

MWMO Board of Commissioners Meeting

July 10, 2007
2:30pm – 4:30pm

Location

The City of St. Anthony
Council Chambers
3301 Silver Lake Road

DRAFT Agenda

(D) – Signifies Decision Item

- 1) Welcome, Introduction of Commissioners, and Roll Call
- 2) Approval of Agenda **(D)** Attachment 2
- 3) Approval of Minutes **(D)** Attachment 3
- 4) Open Public Input (Non-agenda items) Sign-in Sheet

Old Business

- 5) Commissioner Travel and Attendance at Events, Training, Conferences, etc **(D)** Attachment 5
- 6) Staff Updates
 - a) Education Program: Hmong Study Report, POWER Grant, etc JW Attachment 6a
 - b) Administrative: Outreach Assistant, Office Space, and Interns, etc DS Attachment 6b
 - i) Insurance
 - ii) Stewardship Fund Evaluation
 - iii) Joint Research Program
 - c) Other Staff updates:
- 7) Hydraulic Study of the Mississippi River: DK **(D)** Attachment 7
- 8) Regulatory Matrix Study: DK **(D)** Attachment 8

New Business

- 9) 2008 Budget Attachment 9
- 10) Riverfront Organizational Model Attachment 10
- 11) Presentation
- 12) Adjourn

Final Minutes for the Board of Commissioners Meeting

May 8, 2007

2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Meeting Location:

Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board Offices
2nd Floor Boardroom (up the stairs)
2117 West River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55411

Commissioners in Attendance:

Paul Ostrow, Minneapolis, Jerry Faust, St Anthony; Diane Hofstede (Alternate, Minneapolis), Karlyn Eckman, St. Paul, Gregg Richardson (Alternate, St. Paul), Karen Gill-Gerbig, Lauderdale; and Scott Vreeland, MPRB

Staff and Guests:

Doug Snyder (MWMO), Kari Oquist (MWMO), Zhenya Stone (MWMO), Jenny Winkelman (MWMO), Nick Eloff (MPRB), Lorin Hatch (CAC), Craig Larson (CAC), Shannon Hansen (CAC), and Patrick Kvidera (CAC)

Commissioner Ostrow called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m.

Approval of Agenda

The Agenda was approved; there will be no presentation under “New Business.”

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the March 13, 2007 meeting were approved as amended below:

Commissioner Eckman moved that the paragraph beginning “The overall consensus...”, on page 3, be deleted.

Commissioner Eckman also moved that paragraph 2 on page 4, be amended to read –
“Commissioner Eckman asked that the MWMO staff make sure the SEMI project goals are still in line with the MWMO goals before the contract is completed. This has been historically problematic and doesn’t complement the District 12 Plan.”

On page 4, under Feasibility Studies, Commissioner Vreeland stated that point A should read, “This proposal would study the feasibility of using a large-scale grit chamber...” (The draft minutes read “grid”.)

Ostrow commented that if any commissioner has an issue to review, please contact him to have the item placed on the agenda.

Open Public Comment.

There were no public comments.

Old Business

Consent Agenda—Attachment 5

The board approved a monitoring contract with St. Anthony Falls Laboratory to develop outfall monitoring. The contract includes a one-time budget amount of \$53,598 plus \$15,444 to maintain a future associated database.

RFP—Choice of a Planning Consultant Team—Attachment 6

Mr. Kalmon explained the selection process for the choice of a planning consultant to implement the Third Generation Watershed Management Plan. Staff recommended Emmons & Olivier and the Hoisington Koegler Group for the third generation rewrite. The board approved the recommendation.

Updates

Mr. Snyder updated the board on several administrative actives.

Outreach Assistant

The position, which was previously approved by the board, was posted on the website on Thursday.

Consultant to Evaluate the Stewardship Fund

A consultant will also be hired to help evaluate the Stewardship Fund.

MWMO Space Evaluation--Attachment 7b

Mr. Snyder stated that he had met with a number of people and spoke with several more concerning acquiring new space issues. He has provided the “Working Program for Ramsey-Washington Watershed District” as an example of planned space utilization. He discovered that a major question raised by many pursuing space transformations was, “How will the workspace enhance our image and function?”

The MWMO will need to decide whether it wants to buy, build, lease or rehabilitate space for its needs. MWMO will also take teaching possibilities into consideration when seeking new space. Whatever approach is taken, it will take at least a year to resolve. Snyder will have more information for the July meeting.

Policy on Commissioner Attendance of Workshops, Conferences, Events, and/or Assignments Within and Outside of Minnesota—Attachment 7D

In general, the board can decide who attends what, but dealing with short notification—between board meetings-- should probably be handled with a board policy. This can be discussed at the July meeting. Mr. Snyder said the MWMO website will display current opportunities available to commissioners. As new events are brought to the staff’s attention, the website will be updated; changes will be entered on Mondays.

