**Location:** Traverse City Governmental Center, Commission Chambers  
400 Boardman Avenue  
Traverse City, MI 49684

**Boardman River Dams Implementation Team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grand Traverse County</th>
<th>City of Traverse City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traverse City Light and Power Department</td>
<td>Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Hydro Relicensing Coalition</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Traverse Conservation District (Ex officio)</td>
<td>Conservation Resource Alliance (Ex officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Camps and Services (Ex officio)</td>
<td>Watershed Center Grand Traverse Bay (Ex officio)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting Minutes**

**Date:** February 18, 2010

**Facilitator:** Todd Kalish, Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment

**Notes:** Tape recording and hand written notes by Nate Winkler, Conservation Resource Alliance

**Present:**
Dennis Aloia (Grand Traverse County)  
Ben Bifoss (City of Traverse City)  
Steve Largent (Grand Traverse Conservation District)  
Nate Winkler, Amy Beyer (Conservation Resource Alliance)  
Jim Schramm (Michigan Hydro Relicensing Coalition) (via telephone)  
Andy Knott (Watershed Center Grand Traverse Bay)  
Rick Westerhof (US Fish and Wildlife Service)  
Todd Kalish (Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment)  
Mark Rollenhagen (Traverse City Light and Power Department)  
Becky Ewing (Rotary Camps and Services)

**Absent**
Jim Pawloski (Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment)  
Brett Fessell (Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians)  
Lew Coulter (Grand Traverse Conservation District)
1:00-1:05  Introduction
Introductions were made around the chambers by those in attendance.

1:05  Public Comment
Todd Kalish opened up the floor to public comment. As there were no members of the public interested in addressing the IT, the meeting proceeded to the next agenda item.

1:05-1:10  Response to questions posed during prior IT meeting public comment periods (Todd)
Todd Kalish requested comments from the IT regarding potential mechanisms for responding to questions posed by members of the public during the public comment period. In addition, Kalish related that he had responded to a list of questions submitted by Mr. Robin Beardsley in a written letter. Kalish circulated copies of Mr. Beardsley’s letter as well as his responses to the questions to members of the IT. Kalish subsequently suggested that some questions could be answered during the public comment period of the IT meetings, but others may not lend themselves to an immediate response. Kalish asked the IT for feedback on this issue.

Dennis Aloia indicated that he would prefer Kalish respond sooner than later and in the meantime forward a copy of the questions and responses to the IT. Aloia also reminded the IT that Robert’s Rules say no responses are to be given during public comment and suggested that perhaps they be addressed later in the agenda. There was no further input from the IT.

Kalish indicated that he would proceed as Aloia suggested with consultation with CRA. Kalish followed up that he did respond to Mr. Beardsley’s earlier questions posed during the public comment period at a prior IT meeting and those responses were appended to the responses to Mr. Beardsley’s written questions.

1:10-1:15  Additions/deletions to the agenda
There were no members of the IT that had any additions or deletions to the agenda.

1:15-1:20  Review and potential approval of the January 21, 2010 meeting minutes: decision item
There were no suggested changes to the draft meeting minutes by the IT and subsequently were approved by consensus.

1:20-1:25  Presentation of project manager monthly report: discussion item (Nate)
Nate Winkler read aloud the monthly project manager’s report for the period between January 11th, 2010 and February 11th, 2010. As an aside, related that the City of Traverse City has a policy against posting draft meeting minutes on the City’s homepage but they may be posted on the front windows of the Governmental Center. Winkler indicated that there would be a month’s long gap between posting of minutes on the web and the meeting but CRA would continue to distribute draft minutes via e-mail and for hard-copy posting.

Steve Largent asked for clarification on the issue of sediment in the impoundments and where ECT had left off at the completion of the engineering and feasibility study.
Winkler deferred to Kalish who explained that there were some gaps in the data that needed to be filled and ECT was advising on addressing those gaps.

Rick Westerhof inquired of Winkler whether there was any movement on the Corps’ end regarding the selection of a project manager. Winkler related that during a phone conversation with Jim Galloway, Galloway indicated that the Army Corps was still working on filling the position (a contact report of the phone conversation was included in the meeting packet).

Dennis Aloia asked if the Corps had received the City’s letter of intent and Winkler answered in the affirmative.

1:25-1:30 Update regarding bottomlands management plan: discussion (Nate)
Nate Winkler reviewed the purpose and activities of the Bottomlands Management working group of the IT, referring to notes from the first meeting that was included in the meeting packet.

