
AGENDA
Kinni Corridor Project Committee Meeting
Thursday, Jan. 25, 2018
4 – 6:00 p.m.
City Hall – Training Room

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – JAN. 11, 2018 AND DEC. 21, 2017 (REVISED)
2. UTILITY ADVISORY BOARD MEETING UPDATE
3. FINAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESOLUTION
4. NEXT MEETINGS
 - FEBRUARY 13 – COUNCIL MEETING: RECEIVE REPORT
 - FEBRUARY 27 – COUNCIL MEETING: LICENSING DECISION
 - MARCH 8 – COMMITTEE MEETING
5. ADJOURN

Attachments:

- December 21, 2018 Revised Meeting Minutes
- Jan. 11, 2018 Meeting Minutes
- UAB Jan. 15, 2018 Resolution
- Draft Committee Resolution

Revised Minutes

Kinni Corridor Project Committee Meeting

Thursday, December 21, 2017

4-5:30 p.m.

City Hall – Training Room

The Kinni Corridor Committee met on December 21, 2017. Those in attendance included Dan Toland, Lisa Moody, Patricia LaRue, Rick Bowen, Jason Engstrom, Susan Reese, Gary Horvath, Rita Kozak, Chris Blasius, Julie Bergstrom, Adam Myszewski, Scot Simpson, Mary Zimmerman, Dave Fodroczi, Angie Bond, Mike Stifter, Kevin Westhuis and Mark Lobermeier.

Also in attendance: Dave Simons and Andrew Dane from SEH.

Mark Lobermeier called the meeting to order.

Discussion Items

1. Acknowledgements

Mark acknowledged recent correspondence received by the committee from American Rivers, American Whitewater and Judy Foster Babcock. Mark indicated that consistent with the Committee discussion at previous meetings, the correspondence will be included as part of the record but there will not be a specific response.

Mark made reference to comments in the correspondence regarding a scenario referred to as “surrender in place”. He distributed to the committee a position statement regarding the “surrender in place” scenario, which as presented in the correspondence is the same as scenario 2 – remove both facilities.

2. Meeting Minutes

The revised draft meeting minutes from the November 2, 2017 were discussed. Dave F. suggested that the minutes be further revised to strike the email language that was added to the original version to clarify comments at the December 7th meeting. Patricia agreed with the change. A motion was made and seconded to approve the meeting minutes from November 2nd with the new amendment, and to approve the minutes from December 7. The motion was approved,

3. Summary of Public Input

Mark acknowledged the petition that the Friends of the Kinni (FOTK) organization had distributed to the UAB on December 18. Michael Page of the FOTK distributed copies of the petition to the committee, acknowledging that not all of the signatures are from residents and because the river is a regional resource the issue is regional in nature.

Mark referred back to the December 7th Committee meeting, when the Committee requested a summary of public input. A draft of the information has been completed by City staff and will be included in the packet for the next committee meeting on January 11.

4. Scenario Description and Preliminary Costs

Mark explained the scenario cost estimates included in the meeting packet. There were no questions from the Committee regarding the information.

5. Facilitated Discussion on Scenarios

Mark indicated that the balance of the meeting would be spent on the discussion of scenarios. Scot reminded the committee that with two meetings left (January 11 and January 25th) and a possible meeting in on February 1st if needed, the committee needed to work through the information available to come to consensus. He acknowledged the public input summary that will be in the next meeting packet and shared his belief that the committee has had more time and more information than other similar groups to aid in their decisions.

Scot introduced Andrew Dane from SEH who would serve as the facilitator for the discussion.

Andrew shared a decision process diagram depicting how group decisions often start and then diverge into what he called the “groan zone” before converging toward consensus or consent. Andrew asked the committee where they saw themselves in the process. Most believed us to still be in the “groan zone”; Mayor Toland believed us to be starting into convergence.

Andrew asked if there was consensus around the idea of long-term vision of a free flowing Kinni.

