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:
Tom Aja, Bob Allen, Dennis Aloia, Ron Alpers, Eugene Baughan, Robin Beardsley, Annette Benson,
Susanne Biteman, Anne Brasie, Mark Breederland, Eric Clone, Lew Coulter, Beverly Cuthbert, Michael
Donahue, Becky Ewing, Brett Fessell, Edward Flees, Peggy Fry, Rita Hansen, Gerry Harsch, Bob
Hoxie, Joe Kaltenbach, Patrick Kelly, David Kelly, Kyle Kruger, Meral Jackson, Jennifer Jay, Mark
Johnson, Todd Kalish, Joe Kaltenbach, Tanya Kotsekon, Steve Largent, Herb Lemcool, Mark Lewis,
Richard Lewis, Chris Maxbauer, Jim McIntyre, Al Morse, Troy Naperala, Amy Packard, Scott Parker,
Jim Pawloski, Carl Platz, Bill Plough, Linda Racine, Jack Robbins, Gabe Schneider, Jason Send, Roger
Send, Mike Slater, Matt Soltysia, Sandra Sroonian, Tom Wertz, Gary Wilson, Nate Winkler, Sharon
Wise, John Wyrwas, Peter Zirnhelt

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:
First-time meeting attendees were asked to introduce themselves; there were 8 newcomers.
Also introduced were Sharon Wise, representing Representative Dave Camp’s office and Gabe
Schneider, representing Senator Carl Levin’s office.

II. Review Agenda
On the suggestion of a committee member, Update on Facilitation Team Changes was moved up on
agenda.

III. Update on Facilitation Team Changes – Todd Kalish
Todd stated that the BRDC is entering a new and exciting phase in which the membership, which is
made up of many excellent leaders, needs to take back ownership of the process. He suggested that
we keep three goals in mind:

1. Leadership – Personal commitment and leadership skills are evident in the membership. In a
desire to build capacity, members are welcome and encouraged to facilitate meetings.
2. Trust- The BRDC was formed to develop a community driven decision process as a national
model. There is a need to re-establish with old and new members to enhance the process.
3. Humility – Create a process to engage and honor the variety of passionate views and values
with openness and respect. Goal is not to change other’s values, but to educate and respect.

Russ and Leslie Knopp were hired under an at-will contract, beginning January 2006. The decision was
made by their supervisors, Tim Ervin and Todd Kalish, not to renew the Knopp’s contract. Feeling that
full-time devotion is needed, Jennifer Jay’s position will increase to 40 hours per week and she will act
as Project Coordinator. Tim Ervin has officially retired from Water Studies Institute, but is committed to
some fundraising assistance for the BRDC project. Linda Racine, NMC, will be providing interim facilitation help during these transitions.

III. Approve or Amend October Minutes

Discussion: It was suggested that approval of the October minutes be differed until the January meeting

Follow-up Action: The minutes for October and November meetings will be reviewed and approved at the January meeting.

III. Update – status of FERC licenses, Boardman Pond, and questions submitted for the DEQ – Joe Kaltenbach and Dennis Aloia

Dennis stated that TCLP, DEQ, FERC, and the county are all talking. Both the DEQ and FERC are suggesting that, for safety reasons, a 17 foot drawdown of Boardman Pond is recommended and probable, though this does not need to be permanent. Cost estimates exceed $1,000,000 to improve the spillway and make improvements to Cass Rd. The Engineering and Feasibility Study findings will be crucial in determining the long term recommendations for the Boardman Dam and Pond. After the E & F study, if the dam stays the deadline for improvements could be 2010, with little or no assistance monies available. If the dam is removed, the deadline for improvements could be 2012, and there could be money available from outside resources. Either way, fund-raising is critical and will take time.

