Lake Marion to Hampton Advisory Task Force
Second Meeting – Wednesday, April 15, 2009
DRAFT MEETING NOTES

Welcome and Introductions

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). Task force members signed an attendance sheet to indicate their attendance. Observers were reminded that time was set aside, at the end of the meeting, for them to speak to task force members and asked to "sign in" if they intended to speak.

Why We Are Here

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, get a brief review of the two proposed routes, and to begin discussing alternative routes and route segments. Charlie reviewed the groundrules and questions by task force members were discussed and addressed.

Review and Approval of Meeting Notes

Task force members were asked to review the meeting notes and respond with any questions edits changes, etc. No changes were offered by task force members. A task force member, Ms. Jennings, took notes at the first meeting and asked if they could be added to the meeting notes. The task force was asked, after the break, if they had any objection to including these notes. There were no objections. These notes will be appended to the meeting notes from the first meeting.

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 for this transmission line segment. Charlie led members through a "dot exercise" to prioritize these impacts and issues. Task force members were asked to vote as to which ones were most important, very important, or important. The results of this voting are shown in the Lake Marion to Hampton ATF Prioritization Grid (Appendix A).

Scott Ek, OES, noted that the impacts/issues designated as "most important" by the group reflected public comments at recent public meetings.

Review of Applicant's Proposed Routes and Substation Locations

Scott Ek, OES, noted that task force members that were familiar with the applicant's proposed routes. He invited them to think about what they knew about this area, their own area, and to make suggestions about changes in the applicant's routes or entirely new routes. They were also asked to add information to the maps (using post-its) if there were errors or omissions.

Task force members discussed the possibility of moving proposed substations in this segment of the line. A task force member, Mr. Helmberger, noted that he had spoken with Great River Energy about the substations in this area (Lake Marion substation; proposed Hampton substation). From this discussion, there appears to be some flexibility in substation location(s) and size (Mr. Helmberger's notes are included in Appendix B).

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 six maps representing the Lake Marion to Hampton transmission line area and 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 alternatives identified are included in Appendix C.

Public Comment to Advisory Task Force

A period was set aside at the end of the meeting for public comment. Key points of citizens who addressed the task force are listed below.

Speaker I

- Supports the I-90 route
- Move proposed routes further south
- Supports Joel's (task force member) two proposals

Speaker II

- Prefers the I-90 route
- Prefers the proposed south route over the proposed north route: north route issues include: land values are higher for the north route, greater impact on people, potential with metro area expansion

Speaker III

- Supports the I-90 route

Speaker IV

- Prefers to avoid people's houses/homes; does not want line out front door

Speaker V

- Eminent domain provision used on property in 1953 screwed the property owners and does not think it has been improved
- Move the transmission line to Mexico

Speaker VI

- Speaker read statement. This statement is attached (Appendix D).

Speaker VII

- Why the need to expand the line now? In 30 years in the area, there have been no brown-outs
- The property in Scott and Dakota Counties have the third and fourth easements on them
- Why the massive upgrade in the line now?
- Choose a route that impacts fewer homes
- The line impacts land in CRP and crosses the Vermillion River

Speaker VIII

- Supports the proposed route further south (Joel's proposed route)
- Move the Lake Marion substation further south

Speaker IX

- Loss of property on sale of homes; estimate a 10% reduction in property values which would translate to a $25,000 per owner loss in value (80 houses in Eureka Township impacted
- Option to run a line further south than proposed line that does not impact homes
- Keep Eureka Township rural
- Concern on EMF and stray voltage

Speaker X

- Arguments do not support the need for the transmission line
- If it must be built, identify a modified line further south (Joel's Alternative) and move Marion substation further south

Speaker XI

- Proposed line crosses over a thoroughbred barn and the barn would have to be torn down
- Supports the route further south (Joel's Alternative)

Speaker XII

- Impacts thoroughbred breeding operation
- The proposed line would go through wetlands and trees would be lost
- Cannot move barn on property so it would be lost and business impacted
- Supports Joel's Alternative

Speaker XIII

- Agrees/supports Joel's Alternative route
- Had a dream of owning an acreage and has been in dream home less than one year
- The building of the lines will impact property values (decrease them) and reduce the wildlife in the area
- Health issues

Speaker XIV

- Support the proposed route further south (Joel's Alternative)
- Has concerns about property values
- Likes the aspect that the property in the area does not have urban issues and power lines (lived here for 10 years)
- Raised health concerns

Speaker XV

- Concerns about the new proposed route further south (Joel's Alternative)
- Concerned that it impacts home and children
- Prefers that the transmission line to go along interstate, they already have an impact
- For renewable energy, why pit people against each other to place the line
- Person moved for privacy and does not want their view interrupted
- Concern of children's health and reduced property values

Speaker XVI

- Why should this area have easement for power needed in the Twin Cities?
- Has not this area given enough?

