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Approved Meeting Minutes

Date: August 19, 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:
Ben Bifoss (City of Traverse City)
Lew Coulter (Grand Traverse Conservation District)
Nate Winkler, Amy Beyer (Conservation Resource Alliance)
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)
Andy Knott (Watershed Center Grand Traverse Bay)
Mary Gillis (Grand Traverse County Road Commission)
Dennis Aloia (Grand Traverse County)
Jim Pawloski (Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment)

Absent
Jim Schramm (Michigan Hydro Relicensing Coalition)
Brett Fessell (Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00-1:05</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Introductions were made around the chambers by those in attendance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:05-1:06</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>Todd Kalish opened up the floor to public comment. There were no members of the public that wished to speak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:06-1:10</td>
<td>Additions/deletions to the agenda</td>
<td>There were no recommendations for additions or deletions to the agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10-1:15</td>
<td>Review and potential approval of the July 15, 2010 meeting minutes: decision item</td>
<td>There were no suggested additions, deletions, or edits by the IT and subsequently the minutes were considered approved. Todd Kalish recommended that the question and answer sheet that he distributed prior to the meeting be discussed. The content regards questions received during the public comment period of the IT meetings and subsequent answers generated during the Project Managers working meetings. Becky Ewing suggested posting them on the website in reverse chronological order (i.e. most recent questions first). Hearing no other suggestions, Kalish indicated that he would be posting the Q and A to the website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15-1:20</td>
<td>Review action items from July 15 IT meeting: discussion (IT)</td>
<td>Nate Winkler reviewed the action items from the prior months IT meeting. These included the following; Todd Kalish to distribute midyear consultant review to the IT per Dennis Aloia’s request (pending); coordinate a recommendation on who will lead proposal development, serve as applicant, and be responsible for fulfilling GL Fish Trust Application (pending); provide photos used in case statement to CML (done), Steve Largent to forward EPA invasives grant information to CRA (done), Amy Beyer to provide draft scope of work for consultant agreement extension to the IT for comment (done), Nate Winkler to post public notice and notify IT of revised IT meeting schedule for 2010 and first Friday of the month Project Managers meeting/working sessions (pending).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1:20-2:20 | Review local project plan regarding Brown Bridge Dam and dam sequencing: discussion/decision (Todd) | In an effort to direct grant funding toward specific components of the overall project, Todd Kalish recommended a discussion regarding the local plan to remove Brown Bridge dam, funding of such a plan, and where to direct future grant proposal labors. Kalish gave a synopsis of the information contained in the rationale document included in the packet which was developed in part on recommendations from the Project Managers working group. The conversation centered initially on the NEPA requirements if federal funding is used (per Jim Pawloski’s question regarding permitting beyond the state of
Michigan’s requirements). Kalish indicated that if federal funds were not used, the NEPA analysis could be potentially performed by a private consulting firm on a much shorter timeline and at a much lower cost. Rick Westerhof interjected that cumulative impacts would have to be considered which could change the scope of the project. Kalish also pointed out that if Brown Bridge is taken out of the Corps purview, their “no-action” alternative will change to reflect that. Ben Bifoss noted that a presumption is being made that funding will be available for local removal of Brown Bridge Dam. If funding is not attained however, it will be very difficult to insert Brown Bridge Dam back into the Corps plan. Kalish responded that if the IT believed that future grant efforts should be directed toward Brown Bridge and that level of funding was attained, only then would consideration be given to removing that component of the project from Corps purview.

The second scenario was considered which does not involve the Army Corps as the primary sponsor. This would result in allocation of funds immediately to one specific aspect which would expedite work on the ground and provide immediate deliverables but could potentially not mesh with the Corps schedule. Kalish noted that having the Corps as the primary sponsor provided a more robust legal umbrella.

The third scenario described waiting until after the project cooperative agreement (PCA) is signed so that the funds expended will apply to the 35% match cost share. The PCA will be signed by the local sponsor after the NEPA analysis and plans and specifications are developed. This will be approximately four years from the current date. Kalish noted that this scenario would involve curtailing the local fundraising effort for approximately three years. Amy Beyer added with concurrence from Rick Westerhof that this scenario would be the most expensive total cost and therefore likely the most expensive regarding the 35% local cost share. Beyer went on to explain that the recommendation of the Project Management team to pursue local removal of Brown Bridge Dam provides the lowest overall cost and therefore the lowest cost share. In addition, Beyer related that a letter in response to the 95% draft was being generated in the spirit of requesting flexibility in drafting the PCA so that it can be implemented in stages so the cost could be spread out over time.