Commissioners Hofstede and Vreeland both had favorable impressions of the Greening Rooftops for Sustainable Communities Conference 2007, which they attended in Minneapolis.

The Minnesota Green Roof Profile

Ms. Winkelman presented a legacy publication funded by the MWMO for the Greening Rooftops Conference. The booklet showcases seven green roofs from the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Area and prints an inventory of known green roofs found in Minnesota as of March, 2007. The inventory, which is also available in pdf format, will be updated periodically.

NEMO

Two stormwater education positions have been filled. John Bilotta has been hired as the new NEMO Coordinator, and Shane Missaghi has been hired to fill the Stormwater Educator position, formerly held by Ron Struss. They began their new positions on April 30, 2007.

Other Projects

MWMO has participated in stormwater drain stenciling with the City of Minneapolis, multimedia kiosks, and the Hmong Outreach Project.

A grant application has been filed in conjunction with the Heart of the Beast Theatre to use art and videography to enhance science presentations.

A local legislator appreciative of our work about raising awareness with water issues in the Hmong Community asked us to provide him with a description of our proposals for the next legislative cycle.

Monitoring TAC

Ms. Oquist asked the board if they have suggestions for the MWMO's list for technical advisors. To have a name placed on a monitoring or general TAC list, please call or e-mail her.

Mr. Snyder mentioned that the MWMO is seeking a variety of funding sources. We will be working with St. Anthony Falls Laboratory and be in discussion with other organizations. He and Dan have met with Homeland Security, and there are also some possibilities there.

Commissioner Faust asked that Jay Hartman of St. Anthony be added to the TAC list as a point of contact.

New Business

Groundwater and Surface Water Interactions Study—Attachment 8

Mr. Kalmon explained that this study would start with a review of existent research; it will also provide GIS analysis and interactive mapping. The budget for the study will range between \$80 and \$150,000.

Commissioner Eckman requested that the Elm St. Ash Dump be added to the mapping portion of the information gathering part of the study.

The board approved authorizing staff to release a Request for Qualifications and a Request for Proposals to qualified firms for a study of the characteristics of groundwater and groundwater/surface water interactions in the watershed. After conducting interviews, the staff will return with a recommendation for a consultant.

Social Indicators Project for Nonpoint Source Pollution Projects

Commissioner Eckman spoke about an initiative started three years ago by the Water Resources Center at the University of Minnesota to develop social indicators (SI) for nonpoint source (NPS) pollution projects. The indicators will measure changes in behaviors, attitudes, practices, and knowledge of populations targeted by NPS projects. The study is seeking local partners with NPS projects in Minnesota to test the draft indicators and other tools. Eckman stated that the Fortin Consulting road salt project supported by MWMO might be a good match for the SI initiative. Snow plow drivers could be interviewed to see if they got the right message from the workshop they attended.

The U of M WRC will hold a meeting on Friday, May 18, 2007 from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. There will be a thirty minute discussion and presentation.

New Bridge Across Gorge on 27th Avenue

After the board discussed a new bridge being built across the gorge near Shriners Hospital, Commissioner Ostrow asked board members to please let Doug Snyder know if anyone hears of anything significant happening in MWMO's area. He also requested that discussion points, which need to be placed on an agenda, be referred to him prior to future meetings.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on July 10, 2007 at:

The City of St. Anthony
Council Chambers
3301 Silver Lake Road
St. Anthony, MN 55418-1699

**MWMO Board of Commissioners Meeting
Recorded Motions: May 8, 2007**

Motion to approve the agenda (with no presentation during New Business).

Motion passed unanimously.

Moved: Commissioner Ostrow Second: Commissioner Faust

Voting:

Aye - Ostrow Aye - Vreeland Aye - Faust
Aye - Gill-Gerbig Aye - Eckman

Motion to Approve the Minutes of the March 13, 2007 meeting with the following changes:

- **Commissioner Eckman stated that she did not believe that on page 3 the board concluded that RFPs would not be submitted to the board prior to being offered publicly, so the paragraph beginning, “The overall consensus....” was deleted.**
- **Eckman also requested that paragraph 2, on page 4, under the Rainleader Disconnect Agreement #309-0000-07-01 be amended to read:**

“Commissioner Eckman asked that the MWMO staff make sure the SEMI project goals are still in line with the MWMO goals before the contract is completed. This has been historically problematic and doesn’t complement the District 12 Plan.”

- **On page 4, under Feasibility Studies, Commissioner Vreeland stated that point A should read, “This proposal would study the feasibility of using a large-scale grit [not “grid”] chamber....”**

The motion passed unanimously.

Moved: Commissioner Eckman Second: Commissioner Vreeland

Voting:

Aye - Ostrow Aye - Vreeland Aye - Faust
Aye - Gill-Gerbig Aye - Eckman

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda which included a contract with St. Anthony Falls Laboratory for a one-time budget amount of \$53,598 and \$15,444 in addition for database management in future years.

Motion passed unanimously.

