
Minutes

Kinni Corridor Project Committee Meeting

Thursday, October 5, 2017

4-5:30 p.m.

City Hall – Training Room

The Kinni Corridor Committee met on October 5, 2017. Those in attendance included Dan Toland, Lisa Moody, Patricia LaRue, Julie Bergstrom, Rick Bowen, Susan Reese, Gary Horvath, Rita Kozak, Amy Peterson, Chris Blasius, Adam Myszewski, Mike Stifter, Dave Fodroczi, Buddy Lucero, Mary Zimmermann, Bob Kost and Mark Lobermeier.

Buddy Lucero called the meeting to order.

Discussion Items

1. Meeting Minutes

The draft meeting minutes from the September 14, 2017 were reviewed and amended to include the September 14, 2017 dates at the top of page 1. Page 3 was also amended. Agenda item 8, scenario 3 should read “Relicense and remove Powell Falls facility. The minutes were approved as amended,

2. Public Comment

Michael Page representing the Friends of the Kinni organization spoke and handed out a letter to the Committee which was also distributed via email on October 5th. Michael referenced a published article he co-authored with National Park Service’s Randy Thoreson which will appear in the upcoming issue of the River Management Society (RMS) Journal. He also informed the Committee that the book “The Fishing River” is now available at the library.

Neil Anderson addressed the Committee. He expressed his hope for greater discussion of pathways. He felt that there hasn’t been enough discussion or analysis of the trails. He mentioned the economic study and commented that zoning needs to be brought up to date.

Dan Wilcox mentioned that after seeing the progress of the pathway construction that he believes that the design is inappropriate, it is too wide and too many trees were removed.

3. Committee Member Check-in: Questions, comments, items for future agendas

Dave wanted to acknowledge the recent correspondence from the Friends of the Kinni. The group sent a letter to the committee on September 14 and a second letter on October 5. He asked whether there will be a planned response. Mark indicated that there had been no plan to provide a specific response to any of the correspondence that is (and will be) received, but rather the comments and questions will be utilized by the project team as the planning process proceeds. Dave referred to the September 14 letter indicating that he was sympathetic to the questions the FOTK raised about the publication of survey results. Mark indicated that he believed that the December 2016 survey represents a starting point for the process. Now that we have (hopefully) increase the interest and awareness of the

community, we can drive the charrette process and the development of design concepts that will help inform the relicensing decision and establish a final corridor plan.

Gary asked if the Council had endorsed the revised three scenarios for consideration. The Council will act on a resolution that addresses the three scenarios on October 10.

4. Updates

Economic Impact Study

Buddy updated the Committee that he and Scot Simpson had met with Dave Drewiske of the Kinnickinnic River Land Trust and Dr. Logan Kelly from UW River Falls to discuss the KRLT-proposed economic impact study. Buddy indicated that the importance of the study is recognized but it would not occur until after the charrette. He expected Dr. Kelly to come back with a revised scope and approach and meet again with the City.

Dave Drewiske of the KRLT asked to speak. He wondered what information would be most useful to the Council in their relicensing decision process. He indicated that Dr. Kelly had re-drafted the scope around the three scenarios the Committee agreed to at the September 14 meeting. KRLT sees this as valuable information and has offered to fund a portion of the study, hoping to form a partnership to complete the effort. He expressed concern that there is not enough time after the charrette to complete the work. Dave brought copies of the revised scope but did not distribute since City staff had not yet reviewed it.

Dave Fodroczi indicated that there was a lot of support for doing this study. He believed that the intent from the last meeting was to create a broader scope and complete the work within an appropriate time frame to have ready by January 18, 2017.

Decision Matrix

Mark reported that he had not yet set up the two small groups to “test drive” the decision matrix first introduced at the October 3 meeting. He expected the groups to meet within the next 10.

Charrette Presentation and Logistics

Bob Kost outlined the upcoming 3 ½ day event planned for the end of October. He reviewed how the design/planning team would use the three spaces in the library for working space, presentation space and display area, Mary distributed a one page schedule that is also on the website.

Rita asked about the planned interaction between the public and the professionals. Bob explained that on Wednesday night’s orientation, there will be two facilitated exercises: “SIM River” and a facilitated table top discussion. Different scale maps will be used to review the three corridor segment. The largest scale will be used for the middle-Kinni and the downtown. The team will use image cards for man-made and natural features. The facilitated discussions will seek to capture program elements on flip charts organized around corridor planning topics. Starting Thursday, the team will work from the studio on the main level of the library. These working sessions are open to the public but are not meeting; the team will be engaged in the development of concepts as the public offers ideas and suggestions.