Dave F. mentioned that there is not consensus on the vision and that he really wants to see the summary of public input. He suggested that the long term vision means dams removed and river restored, and that absent the summary, it is hard to agree to that. He discussed that we did not discuss the results of the decision matrix in detail, but after his review it appeared that 7 of the 10 respondents were leaning towards scenario 2 – remove both facilities. He had hoped to have discussed it at our last meeting

Gary supported Dave’s comments. Rick asked for more information regarding the DNR process under the surrender in place option that has been mentioned.

Mark reminded the committee that there are no parameters yet on what “long term” means.

Patricia voiced her preference to putting money into the dams and lakes, and renewable energy. She noted that in the survey there were no questions related to green energy. Her choice would be scenario 1 but to more importantly she would hope to not split apart the community over the decision.

Dan acknowledged that 50 years from now obviously we wouldn’t have the dams. However, there is concern about the capital expenses. Lisa agreed with the Mayor but doesn’t think it makes any sense to leave the facilities in place and not generating electricity when they could operate another 40 years. She added that it would be foolish to let them crumble. Susan agreed.

Rita observed if we are discussing a long-term vision that she believes scenario 2 tends to lean towards scenario 1 – relicense both facilities.

Dan reiterated the problem that relicensing is fast approaching. Mark said it is really about 2 questions: (1) keep one or more dams, and; (2) timing of ultimate removal. Patricia indicated that she is not dead set against scenario 2 – remove both facilities.

Rick said he wrestles with the green energy, asking “40 years from now, what does the science say about the river.” He asked if we can buy energy as cheap as we generate it.

Jason believes that scenario 2 – remove both facilities is the vision but that he is concerned about funding. Adam agreed with Dan, Susan and Lisa about the overall long term vision. However, he wondered how best to benefit the City – relicense 1 and remove the other?

Susan expressed that she is for improving the in-place facilities to produce as much energy as possible. She reiterated that we need to trust that the City Council will be responsible in addressing the future of the river. She believes we should take advantage of the assets we have and not throw away the investments. She acknowledged that she does not see them removed now but is not opposed to removal in 10 – 15 years. Adam question how much of an investment in Powell Falls would be too much? Susan was in favor of make the identified repairs.

Chris believed she could get to scenario 2 – remove both facilities at some point in the future, but the big hang up is fiscal responsibility.

Andrew referred back to the matrix in an effort to identify which scenarios best meets their beliefs. He placed “x’s” to indicate lack of support and check marks to represent support in the scenario columns and category rows.

Rita asked about weighting the categories. Mark reminded the committee that the matrix was a tool for them to express their preference and not to produce a numerical answer. Lisa reiterated that Lake George needs to be fixed and should be part of any scenario.

Scot observed that the committee seems to be in general agreement regarding long term removal. Susan questioned whether we agree on remove in 30 years (referring to the end of the next license). Susan, Chris and Lisa agreed that at present it is not okay to eliminate scenario 1.

Andrew shifted the discussion to the community vision. Conditions to accompany an eventual removal scenario were discussed.

- Work on Lake George.
- Timing of removal(s).
- Green Energy – utilization of assets.
- Maintain a cohesive communication.
- Cost/funding.
- Invest/increase hydro production.
- Maintain fiscal responsibility.
- Address storm water.
- Restoration of reclaimed flood plain.
- Changes to the river.

Chris asked about the order of removal – taking out one but not the other. Lisa had a similar question. Patricia reiterated the need to clean up Lake George.

Dave F. had questions regarding storm water, wondering about dredging of Lake George which could be a 7-figure cost. He believes we need to be strategic on sediment management. Chris stated that if we get rid of Lake George, we still need to do something with sediment and that also comes with a cost. Susan indicated that we can’t simply ignore the City budget (constraints).

Andrew asked for a straw poll of the committee asking for who was in favor of scenario 2 – remove both facilities; 5 of the 11 committee members indicated their current support for scenario 2.

Dan thought it would be a mistake to not relicense for at least a short time and then surrender at a later date.

Andrew asked the committee to indicate if they would relicense. Half of the committee indicated they would support relicensing. Rick asked for further explanation of “surrender in place”. Mark referred to the position paper he distributed.