Moved: Commissioner Ostrow Second: Commissioner Vreeland

Voting:

Aye - Ostrow Aye - Vreeland Aye - Faust
Aye - Gill-Gerbig Aye - Eckman

Motion: The MWMO Board moves the development and signing of an agreement between the MWMO and Emmons & Olivier Resources (EOR) and the Hoisington Koepler Group (HKgi) for the writing of the Mississippi Watershed Management Organization's Third Generation Watershed Management Plan. The final dollar amount is not to exceed the amount set aside in the MWMO's final 2007 annual budget for planning.

The motion passed.

Moved: Commissioner Ostrow Second: Commissioner Vreeland

Voting:

Aye - Ostrow Aye - Vreeland Nay - Faust
Aye - Gill-Gerbig Aye - Eckman

Motion to authorize staff to release a Request for Qualifications and a Request for Proposals to qualified firms for a study of the characteristics of groundwater and groundwater/surface water interactions in the watershed. Staff will return to the board with a recommendation for a consultant.

Motion passed unanimously.

Moved: Commissioner Ostrow Second: Commissioner Vreeland

Voting:

Aye - Ostrow Aye - Vreeland Aye - Faust
Aye - Gill-Gerbig Aye - Eckman

Motion to adjourn.

Motion passed unanimously.

Moved: Commissioner Ostrow Second: Commissioner Vreeland

Voting:

Aye - Ostrow Aye - Vreeland Aye - Faust
Aye - Gill-Gerbig Aye - Eckman

Motion to fund registration for one commissioner from each jurisdiction for the Green Roof Conference.

Motion passed unanimously.

Moved: Commissioner Faust Second: Commissioner Vreeland

Voting:

Aye - Ostrow	Aye - Vreeland	Aye - Faust
Aye - Gill-Gerbig	Aye - Eckman	

Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion passed unanimously.

Moved: Commissioner Gill-Gerbig Second: Commissioner Eckman

Voting:

Aye - Ostrow	Aye - Vreeland	Aye - Faust
Aye - Gill-Gerbig	Aye - Eckman	

LMC DRAFT

ELECTED OFFICIAL OUT-OF-STATE TRAVEL POLICY

Purpose: The City of _____ recognizes that its elected officials may at times receive value from traveling out of the state for workshops, conferences, events and other assignments. This policy sets forth the conditions under which out-of-state travel will be reimbursed by the City.

General Guidelines:

1. The event, workshop, conference or assignment must be approved in advance by the City Council at an open meeting and must include an estimate of the cost of the travel. (*Note: the League recommends use of a resolution or a detailed motion outlining what exactly is being approved.*) In evaluating the out-of-state travel request, the Council will consider the following:
 - Whether the elected official will be receiving training on issues relevant to the City or to his or her role as the Mayor or as a council member;
 - Whether the elected official will be meeting and networking with other elected officials from around the country to exchange ideas on topics of relevance to the City or on the official roles of local elected officials.
 - Whether the elected official will be viewing a city facility or function that is similar in nature to one that is currently operating at, or under consideration by the City where the purpose for the trip is to study the facility or function to bring back ideas for the consideration of the full council.
 - Whether the elected official has been specifically assigned by the Council to visit another city for the purpose of establishing a goodwill relationship such as a “sister-city” relationship (see Note below).
 - Whether the elected official has been specifically assigned by the Council to testify on behalf of the city at the United States Congress or to otherwise meet with federal officials on behalf of the city.
 - Whether the city has sufficient funding available in the budget to pay the cost of the trip.
2. No reimbursements will be made for attendance at events sponsored by or affiliated with political parties.
3. The city may make payments in advance for airfare, lodging and registration if specifically approved by the council. Otherwise all payments will be made as reimbursements to the elected official.
4. The City will reimburse for transportation, lodging, meals, registration, and incidental costs using the same procedures, limitations and guidelines outlined in the city’s policy for out-of-state travel by city employees. (*If the city does not currently have a policy for city employees, consider adding the following:*
5. *Airfare will be reimbursed at the coach rate.*
6. *Mileage will be reimbursed at the IRS rate. If two or more council members travel together by car, only the driver will receive reimbursement. The city will reimburse for the cost of renting an automobile if necessary to conduct city business.*
7. *Lodging costs are limited to \$____ per night and meal costs are limited to \$____ per day. (If the city sets such limits, it may want to keep in mind the differences in these costs throughout the country –*

especially coastal cities. Alternative language could be “Lodging and meal costs are limited to those which are reasonable and necessary.”)

