



Coordinating Sensible Stewardship Of The Land

Notice

Location: Traverse City Governmental Center, Commission Chambers
400 Boardman Avenue
Traverse City, MI 49684
Facilitator: Todd Kalish, Michigan DNRE

Boardman River Dams Implementation Team

| | |
|--|--|
| Grand Traverse County | City of Traverse City |
| Traverse City Light and Power Department | Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians |
| Michigan Hydro Relicensing Coalition | US Fish and Wildlife Service |
| Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment | |
| Grand Traverse Conservation District (Ex officio) | Conservation Resource Alliance (Ex officio) |
| Rotary Camps and Services (Ex officio) | Watershed Center Grand Traverse Bay (Ex officio) |
| Grand Traverse County Road Commission (Ex officio) | |

**Thursday, June 17, 2010
1:00 p.m.
City Commission Chambers, Governmental Center
400 Boardman Avenue
Traverse City, MI 49684
Posted:**

The City of Traverse City does not discriminate on the basis of disability in the admission or access to, or treatment or employment in, its programs or activities. Makayla M. Vitous, Assistant to City Manager, 400 Boardman Avenue, Traverse City, Michigan, 49684, 922-4440, TDD 922-4412, has been designated to coordinate compliance with the non-discrimination requirements contained in Section 35.107 of the Department of Justice Regulations. Information concerning the provisions of the Americans With Disabilities Act, and the rights provided thereunder, are available from the ADA Coordinator.

Agenda

- 1:00-1:05** **Introductions**
- 1:05-1:20** **Public comment**
- 1:20-1:25** **Additions/deletions to the agenda**
- 1:25-1:30** **Review and potential approval of the May 20, 2010 meeting minutes: decision item**
- 1:30-1:35** **Army Corps update: discussion (Carl Platz, US Army Corps of Engineers)**
- 1:35-2:00** **Review and potentially approve “Hydropower Summary” and “Boardman River Restoration Q and A” documents: discussion/decision item (Nate)**
- 2:00-2:10** **Bottomlands ownership at Boardman Pond: discussion (Todd, Dennis)**
- 2:10-2:25** **Presentation of fundraising activity report and fundraising updates: discussion (Amy)**
- 2:25-2:35** **Project manager monthly report: discussion (Nate)**
- 2:35-2:45** **Agenda items for the next meeting and meeting review: discussion/decision item**
- 2:45-3:00** **Public comment**
- 3:00** **Adjourn**

Coordinating Sensible Stewardship Of The Land

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

Boardman River Dams Implementation Team

| | |
|--|--|
| Grand Traverse County | City of Traverse City |
| Traverse City Light and Power Department | Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians |
| Michigan Hydro Relicensing Coalition | US Fish and Wildlife Service |
| Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment | |
| Grand Traverse Conservation District (Ex officio) | Conservation Resource Alliance (Ex officio) |
| Rotary Camps and Services (Ex officio) | Watershed Center Grand Traverse Bay (Ex officio) |
| Grand Traverse County Road Commission (Ex officio) | |

Meeting Minutes

Date: May 20, 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)
Steve Largent (Grand Traverse Conservation District)
Nate Winkler, Amy Beyer (Conservation Resource Alliance)
Jim Schramm (Michigan Hydro Relicensing Coalition)
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)
Jim Pawloski (Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment)
Brett Fessell (Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians)
Andy Knott (Watershed Center Grand Traverse Bay)
Heather Jamison (Grand Traverse County Road Commission)

Absent

Dennis Aloia (Grand Traverse County)