Dave F indicated that he would need more scientific/engineering information if we were morphing from scenario 3 – remove Powell Falls and relicense Junction Falls – to Scenario 2 – remove both facilities. He recalled that Inter-Fluve’s report to the FOTK recommended removing Junction Falls first and using Lake Louise and Powell Falls to better contain sediments. Mark acknowledged Inter-Fluve’s recommendation which was based on removing both facilities at the same time.

Dave F. saw that our presentation to the UAB on December 18 included a number related to the equivalent number of solar panels top offset lost hydro production. He does not believe this is practical. Andrew asked about what would be a pragmatic strategy – green block sales, solar, combination, etc.?

6. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at about 5:40 pm

Minutes

Kinni Corridor Project Committee Meeting

Thursday, Jan. 11, 2018

4-5:30 p.m.

City Hall – Training Room

The Kinni Corridor Committee met on January 11, 2018. Those in attendance included Dan Toland, Lisa Moody, Patricia LaRue, Rick Bowen, Jason Engstrom, Susan Reese, Gary Horvath, Rita Kozak, Chris Blasius, Adam Myszewski, Scot Simpson, Mary Zimmerman, Dave Fodroczi, Angie Bond, Amy Peterson, Mike Stifter, Kevin Westhuis, Buddy Lucero and Mark Lobermeier.

Also in attendance: Dave Simons and Andrew Dane from SEH. Members of the public included William Hansen, Jeff Bjork, Kent Johnson, Allison Page and Michael Page.

Buddy Lucero called the meeting to order at 4:04 pm and took roll call. All of the committee members were present.

Discussion Items

1. Meeting Minutes

The meeting minutes from the December 21, 2017 meeting were discussed. Dave F. suggested that page 2 of the minutes under the fifth paragraph under item 5 be revised to replace the phrase “he questioned...” with “He suggested...” A motion was made and seconded to approve the meeting minutes from December 21st as amended. A motion was made and seconded to approve the revised minutes from December 7. Both motions were approved,

2. Acknowledgements

Mark acknowledged recent correspondence received by the Committee from The Kinnickinnic River Land Trust and Trout Unlimited. Mark indicated that consistent with the Committee discussion at previous meetings, the correspondence will be included as part of the public record but there will not be a specific response.

3. Facilitated Discussion on Scenarios

Andrew Dane addressed the Committee. He described the evening’s objective was to craft the bones of a resolution for the City Council to consider. Andrew stated that our observation from the last meeting was that the Committee has a shared long term vision for a free flowing river. There were no objections voiced to that statement.

He reviewed the agenda for the evening, and handed out a 1 page document based on the discussion and identified parameters from our December 21 meeting. The document was written in terms of a policy framework for proceeding forward with discussion and drafting a resolution.

The Committee was asked to spend 5 – 10 minutes reviewing the policy framework. Noting which items they agreed with and which they disagreed with. Mark wrote the first five policies on the white board, while Andrew answered clarifying questions from the committee.

Andrew reconvened the Committee and began to discuss each policy.

- i. The City shall make decisions based on shared long term vision of a free flowing Kinnickinnic River and associated ecological restoration.***

The Committee agreed to policy i.

- ii. The City will aggressively continue efforts to complete the Corridor Plan that will define implement action plans that achieve the long term vision of a free flowing Kinnickinnic River.***

The Committee agreed to policy ii, noting that “long term” will need to be defined.

- iii. The City shall develop a fiscally responsible financing plan to implement the recommendations of the final Corridor Study including dam removal and stream restoration***

The Committee agreed to policy iii.

- iv. The City shall develop two options for removing Powell Dam prior to 2038. Options will describe fiscal impact to City, property owners and rate payers given assumptions regarding sources and uses of funds.***

The 7 of 11 Committee members agreed to policy iv. Those not supporting included Gary, Rita, Dave and Rick. They indicated that the statement indicated that 2038 was too long. The wording was change for 2038 to the earliest possible date. Only 4 Committee members supported that change.

- v. The City will take necessary steps to remove the Powell Dam no later than 2028.***

The Committee was mixed relative to policy v. Gary indicated that 2028 was too long, preferring 2025. Mark explained why first believed 2028, based on a time line to complete funding, design and construction. Adam believed that in a best case scenario it might be 8 years to remove the dams, more likely 10 -12 years. Rita asked when the necessary steps would begin, preferring to start taking steps now versus in say 2027. She would support 2025 instead of 2028. Patricia would like to see Powell generate electricity until removal.