Speaker XVII

- Develop a new route other than any of those submitted
- If a new route is developed will it go through this input process also? Answer is yes; individuals will be notified, the same process will be used, and their questions will be responded to.

Speaker XVIII

- Supports Joel's Alternative route further south
- Would not have purchased land if they knew a transmission line was coming through

Speaker XIX

- Supports line along I-90 and can ship power directly to Lacrosse
- Supports move of Lake Marion substation further south
- The line will squelch development and reduce property values

Speaker XX

- Support taking line from Helena substation south along Highway 19 then following I-90

Speaker XXI

- Does not want to see transmission line outside residence but does not what others impacted by the line
- Can the line be buried? (response from audience was no)

Next Steps

Maps indicating all of the identified alternatives, changes, and new possibilities will be sent to task force members with meeting notes. Task force members were asked to review the alternatives in preparation for the next meeting. The next meeting will be April 29, 2009, 1:00 – 5:00 PM in Elko New Market.

office of energy security
Minnesota Department of Commerce

STATE OF MINNESOTA
Energy Facility Permitting

Attendance Sheet
Proposed Brookings County - Hampton 345 kV Transmission Project
Lake Marion to Hampton Advisory Task Force
April 15, 2009

PLEASE FILL IN ANY BLANKS, MAKE SURE INFORMATION IS CORRECT, AND CHECK BOX TO INDICATE ATTENDANCE

Last	First	Title	Local Government Unit	Address 1	Address 2	City	State	Zip	Phone	Email		
Bray	Bill	Water Superintendent	City of Hampton	PO Box 128		Hampton	MN	55031	651-437-8846	cityofhampton@bevcomm.net	☒	In Attendance
Chlan	Ken M.	Township Supervisor	New Market Township	27656 Texas Ave.		Webster	MN	55088	952-652-2603	kcb~~458~~ 485@integra.net	☒	In Attendance
Docken	Jeff	County Commissioner	Rice County	6320 Chester Ave.		Northfield	MN	55057	952-652-2876	jdocken@co.rice.mn.us	☐	In Attendance
Malecha	Galen	County Commissioner	Rice Co	1607 Pheasant Wood Trail		Northfield	Mn		507-645-6641	gmalecha@co.rice.mn.us	☑	
Dubbels	Merlin		Sciota Township	609 Gill Lane		Northfield	MN	55057	507-645-5926		☒	In Attendance
Erickson	Joel	City Administrator	City of Lonsdale	415 Central St. W	PO Box 357	Lonsdale	MN	55046	507-744-2327	jerickson@means.net	☒	In Attendance
Helmberger	Joel			24311 Dakota Ave.		Lakeville	MN	55044	651-210-9145	jhelmberger@forwardair.com	☒	In Attendance
Jennings	Carrie	Township Supervisor	Eureka Township	8919 280th St. W		Northfield	MN	55057	952-469-4976	carriegeo@gmail.com	☑	In Attendance
Johnson	Trish			3940 220th St. East		Hampton	MN	55031	651-463-7899	trishlj@frontiernet.net	☒	In Attendance
Kaufenberg	Ray			24501 Dodd Blvd.		Lakeville	MN	55044	952-469-2340	ffscorp@qwestoffice.net	☒	In Attendance
McFadden	Lawrence	Township Supervisor	Webster Township	6120 Elmore Ave.		Webster	MN	55088	507-744-2620	sunnyvalley1945@yahoo.com	☒	In Attendance
Mertens	John	Office of Planning and Analysis	Dakota County	14955 Galaxie Ave.		Apple Valley	MN	55124	952-891-7036	john.mertens@co.dakota.mn.us	☒	In Attendance
Nagel	Mark	Assistant City Administator	City of Elko New Market	601 Main St.	PO Box 99	Elko New Market	MN	55054	952-461-2777	mnagel@ci.enm.mn.us	☒	In Attendance
Salaba	Clarence	Township ~~Supervisor~~ CLERK	Wheatland Township	9376 60th St. W		Lonsdale	MN	55046	507-744-2274	silvmem@myclearwave.net	☒	In Attendance

STATE OF MINNESOTA
Energy Facility Permitting

Attendance Sheet
Proposed Brookings County - Hampton 345 kV Transmission Project
Lake Marion to Hampton Advisory Task Force
April 15, 2009

