Boardman River Dams Implementation Team
Grand Traverse County, the City of Traverse City, Traverse City Light and Power Department, the Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians, the MI Hydro Relicensing Coalition, the US Fish and Wildlife Service, the MI Department of Environmental Quality, and the MI Department of Natural Resources

400 Boardman Avenue
Traverse City, MI 49684

Implementation Team Meeting Notes

Location: Traverse City Governmental Center, Commission Chambers
Time: 1:00-5:00 PM
Date: August 27, 2009
Conference Call: Yes
Facilitator: Todd Kalish
Notes: Tape recorder

Implementation Team members present: Ben Bifoss, Todd Kalish, Brett Fessell, Dennis Aloia, Rick Westerhof, Mark Rollenhagen, Jim Pawloski, and Jim Schramm (via conference call)

1:00-1:05  Introduction; discussion item (Todd)

Todd provided an overview of the agenda, reviewed the meeting process, and facilitated introductions of all the attendees.

1:05-1:15  Public Comment

Fred Boisington wanted to make sure the IT incorporates the efforts to create a pedestrian trail over or under South Airport Road into the larger dam removal project.

Brad Kaye from Garfield Township wanted to express the Townships willingness to actively participate in the dam removal project as the IT deems appropriate.

1:15-1:20  Review and potential approval of project manager applicants and subsequent interviewees (Todd)

1:20-1:25  IT decision-making process

The Implementation Team received four applications for the Project Manager position. The IT applied a screening process to the four applicants and determined that two should move forward to an interview stage; the Conservation Resource Alliance (CRA) and Environmental Consulting Technologies (ECT) because these two applicants had extensive dam removal project management experience. The IT made this decision via e-mail between the July and August 2009 meetings, which may have violated the MI Open Meetings Act. Therefore, Ben Bifoss consulted with Traverse City’s legal council, and she indicated that the potential violation could be rectified if the IT added this decision item to the August meeting agenda. Therefore, the IT partook in it’s decision-making process to review the applicants and consensus was achieved to interview CRA and ECT.
1:25-1:30  Review and potential approval of the July 9, 2009 meeting minutes; decision item (Todd)

The IT achieved consensus to approve the July 9, 2009 meeting minutes as written.

1:35-1:40  Implementation Team ex officio member composition; discussion item (Todd)

Todd reported that letters were sent to offer ex officio status to the Conservation Resource Alliance, the Watershed Center Grand Traverse Bay, the Traverse City Rotary, and the Grand Traverse Conservation District. All of these organizations responded in writing affirming the IT’s invitation of ex officio status.

The IT discussed the appropriateness of adding additional ex officio members to assure appropriate representation to efficiently and effectively implement the dam removal project. The Settlement Agreement allows for adding ad hoc committees as well as ex officio members. The IT will review a draft organizational framework at next month’s meeting. Once the framework is finalized, the IT will address the appropriateness of adding additional members to the team.

1:40-1:50  Grand Traverse County and Traverse City report; discussion item (Dennis Aloia and Ben Bifoss)

Dennis and Ben provided a status report regarding potential liability insurance for the Implementation Team. The IT members are covered for liability through their employers, so additional coverage may not be necessary.

1:50-1:55  Corps of Engineers and Rotary Camps and Services status update; discussion/decision item (Todd)

Todd provided an update on the status of the Corps of Engineers and Rotary Camps and Services participation in the dam removal project. The Corps of Engineers has offered to finalize the dam removal/ modification design plan, and Rotary Camps and Services have offered to facilitate and coordinate a fund raising development initiative for the dam removal project. The IT came to consensus to not finalize the role of the Corps or Rotary until the organizational framework is presented and finalized by the IT. The IT will invite the Corps to further discuss their role in this project at the September meeting. The IT also thanked Rotary for volunteering to coordinate the fund development initiative for this project.

*The complete audio transcript of the interview process for CRA and ECT is available at the Governmental Center (Traverse City Manager Administrative Assistant office). The following notes are a brief synopsis of the interview proceedings.*

2:00-2:10  Presentation from a Project Manager applicant

Representatives from CRA presented their response to the following question “How would you (as the Boardman River Dams Project Manager) efficiently and effectively design, implement, communicate, and document the Boardman River Dams removal/modification project?

