



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

**Hampton to Northern Hills Advisory Task Force
Second Meeting – May 11, 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 indicate who they represent (e.g., township, city).

Charlie reviewed the task force charge and the agenda for the second meeting. He emphasized that the work of this meeting was to further clarify and prioritize issues and impacts and to develop alternative routes, route segments, and substation locations.

Review and Approval of Meeting Notes

Task force members were asked to review the meeting notes from the first meeting and respond with any questions, edits, changes, etc. Edits and/or additions to the April 27, 2010 meeting notes included:

- Marlin Reinardy, task force member, offered the following edit: On page one, second bullet under “Welcome and introductions;” strike the language “more through the main part of the city” and insert: “along the east city limits line.”
- Ann Fahy, task force member, offered in the Issues and Impacts Identified section an additional bullet item under Future Development: Land use: “Future public land use: churches, schools, parks”

The task force reviewed and approved these 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 four most important “impact and issue” categories. The results of this voting are shown in the Hampton to Northern Hills ATF Prioritization Grid (Appendix A).

Task force members discussed the usefulness of the “dot exercise.” Members expressed concern that the results of the exercise are skewed by who shows up. Members then discussed the results of the exercise.

Matt Langan, OES, reminded task force members that they could comment during the scoping period outside of the task force, i.e., as individuals or as representatives of their local government. Comments are due to Matt by May 20th. Matt asked task force members if they were agreeable to having their contact information listed on the OES website. Citizens at the scoping meetings had requested this information.

Charlie noted that he was still accepting issues and impacts “homework sheets.”

Identification of Alternative Routes, Route Segments and Substation Locations

Task force members were asked to work in small groups to identify possible alternative routes, route segments, and substation locations. Each group was provided with a set of maps representing the Hampton to Northern Hills transmission line area.

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. Questions by task force members were discussed and addressed. Matt noted that the location of the proposed North Rochester substation was open for consideration by the task force. Grant Stevenson, Xcel Energy, provided a brief overview of Xcel Energy’s process in developing its proposed routes.

The small groups reported back their ideas; alternative routes and reasons for the routes were shared with all present. Maps depicting the alternative routes identified will be sent out to members approximately one week prior to the June 2, 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.

The next task force meeting will be held in Cannon Falls on Wednesday, June 2, 2010 from 1:00 PM – 4:30 PM. This will be the final meeting of the task force.

Appendix A

**Hampton to Northern Hills Advisory Task Force
May 11, 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?*

	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
Number of Votes	0	4	5	0	0	3	4	6	1	1
Priority Level	Priority	Top priority	Top priority	Priority	Priority	Top priority	Top priority	Top priority	Priority	Priority
	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) ▪ Shore land zoning: Pine Creek, Cannon River, etc. ▪ Cannon River: aesthetic, environmental (habitat – bird rookery) ▪ Aesthetics: view as approach Cannon Falls, tourism, 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 	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 ▪ Future public land use: churches, schools, parks 	Future commercial development	Commercial and residential development, growth conflicts – limit growth to west in Cannon Falls