Discussion:

What if the County Board doesn’t agree? Dennis reported that a conference call took place on November 16 with 14 FERC representatives from around the country, along with the TCLP, DEQ, County and FERC. The verbal understanding is that if there is no agreement reached between the DEQ and the county by January 1, FERC will take the pond down 17 ft. There is still some discussion between TCLP and FERC regarding compliance and surrender. There is an assumption that DEQ could be satisfied with drawing the pond down 2’ or 3’, taking the additional 14’ – 15’ by August of ’07. FERC would require the drawdown sooner. Who is more stringent, DEQ or FERC? It is thought that, overall, the DEQ is less stringent. They are looking for compliance for half-probable maximum flood conditions; FERC demands compliance for full maximum flood conditions. What’s the stumbling block between the County and the DEQ? Dennis reports that the County commission has concerns regarding the pond drop, though it may be inevitable. How was the 17’ level determined? This is the lowest level possible below the current levels, and was recommended to reduce hazards from the poor spillway. The Boardman Dam has a regulatory classification as ‘high hazard’, meaning that failure in the event of flood conditions could result in real property damage and loss of life. Projections are that 5’-6’ of water could flow through Logan’s Landing and cover Airport Rd. ‘High hazard’ classification requires the most stringent spillway requirements to meet a minimum of half probable flood effect. We were led to believe that FERC did inspections in September…did they? Yes, they did routine maintenance and operation inspections and found all dams to be in good condition. An in-depth engineering study happens every five years. Would the 17’ drawdown be the end of it? Would repairs still be needed? The 17’ drop does not meet full flood concerns. The spillway would still need repair. The E & F study will assist in developing a recommendation regarding the fate of the dam. DEQ could work with BRDC for years; FERC would no doubt require immediate action. If $1,000,000 is required for fix, who picks up the tab? Could that be considered subsidizing waterfront property owners? E and F study will need to make determinations. Who is responsible for the exposed bottom lands that would result from the draw down? This is one of many questions on the list to be answered by the DEQ, hopefully by January. If water is lowered, landowners may need new wells. What then? It was stated that, according to the law, Riparian owners have no right to water level. What needs to happen to Cass Rd? If the dam stays in, improvements will need to be done to both the spillway and to Cass Rd.
Follow-Up Action:

- Jennifer Jay will list ongoing questions on the web site, and post answers as they are received. She will follow up with the DEQ and others as needed to request answers until they are received.
- DNR, DEQ, firms working on the E & F study, must also be aware of concerns regarding Boardman River valley on ALL levels. Questions will be shared with all.

IV. Update from Carl Platz, USACE and Gary Wilson, Gourdie Fraser

USACE is about to commence feasibility study regarding fish and ecosystem restoration. There is not an exact budget until January, but there is budget carry-over from ‘06 to move study forward. There is a team in place with a detailed scope of work and funding has been identified to hire a local survey team to gather underwater baseline data. Gary Wilson reports that Gourdie Fraser has been gathering topographical info on all four dams, and has done a series of soundings to define existing conditions. Field data has been compiled and collected, and they are in the process of verifying data and getting mapping done.

Discussion:

What is the budget level for this work plan? Low level budget is adequate to begin. Will this dovetail with the ECT study? Yes. We want to avoid duplication of effort.

V. Clarification from City regarding licenses as assets

The city charter states that the license is not real property, is not considered an asset and, as such, does not require a vote to dispose. A copy of the full ruling has been requested and will be available at the January meeting, or earlier by request.

Scoping Team Report

The Scoping Team met on October 11 via conference call and reviewed the ECT scope of work and contract. The team also met in Traverse City on October 17 to revise budget issues. The final recommendation has been submitted to the IT team, who will review it at their meeting on December 12th. The recommendation includes a range of costs and tasks, and stresses efficient coordination with USACE. The contract will focus on a work order system for every specific task, with a budget and specific deliverable attached. IT will work aggressively to secure funding. The Scoping Team and the Finance Team will be key in developing work orders. Existing data will be fully inventoried and all contracts fully coordinated.