8. *Receipts are required for lodging, airfare, and meals and should accompany an expense report form. It is not necessary to have receipts for cabs and tips. The expense report form shall be submitted to the City Clerk (or Finance Department) for payment.*
9. *The city will not reimburse for alcoholic beverages, personal telephone calls, costs associated with the attendance of a family member, rental of luxury vehicles, meal expenses included in the cost of registration, or recreational expenses such as golf or tennis.*

OTHER PROVISIONS THE CITY MAY WANT TO CONSIDER:

- *Limitations on the number of council members who can attend the same event;*
- *Limitations on paying for council members who have announced their intention to resign, not to seek reelection, or who have been defeated in an election (however, there may be some benefit to the city in having newly elected officials who have not yet taken office attend training beforehand);*
- *Requirements for council members to give oral or written reports on the results of the trip at the next Council meeting;*
- *Requirements for the council members to turn over materials received to the city;*
- *The ability for the city to make exceptions to the policy;*
- *The requirement for all frequent flyer miles to accrue to the city;*
- *Requirements to use the most cost-efficient mode of travel available taking into consideration reasonable time constraints; or*
- *The requirement to use a city car when available;*

Note: The State Auditor’s Office has taken the position in at least one city that there was no direct authority to expend public funds for the Sister City Program.

**Community POWER Grant Project:
Waste and Toxicity Reduction in the Hmong Community and North Minneapolis**

Partners:

- Association for the Advancement of Hmong Women (AAHWM)
- Volunteers of America, Hmong Elder Connections (VOAHEC)
- Lind-Bohanon Neighborhood Association (LBNA)
- Mississippi Watershed Management Organization (MWMO)
- Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB)

Funding Amount: \$12,000 (August 2007-August 2008)

Key Audiences:

- Southeast Asian community – Hmong elders, ESL learners, youth, families
- Residents of North Minneapolis (general public, seniors, large Asian population)

Project Description:

Background: Most waste and toxicity reduction messages and information are designed for native English speakers and readers. As a result, many residents in the highly diverse metro area are not being reached by this information and do not participate in waste reducing behaviors. The overall goal of this project is to involve difficult-to-reach residents in waste and toxicity reducing behaviors by creating a combination of specialized and mainstream activities that are relevant and intersect with their lives.

This project builds on the findings of a recent study to develop multicultural approaches to environmental education (MWMO 2007). The Hmong community, and particularly the elders and new immigrants who have limited English proficiency, are not well-informed and have low rates of participation in toxicity and waste reduction and recycling activities. There is also a lack of knowledge and connection to mainstream public spaces and opportunities (such as city recreation centers and programs and neighborhood events), which are often sources of environmental education. Nonetheless, the Hmong community's strong motivation to be good citizens, lead healthy lives and protect an environment they cherish, creates tremendous potential for change.

The Project. This project will make residents aware of waste types and problems and how they can reduce them by properly disposing of materials, reducing junk mail, recycling, and using non-toxic cleaners. This project will also familiarize participants with where to find information and increase their contact with local and knowledgeable community groups (such as neighborhood organizations, MPRB, MWMO, county and city programs). Through the unique partnerships in this project, waste reduction activities will be incorporated into existing programming that takes place on an ongoing basis and has dedicated staff, as well as at larger mainstream events, such as National Night Out.

Activities will be made available to more than 1300 participants and trainers. Key activities of this project include:

- 11 field trips to waste-related sites (wastewater treatment, landfills, etc) and a MPRB park or recreation center where they will meet with staff
- Seven workshops (including one Train-the-Trainer) about *Household Chemicals*
- Seven workshops (including one Train-the-Trainer) about *Getting Rid of Junk Mail*
- Educational entertainment using music and puppets at mainstream community events
- Project coordinator is part of the AAHWM staff and will continue to act as a resource
- Promotion on Hmong radio

PROPOSED RESEARCH GRANT CONTRIBUTION

WATERSHED	TAXABLE MARKET VALUE	CONTRIBUTION	% of TMV	Sample of 2006-07 Budgets	% of Budget
Browns Creek	1,484,454,300	\$4,062	0.00027%	\$ 950,000	0.43%
Capital Region	15,897,070,400	\$43,496	0.00027%		
Carnelian Marine	693,161,200	\$1,897	0.00027%		
Comfort Lake/Forest Lake	1,714,869,100	\$4,692	0.00027%		
Coon Creek	9,123,260,400	\$24,962	0.00027%		
Lower Minnesota River	6,870,184,900	\$18,798	0.00027%		
Minnehaha Creek	36,548,241,025	\$100,000	0.00027%	\$ 3,590,000	2.79%
Mississippi WMO	17,212,735,517	\$47,096	0.00027%	\$ 4,375,000	1.08%
Nine Mile Creek	15,722,178,700	\$43,018	0.00027%		
Prior Lake/Spring Lake	2,598,915,700	\$7,111	0.00027%	\$ 500,000	1.42%
Ramsey Washington Metro	11,632,990,200	\$31,829	0.00027%	\$ 3,956,300	0.80%
Rice Creek	17,602,609,500	\$48,163	0.00027%		
Riley Purgatory	11,596,684,100	\$31,730	0.00027%		
South Washington	8,095,523,400	\$22,150	0.00027%	\$ 1,775,000	1.25%
Valley Branch	3,432,101,800	\$9,391	0.00027%	\$ 234,000	
	160,224,980,242	\$438,393			

Mississippi Riverbank Restoration Guide: Hydraulic Study

Background:

The MWMO needs to conduct a hydraulic study along the MWMO's reach of the Mississippi River. In the short-term, the study will inform the Mississippi Riverbank Restoration Guide (MRRG) project of riverbank erosion potential and in the future may be used to track pollutants within the reach of the river.