There will be scheduled opportunities for the committee to interact on both Thursday and Friday. Images will evolve and will be displayed in the lobby area of the library throughout the process. Both Friday and Saturday culminate with presentations.

Gary asked about the presentation format. Bob explained that Wednesday night will be a short formal presentation followed by interaction opportunities. On Friday and Saturday, there will be a public presentation of the evolving concepts with public reaction and comment.

Mary directed the Committee to the Charrette page on the project web-site.

Committee Communication

Mary discussed the draft communication piece she had sent to the committee on October 4 for review. The intent of the article for the River Falls Journal was to reinforce the point that no decisions have been made and that the committee is independent of the citizen groups that have formed around the process. Gary believed that some parts needed greater clarification around the potential of an interim decision as described in item two which suggested that if a decision was made to relicense it didn't mean that it was a 30 year commitment and that the City could always make a subsequent surrender decision at a later date. Gary felt that this could only happen if included as part of the initial decision. Mark committed to further edit the correspondence. Dave suggested that we eliminate item 2 altogether and remain focused on what is in and what is not in. He also suggested that we not refer to specific stakeholder groups in number 4. Number three will also be reworded.

Mary had hoped to clarify that the Committee was separate from the stakeholder groups. Rick suggested we find a shorter way to say that no decision is made yet. Lisa referred back to item two, clarifying that it would still be possible for the City to operate the hydros a little longer. Gary again made the point that a future surrender would then need to be included in the initial decision to relicense. Susan wondered if such language would be binding, especially if it a different council in the future.

It was agreed that the edited document will be sent back to the committee for consensus approval.

Mark asked the committee to discuss responding to correspondence received. The committee discussed the importance of responding with one voice and sharing the response to the full committee. Mike and Dave suggested acknowledging receipt even if a full response is not forth-coming.

5. Frequently Asked Questions Process and Editing

Mark discussed the recently distributed FAQ document and the process for making edits based on comments from the committee. Rick identified the need to correct one for the answers provided on page 7 regarding electric rates.

How much will electric rates go up if the dams are removed and restoration is complete?

Rate increases due to dam removal have not been calculated. An increase in rates would relate to the City's desire to recover lost hydroelectric revenues over time. In 2016, the City's net revenues from the sale of 2.1 million kWh was \$125,840. The 2016 retail rate for electricity was \$0.0977/kwh. Using total power sold of 25,000,000 kWh, rates could increase by 10%.

Mark said it would be corrected and reiterated that this document will evolve with new information and clarifications to others as needed.

6. Planning Principals

Bob Kost reviewed the October 2 draft of the planning principals, noting that they are high level but specific enough for the project. Buddy noted that the City Comprehensive Plan has about a dozen themes and that we should be pulling those key words from the Comp Plan into Planning Principals. Rita suggested the planning principals reflect a sense of place for both residents and for visitors.

Bob discussed the "sense of place". He indicated that planning principals are not an ordered list, but rather the big concepts that we will continually test the plan against. Resiliency is one of the emerging important principals.

Rita as if Public Engagement/Public Participation could be a planning principal. Bob suggested it might be covered under item "d", but we could also create a new one.

The Committee questioned how the planning principals. Bob clarified how they would be applied during and after the charrette to draft and complete the corridor plan. Dave suggested that the planning principals could apply to the decision matrix.

Mike suggested key words like ‘stewardship’ and ‘responsibility’ would make sense. Amy added “aesthetics”, “architecture” and “transportation”. Patricia added “education”, noting that there is no museum in town. Rick agreed that “heritage” Bob encouraged the committee to send him other thoughts and ideas.

7. Cost of Dam Removal

Mark reviewed the poster from Tech Talk No. 5 – Dam Removal. Dave was concerned that the Committee hadn’t had a chance to review what was behind the proposal or costs and questioned the value of the estimate. Mark explained that the cost estimate is one part of the three scenario analysis. Dave had hoped all the cost estimates would be available for the charrette.

Mark discussed the level of the estimate, recognizing that the numbers are estimates as no preliminary designs are in place. Rita was concerned that the numbers were not accurate. Gary was concerned that there is nothing to compare the estimate to. Dave wondered how the concepts generated by the charrette could progress without the type of economic analysis suggested by the Land Trust. Rita agreed that we need numbers of the other scenarios.

Mark explained that the charrette was expected to define programming elements that would apply to the other scenarios and that the other cost estimates would follow.

8. Schedule – Upcoming Meetings

Mark reviewed the upcoming schedule including the October 25 – 28 charrette and the November 2nd Committee Meeting. He handed out an updated draft schedule for the next several months of the project.

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at about 6:10 pm