PLEASE FILL IN ANY BLANKS, MAKE SURE INFORMATION IS CORRECT, AND CHECK BOX TO INDICATE ATTENDANCE

Last	First	Title	Local Government Unit	Address 1	Address 2	City	State	Zip	Phone	Email		
Stoffel	Ralph	Township Treasurer	Vermillion Township	9090 170th St. E.		Hastings	MN	55033	651-437-3500		☒	In Attendance
Wagner	Joe	County Commissioner	Scott County	18020 Xanadu Ave.		Jordan	MN	55352	612-270-2660		☒	In Attendance
Weber	Sandra	Castle Rock Bd Member	Castle Rock Planning	24650 Akron Ave.		Farmington	MN	55024	651-463-4725	sandra@crusadermfg.com	☒	In Attendance
Wintes	Robert	Township Supervisor	Greenvale Township	5975 320th St. West		Northfield	MN	58057	507-645-7395	muddymarshfarms@msn.com	☐	In Attendance
Zellmer	Russ	Township Supervisor	Castle Rock Township	25473 Alverno Ave.		Farmington	MN	55024	651-463-4064	zellfarms@frontiernet.net	☒	In Attendance
Ek	Scott	Office of Energy Security		85 7th Place East	Suite 500	St. Paul	MN	55101	651-296-8813	scott.ek@state.mn.us	☒	In Attendance
Kirsch	Ray	Office of Energy Security		85 7th Place East	Suite 500	St. Paul	MN	55101	651-296-7588	raymond.kirsh@state.mn.us	☒	In Attendance
Petersen	Charlie	Management Analysis & Development		50 Sherburne Ave.	203 Admin. Bldg.	St. Paul	MN	55155	651-201-2276	charlie.petersen@state.mn.us	☒	In Attendance
											☐	In Attendance
											☐	In Attendance
											☐	In Attendance
											☐	In Attendance
											☐	In Attendance

Appendix A
Lake Marion to Hampton Advisory Task Force
April 15, 2009

Lake Marion to Hampton ATF Prioritization Grid

	Fairness (collectiveness)	Farming	Use existing right-of-ways (but not pipeline)	Wetland damage – during construction and ongoing	Construction issues – damage of roads, R.O.W., water	Rate increases	Coordination with existing comprehensive plans and other ongoing studies – future and existing land use with respect for cultural values of community	Emergency and safety issues	Health issues – concerns for humans and wildlife, electromagnetic fields and static electricity	Negative impact on property values and loss of future property value for developed and undeveloped land	Affect on unique cultural and religious resource – Cambodian Buddhist Temple
Voting results	**Second Priority**	**Second Priority**	**Third Priority**	**Third Priority**			**First Priority**		**First Priority**	**First Priority**	
Most Important	**4**	**3**	**3**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**9.5 (one vote was split)**	**10.5 (one vote was split)**	**1**
Very Important	**10**	**12**	**8**	**7**	**4**	**1**	**8**	**6**	**3**	**6**	**3**
Important	**3**	**2**	**5**	**6**	**9**	**12**	**3**	**10**	**3**	**1**	**12**

Appendix B

Lake Marion to Hampton Advisory Task Force
April 15, 2009

Notes from Mr. Helmberger
Discussion with Great River Energy

Why is Lake Marion substation important to the transmission line?

It was not part of the initial concept but was proposed by OES that it be included as an intermediate tap (a waypoint that could derive electricity from the transmission line). There would be many enroute to Hampton.

Right now the Lake Marion substation receives power from primarily Black Dog and is supplemented by Prairie Island and a gas fired plant in Mankato.

What is the present service area of the Lake Marion Substation?

It now serves the area in several directions. It supports an area to the north that is shared with the Kendrick substation in Lakeville and Dakota Heights substation in Burnsville. It also supplies customers to the east in Lakeville and Eureka and to the south and the west in townships.

Why would the Lake Marion substation need to be expanded?

It presently has 1.6 acres in its fenced compound and CAPX plans to expand it by 15 to 20 acres. The main reason is that the transmission line is to hot for the size of the substation at this point. It would need more step-down transformers and cooling apparatus to handle that kind of power.

Wouldn't this be just the time to more it to the South instead of reworking it where it is today?

If you move it south, you experience and energy loss by distance that (may) not be as efficient due to the lower KV lines that would come to it. The principal is to surge impedance limits. Basically, that electricity flow follows the path of least resistance and that it will prefer to stay on the 345 kv line instead of traveling the smaller line to the north. There are systems to block "back feed" or "stray voltage" but they aren't normally employed in this situation.

One interesting item that CAPX did not address is that there would not be much need to run a double circuit up to the Lake Marion substation. It could be served with a single circuit. That alone, makes the south route more feasible than anticipated.

As far as running a single circuit up to Lake Marion and returning on the same pole, it is not impossible but CAPX subscribes the N.E.R.C. rules which require physical separation of lines running over 1 mile in order to limit outage potential.

Transmission lines can run in 115kv, 138kv, 230kv, 345kv, and really large 765kv.