Dennis Aloia related that he had concerns regarding the actual savings by the local sponsors if local removal of Brown Bridge Dam is pursued and that amount of funding is not credited toward the 35% cost share. Rick Westerhof indicated that by reducing the overall cost of the project so the Corps would not have to do NEPA, plans and specifications, and construction, the 35% cost share would be that much less. The idea was fielded that a local implementation of the Brown Bridge Dam removal will result in a lower overall cost because the time to do the work will be reduced by three years. Kalish went on to relate that federal funds will likely be part of the Brown Bridge Dam
removal process, but would not know for sure until the Fish Trust was approached with a successful proposal.

Aloia went on to express concern about funding the cost of the remaining two dams to be removed that are owned by the County subsequent to assisting the City in removing Brown Bridge. Ben Bifoss responded that that was currently an ambiguous issue and definitely needed clarification since this was considered one entire project. Bifoss and Aloia agreed that while hopeful that a portion of the 35% match would be offset by the land value of the exposed bottomlands, there was no guarantee. Beyer posited the question of the City and County joining together in a resolution to jointly fund the overall project. Bifoss responded that this would be complicated by the presence of the Cass Road crossing at Boardman Dam and the City likely would not be in favor of funding a County-owned bridge replacement. Aloia indicated that perhaps the agreement could remove the crossing from the project and just involve dam removal. Another benefit to a joint resolution discussed would assure the Army Corps that the local sponsors were looking at this as one project. In addition, a joint resolution and a joint application would be looked upon favorably by funding agencies. **Action item: Nate Winkler/Todd Kalish** to draft letter on behalf of IT to City and County commissions regarding a joint resolution.

A question was posed by Ben Bifoss related to the table illustrating the estimated cost for the local project removing Brown Bridge Dam concerning line item costs. This involved the construction line item and demolition line item and what the difference is between the two. **Action item: Nate Winkler** to determine reason for two seemingly similar line items. Becky Ewing suggested an “Army Corps Multiplier” to determine how much more the Brown Bridge Dam removal would be under the Corps compared to a local effort. Todd Kalish pointed out that it would be very difficult to parse out the exact cost from the Corps’ estimate because it is all encompassing. **Action item: Rick Westerhof** to research cost estimates from two other Corps projects, the Marion Dam and the Ballville Dam.

Aloia indicated that he could not support any emphasis on Brown Bridge Dam funding until a resolution between the City and the County was joined.

**Decision item:** The proposal that the IT will live with Scenario Two pending a joint resolution between the City and County was approved by consensus.

2:20-2:25 **Establish date for Implementation Team retreat: discussion/decision (Todd)**

An IT retreat was scheduled for Thursday, December 2nd from 1:00-5:00 pm at the Grand Traverse County Nature Center. Dennis Aloia indicated a desire to have it late in the year so that new County commissioners may be attend.
2:25-2:30  Presentation of fundraising activity report and fundraising updates: discussion (Amy)
Amy Beyer reviewed fundraising materials included in the meeting packet. Andy Knott announced that the MDNRE grant for baseline water quality monitoring had been awarded to the Watershed Center.

2:30-2:40  Communications update: discussion (Amy)
Amy Beyer reported on the communications work done subsequent to the prior IT meeting. This activity included issuance of first press release and follow up media response assessment. Beyer indicated that the next press release would involve the Conservation District’s NOAA grant and subsequent bottomlands work. Beyer also reviewed the Boardman River float trip coordinated by CRA which included representatives from agencies, stakeholder groups, and the media. Additional outreach activities anticipated for the near term include Beyer’s project presentation at the “Healing our Waters” conference in Buffalo, NY as well as Todd Kalish and Becky Ewing’s project presentation at the Michigan Funder’s Group meeting in October. Kalish also led an NMC “Lifelong Learning” group tour of the project recently.

2:40-2:45  Project manager monthly report: discussion (Amy)
Amy Beyer referred to the project manager’s monthly report in the meeting packet which was organized by the three separate workplans: local project management plan, communications plan, and fundraising plan.

2:45-2:50  Agenda items for the next meeting and meeting review-discussion/decision item
Agenda items for September’s meeting include presentation of 2011 IT meeting schedule and presentation of consultant agreement.

2:50-2:50  Public comment
There were no members of the public that indicated the desire to comment.

2:50  Meeting Adjourned