Based on a straw poll, 8 members supported the statement with the 2025 date while 3 did not. Susan proposed that we be allowed to generate power up to 2025. Dan agreed with Susan, suggesting that 2025 seems rushed. Mark mentioned that the City could still relicense Powell while expressing to FERC that the dam will come out in 2025. Susan reiterated that the studies need to relicense are different that those to surrender. The committee agreed to change the phrase “take the necessary steps” to “take the necessary steps right away”.

Chris was hesitant to use any dates, suggesting we need to collect more information. Jason reinforced the point that the dates need to be dependent on policy 3.

Mark suggested that the statement discuss removal “at the earliest possible date and generate electricity up to that time”. The Committee did not support the change. Dave and Gary were supporting no power generation after 2023.

- vi. *The City will document and evaluate the dam removal process to learn about ecological restoration successes and failures and use those findings to plan for removal of Junction Falls dam and associated river restoration.***

The Committee agreed to policy vi.

- vii. *The City will take necessary steps to remove the Junction Falls dam no later than 2040. In the meantime the City will minimize necessary investments to cost effectively continue to generate clean hydropower energy from the existing facility.***

Susan questioned the 2040 date. Mark explained that it coincided with the estimated 50 year design life of the facility. She asked about future repairs. Mark explained that if a storm came and knocked out the facility it would not be replaced, but if a few bolts came loose they would be repaired. Susan supported the idea of limiting future major expenditures.

Gary and Dave supported 2038 (which is 20 years from now). Gary said he could also say yes to 2040. Lisa asked if revenues from Junction Falls will rise when depreciation ends (in 2030). Mark answered yes, depending on other costs and repairs. Susan was not in favor of either date, thinking we should stop when the facility is knocked offline. She asked about a scenario where a new source of renewable energy emerges while the hydro is still running.

It was suggested that we add language “that this will be the last license”. Chris preferred no dates in favor of language that reads “The City should take necessary steps to...”. Three of the eleven Committee members (Dave, Rick and Gary) supported actual dates in the statement. Gary believed that without dates, we are just kicking the issue down the road.

- viii. *The City shall earmark future hydropower revenue for future dam removal and river restoration activities.***

Patricia disagreed with the idea that the utility customers (rate payers) should have to pay for removal and restoration, suggesting that the money be used to replacing lost sources of renewable energy. Chris questioned whether this policy was needed, the vast majority of the Committee agreed the policy could be eliminated. Gary believed that we should still work to create a fund. Mark referred the Committee back to policy iii.

Only 2 Committee members did not support policy viii., but half of the Committee did not think we needed to keep it.

- ix. *The City shall develop a renewable energy policy that creates greater amounts of clean energy from other sources and identify strategies for reducing overall consumption compared with the current situation.***

Dan indicated that City is already doing this, questioning the need for the statement. The Committee agreed to leave the statement in. Dan suggested the statement change from “shall develop” to “shall continue to”. Gary supported the change.

- x. ***The City shall update and implement a Lake George Improvement Plan including comprehensive stormwater strategies within the contributing subwatersheds.***

Susan questioned how could increase funding. The Committee supported the policy as written.

- xi. ***The City shall develop investigate potential for increasing funding to support stormwater management best practices in order to minimize the thermal and pollutant loading to the river,***

Rita suggested that the policy read “shall develop policies for increasing funding”. The Committee supported the policy as revised.

Andrew asked the Committee to identify any other guidelines. Those noted included:

- Remove facility when funding is available, not just by a date.
- Removal at an earlier time corresponds with community input.
- Include abbreviated direction in the resolution with greater detail in the corridor plan.

Scot observed that there is work to do on the time line as there are significant differences. He questioned how much we should tell the Council regarding dates at this time as they only need to decide about relicensing.

