfy the interests of the BRDC as stated in the RFQ questions and the overall project Scope of Work. ECT indicated that given the limited resources available to complete the existing conditions study that ECT recommended that the historic status of the dams and buildings be evaluated as soon as possible because of the impact a historic designation could have on alternative development. Also, the Scoping Team noted

that the estimated cost of this task, as presented in the project Scope of Work, is significantly higher and accommodates a much greater breadth of investigation and level of detail. ECT agreed to review the cost estimate.

Task 4 (Socioeconomic Studies). The Scoping Team indicated that the level of detail presented was inadequate and did not address the range of socio-economic questions presented in the Request for Qualifications. The task must be outcome oriented, rather than to just “validate a qualitative model...” Also, the scope of this effort must be much broader: only examining changes in land use patterns, expenditures and local economies (as proposed) is not responsive to BRDC needs. ECT indicated that the intent of the “existing conditions” portion of the EFS was to document existing, or baseline conditions as well as the processes that define the relationships between the Boardman River and the environmental, engineering, societal, and economic concerns of the community. Members emphasized that this task must yield quantifiable data and detailed information that addresses the RFQ questions and is included in the fact sheets for the various alternatives. ECT agreed to modify the scope of this task, consistent with limited resources

Scoping Team members also reviewed the two “Additional High Priority Tasks for Consideration” presented by Scott Parker. Comments were as follows:

Task A (Cost Estimates for Removing/ Modifying Existing Dams.) The Scoping Team emphasized that this task must generate data and information of sufficient detail to guide evaluation of alternatives. Language in the draft task is too vague, indicating only that a cost model will be developed, information on procedures and costs will be presented, and dam removal and sediment management “concepts” will be offered. Rather, this task must provide defensible cost estimates for retain/ repair, removal and modification alternatives for the dams. ECT agreed that the cost estimates need to generate as much information as possible on the cost of various alternatives. However, this task is constrained by the lack of information on the specific nature and description of the modifications to the dams. ECT agreed to add detail to this task and revise the task description.

Task B (Public Survey). Scoping Team members questioned the need for a public survey, given that the Watershed Center had just completed one that included questions specific to the EFS. ECT indicated that they had reviewed the survey results and, in their opinion, additional information would be useful. Also, the high cost (\$34,000) for the task was questioned, given that an Internet- based survey was proposed. The draft task language also lacked detail on who the target audience would be and what the content would address. It was questioned whether this significant level of funding might be better spent on other priorities consistent with completing the EFS. The consultant team was asked to review the Watershed Center survey and re-consider the need for this task in light of other priorities. The Scoping Team indicated that action on this item should be postponed until sufficient information is available to determine the value of this proposed task and whether to proceed or direct the funds to another task.

10. The Scoping Team asked Mike Donahue, in consultation with Jennifer Jay, to develop a template for the prospective task orders, and work with the consultant team to develop narrative in sufficient detail to ensure responsiveness to the project Scope of Work and RFQ questions, and to budgetary requirements. The Task Order(s) are to be completed in draft and provided to the BRDC prior to its January 22 meeting.
11. It was agreed that the Scoping Team would continue to meet on a periodic, as-needed basis for the balance of the EFS. Meeting notices would go out at least two weeks in advance whenever possible.
12. Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:15 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael J. Donahue, Ph.D.
Technical Coordinator

Vice President, Water Resources and
Environmental Services
URS Corporation

January 4, 2008