



**Hampton to Rochester to La Crosse
345 kilovolt (kV) Transmission Line Project
Advisory Task Force**

**Hampton to Northern Hills Advisory Task Force
Third Meeting – June 2, 2010**

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 third meeting, was to discuss in greater detail: (1) the applicant's proposed routes, (2) the alternative routes proposed by the task force at its second meeting, and (3) any additional routes or route segments, and discuss the process for developing the report of the task force. 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 from meeting #2 and respond with any questions edits changes, etc. No changes were offered to the meeting notes.

Review of ATF Generated Routes, and Route Segments

Advisory Task Force members were provided with maps of the alternative routes and route segments identified at the second meeting. A map identifying all the routes discussed is attached. The members reviewed each alternative and identified pros and cons for each.

Applicant preferred 345 kV route

Pros

- Does not disturb roads and homes in Hampton township, goes down U.S. 52
- Shortest route
- Takes less private land; half of route is on U.S. 52
- Cheaper – do not have to buy private land
- Stays out and away from west side of Zumbrota and their economic development area

- Bundled with other lines later on – out of substation area between Zumbrota and Pine Island

Cons

- Highway and businesses impacted in the City of Hampton
- Top four issues and impacts identified by ATF: future land use and future development; health and happiness – most residents impacted; economic – decreased property values; environment
- Major impacts on Cannon Falls and Hampton
- Uses new right-of-way west of Zumbrota
- Runs through planned future land use area north of Pine Island
- Goes over top (north end) of new highway interchange on U.S. 52 in Pine Island
- Greater visual impact for more people as it follows a major highway corridor (U.S. 52)

Applicant alternative 345 kV route

Pros

- Avoids issues with Cannon Falls (does not go through Cannon Falls)
- Avoids issues with Zumbrota, Pine Island and Hampton (does not go through communities)
- Makes use of substation at proposed substation area between Zumbrota and Pine Island

Cons

- Longer route
- Disrupts farmlands and farm homes
- Top four issue and impacts identified by ATF for the rural area: future land use; health and happiness; economic; and environmental
- Impacts City of Randolph
- Potential impact on west side of Lake Byllesby
- Takes or crosses more private land
- Potentially more expensive; cost to purchase private land
- Lake Byllesby – impacts west end of park on MN 56 (route goes west of Randolph and MN 56)

Applicant preferred 161 kV route

Pros

- Shorter than the alternative 161 route

Cons

- Jogs through northeast corner of Pine Island
- Does not follow existing right-of-way; does follow parcel lines but does not follow property lines therefore it cuts across a single farm
- Impacts new interchange for Pine Island; construction on interchanges is scheduled to start this summer; also crosses roads leading to interchange (this road does not exist now)

but is proposed new county highway (maybe county highway 12 or a combined 12/31/5); it will be the main feeder road for Pine Island from the west

- Impacts planned healthy living center; planned center is west of proposed transmission line and north of new highway; sewer and water have been installed but land has not been surveyed
- Impacts Douglas area along 60th Avenue; impacts five to six homes in the route

Applicant alternative 161 kV route

Pros

- Follows existing 345 kV line around Pine Island
- Does not go through future land use plan area for Pine Island (However, does impact future planning – more than 20 years – for Pine Island)

Cons

- Follows 3.5 miles of Douglas Trail – hiking biking trail
- Runs next to and/or adjacent to existing 345 kV lines – difficult to repair lines when so close together
- Cuts through New Haven township and impact four issues and impacts identified by ATF – economic, health and happiness, future land use, and environment
- Uses new right-of-way for south portion of route
- Longer route and not as direct

ATF alternative 345 kV route – Group 1 – Alt 1

Pros

- Misses house along U.S. 52

Cons

- Crosses back and forth along U.S. 52 making the line more visible

ATF alternative 345 kV route – Group 1 – Alt 2 (later in the meeting this route was pulled from consideration by an eight to one vote of the ATF members)

Pros

- Stays on U.S. 52 and uses existing right-of-way
- Stays in township
- Northern end catches right-of-way of existing power line

Cons

- Route places two 345 kV power lines in the same place (double the impact on same people)
- Impact the land use plan developed by the City of Zumbrota
- Impacts a large number of people in residential area on east side of U.S. 52; impacts their health and happiness (on west side of U.S. is commercial area – equally an issue)

- Impacts top four ATF identified issues and impacts: future land use, economic, health and happiness, environment
- City of Zumbrota would be boxed in by 345 kV lines; existing 345 kV line on east side and now the proposed 345 kV line on west side of Zumbrota (also 69 kV line coming in from the west)

ATF alternative 345 kV route – Group 1 – Alt 3 (later in the meeting this route was pulled from consideration by an eight to one vote of the ATF members)

Pros

- Follows right-of-way of U.S. 52 on north end and 69 kV power line on south end
- Shorter route than applicant preferred
- Misses more of Zumbrota than ATF – Group 1 – Alt 2 but less than applicants preferred route

