



**Fargo to St. Cloud
345 kilovolt (kV) Transmission Line Project
Advisory Task Force**

**Freeport to St. Cloud Advisory Task Force
Second Meeting – February 4, 2010**

DRAFT Meeting Notes

Welcome and Agenda Review

The facilitator for the task force, Charlie Petersen, State of Minnesota, Management Analysis & Development, welcomed task force members and all present. Task force members were asked to introduce themselves and share their designation (representing a particular constituency or serving as an individual citizen member of the advisory task force).

Charlie reviewed the task force charge and emphasized that the work of this day, the second meeting, was to further clarify and prioritize issues and concerns and to begin discussing alternative routes, route segments, and substation locations.

Review and Approval of Meeting Notes

Task force members were asked to review the meeting notes and respond with any questions, edits, changes, etc. Richard Bresnahan, task force member, offered additions to the January 22, 2010 meeting notes. These additions included:

- On page two in the area of the Project overview there was no mention of Darrin Lahr, Xcel Energy, mentioning to the ATF that the three segment of routing didn't have a priority of importance that it was required by the PUC to label the segments of priority.
- Also the comment that Xcel doesn't really care where the line goes so long as it gets from point A to Point B which is the Fargo to St. Cloud route. These are copy word for word in my notes.
- Also missing in the Xcel presentation is the fact that Herbicide Chemicals are sprayed under the 150 ft width of the towers and power lines on a yearly basis to kill brush and trees. This would also include spraying on the additional 26 ft road access along the power line. These chemical imputes would be for the life of the line.

The task force reviewed and approved the additions. The task force then approved the meeting notes as amended.

Review and Prioritization of Impacts and Issues

Task force members were asked to look at the “impacts and issues” categories they identified at the first meeting. Charlie led members through a “dot exercise” to prioritize impacts and issues identified by the task force. Task force members were asked to vote for their three most important “impact and issue” categories. Members discussed how they could apportion their three dots and it was decided that members could place their dots however they wished – selecting three separate items or placing all three dots on one item or some combination of multiple dots on an item. The results of this voting are shown in the Freeport to St. Cloud ATF Prioritization Grid (Appendix A).

Identification of Alternative Routes, Route Segments and Substation Locations

Task force members were asked to work in small groups to identify possible alternative routes and substation locations. Each group was provided with a set of maps representing the Freeport to St. Cloud transmission line area. Members raised questions on how current were the maps and associated data provided in the application. Members noted they knew of homes that were not identified on the maps and one member stated that a drainage ditch (Ditch #17) was still in its 1985 location when it had been moved several years ago. Charlie stated that finding these inconsistencies was a role of the task force and Darren ask if anyone knew of discrepancies in the maps or data to contact him with the current information.

Task force members were then asked to use markers and tape to indicate route alternatives and to describe the alternative(s), explain what impacts they were trying to avoid, and suggest what new impacts might be created. The small groups reported back; their ideas and information about alternatives and potential impacts were shared with all present. Maps depicting the alternative identified will be sent out to members approximately one week prior to the February 25, 2010 meeting.

Next steps

Charlie reminded task force members that their homework for the next meeting was to review the various routes (both the applicants’ identified routes and the routes that the task force created and come prepared to discuss the pros and cons of the various route alternatives. Richard Bresnahan noted that the information he sent out to the task force, via the notes for the first meeting, could be a valuable tool for member to use doing their home work.

The next task force meeting will be held in Avon on Thursday, February 25, 2010 from 9:00 AM – 12:30 PM. This will be the final meeting of the task force.

Appendix A

Freeport to St. Cloud Advisory Task Force January 22, 2010

Identification of Impacts and Issues as prioritized - *What land use planning or other impacts and issues need to be considered in the evaluation of proposed transmission line routes and/or sub-station locations?*

Design considerations	Environmental impacts	Economic impact	Impacts on residents (direct and indirect)			Historical Implications	Zoning impacts
			Public health and safety	Aesthetics	Electronic interference		
<i>Top Priority Fourteen votes</i>	<i>Second Priority Five votes</i>	<i>Third Priority Three votes</i>				<i>Third Priority Two Votes</i>	<i>Second Priority Six votes</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “State of the art” project: option to go underground and address aesthetics, some environmental concerns, public health and safety, impact on residents, and greater security from weather ▪ <i>Follow existing public use corridors</i> ▪ <i>Avoid proliferation of new corridors (Eleven of the 14 votes were for these two items in this category)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental Impacts: 150 ft. swath, trees, significant natural resources in the area – bogs, lakes, wetlands, woodlands; bio-impact survey ▪ Least environmental impact ▪ Avoid wetlands, flood plains and all environmentally sensitive areas ▪ Preserve wetlands and woodlands ▪ Wildlife; designated areas, wildlife survey, production areas, recreational areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Avoid agriculture land with irrigation systems; loss of productive land, nuisance of electro-magnetic fields on ag operation ▪ Irrigation potential ▪ Avoid disrupting farmland by not criss-crossing farmland, only follow road right-of-ways ▪ Minimize economic impact; preserve jobs and businesses, consider businesses ability to expand, preserve farmland, avoid impacts on farm operations 	<p><i>Top Priority Nine votes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacts on residents, loss of homes and living next to the line ▪ Public health and safety, electromagnetic fields, impacts on current or newer electronic devices, e. g. pacemakers ▪ Health both human and animal; magnetic fields, electrical induction issue, stray voltage issue 	<p><i>Priority No votes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Aesthetics, visual ▪ Have a large buffer between power lines and residential dwellings ▪ Large tract acres vs. small tract areas 	<p><i>Priority No votes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TV and radio reception 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Historical implications, century farms and others – churches, cemeteries ▪ Century farms; 100 years in business, emotion, family farms, historical, heritage character ▪ Large tract acres vs. small tract areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Avoid city limits and defined/annexed potential city growth areas ▪ Annexed future residential development along County Road 138 between Waite Park and County Road 121 ▪ Southwest beltway corridor between Waite Park and St. Joseph cities ▪ Affect on property value