Staff spoke with three firms from our engineering pool, providing them some project background and an estimated cost for the project. Following the discussions, a request for quotes was sent out with the following six line items included:

- kick off meeting,
- data collection,
- model simulation,
- findings meeting,
- technical writing, and
- development of erosion criteria.

The request went out to: Barr Engineering, Mead and Hunt, and LimnoTech. Barr engineering chose not to respond to the request. LimnoTech submitted a quote for \$29,820.00 and Mead and Hunt submitted a quote for \$37,968.00.

The proposals recommended using two different public models (i.e. non-proprietary). LimnoTech offered the EFDC model and Mead and Hunt the HEC-RAS model. On review, staff considers the EFDC model to be better suited for the immediate project requirements and long-term water quality modeling that may be needed on the river. Staff is recommending the selection of LimnoTech, the lower of the two quotes, for the study.

As part of the study, staff will need to purchase GIS data sets to use for this and future studies on the river. Staff is requesting up to \$1,180 for this purpose.

Funds for the project are available within the 2007 Watershed Assessments Budget. Please contact Dan Kalmon at 612-360-7335 to receive additional information on this project. Copies of the request for quotes and LimnoTech's submitted quote are available.

Recommended Motion:

The Board moves to approve the selection of LimnoTech for the Mississippi Riverbank Restoration Guide: Hydraulic Study. Funding for the study shall not exceed \$31,000.

Regulatory Matrix Study

Background:

The MWMO needs to conduct a Regulatory Matrix Study as a supporting document to the 3rd Generation Watershed Management Plan. The matrix will identify member organizations' authorities, roles, and responsibilities for planning and regulation related to water and natural resource management and protection. The matrix aids in identifying future projects and planning efforts on which the MWMO and members can work together.

Staff is requesting the Board's approval to send out a request for quotes on a Regulatory Matrix Study. The Regulatory Matrix Study request for quotes will include a scope, an itemized budget, staff hours, timeline and deliverables. The request for quotes will, at a minimum, be sent to: Barr Engineering, Houston Engineering, and HDR Engineering, based on qualifications provided for inclusion on the engineering pool list and from interviews conducted as part of the watershed management plan request for proposals. If you are aware of other firms or people qualified for this type of work through work your community has conducted, please let us know. Some initial conversations with the firms have provided staff with a rough estimate of the project cost - \$30,000. Staff will provide the board with a quote summary and recommendation for the project at the regular board meeting in September.

The study will have three primary deliverables 1) the matrix of planning and regulatory authority and roles, 2) an interactive GIS management tool, and 3) copies of all supporting documentation for the MWMO library. The matrix will include source of authorities (e.g. state statute, federal clean water act, etc.); ordinances; key deadlines; current status of planning and reporting requirements (completed, draft, approved?); related entities with review authority; related entities with oversight or approval authority (e.g. DNR, MNRRA, Critical Area, etc.); related entities with overlapping responsibilities (e.g. Non-degradation, TMDL, NPDES within Minneapolis); requirements related to ground and surface water (e.g. brownfields, above- and underground storage tanks, etc.); and contacts for the responsible staff position and department within each organization. The GIS (Arcview format) tool will allow MWMO to access relevant information on planning and regulatory requirements for any given project site within the MWMO. This tool will be designed as a reference tool for MWMO and members. Third, the contractor will provide the MWMO with an electronic or hard copy of all documents mentioned in matrix for the MWMO resource library.

Recommended Motion:

The MWMO Board directs staff to release a request for quotes for a Regulatory Matrix Study.

Draft Budget 2008 2007.06.01

Levy Limit set at September 2007 MWMO Board Meeting

Final Budget set at the November 2006 MWMO Board Meeting

Approval of the budget does not constitute approval of individual projects. Funds will be encumbered to a project only after an agreement between the MWMO and the Lead Agency describing the specific scope of work is completed.

