



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

North Rochester to Mississippi River Advisory Task Force
Second Meeting – May 12, 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.

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.

Review and Approval of Meeting Notes

Task force members were asked to review the meeting notes and respond with any questions, edits, changes, etc. Task force members had additions to the Issues and Impacts Identified portion of the notes. They included:

- Add an additional bullet point under the heading “Environmental and natural resources: impacts nature and impacts people”: Ecotourism
- Add an additional bullet point under the heading “Rural and agriculture land-use impacts”: Cultural heritage
- Add an additional bullet point under the heading “Potential option from new technology”: Grid and alternative energy technology

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 three most important “impact and issue” categories.

Task force members discussed the usefulness of the “dot exercise.” A minimal number (4) of task force members were present to do the exercise. Because of the small number of participants, the results of the exercise are inconclusive. All issues and impact identified at the first meeting were considered a priority. No issue or impact received a vote from all the participants and all issues and impacts received at least one vote. The results of this voting are shown in the North Rochester to Mississippi River ATF Prioritization Grid (Appendix A).

In the discussion that followed the exercise, two observations were made. First, the votes by task force members could be broken down on a geographic and topographic basis and this could account for all items receiving a vote. Second, the issue and impact that received the most votes had a focus on environmental stewardship and this is a critical concern of task force members.

Identification of Alternative Routes, Route Segments and Substation Locations

Task force members were asked to work as a group to identify possible alternative routes, route segments, and substation locations. The group was provided with a set of maps representing the North Rochester to Mississippi River 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 from task force members were discussed and addressed. The small group 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 at least one week prior to the June 3, 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 Plainview on Thursday, June 3, 2010 from 1:00 PM – 4:30 PM. This will be the final meeting of the task force.

Appendix A

North Rochester to Mississippi River Advisory Task Force April 28, 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?

	Environmental and natural resources: impacts nature and impacts people	Property values (under private ownership)	Health and safety	Rural and agriculture land-use impacts	Potential option from new technology	Use existing corridors	Conflicts with land use options	Economic cost of construction and maintenance of line
Number of Votes	3	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
Priority Level	Priority	Priority	Priority	Priority	Priority	Priority	Priority	Priority
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Save wildlife habitat Environmental impacts: wildlife, natural beauty of the area Environment: critical and rare – habitat and biodiversity Migratory flyway (birds, bats, butterflies) located on United States Fish and Wildlife Service land, Department of Natural Resources land, close to Nature Conservancy land Bluffland, watershed, wetland, water quality: destruction and decreased quality from construction and maintenance Effects on rare and unique resources; i.e. wild/scenic bird roosting sites Save woodlands in stewardship project, especially hardwoods Recreation/Aesthetics: loss and hindrance of Good stewardship Intrinsic qualities required to maintain National Scenic Byway: cultural/heritage, environment, agriculture and recreation area, marketing (these are federal highway department criteria) Ecotourism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Property valuations: fair compensations for property owners (future use) Home/Property values; aesthetics of powerline could decrease existing values Side by side structures double negative impacts for landowners (Pine Island’s 161 lines would be separate) Most economical: river crossing, easements, private property impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety; increase of stray voltage affecting cattle and electromagnetic fields (EMF) affecting humans Health concerns: stray voltage – wildlife and agriculture; EMS – humans Health issues; human, animal emotional distress caused 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farming; destruction of crops during construction and maintenance of lines Land-use: both of plan implementation, productions, growth and income (both individual and community) Sight “looks” – duplication of lines, waste of agriculture land Cultural heritage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land use – sustainability and green usage – future technologies (options for new technologies to create electricity, impacts on local economy) Grid and alternative energy technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No existing environmental corridors; need to clear-cut areas, proposed transmission lines creates fragmentation of property and habitat Use public property (road right-of-way) rather than private property 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Pine Island; proposed 345 and 161 kV lines will be built in areas the city has designated for future residential growth and development 	