Andrew ask the Committee if the Committee though we were “a long-ways away”. Patricia offered that the Powell Falls issues need work. It doesn’t make sense to her to not generate electricity from a facility that is in place just because of a date. She believed that she had moved a long way from her original position and questioned why others were not more will to moderate from theirs. Dave advocate for earlier dates, expressing disappointed that the summary of public input in the meeting packet was without quantification. Dan suggested the relicensing is the question, questioning if we needed the other details at this time.

Gary felt we need to give the Council more than bare-bones direction – then it is on the record. Susan was in favor of a more abbreviated direction with further detail to be developed in the Corridor Plan.

Buddy suggested that the next step was for staff to draft a resolution for the Committee to review and approve. Scot believes there is enough meat on the bones for people to say that they would not want to relicense, indicated that the community has complete control over the process. Rick referred back to the 1990 decision to rehab Junction Falls, and not wanting to repeat that mistake. He agreed with Buddy’s suggestion to develop a draft resolution for review at the next meeting.

Lisa asked for clarification – is it 1 license or 2? Mark indicated that there is one license that covers both facilities.

Chris again questioned the importance of dates, wondering how the City would prioritize these dates and actions with all the other various projects. Lisa agreed, what happens if say there is a water main break, then funds may not be available for another project on a specific date.

Buddy reminded the Committee that at the start of the project everyone agreed to have an open mind. He asked that they work to represent the whole community as we move forward.

4. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at about 5:40 pm



RESOLUTION NO. 2018-XX

**RESOLUTION REGARDING RELICENSING OF
HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT P-10489**

WHEREAS, the City of River Falls operates two hydroelectric facilities on the Kinnickinnic River known as Hydroelectric Project (P-10489) and

WHEREAS, the hydroelectric facilities are operated under license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC); and

WHEREAS, the current FERC license expires as of August 31, 2023; and

WHEREAS, the Junction Falls facility is currently capable of generating approximately \$40,000 in net revenues per year from power generation; and

WHEREAS, the Junction Falls facility was reconstructed in 1990 at a cost of \$950,000 and will be fully depreciated in 2030; and

WHEREAS, the Junction Falls facility is currently in good operating condition with no significant capital expenditures anticipated for more than twenty years; and

WHEREAS, the Powell Falls facility is currently capable of generating approximately \$35,000 in net revenues per year from power generation; and

WHEREAS, the City is required to notify FERC regarding its intentions regarding the future of the licensing the facilities by August 31, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the process for submitting sufficient notice and pre-application documents to FERC should begin by March 1, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the City of River Falls has initiated the development of a corridor plan to help establish the long term vision for the Kinnickinnic River corridor and to inform the licensing decision; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has established an eleven person Kinni Corridor Project Committee to guide the planning process and to recommend to the City Council an appropriate action regarding the relicensing decision on or before February 27, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has identified three licensing scenarios: (1) relicense both facilities, (2) surrender the license, and (3) relicense the Junction Falls facility.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Utility Advisory Board (UAB) of the City of River Falls hereby recommends relicense of the Junction Falls hydro facility, and removal the Powell Falls hydro facility and dam at some point in the future. Any hydro or dam related expenditures over \$5,000 will be brought to the Utility Advisory Board and City Council for review and approval.

Dated this 15th day of January, 2018.

Adam Myszewski, President

ATTEST:

Amy White, City Clerk



RESOLUTION NO. 2018-01

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING RELICENSING OF HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT P-10489

WHEREAS, the City of River Falls has initiated the development of a corridor plan to help establish the long term vision for the Kinnickinnic River corridor and to inform the licensing decision; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has established an eleven person Kinni Corridor Project Committee to guide the planning process and to recommend to the City Council an appropriate action regarding the relicensing decision on or before February 27, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the Kinni Corridor Project Committee, City staff and consultants undertook a comprehensive analysis of existing conditions, public input and relevant studies, and

WHEREAS, the City of River Falls operates two hydroelectric facilities on the Kinnickinnic River known as Hydroelectric Project (P-10489) and

WHEREAS, the hydroelectric facilities are operated under license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC); and