Discussion:

What is the low end of the estimated costs? ECT will re-allocate existing funds to prioritize needs. Open communication with USACE will eliminate duplication of effort and cost.

Finance Team Report

Herb Lemcool reported that there is a desire to have a property owner on the finance committee. Their presence could help too in receiving funding. There is very little change in the spreadsheet from last month. Finance team will be meeting with Vicki Cook at NMC to clarify and define expenses. Jennifer Jay will notify the Finance Team members of that meeting. Committee will also be looking at how to apply in-kind contributions in the ongoing ECT and USACE work. Tim Ervin will be arranging a meeting with state representatives regarding funding in January. Jennifer Jay will notify membership of that meeting. Marsha Smith of Rotary will also be arranging a meeting regarding funding. There was a
request made for interested volunteers to be involved in fund development. More funding is needed to insure a quality study. Interested members can contact Jennifer Jay.

Discussion: The costs of meeting at Hagerty Center were discussed. It was stated that each meeting costs approximately $800.00. A discount is not available because the management organization at Hagerty is privately owned. The Civic Center is available at no cost. Does the BRDC want to change meeting location? It was suggested that the meetings move out into the community (schools, township halls, Ranch Rudolf, etc.) in a desire to engage more citizens. It was also suggested that continuity is important to building membership and commitment. Options presented to the membership were:

1. Stay at Hagerty and pay.
2. Move to the Civic
3. Go to multiple locations

A move to the Civic Center was approved. Informational meetings and some sub-committee work should be encouraged to be held in a variety of community locations. The next BRDC meeting will take place at the Civic Center on January 23rd at 6 pm.

Follow-up action:

The change of venue for the January meeting will be announced in the paper and on the web. Notices will be posted at Hagerty as well.

Communication Team Report

Sandra Sroonian reported that the Communication Team did not meet in November. The team wanted to review the Focus Group feedback before meeting. Sandra has been working on polishing up a power point presentation that was given to her by Leslie Knopp. She would welcome feedback from team members as to the content. An agenda for the next communications meeting will be developed and will include review of the focus group feedback. The Communication Team will meet on December 12, 2006 at 4:30PM

Focus Group Report

Jennifer Jay reported that 28 people attended the focus groups to talk about the project and the process. There was great input provided and input continues to come in. Feedback compiled is included in the agenda packet. Linda Racine added that there are tabletop forms available on which to add comments and concerns.

Discussion:

A request was made for volunteers to form a task force to compile input from the focus groups and from the BRDC, and develop recommendations with specific tasks and outcomes for the membership. Volunteers who came forward were Sandra Sroonian, Bill Plough, Beverly Cuthburt, Meral Jackson and Ann Brasie. Thank you all very much! Jennifer Jay will email this group with to schedule a meeting and plan their task.

Is there a need or desire for the creation of an agenda team to create meeting agendas? The rationale is that we would then be truly community driven. Comments that followed included that agenda’s are made in advance, with a draft posted on the web and anyone can make suggested additions once posted. Items can be added before the meeting if the group agrees. Committee Chairs need to get all agenda items to Jennifer Jay before meetings. Post cards, email and the web announce meetings.
dates and location. Jennifer Jay will follow up on calendar of events and press release options.
Consensus was that the agenda process works well and that there is no need to change it at this point.

**Agenda Items for Next Meeting:**

1. Presentation by Eric Clone: Recreational options for the Boardman River
2. ECT update
3. IT Team update from 12/12 meeting
4. Standing/Task Team reports
5. Update on DEQ, county, TCLP and FERC negotiations
6. Approval of minutes – October and November meetings
7. Additional items should be submitted to Jennifer Jay

**Next meeting: January 23rd, 2007, Civic Center, 6 pm**

**Meeting Adjourned: 8:00 p.m.**

Submitted: November 29, 2006
Jennifer Jay, Project Coordinator
Phone: 231-995-2617
Email: jjay@nmc.edu