Cons

- Impact the land use plan developed by the City of Zumbrota
- Impacts a large number of people in residential area on east side of U.S. 52; impacts their health and happiness (on west side of U.S. is commercial area – equally an issue)
- Impacts top four ATF identified issues and impacts: future land use, economic, health and happiness, environment
- City of Zumbrota would be boxed in by 345 kV lines; existing 345 kV line on east side and now the proposed 345 kV line on west side of Zumbrota (also 69 kV line coming in from the west)

ATF alternative partially joint 161 kV and 345 kV routes – Group 1 – Alt 4 (later in the meeting this route was pulled from consideration by consensus of the ATF members)

Pros

- Stays along 500 Street existing right-of-way

Cons

- Goes through more agriculture land

ATF alternative route – Group 1 – Alt 5 (this route did not exist being inadvertently skipped when the alternatives were numbered)

ATF alternative 161 kV route – Group 1 – Alt 6 (later in the meeting this route was pulled from consideration by consensus of the ATF members)

Pros

- Misses planned healthy living center
- Follows U.S. 52 and comes back to 161 kV route past new interchange
- Comes across south of new interchange soon to be under construction

Cons

- Odd angles to route as it comes back to applicant preferred 161 kV route
- Longer route

ATF alternative 161 kV route – Group 1 – Alt 7 (ATF recommends double circuit with existing 345 kV line or placing new 161 kV line west of existing 345 kV and/or double circuit with existing 69 kV line)

Pros

- Places new line farther away from Trophy Lake
- Uses existing poles (or route) to run new line

Cons

(none)

ATF alternative 345 kV route – Group 2 – Alt 1

Pros

- Outside City of Hampton, follows Hampton city limits on east side

Cons

- Top four impacts and issues identified by ATF: environment, economic, future land use, health and happiness
- Splits a single landowner’s property
- Longer and therefore more costly than preferred route
- Does not follow existing right-of-way
- Affects houses

ATF alternative 345 kV route – Group 2 – Alt 2

Pros

- Stays in MN 56 right-of-way
- Avoids top four issues and impacts identified by ATF for Cannon Falls

Cons

- Comes close to Stanton airport (private airport with some public use – in area of MN 56 and MN 19)
- Goes through west side of Lake Byllesby Park; bird area
- Goes along city limits of Randolph

[**Note:** the ATF acknowledged an overhead alternative along Highway 56 at Stanton would adversely impact the east-west runway at the Stanton airport. Therefore, they acknowledged the alternative would need to avoid the runway by approximately one mile to be viable as an overhead route, but did not specifically designate the route change. There was discussion that ATF alternative 345 kV route – Group 2 – Alt 2 could join the applicant’s alternative route where they intersect north of Randolph and follow the applicant’s alternative around the wide side of Stanton. Once sufficiently south of Stanton the alternative could rejoin Highway 56.]

ATF alternative 345 kV route – Group 2 – Alt 3

Pros

- Stays in MN 56 right-of-way
- Shorter than applicant's alternative route

Cons

- Longer than applicant's preferred route

ATF alternative 345 kV route – Group 2 – Alt 4

Pros

- Stays on County Highway 9
- Shortens by-pass route around Cannon Falls (as opposed to applicant's alternative)

Cons

- Goes through Sogn Valley; potential historical site

ATF alternative partially joint 161 kV and 345 kV routes – Group 2 – Alt 5

Pros

- Follows township lines for new 161 kV part
- Minimal land use impact by combining two routes for part of this alternative
- Misses interchanges and healthy living center
- Follows applicant's preferred 345 kV route for part (as a joint 345 kV and 161kV line) and applicant's preferred 161 routes for another part, routes already studied
- Stays out of Pine Island future land use plans (does go into 20 year plan area)

Cons

(none)

ATF alternative partially joint 161 kV and 345 kV routes – Group 2 – Alt 6 (later in the meeting this route was pulled from consideration by consensus of the ATF members)

Pros

- Follows township lines for new 161 kV part
- Minimal land use impact by combining two routes for part of this alternative
- Misses interchanges and healthy living center
- Follows applicant preferred 345 kV route for part (as a joint 345 kV and 161kV line) and applicants preferred 161 routes for another part
- Stay out of Pine Island future land use plans (does go into 20 year plan area)
- Follows county line and township line for 161 kV line portion

Cons

- Goes through existing industrial development area

- North edge of biotech park with new businesses slated to start in June of 2010

The task force noted that all ATF routes identified above – and not removed from consideration by the task force – should be carried forward.

Report Process

Charlie will draft a report based on the three meetings of the task force, outlining the process and the action of the task force. The report will be e-mailed to task force members for review and comment. The comments will be reviewed and incorporated into the report as appropriate. If the comments are extensive or differ substantially from meeting notes, then a request may be made to have these comments submitted and referenced electronically.

Notes from meeting #3 will be sent to task force members for review and comment prior to development of the final report.

The task force was thanked for its good work, understanding this was a difficult issue to undertake.