- 1:00-1:05 Introduction**
Introductions were made around the chambers by those in attendance.
- 1:05-1:10 Public Comment**
Todd Kalish opened up the floor to public comment. Mr. Norbert Tutlis of the Boardman Valley Preservation Society made comment regarding several issues. These included ramifications of retaining the Union Street dam, potential failure of the upper three dams, and the warming effect that Boardman Lake has downstream of the Boardman River's outlet. Mr. Tutlis also handed out a document describing his concerns prior to the meeting beginning. Mr. Robin Beardsley expressed his concerns about loss of use of Boardman Pond due to drawn down conditions and thought perhaps Sabin and Brown Bridge ponds should not be drawn down until a firm plan was in place.
- 1:10-1:15 Additions/deletions to the agenda**
Nate Winkler indicated that Carl Platz would not be able to provide an Army Corps update via conference call due to unforeseen circumstances and that he (Winkler) would provide the update. Todd Kalish suggested that because Dennis Aloia was not present, the issue regarding Boardman Pond bottomlands ownership should be postponed until the following (June) meeting.
- 1:15-1:20 Review and potential approval of the April 15, 2010 meeting minutes: decision item**
There were no recommendations for additions, deletions or edits with regard to the April 15th draft minutes and were subsequently approved.
- 1:20-1:25 Review of CRA quarterly invoice for project management: discussion/decision item**
Steve Largent inquired as whether or not the in-kind services rendered indicated on the invoice were described in more detail elsewhere. The question was answered in the affirmative by Nate Winkler and Amy Beyer. Hearing no further questions, the invoice was considered approved for payment.
- 1:25-1:55 Discussion regarding key messages and short term communications plan: discussion/decision (Chuck Lombardo)**
Mr. Chuck Lombardo of CML Marketing (the communications and marketing firm under contract by CRA) gave an overview of the development of a suite of key messages and the need to keep them short and easily repeatable. The level of detail required to elaborate on the key messages would then be found in the next level of the "information pyramid" in documents such as a "frequently asked questions" sheet(s). Mr. Lombardo subsequently opened the floor to the IT for discussion.
- Becky Ewing commented that the key messages should include enough detail so that the messages are given with context. Andy Knott had a cost estimate question which

was in fact changed accordingly prior to the meeting packets being sent out. Knott also had a question regarding the Corps' use of semantics related to reports and studies already completed in the process. Ben Bifoss indicated that the issue of hydroelectric production should be addressed with Mr. Lombardo responding that he was still teasing out the distinction between the IT's role as an implementation body and a decision making body. Bifoss followed up that the first question asked of him by constituents was "why the dams aren't being used for hydroelectric generation". Mr. Lombardo indicated that the question should then be addressed in the key messages. Knott noted that many on the IT have been involved with the process since the beginning and many in the community are not as educated on the project as they are quite new to it. Mr. Lombardo indicated that the issue of hydroelectric generation would be placed front and center noting also that Traverse City Light and Power and the owners of the dams (Grand Traverse County and the City of Traverse City) should be in lockstep with the IT regarding the issue of why hydroelectric power generation is no longer economically feasible at those facilities.

Amy Beyer noted that the next "big thing" in the community not necessarily focused on the dams but related in some way to them might cause the key messages to change accordingly. Mr. Lombardo indicated that the key messages themselves would remain somewhat static but talking points would be modified over time due to potential situational changes and would be emanating from a living document.

Nate Winkler inquired as to whether the IT's mission might be revisited as an implementation body as opposed to the decision-making body who's assessment of the fate of the dams was their removal. Bifoss opined that this was akin to a "distinction without a difference". Mr. Lombardo indicated that there would not be a lot of value in that tack and could be misconstrued as ducking behind the IT's mission to skirt the issue of hydroelectric generation.

Mr. Lombardo wrapped up the presentation by indicating that generation of press releases would continue but those regarding the tribal grant awards would be postponed until details are squared up. Mr. Lombardo also noted that the frequently asked question and backgrounder sheets were currently being constructed as well as the updating of the website.

Rick Westerhof went back to the issue of the key messages and asked whether or not the information was available on the issue. Todd Kalish answered in the affirmative and that he would forward the information to Mr. Lombardo. Mr. Lombardo indicated this information among other details would be incorporated by the end of following week.

Winkler asked Mr. Lombardo if he could speak to the roles of the owners of the dams and the communications effort. Mr. Lombardo indicated that Kalish would remain the

spokesperson for the project with Beyer following up with the comment that the IT should stand in unison to answer the question regarding hydroelectric production regardless of the agency representation.

1:55-2:00 Army Corps update: discussion (Nate)

Nate Winkler presented information related to him by Carl Platz of the US Army Corps of Engineers regarding the status of their particular roles in the project. Winkler indicated that the information relayed to him included the hiring of URS-Baird (a joint venture) to prepare a preliminary management plan which will describe the remaining tasks to finish the feasibility stage per Army Corps policy. A "50%" draft of this document has been submitted to the Army Corps for review and comment and will be turned back to URS-Baird for completion of a "95%" draft within two weeks and return this to the Army Corps. The target date for the final product is the first week of July (2010). Funds may be used for this part of the project from the Great Restoration Initiative but are not guaranteed.