Dennis Aloia asked Winkler whether the Boardman River Watershed Stewardship group was the same thing as the bottomlands working group with Winkler answering “no”.

Andy Knott related that the Watershed Center had recently submitted a MDEQ 319 proposal which included funds for performing bottomlands management planning.

1:30-1:35 Presentation and discussion of fundraising activity report: discussion (Amy)
Amy Beyer referred to the updated fundraising report included in the meeting packet. The major change from the prior IT meeting was the inclusion of Grand Traverse Band’s 2% allocation for support of CRA’s River Care program, of which some funds will be used in support of the Boardman River Dams project. Other items discussed included a summary of pending proposals as well as upcoming deadlines for proposal submission, in addition to the Congressional Appropriation Request submitted to Carl Levin’s office by CRA.

1:35-1:40 Update of draft communications plan: discussion (Amy)
Amy Beyer reviewed the recent process by CRA for selecting a firm to provide communications plan services to CRA and related that the marketing firm CML (Chuck Lombardo) had been selected to perform the services.

Becky Ewing asked Beyer if there was a need for the IT to help with development of the communications plan with Beyer responding in the affirmative, especially when trying to developing the mechanisms for external information flow.

1:40-1:45 Presentation of financial information sheet: discussion (Todd)
Todd Kalish presented a historical summary table of funds expended on the project to date and noted that he would be providing an “in-kind” match spreadsheet to the IT in the near future for review and comment. Kalish related that this will be crucial with respect to potential use of in-kind for the 35% match requirement by the Army Corps that Carl Levin’s office was working on.
Kalish also related (in response to questions regarding a project budget) that the IT has never served as a fiduciary for the Boardman River Dams project and therefore does not have a budget per se for the project. The budgeting and reporting is up to the individual members of the IT who are raising funds for the project.

Ben Bifoss suggested a column in Kalish’s upcoming grant spreadsheet that describes what activities each grant will be focused on.

Kalish indicated that he would provide the grant summary and in-kind spreadsheets by the next IT meeting.

1:45-1:50  **Mechanisms for tracking in-kind: discussion (Todd)**
Todd Kalish reiterated that he would be generating an in-kind spreadsheet for both historical and recent in-kind match activity. Kalish requested feedback on how to effectively present such information after the IT has been able to review the tables.

1:50-1:55  **Procedural language and mechanisms for adding/removing ex officio IT members: decision (Todd)**
Todd Kalish referred to language he crafted regarding adding/removing ex-officio members to the IT. Kalish opined his preference to lean heavier on structural language and rely less on guidance in an effort to retain autonomy of the IT. Kalish subsequently reviewed aloud the language he had drafted and went on to describe various scenarios for adding ex-officio members as well as how to vet potential ex-officio members (i.e. recommendations by the IT as well as from local units of government or the public).

Kalish also discussed rationale for recommendations to add or not to add members and the use of the consensus process of the IT.

Dennis Aloia and Jim Schramm indicated approval of the draft language and related that a crucial point is that the language may be modified in the future. Becky Ewing and Steve Largent suggest minor changes.

The language and guidance document was approved and finalized through consensus of the IT.

1:55-2:00  **Addition of the Grand Traverse County Road Commission: discussion/decision item (Dennis)**
Dennis Aloia recommended that the Grand Traverse County Road Commission (Road Commission) be added to the IT due to the expertise they bring to project regarding roads associated with the dams as well as a unit of government of the County. Ben Bifoss asked if this was a formal request by the County Board and Aloia responded in the affirmative.

Jim Schramm asked if the Road Commission was asked if they were interested and Aloia responded that there was some interest at the Road Commission board level.

Amy Beyer opined that this was the appropriate time to add the Road Commission as decisions regarding roads and transportation were being researched currently.
Becky Ewing related that the inclusion of the Road Commission would be in keeping with the mission of the Grand Vision process.

Kalish related that in fundraising, the Road Commission may provide robust potential funding opportunities.

Through the consensus process, the IT recommended the Road Commission be invited to join the IT as an ex-officio member. Kalish indicated that he would generate a letter of invitation on behalf of the IT and submit it to the Road Commission with a request for a response in writing.

2:00-2:05  
Agenda items for the next meeting and meeting review: discussion/decision item  
(Todd, Nate)  
Recommendations for the March IT meeting agenda included a draft communications plan by Nate Winkler.

Dennis Aloia recommended a brief discussion on potential IT ex-officio members.

2:05  
Public Comment  
There were no members of the public that were interested in addressing the IT.

2:05  
Adjourned