2007 Budget	2007 Total
Projects	\$ 1,000,000
Programs	\$ 2,595,000
Administration	\$ 690,000
Subtotal Budget	\$ 4,285,000
Contingency 2% (Uncollected Levy)	\$ 90,000
Total Budget	\$ 4,375,000

Projects	\$ 1,000,000
Mississippi River Gorge Stabilization Ford Dam to Franklin Avenue	\$ 400,000
Mississippi River Gorge Erosion Stabilization 38th & 44th	\$ 200,000
Father Hennepin Park	\$ 100,000
Heritage Park Stormwater Treatment	\$ 300,000

Programs	\$ 2,595,000
Water Conservation	\$ 100,000
Education/Information Nonpoint Source Pollution Program	\$ 165,000
Stewardship Grant Fund	\$ 250,000
Planning	\$ 275,000
Watershed Assessments (Research, Hydrologic and Hydraulic Studies)	\$ 800,000
Monitoring	\$ 155,000
Greening	\$ 200,000
Land Acquisition	\$ 600,000
Program Support / Consultants	\$ 50,000

Administration	\$ 690,000
Staff Salary and Benefits	\$ 425,000
Commissioner Expenses	\$ 10,000
Rent, Office Administration, Equipment, and Supplies	\$ 95,000
Service Providers - Legal, Engineering, IT, HR, Auditor, Accounting	\$ 70,000
Operating Reserve	\$ 90,000

**2% increase
2008 Total**

\$	1,020,000
\$	2,647,000
\$	704,000
\$	4,371,000
\$	88,000
\$	4,459,000

\$	1,020,000

\$	2,647,000

\$	704,000



**Riverfront Organization Model
Recommended by
Riverfront Blue Ribbon Task Force
to Riverfront Policy Oversight Task Force**

April 9, 2007

**As revised and clarified by the
Riverfront Policy Oversight Task Force and
Riverfront Senior Management Task Force**

RBR-Recommended Organization Model

Riverfront Organization Model

NEW PUBLIC/PRIVATE ENTITY

What do we hope to achieve with a new entity? (also see Success Criteria)

- Coordinate efforts among entities involved in riverfront work so all are pulling in same direction at same time for optimum effectiveness and efficiency
Attract new investors and increased support from parties who may be more interested in supporting a coordinated riverfront revitalization strategy than in fielding multiple disparate requests
Achieve better outcomes because projects are inspired over long-term to achieve multiple aspects of vision (see Working Vision), not just meet minimums or achieve one entity's set of goals
Streamline development process and/or make it more effective and productive
Support more productive community input into plans, projects, proposals

- Deleted: Benefits/
Deleted: Goals of
Deleted: N
Deleted: E
Deleted: Enhanced ability to c
Deleted: Good potential to a
Deleted: Riverfront revitalization
Deleted: may be better if
Deleted: Potential for s
Deleted: ing
Deleted: ing
Deleted: Will allow overall
Deleted: to have more productive

Functions

- New entity will have functions shown in attached "Recommended Functions"
Board will meet regularly to:
o Provide overall strategic direction and agree upon shared goals and action plans
o Be the impetus for achieving shared agenda, ensuring coordination of activities and sharing information
o Identify key activities, and approve new entity's work plan and budget (both operating budget and allocation of funds to special initiatives and key activities)
New entity leads visioning process and establishes design guidelines
New entity develops and implements communications plan
New entity's staff will implement work plan, provide staff support for board and have day-to-day involvement in coordination, design center oversight, etc.
Design center review will complement existing project review process (which focuses on administration of ordinances, minimum requirements and technical considerations) by providing upfront coordinated input on design considerations and opportunities for both coordination and enhancements to achieve vision
New entity will take over convening Riverfront TAC and also will convene senior management and policy makers as needed. Governmental members will commit to participate.
New entity will have legal authority to acquire, hold and dispose of land, but role (at least initially) may be achieved via support of member entities' land acquisition and/or by working in partnership with a nonprofit with that skill set. Land acquisition would be considered only when needed to achieve a strategic goal that a partner cannot achieve and only when the representatives of all governmental members unanimously support the acquisition. Any land ownership by the new entity is expected to be for a short transitional period, not long term, and only when there is a clear plan for the parcel's disposition and eventual use in accordance with approved plans.
Governmental members will continue their current planning and implementation roles

- Deleted: entitle
Deleted: roles for
Formatted: Font: 11 pt
Formatted: Space Before: 3 pt
Formatted: Font: 11 pt
Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Geographical scope

The new entity will be involved with the entire length of the Mississippi River within Minneapolis, but with recognition that the different segments of the riverfront will have different needs over time.*

* Expectation is that initial strategic capital investment priority will be Upper River.

RBR-Recommended Organization Model

Powers needed by new entity

- Hire staff
- Accept grants, donations, government member contributions, membership fees; structure will allow contributions to be tax deductible
- Make grants to governmental, private and nonprofit entities
- Enter into contracts (office space, professional consultants, web site, etc.)
- Acquire/hold/dispose of land (directly or in cooperation with partners)
- Incur debt

Governance

- Board will include representative(s) of following governmental bodies:
 - City of Minneapolis
 - Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
 - Hennepin County
 - Metropolitan Council
 - Mississippi Watershed Management Organization
 - Minnesota Historical Society
 - University of Minnesota
- Board also will include private/nonprofit/foundation/business/community representatives and possibly a St. Paul representative
- Board chair will be shared between two members (one public and one private)