WHEREAS, the current FERC license expires as of August 31, 2023; and

WHEREAS, the City is required to notify FERC regarding its intentions regarding the future of the licensing the facilities by August 31, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the process for submitting sufficient notice and pre-application documents to FERC should begin by March 1, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has identified three licensing scenarios: (1) relicense both facilities, (2) surrender the license, and (3) relicense the Junction Falls facility; and

WHEREAS, the Utility Advisory Board (UAB) of the City of River Falls has recommended scenario (3) that the City relicense the Junction Falls hydro facility, and remove the Powell Falls hydro facility and dam at some point in the future, and that

any hydro or dam related expenditures over \$5,000 will be brought to the Utility Advisory Board and City Council for review and approval.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Kinni Corridor Project Committee hereby finds that the future of the Kinnickinnic River Corridor should be based on shared long-term vision of a free flowing Kinnickinnic River, including associated ecological restoration to maintain the current classifications as a Class I trout stream, an Outstanding Resource Water above STH 35 and an Exceptional Resource Water below STH 35 as defined by the WDNR.

Committee Note: <http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/SurfaceWater/orwerw.html>

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Kinni Corridor Project Committee hereby recommends that the City relicense the hydroelectric project for the final time and take steps to pursue the long-term vision for the Kinnickinnic River Corridor within the following policy framework:

- i. The City shall aggressively continue efforts to complete Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Corridor Plan that will define implementation action plans and dates that achieve the long-term vision of the corridor.

Committee Note: A fully-implemented plan for the river corridor is envisioned to comprise three phases:
Phase 1 – Analysis, Feasibility, and Preliminary Concept Plans
Phase 2 – Final Design and Permitting
Phase 3 – Design Implementation and Construction

- ii. The Corridor planning process shall establish a fiscally responsible financing plan to implement the recommendations of the final Corridor Plan including ultimate dam removal and stream restoration (A) , (B) by the end of 2018, or (C) by the end of 2021.

Committee Note: The financing plan will minimize the impact of any of the improvements on taxpayers and utility customers by seeking public private partnerships, in-kind contributions (technical and non-technical), grants and other sources of non-general fund dollars.

- iii. The City will proceed immediately to define and complete necessary steps to remove the Powell hydroelectric facilities and complete associated stream restoration no later than (A) 2026, (B) 2028 or (C) 2033.

Committee Note: Necessary steps include the financing plan (above). It is recognized that portions of the dam may remain in place during stream restoration as part of the sediment management strategy. It is further recognized that a portion of the restoration within former Lake Louise may be temporarily configured to serve as a sediment management strategy for the future removal of the Junction Falls facility.

If approved by FERC, the Powell facility may be allowed to generate electricity beyond 2023, however, once the lake draw down occurs, generation will cease.

Under this scenario, the City may maintain Junction Falls as a generating facility and pursue a new FERC license for the hydroelectric facility. The surrender and ultimate removal of the Powell dam and facilities would be included in the license application. This portion of the application would need to address all studies and information FERC would need to decide that removal of one dam and maintaining the other is the best use of these sites. The studies required would be similar to removal of both dams and would need to address continued operation of the remaining dam and proposed changes with dam removal. This may reduce the cost of future surrender efforts for Junction Falls.

- iv. The City shall document the Powell hydroelectric facility removal process to evaluate ecological restoration successes and failures and use those findings to enhance strategies plan for the ultimate removal of the Junction Falls hydroelectric facilities and associated river restoration.
- v. The City will take necessary steps to remove the Junction Falls dam no later than (A) 2038 20 years from today, (B) 2040, coincident with the estimated 50 year useful life of the facility, (C) 2048 30 years from today, (D) when actual and estimated maintenance and repairs to safely operate the facility exceed \$100,000, or (E) immediately following license surrender in 2063. Any future hydro or dam related expenditures over \$5,000 shall be brought to the Utility Advisory Board and City Council for review and approval

***Committee Note:** Necessary steps include the financing plan (above). It is recognized that portions of the dam may remain in place during stream restoration as part of the sediment management strategy. It is further recognized that a portion of the restoration within former Lake George may be temporarily configured as part of a sediment management strategy. Once the lake draw down occurs, generation will cease.*

- vi. The City shall set aside all future hydropower net revenue beginning on January 1, 2019 to be used as follows: (A) towards future dam removal and river restoration activities, (B) 50% towards future dam removal and river restoration activities and 50% for development of new renewable energy sources for the City, or (C) to for development of new renewable energy sources for the City.