2:00-2:10 Presentation of fundraising activity report and fundraising updates: discussion (Amy)

Amy Beyer reviewed the fundraising activity report materials that were included in the IT meeting packet. Beyer indicated that is has very helpful for those submitting proposals to submit them to her for inclusion in the fundraising reporting table.

Beyer also inquired of Becky Ewing whether or not the "Case Statement" had been finalized. Ewing indicated that a draft had been completed but would have Carl Ferguson work toward getting it closer to completion for review and comment. Beyer followed up by mentioning that she had heard the day prior that the Great Lakes Fishery Trust would be in the area the following day in part to review the Boardman River Dams Project and potential funding opportunities. Ewing responded in the affirmative and would discuss allowing CRA staff to participate in a planned site visit to the Boardman River with Great Lakes Fishery Trust personnel.

2:10-2:15 Project manager monthly report: discussion (Nate)

Nate Winkler referenced the one page monthly report included in the meeting packet which described CRAs activities for the past month.

2:15-2:20 Agenda items for the next meeting and meeting review: discussion/decision item (Todd, Nate)

Kalish suggested that the status of the ownership of bottomlands at Boardman Pond be included on the next meetings agenda. Amy Beyer inquired of Mark Rollenhagen if more information was available at his shop for hydroelectric generation feasibility. Rollenhagen indicated that he was not aware of what exactly was available at Traverse City Light and Power but if more information was needed than what Kalish could provide then he (Rollenhagen) could be contacted.

2:20-2:35

Public comment

Mr. Norbert Tutlis presented information regarding a presentation that was to occur in Elk Rapids later that evening regarding the generation of power at the dam on the Elk River. Mr. Tutlis also noted that the Grand Vision was quoted in the key messaging and wondered if they had been consulted regarding that beforehand. Mr. Tutlis also indicated that citations needed to be included in the fact sheet(s) as well as consideration of the Cass Road bridge and mitigation of contaminated sediments in the impoundments and that there should be an investigation of rates charged for hydroelectric power as opposed to other forms to find the actual costs associated with hydropower generation.

Mr. John Porter commented on the potential losses and gains related to recreation associated with the Boardman River impoundments. Mr. Porter indicated that it would be very expensive to build a dam and create a situation such as the one that currently exists at the impoundments.

Mr. Robin Beardsley made comment related to the discrepancy in information he received about the cost of biomass production from Traverse City Light and Power. Mr. Beardsley indicated that facts and figures related to the Boardman River Dams Project should be acquired from a variety of sources for a complete and accurate picture.

2:35

Meeting Adjourned

Hydropower Summary

The Boardman Dam Removal Project

- The dam removal project is the result of an elaborate and impartial community assessment of options regarding the dams and their impact on the Boardman River.
- The Boardman River Dams Committee (BRDC) was formed in 2005 to determine the best solution for the dams.

Hydropower Feasible?

- A main reason for considering hydropower is to utilize available renewable energy sources.
- The BRDC hired an engineering firm to conduct an Engineering and Feasibility study to gather whether hydropower was a feasible option socially, economically and environmentally.
- Bringing the dams up to regulation standards for hydropower would cost the same initially as removing the dams.
- The estimated cost of restoring hydroelectric power generating capacity is \$8 million to \$15 million. The estimated revenue brought in from selling electricity is \$8.5 million over thirty years, which may not recover the costs incurred during restoration.
- Studies conducted on other renewable energy sources showed that wind power has the potential to produce, at a minimum, double the amount of energy while spending the same amount of money to install five wind turbines.
- Since wind power is considered a clean energy, producing double the amount of energy as hydropower also means displacing twice the amount of harmful emissions, including carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxide, sulfur dioxide and mercury.

An Environmental Look

- Removing the dams and modifying the Union Street dam will:
 - Restore the river to its natural state as a free-flowing, cold-water river.
 - Provide a natural habitat for native fish species and organisms preferring cold water.
 - Increase the population density and biodiversity of species.

An Economic Look

- An estimated increase of \$3 million in revenue will come from increased recreation, tourism and property values.
- The completion of this project promotes business growth and new business opportunities because of the increased interest in water related activities, including fishing, kayaking, canoeing and tubing.
- The dam removal supports the long-term goals of the Grand Vision in recreation, land use and transportation.

Outcomes

- After thoroughly analyzing all options, the BRDC concluded that socially, environmentally and economically, removing three of the dams and modifying the Union Street dam would be the best option.