Authority

New entity will have following authorities (in addition to influence it can wield via power of vision and working relationships):

- Approve strategic and work plans for new entity's activities
- Approve budget for funds raised by new entity and identify key activities to be supported with funding and/or advocacy
- Review of (and making recommendations on) plans and public projects: Member governmental entities will commit to: a) submit plans and major public project decisions (e.g., developer selection, public project designs) to new entity for review, and b) consider its input. New entity will review proposed plan/project and make recommendations on opportunities for coordination and alignment and ways to assure compliance with vision. New entity will not have veto power.
- Private project review (and making recommendations on): Member governmental entities will commit to encourage private parties to submit private project plans for review by design center.
- Design guidelines: Once design guidelines have been approved by new entity, will explore whether any part could/should be enforced via member governmental bodies' tools (e.g., zoning)

Authority/powers not needed or wanted

- Eminent domain
- Taxing
- Bond issuance

RBR-Recommended Organization Model

Staffing

- New entity will need following competencies (through staff hired by new entity, staff support contributed by members and/or contracting out):
 - Executive director/leadership
 - Fundraising/development/advocacy
 - Design center oversight
 - Communications
 - Ombudsman (to work with developers and businesses that may be affected)
 - Community engagement
 - Legal counsel
 - Administrative support
- Staff from governmental member entities also will provide staff support to facilitate coordination and buy-in and to expand capacity

Funding

- As with Heritage Board, some or all governmental/institutional member entities could make annual contributions to support basic operations and core activities
- One-time funding for visioning process and design guidelines
- Ongoing funding of communications program, design center function and staff
- Contributions sought for ongoing basic operations and for special initiatives and key activities undertaken by the Board
- Potential funding sources (for operations and/or key activities):

Note: The desired result will be to have a larger funding “pie” that can be split up more cooperatively and strategically, rather than adding another entity to compete for the same pie.

 - Governmental members’ annual contributions
 - Contributions of staff time, other
 - Fundraising:
 - Grants from governmental entities
 - Foundations
 - Corporations (both philanthropy and for marketing)
 - Individuals
 - Membership dues
 - Land revenues (sales proceeds, leases, etc. - direct or assigned by others)
 - Merchandising

Community engagement

Additional work needed to determine role of community (i.e., existing neighborhood organizations, advisory committees, other stakeholders) in:

- Input towards creation of new organization
- Participation on board
- On-going relationship between board and existing neighborhood organizations/advisory committees
- Whether new organization can/should take over leadership of some input processes to strengthen, streamline and coordinate
- Extent to which new organization will seek and respond to community input

RBR-Recommended Organization Model

Establishment

- State will be asked to statutorily establish (or authorize creation of) a public-private nonprofit charged with coordinating and facilitating riverfront revitalization. New body will have status as a legal entity and will have authority/powers noted above.
- New entity may begin modestly and grow over time into full set of functions.
- Long-term goal is to strengthen regional riverfront revitalization (starting with the relationship with St. Paul). Options that will be explored during Task 4 will include: a) two separate organizations working as partners, b) working with/through Met Council as a regional body, or c) creating a merged organization with St. Paul. May seek legislative authority for one or all options.

Deleted: <#>Feasibility of establishing new entity as a nonprofit without legislative action also will be explored during Task 4.¶
<#>After evaluation of options and pros/cons, if it is decided that role of existing St. Anthony Falls Heritage Board should be folded into new entity, that also will require legislative action.¶

Interim task force support

In interim until formal approval and establishment of new entity, Riverfront Policy Oversight Task Force may ask appropriate members of Riverfront Blue Ribbon Task Force to continue to participate in one or more manners:

- Be involved in gathering input and building support during upcoming community outreach phase
- Assist in preparing the legislative proposal and seeking approval
- Do some initial fundraising

RBR-Recommended Organization Model

Recommended Functions of New Organization

Coordination/ Administration	Development	Marketing/Promotion/ Communications	Planning/Design/ Implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convene partners and facilitate communication and coordination • Obtain broad community input and support • Refine and then hold the vision/inspire • Facilitate and mediate toward the goals • Identify shared priorities and key activities • Streamline processes • Provide transition/relocation assistance • Represent Minneapolis in coordinating regional riverfront discussions and activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fundraise for key activities (including land acquisition) • Advocate for key activities legislative and other (but not lobby) • Provide seed/gap funding to assist large key activities 	<p>Educate stakeholders about importance of River and vision</p> <p>Promote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits of revitalization to funders, decision-makers and overall community • Sites to developers • Overall package of amenities to consumers and visitors • Riverfront neighborhoods to existing residents and potential investors • Options to potential residents and tenants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide top-level coordination of plans to assure they align and achieve vision • Prepare design guidelines • Offer design review and input for specific projects (including developer selection) • Might have ownership of one or two modest projects/amenities <u>(e.g., signage system)</u> • Would have authority to acquire, hold and sell land <u>(see text)</u>

