

**Stakeholder Meeting regarding Hydroelectric Licensing &
Kinnickinnic River Corridor Planning Strategy**

River Falls Hydroelectric Project | P-10489

May 14, 2015

Attendees: Peter Anderson, City Council
Diane Odeen, City Council/Utility Advisory Board
Patricia La Rue, Resident/Park & Recreation Advisory Board
Dan Wilcox, Trout Unlimited
Michael Page, Friends of the Kinni
Peter Dahm, Kinnickinnic River Land Trust
Dave Fodroczi, Kinnickinnic River Land Trust
Jarrod Blades, UWRF
Jill Coleman Wasik, UWRF
David Babcock, Resident
Marti Piegras, Resident (phone)
Denny Canef, Wi River Alliance (phone)
Cheryl Latsch, WiDNR (phone)
Weston Arndt, WPPI Energy
Reid Wronski, City of River Falls
Kevin Westhuis, City of River Falls
Mike Noreen, City of River Falls
Scot Simpson, City of River Falls
Ray French, City of River Falls

Introductions

The meeting began with introductions of all attendees, in person and by phone.

Discussion of Directed Studies – Sediment Survey

Ray began by introducing the handout of [Directed Studies to Begin Immediately](#). The consensus of stakeholders and staff is that the biggest unanswered question for possible future dam removal or relicensing relates to the quality of the sediment in the reservoirs. This was the biggest challenge in getting a clear picture of for future costs in the licensing alternatives analysis. The primary issues to study are whether any of the sediment is contaminated, how much there is, and what would it cost to deal with it in the case of dam removal. The City has begun conversations with TRC to submit a proposal for this work.

Dan said that stakeholders needed to have the information provided at these meetings earlier than end of business day the day before the meeting. He asked for more timely and relevant communication than what they are receiving. He also acknowledged that the description of the study provided was not a project scope and that more information was needed.

Denny added that they would be concerned about TRC's expertise in completing the sediment analysis. He challenged their numbers for sediment removal as a part of the licensing analysis last fall. He recommended a company like Inter-Fluve for their expertise in dam removal.

Discussion continued on the importance for experimental design of the studies (Dan) and whether we should convene a technical advisory group to prepare the scope of work (Peter D.). Cheryl discussed the DNR Sediment Guidelines and the importance of DNR consultation in the study process and any dewatering situation.

There was consensus that a sediment study is the appropriate first step. Cheryl emphasized that this process still needs the consent of FERC. Discussion continued on the merits of using TRC or another consultant to conduct the study.

There was also discussion on how long the information from sediment studies would be good for, especially in the case of dam removal, beyond a certain number of years. Dan suggested a new bathymetric study of Lake George may even be needed. Cheryl added that there should be a clear understanding in the study process of what information would be used by FERC, the DNR, or stakeholders in various stages of the process. Others added that there are plenty of examples and guidelines for studying sediment.

Michael asked about a timeline for the extension. Ray indicated it is currently under review internally.

Discussion of Directed Studies – Recreation Use Survey

Discussion began regarding the recreation use survey and the [draft project boundary map](#) (8mb pdf). Ray discussed that there needed to be a new project boundary map drafting to guide the study process and any future licensing processes. The current project boundary map is insufficient for those purposes.

Jill asked if the recreation survey is intended to be just for a baseline of uses or if it will be guiding future use in the project boundary. Ray indicated that it is intended just to provide a baseline inventory and satisfy current license requirements.

Jarrod asked how this relates to the Kinnickinnic River Corridor Planning Boundary, which will incorporate the whole Kinnickinnic River through the City. Perhaps this project boundary and its initial studies could be part of the first phase of the corridor planning process. Cheryl emphasized the need for separate boundaries for the Corridor Plan and the FERC project boundary.

Dan suggested that the water and area affected by the dams is probably larger than what is on the map. Denny added that, while we are beginning the baseline recreational use survey, it may be useful to engage a landscape architect to envision and design recreation for after dam removal.

Diane thought that the draft project boundary map well identified the area necessary for study and to give an understanding of how the area is used recreationally. Peter D. added that the draft boundary is what is important now and that through the corridor planning process there can be more linkage to the other projects; this is a cumulative effort.

Michael discussed the need to measure what on-the-water recreational use may or may not be happening. Discussion continued on other possible uses. Dan emphasized the importance for a

professional and experimental design for a recreation survey, but that it is good the City is using existing resources to complete the baseline survey.

Patricia talked generally about the importance of taking our time with these studies and making sure we get all of the information we can to educate the community about hydropower and dams.

Other Comments/Updates

Dan and Peter D. offered the expertise of the stakeholder groups in the design of the studies. There was additional discussion about whether to convene a technical advisory group.

Jarrod updated the group on the activities of the Kinnickinnic Watershed Consortium. The conducted focus groups with 45 people and presented their results at the recent St. Croix Summit [here](#). They will next be conducting a household survey in the watershed to measure the attitudes of the general public at-large versus the stakeholders that took part in the focus groups.

There was also discussion on what time of day would be best for these meeting with some interest in evening meetings.