Appendix C

Lake Marion to Hampton Advisory Task Force
April 15, 2009

Maps of Alternative Routes and Substation Locations

Appendix D

Lake Marion to Hampton Advisory Task Force
April 15, 2009

Speaker VI's Comments

My name is cindy and my family represents one dot on this map of many. We have lived in our home for twelve years. When we first moved here my husband chose our home because it provided for our three sons to be free in the country. They could run and roam all they wanted. Up until this time we had lived in a suburb setting and decided it would be better to raise them in the openness of the country. He made the right decision. We enjoy peace and quiet and watching the seasons change from our dining room table. The boys have learned how birds and animals survive in the wild. We have seen deer eating apples from our trees in the evening light. We have a variety of birds including a pileated woodpecker which eats off of our suet feeder. It is on the endangered species list. In the fall the pheasants eat the berries off the trees in our back yard. The wrens have taken over one of our trees and now nest there year after year. One day a red tailed hawk swooped down on our deck and ate a chickadee as we were eating our evening meal. None of these experiences would have been possible had my husband not chosen this location and home.

I am a nurse and this capx project is quite worrisome from a medical point of view for me. The WHO has been studying the effects of electromagnetic fields or EMF for many years. A task force was chosen from scientists and medical professionals from all over the world. They coincidentally are meeting tomorrow in China for their annual meeting, next year it will be in Moscow. I advise all of you in this room to get on their website and read the information that they have put forth. According to the

WHO, scientists have not come to any conclusion on the effects of EMF on humans. It is not that they are saying it does NOT cause problems nor are they saying that it causes no harm to the general public. That is the problem. Every study and paper that has been written is inconclusive on this matter.

They state that "exposure limits are based on effects related to short term exposure, because the available scientific information on the long term low level effects of exposure to EMF fields is considered insufficient."

Because there are remaining uncertainties as to the overall health impact of EMF, the use of precautionary approaches is warranted. This means that it is essential that guidelines be developed and in place in order to protect against adverse effects. What constitutes these precautionary approaches. To me it is further studies by the experts in the field. We do know that low voltage lines have been around for many years in our countryside and people have been living fairly risk free lives. There has NOT been instances of people living around this high voltage to even begin to decide. The utility companies that want this line have probably done this homework and they are going to try to convince us that the studies do NOT show that there is a problem so that the line should be built. In medicine we have radiology technicians that wear badges to detect exposure to radiation. These badges are turned in monthly to detect their risk. They know which readings are detrimental to their health. I am sure that workers on these lines wear something comparable and are well aware of the risk they are taking. They CHOSE to do this. We as homeowners have not chosen to be exposed to this.

One of my sons has HLA B27 deficiency. It is a genetic disorder in which he is prone to many disease processes. He will soon be started on daily immunosuppressants. To those of you who do not know what that means, he will be without an immune system. He will be open to contacting many infections. I do not know what impact this line will have on his health, but I certainly don't want to find out.
I went to the public meeting last week with scott ek. He seemed to be a reasonable man and encouraged us to come forth with our suggestions. I listened as many individuals got up and voiced their concerns. One farmer has had several changes to his farm in the last ten years and my heart went out to him. Another voiced the environmental concerns and still another about the monks living east of Farmington and what the effects would be to them.
After the meeting my husband and I drove to the proposed sight for the transformer station in Hampton. It was out in the middle of a field with very few houses around it. We then drove south and I saw the farm that has been cut up by the road projects and I understood the impact that it had on the farmer. I also live near a temple located on cedar avenue. It is for the Laotians in our area to worship. It is also in the path of the line.
I am proposing that you route this high voltage line out in the country. South of either proposed lines on these maps. It would impact far fewer people and wildlife. I know the utility companies would have to pay more for the extra lines and poles but could any of them live with the consequences of harming the general public. One route that was proposed in the beginning went south of the lake marion substation and then back up to the Hampton station.

It is more rural than any of the either proposed routes. It would cost more in the long run to the utility companies. I do not think that there is any way to compensate us for our decrease in property values. Once the certificate of need is approved it will be public knowledge that this line will go through in our area. Would any one want to even buy our homes with the uncertain future of the line and where it would go? I don't think so. We would all live in limbo. When the scientist do find out in another ten years that people should not live near these high voltage lines would the utility company come back and compensate us then? Again I do not think so.

Another concern I have is that this power line is not for Minnesota at all, it is for people farther down the line in Wisconsin and probably Illinois and beyond. It is only a small part of a much bigger utility grid. Why should we pay the price here in Minnesota? I know that the utility companies would come back and say that our power comes from someone in south or north Dakota. I grew up in south Dakota and have seen much of north Dakota. There is no comparison. The wide open prairies in both states are much more suited for these lines that the metropolitan area of Minnesota.

I urge you all to voice your opinions either by email or letter. This line needs to go farther south of the metro area away from us and our neighbors. The wildlife needs to stay in the area and more studies need to be done. Move this power line out in the open even if that means more cost in the long run. You can not put a price on human lives.

Thank you for time.