- The results of extensive study show that while the potential exists for hydro generation, the cost to license, repair and upgrade the dams in order to comply with state and federal rules and regulations may outweigh the revenue to be generated by selling electricity generated at the dams. The decision to remove the dams was made after methodical evaluation of this and all other available data and options, as well as a comprehensive public input process.
- Green energy is a top priority, but so is restoring our natural rivers for social, environmental and economic benefits. Other renewable energy solutions have been reviewed and are more feasible for the cost of long-term maintenance and the life of the energy source.

Boardman River Restoration Q+A

What is the scope of the project?

The project involves the removal of three dams: Sabin, Boardman, and Brown Bridge, and modification to Union Street dam. The scale of the project is unprecedented in the State of Michigan and is made possible through the collaboration of multiple stakeholder agencies and organizations with elaborate and impartial community assessment of options regarding the dams and their impact on the Boardman River. When completed, this will be the largest dam removal project in state history, reconnecting over 3.4 miles of stream to the Great Lakes. It is also one of the largest wetland restoration projects to be undertaken in the Great Lakes Basin, involving over 250 acres of wetlands.

How much will the Boardman River Restoration Project cost?

The initial cost estimate to complete the project is \$5 – \$8 million, however this cost does not include all associated projects, such as the Cass Road crossings. Actual costs will be determined through the engineering and feasibility study, and all costs are subject to refinement as the major design parameters are finalized.

How will the Boardman River Restoration Project be funded?

The project will be paid for through a combination of Federal, State, Tribal and local government sources, as well as private funding sources.

Who is managing the Boardman River Restoration Project?

In 2009, the City and County passed the resolutions granting authority to an Implementation Team for project oversight. The IT is comprised of the dam owners and key agency stakeholder representatives. The IT makes decisions concerning overall planning and direction of the dam removal process and is responsible for engaging professional services that will be involved in dam removal work.

Who can attend IT meetings?

All IT meetings are open to the public and subject to the Open Meetings Act. Upcoming meetings will be posted on the website, www.theboardman.org.

Will the IT seek expertise from other organizations and experts during the restoration?

The IT will be engaging the services of consultants, agencies and conservation organizations throughout the life of the project. Included in this group are the Conservation Resource Alliance and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and private contractors.

Will existing infrastructures be impacted by any of the dams removed?

The IT recognizes that the Boardman Dam crosses Cass Road and the removal of this dam will require an alternative to this road crossing. This provides a unique opportunity for stakeholder agencies to meet on common ground and collaborate on a design for replacement of the Cass Road crossing.

What environmental impacts will removing the three dams have on the surrounding area?

Removing the Sabin, Boardman and Brown Bridge dams will restore more than three river miles of native coldwater fisheries habitat. More than 250 acres of wetlands will be restored, as well as nearly 60 acres of upland habitat.

Does the Boardman River Restoration Project support long-term community goals?

The project supports the overarching principles of the Grand Vision with respect to natural resources, transportation, recreation and energy. Critical to long-term successful outcomes is continual community involvement in the project and the Boardman River Watershed.

How will the project effect local businesses?

Restoring the river will bring more than \$3 million of increased revenue into the region from increased recreation, tourism and property values. The increased recreation and tourism will promote business growth, including new businesses to support an increase in fishing, kayaking, canoeing and other water related activities.

Why was the decision made to remove the dams instead of continuing to use them to generate electricity?

The results of extensive study show that while the potential exists for hydro generation, the cost to license, repair and upgrade the dams in order to comply with state and federal rules and regulations may outweigh the revenue to be generated by selling electricity generated at the dams. The decision to remove the dams was made after methodical evaluation of all available data and options, and a comprehensive public input process. This evaluation included over 170 public meetings with over 1,000 unique participants, and analysis of 81 different options for dam retention, removal and modification.

What can the community expect to see as the restoration progresses?

As the project progresses, visible physical changes will be seen on stream banks and a clear, cold and uniquely high gradient river will emerge. Improved fish and wildlife habitat and enhanced recreational opportunities will result as the river evolves and finds its stable form in the areas within and nearby the impoundment basins.



**GRAND TRAVERSE COUNTY
ADMINISTRATION OFFICE**

400 BOARDMAN AVENUE
TRAVERSE CITY, MI 49684-2577

DENNIS ALOIA, ADMINISTRATOR 231/922-4780
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS 231/922-4797
ADMINISTRATION FAX 231/922-4427

DATE: June 10, 2010
TO: Boardman River Dams Implementation Team
SUBJECT: Update on Boardman Dam Bottomlands Information
FROM: Dennis Aloia *DA*

Dear Implementation Team:

Last month the County Board asked, Nyal Deems, from Varnum Law to attend the committee meeting to discuss options in finalizing bottomland ownership issues facing the County. At this meeting, several options were discussed. Mr. Deems reiterated the fact that he concurred with the County Prosecutor, Al Schneider, that the bottomlands would be owned by Grand Traverse County.