2:10-2:15  Presentation question and answer session between the applicant and the IT
The IT questioned CRA about their response to the question in order to determine their experience, expertise, and capacity to efficiently and effectively manage the Boardman River Dams removal/modification project.

2:15-2:45  **Question and answer session between the applicant and the IT**

The IT assessed CRA’s capacity to act as the Boardman River Dams removal/modification project by assessing their ability to perform various tasks within five major categories: 1) Management and Operations 2) Fund Development 3) Leadership Attributes 4) Communication and Project Documentation and 5) Committee Implementation. The IT asked questions within these categories to determine CRA’s level of experience and expertise to efficiently and effectively manage the Boardman River Dams removal/modification project.

3:00-3:10  **Presentation from a Project Manager applicant**

Representatives from the ECT presented their response to the following question “How would you (as the Boardman River Dams Project Manager) efficiently and effectively design, implement, communicate, and document the Boardman River Dams removal/modification project?

3:10-3:15  **Presentation question and answer session between the applicant and the IT**

The IT questioned the ECT about their response to the question in order to determine their experience, expertise, and capacity to efficiently and effectively manage the Boardman River Dams removal/modification project.

3:15-3:45  **Question and answer session between the applicant and the IT**

The IT assessed ECT’s capacity to act as the Boardman River Dams removal/modification project by assessing their ability to perform various tasks within five major categories: 1) Management and Operations 2) Fund Development 3) Leadership Attributes 4) Communication and Project Documentation and 5) Committee Implementation. The IT asked questions within these categories to determine ECT’s level of experience and expertise to efficiently and effectively manage the Boardman River Dams removal/modification project.

4:00-4:10  **Public comment**

Mary Gilis reported that the Road Commission is waiting for the Grand Vision recommendation regarding Cass Road, and wanted to assure that this project works in collaboration with the Grand Visioning process. Both candidates seem acceptable, and would bring different skill sets to this process.

Steve Largent reported that it will take a community/team approach to effectively implement this project and it’s critical to keep the public apprised of our progress. There are a variety of ongoing local issues and initiatives that need to be incorporated into this project.

4:10-4:40  **IT Project Manager deliberation; decision item (Todd)**

The IT evaluated the applicants’ performance and application materials to determine the most appropriate project manager for the Boardman River Dam Removal Project Manager position.
ECT has more engineering/technical experience, but the IT is not interested in a design/build contract. CRA is more adept at working at a funding as you go project. CRA would bring a completely different skill set than ECT. CRA has significant community ties and a strong local presence. CRA has a strong organization and would bring a high level of community comfort level due to their historic involvement in numerous local projects in the past. CRA brings more Project Manager skills, expertise, and experience than ECT. CRA also has more experience in Securing funding. CRA also has local dam removal project management experience. CRA can also act as the fiscal agent for this project. If CRA gets this contract it will build capacity locally, which has been one of the long-term goals of the Boardman River Dams Project from the beginning. Some concerns expressed with CRA are their internal ability to manage this large project and still provide a high level of service to their other initiatives because this project will be very time consuming. This contract would also put CRA in a different position than the other environmental non-profits in the area, and would have to be managed to assure that all appropriate non-profits have an equal standing in regards to their participation in this project. The IT reached will-live with consensus to proceed with finalizing a contract with CRA to serve as the Project Manager for the Boardman River Dams removal/modification project.

4:45-4:50 Project Manager Independent Contract; discussion/decision

The IT asked for IT volunteers to develop a draft contract for review at the September meeting. Ben Bifoss, Rick Westerhof, and Todd Kalish will work with CRA to develop a draft contract and a scope of work that defines the specific roles and responsibilities of CRA and Todd in the project management aspect of this project.

4:50-4:55 Agenda items for the next meeting and meeting review; discussion item (Todd)

Recommended agenda items for the September IT meeting are: 1) Corps of Engineers role in this Project; 2) Finalize the Independent Contract with CRA; 3) Discuss and potentially finalize the organizational framework for this project; 4) Discuss and potentially finalize additional ex officio or ad hoc teams to fulfill the organizational framework; 5) Finalize the distribution of roles and responsibilities between CRA and Todd regarding project management; 6) Revisit the liability issue; and 7) Have an informational presentation about the Open Meetings Act.

4:55-5:00 Public comment

Lew Coulter expressed his appreciation of the IT’s decision to pursue a contract with CRA.