***Committee Note:** Over the last five years, Junction Falls generated approximately \$40,000 per year in net revenues, while Powell Falls contributed and average of \$35,000 over that same period. In addition, the hydro operations contribute approximately \$15,000 in fees in lieu of taxes to the general fund. This is the PILOT contribution. Junction Falls improvements from 1990 are currently being depreciated at a rate of approximately \$21,500 per year. For each year of operation after 2030, the Junction Falls facility will generate an additional \$21,500 per year in net revenues for the City.*

- vii. The City shall continue to pursue its' renewable energy policies to create greater amounts of clean energy from other sources and identify strategies for reducing overall consumption compared with the current situation.
- viii. The City shall update and implement a Lake George Improvement Plan including comprehensive stormwater strategies within the contributing subwatersheds, in accordance with the adopted Corridor Plan.
- ix. The City shall develop additional policies for increasing funding to support stormwater management best practices in order to minimize the thermal and pollutant loading to the river.
- x. The City shall aggressively pursue policies to address adverse development impacts in the upper Kinnickinnic River Watershed that would diminish the quantity and quality of future groundwater sources that contribute to the Kinnickinnic River and its current thermal condition above the City.

Committee Note: One of the biggest threats to the future of a free-flowing outstanding resource water class I trout stream within the planning corridor is development with in the headwaters of the river and in the groundwater recharge areas within the upper watershed. If the river above the City ceases to be an outstanding resource water and a class I trout stream, the long term vision of the corridor plan cannot be realized.

Dated this 25th day of January, 2018.

The Kinni Project Corridor Committee guided the language of this resolution, and while each word and provision may not have complete agreement of each member of the Committee, the members by their signature below acknowledge their support of the overall recommendation:

Chris Blasius

Patricia La Rue

Rick Bowen

Lisa Moody

Jason Egerstrom

Adam Myszewski

Dave Fodroczi,

Susan Reese

Gary Horvath

Dan Toland

Rita Kozak

DRAFT

Wisconsin DNR Definitions

Class 1 Trout Stream:

High quality trout waters that have sufficient natural reproduction to sustain populations of wild trout, at or near carry capacity. Consequently, streams in this category require no stocking of hatchery trout. These streams or stream sections are often small and may contain small or slow-growing trout, especially in the headwaters.

Outstanding Resource Waters (ORWs) or Exceptional Resource Waters (ERWs)

Wisconsin has designated many of the state's highest quality waters as Outstanding Resource Waters (ORWs) or Exceptional Resource Waters (ERWs). Waters designated as ORW or ERW are surface waters which provide outstanding recreational opportunities, support valuable fisheries and wildlife habitat, have good water quality, and are not significantly impacted by human activities. ORW and ERW status identifies waters that the State of Wisconsin has determined warrant additional protection from the effects of pollution. These designations are intended to meet federal Clean Water Act obligations requiring Wisconsin to adopt an "anti-degradation" policy that is designed to prevent any lowering of water quality – especially in those waters having significant ecological or cultural value.

ORWs receive the state's highest protection standards, with ERWs a close second. ORWs and ERWs share many of the same environmental and ecological characteristics. They differ in the types of discharges each receives, and the level of protection established for the waterway after it is designated.

- ***ORWs:*** *ORWs typically do not have any point sources discharging pollutants directly to the water (for instance, no industrial sources or municipal sewage treatment plants), though they may receive runoff from nonpoint sources. New discharges may be permitted only if their effluent quality is equal to or better than the background water quality of that waterway at all times – no increases of pollutant levels are allowed.*
- ***ERWs:*** *If a waterbody has existing point sources at the time of designation, it is more likely to be designated as an ERW. Like ORWs, dischargers to ERW waters are required to maintain background water quality levels; however, exceptions can be made for certain situations when an increase of pollutant loading to an ERW is warranted because human health would otherwise be compromised.*