A discussion ensued regarding a strategy for addressing this issue in a way that would not delay the dam removal project from moving forward. Mr. Deems indicated that one option would be to file for Quiet Title and invite the property owners to make their case in Circuit Court. He felt this would best be accomplished once a bottomlands management plan had been developed which could show the court how the land would be utilized once the dams are removed. I would assume that this would include answers to the following questions:

- Would this be considered park land?
- What kind of access the public would have?
- What kind of facilities might be placed on the land?
- Would trails be included?

I know that the bottomlands committee is working on management of the bottomlands issue and at this point, I don't believe anything has been done to fully develop a reuse plan. I have had preliminary conversations with soil conservation about the possibility of developing a draft reuse plan. To this point nothing has been formalized. The Board has taken no action on this issue, although I am interested in discussing with all parties a timeline for completing the bottomlands management plan and getting opinion from the group on the advisability of developing a reuse plan to present at the time that Quiet Title is filed.

Once again, I want to stress that the County Board has taken no official action on this issue at this time; I am only evaluating alternative options.

Sincerely,

Dennis Aloia

Dennis Aloia



Boardman River Dam Removal – Fundraising Update

Date: June 2010

Major Activities and Milestones:

Project management team is continuing to develop the dam removal overall workplan and simultaneously map out how each source of funds can best be deployed. The work of the Army Corps contractors to identify data and work elements needed for design is expected to aid in this work.

Rotary and Todd Kalish hosted Great Lakes Fisheries Trust staff for preliminary discussions of funding opportunities. MDNRE and GT Conservation District assisted with recent EPA tribal science forum site tour of the Boardman Dams project.

Tribal Wildlife and BIA Circle of Flight grants are both in development, committed but not finalized yet; Fessell is working with agencies to finalize.

New Developments:

Great Lakes Fisheries Trust opportunity is being developed for proposal as early as August.

MDNRE Coastal Management proposal to support communications/outreach costs is being investigated in late June.

Upcoming Deadlines for Proposals:

Spring 2010 - EPA GLRI second RFP (expected to have resources matching design needs)

August 2010 – US Fish & Wildlife Service Fish Passage preproposals

September 2010 – Midwest Glacial Lakes Partnership preproposals

Open Items:

NEW – GL Fish Trust proposal scope, sponsor, applicant (Todd responsible for dam removal portion)

NEW – Projection of project management and communications costs needed (CRA)

OLD - Project Management team suggestion to kick off exploratory discussions with larger private foundations (Gabe)

OLD - Stewardship Team is developing case statement to use in proposals (Becky/Carl will forward working draft to CRA)

OLD - Senator Levin's office is tracking opportunity to petition for past community matching funds eligibility

OLD - Potential funding availability through Grand Vision for needs associated with road crossings (TC-TALUS)

Boardman River Dams Implementation Team

Project Manager Monthly Update

6-17-2010

The following synopsis describes activities performed on behalf of the Boardman River Dams Implementation Team for the time period 5-14-2010 to 6-11-2010;

Edited and distributed April 15, 2010 approved IT meeting minutes.

Updated "Boardman River Dams Project" distribution list in response to requests to be added or removed.

Coordinated and attended meeting regarding bottomlands management plan development.

Site visit to Boardman River with staff from the Great Lakes Fishery Commission and IT.

Contact with Army Corps regarding project updates.

Contact with Grand Traverse County regarding commission meeting minutes related to disposition of the dams.

Contact with Grand Traverse County regarding bottomlands ownership at Boardman Pond.

Contacted SHPO office about their requirements for archaeological survey of shoreline and bottomlands at impoundments.

Attended and participated in May 20 IT meeting.

Composed and distributed draft May 20, 2010 IT meeting minutes.

Participated in Boardman River Dams Project Managers meeting.

Updated and revised fundraising reports and tables.

Meetings with communications consultant to discuss hydropower messaging, website development, and faq sheets.

Compiled and forwarded photos and documents related to project to communications consultant.

Communications with partners regarding various aspects of the project.

Compiled materials for packet; generated and sent out for June 17 IT meeting.