Deleted: Construc

Examples of functions that would remain where they currently are:

- Land acquisition and ownership, perhaps using funds raised by new entity, with some improvements to existing processes/requirements; a strategic partner such as Trust for Public Land also could assist
- Completion of comprehensive, small area, park, transportation, public improvements and other plans
- Design, construction, maintenance and operation of projects/buildings/parks, etc.
- Administration of zoning and other controls
- Provision of educational, recreational, cultural and interpretive programming
- Financing and fundraising for projects and activities that are not targeted as "key activities"
- Promotion and marketing of specific attractions, programs and projects
- Solicitation and selection of developers for publicly-owned land
- Completion of environmental improvements (and regulating of same)

RBR-Recommended Organization Model

Success Criteria

Will this organization model...?:

Be effective/efficient?

- Assure better coordination and cooperation?
- Enhance timely identification of priorities?
- Develop and then track quantitative measures of success?
- Assure for those who are working on riverfront projects that the process will be clear, predictable and reasonably efficient?
- Effectively handle all of the potential "balance points" that will present themselves and come to creative, productive resolutions?
- Be more flexible and entrepreneurial than what we have today?
- Be nimble and responsive to emerging possibilities, including acquiring key land parcels when they become available?
- By design, assure a place for all viewpoints to be presented and considered?

Keep the vision?

- Effectively implement all aspects of the vision of positive change for the riverfront?
- Embrace the vision of the river as an amenity equal to the chain of lakes?
- Serve as the "keeper of the vision," both near-term and over the long-term (20+ years)?
- Effectively articulate the shared vision at a high level and to the general community in a way that draws in support toward our collective, international aspirations?

Achieve the needed level of support?

- Have a clear champion for the work?
- Strengthen trust among various levels of government and the broader community?
- Attain the level of support needed to implement its work?
- Have the authority and support needed to further the vision of the river?
- Be politically sustainable, including over the long term (20+ years)?
- Create a sense of shared ownership and leadership?

Improve marketing/communication?

- Assure there are improved awareness, communication and public relations around riverfront activities?
- Educate about the importance of the river and why achievement of the vision is valuable?
- Generate excitement and enthusiasm for riverfront revitalization, both short-term and long-term?
- Effectively celebrate and market riverfront successes?
- Successfully send the message that all of Minneapolis is a river city?

Expand funding?

- Be effective in attracting additional funding and expanded resources?

Have the right focus?

- Continue the success experienced on the central riverfront?
- Represent the needs of the upper, central and lower gorge?

Support organizational values and systems thinking?

- Value inclusiveness and be willing/able to hear the multiple viewpoints (e.g., ecology, business)?
- Be able to use systems thinking to see connections and pursue opportunities for specific actions and decisions to achieve multiple aspects of the vision?

RBR-Recommended Organization Model

Minneapolis' Riverfront Revitalization Working Vision

Minneapolis treasures the Mississippi River as one of its premier assets and the reason Minneapolis exists. Leadership and resources are committed to assuring that both people and nature benefit from a healthy ecosystem, exceptional riverfront parks, world-class history and culture and a vital, livable community.

A healthy ecosystem

Minneapolisians are active stewards of the Mississippi River, treasuring it as a special, world-class resource. Humans and the built environment coexist harmoniously with the natural environment. Development uses sustainable approaches, accommodates river access and protects water quality. When the Mississippi River leaves Minneapolis, the water quality is as good as or better than it was when it entered the city. And, the river corridor provides a successful habitat for native plants and animals.

Exceptional riverfront parks

The river is lined with publicly accessible open spaces that feature the river and offer people recreation and places to enrich their spirits by connecting with nature. These open spaces are connected along the river and into the rest of the city by parkways, trails and greenways, so that all of Minneapolis feels like a river city. Appropriately located recreational features (including some that use the river itself for recreation) take advantage of natural and historic resources and provide a variety of activities for people of all ages and abilities.

World-class history and culture

Preservation and interpretation protect and build upon the authentic history and natural resources of the river, providing a distinctive sense of place. A variety of historical, cultural and educational features and programs attract people to the riverfront for unique and memorable experiences. These programs also reach out into all of Minneapolis to help residents understand how the river and the city have shaped each other. High quality design by both the public sector and private developers complements the significance of the river and, where appropriate, provides signature design that is an attraction itself.

A vital, livable community

Minneapolis' status as a renowned river city adds to the quality of life that attracts residents, businesses, employees and investors. The riverfront and riverway offer a thoughtful mixture of land and water uses that meet today's and tomorrow's needs and provide great places to live, work, play, learn and do business. Continued riverfront revitalization brings more housing, jobs, taxes, business opportunities and economic vitality to the city without jeopardizing the natural environment. Riverfront land uses benefit from proximity to the river, while also providing a benefit to the river corridor.



Approved by Riverfront Policy Oversight Task Force December 12, 2006