



**Hampton to Rochester to La Crosse
345kV and 161kV Transmission Line Project
Advisory Task Force**

**Hampton to Northern Hills Advisory Task Force
First Meeting – April 27, 2010**

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. He asked task force members to, in “around the table” fashion, introduce themselves and to relate one expectation that they had for the work of the advisory task force. Expectations included:

- To be fair with all the landowners in the area
- Place the line on the edge of Hampton rather than how it is routed now more through the main part of the city
- Learn about the transmission line siting process and take the information back to the community
- Routing process is fair to the landowners and has the least impact on these landowners
- Location of the line; where it will go through the township
- Bring up and discuss issues; get the issues in the record
- Present the city’s side of the routing issues and bring information back to city council

Why we are here

Charlie reviewed with the task force, the charge of the task force and a draft plan for accomplishing the charge over the course of three task force meetings. Charlie described his role as a facilitator and documenter of the task force’s work. He described the report which will be the product of the task force’s work and how it will be developed. Charlie also provided ground rules for meeting logistics. Questions by task force members were discussed and addressed.

Task force members discussed meeting dates and times for future meetings. Meetings will be held in Cannon Falls at the Cannon Falls Government Center (same location as meeting #1).

Meetings dates are:

- May 11, 2010, 1:00 – 4:30 PM
- June 2, 2010, 1:00 – 4:30 PM.

State route permitting process

Matt Langan, Office of Energy Security, discussed the state permitting process and the role of the advisory task force. He discussed the criteria used by the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission in making a route permitting decision and issues typically covered in an

environmental impact statement (EIS). Questions by task force members were discussed and addressed.

Project overview

Tom Hillstrom, Xcel Energy, provided an overview of the proposed transmission line project and process used by Xcel Energy to develop the proposed routes. He discussed the two transmission lines (a 345 kV line and a 161kV line) that will be the focus for this task force and the substation locations. He noted the “North Rochester Substation” was initially located closer to Rochester (hence the name) but during siting discussions it has been moved farther north to a location between Pine Island and Zumbrota. Electronic copies of the application were handed out to task force members. The application can also be found at:

<http://energyfacilities.puc.state.mn.us/resource.html?Id=25750>

Questions by task force members were discussed and addressed.

Issues and Impacts Identified

Charlie led the task force through a small group discussion exercise to identify and categorize impacts and issues that should be considered in the environmental impact statement (EIS) for evaluation of proposed routes. The task force members responded to the question: *What land use planning and other impacts and issues need to be considered in the evaluation of proposed transmission line routes and/or substation locations?* The task force identified seven impact and issue areas to be evaluated in the EIS. These issue areas and specific comments are included in the notes and table below.

The issues and impact areas identified include:

Can existing power lines be put on same tower as new lines?

- Alternative route on west side of Pine Island where towers already exist

Environment

- Environmental impacts: landscape, wildlife, trails – Cannon Valley Trail on north (345 kV) and Douglas Trail on south (161 kV)
- Shoreland zoning: Pine Creek, Cannon River, etc.
- Cannon River: aesthetic, environmental (habitat – bird rookery)
- Aesthetics: view as approach Cannon Falls, tourism impact, sight lines

Health and Happiness

- Public health – electromagnetic field effects
- Quality of life for residents nearby; health and happiness (aesthetics, landscape impact, and emotional impact)

During construction

- Road damage
- River crossing; how much damage

Stanton airport

- Along highway 56, may move line further west

Land use: Agriculture

- Stay on section lines when crossing farmland
- Use existing right-of-ways
- Farmland: Dakota County easements, operations

Future Development

- **Economic**
 - Land values: current and future
 - Land value impacts: commercial areas on Hwy 52 in Cannon Falls, around new interchanges
 - Declining property values – fair compensation
- **Land use**
 - Comprehensive plans
 - Future land uses proposed; residential, industrial, commercial, wind turbines
 - Place line outside of city limits in Hampton – move to further eastside
 - Interchange conflict; Hwy 86 Cannon Falls, south of Cannon Falls, double stop light elimination
- **Commercial**
 - Future commercial development
- **Residential**
 - Commercial and residential development, growth conflicts – limit growth to west in Cannon Falls

Task force members were also asked to identify impacts and issues through a second means – completion of a worksheet, which was “homework” between the first and second meeting of the task force. These impacts and issues will be included in the meeting notes of the second meeting.

Hampton to Northern Hills Advisory Task Force

April 27, 2010

Identification of Impacts and Issues - 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?

Can existing power lines be put on same tower as new lines?	Environment	Health and Happiness	During construction	Stanton airport	Land use: Agriculture	Future development			
						Economic	Land use	Commercial	Residential
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alternative route on west side of Pine Island where towers already exist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental impacts: landscape, wildlife, trails – Cannon Valley Trail on north (345 kV) and Douglas Trail on south (161 kV) ▪ Shoreland zoning: Pine Creek, Cannon River, etc. ▪ Cannon River: aesthetic, environmental (habitat – bird rookery) ▪ Aesthetics: view as approach Cannon Falls, tourism impact, sight lines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public health – electro-magnetic field effects ▪ Quality of life for residents nearby; health and happiness (aesthetics, landscape impact, and emotional impact) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Road damage ▪ River crossing; how much damage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Along highway 56, may move line further west 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stay on section lines when crossing farmland ▪ Use existing right-of-ways ▪ Farmland: Dakota County easements, operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land values: current and future ▪ Land value impacts: commercial areas on Hwy 52 in Cannon Falls, around new interchanges ▪ Declining property values – fair compensation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comprehensive plans ▪ Future land uses proposed; residential, industrial, commercial, wind turbines ▪ Place line outside of city limits in Hampton – move to further eastside ▪ Interchange conflict; Hwy 86 Cannon Falls, south of Cannon Falls, double stop light elimination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Future commercial development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commercial and residential development, growth conflicts – limit growth to west in Cannon Falls

Next steps

Charlie reminded task force members that their homework for the next meeting was to come prepared to discuss and draw route alternatives that might address the impacts and issues identified in the first meeting. He also invited members to complete their issues and impacts worksheet and submit them at the second meeting.