

Community Partnership for Energy Planning

Community Working Group – A

(Pinellas, Pasco, Hillsborough, Polk)

Meeting Summary

Franklin Templeton Conference Center – St. Petersburg, FL
March 19, 2008

Time: 11:30 AM to 1:30 PM

Facilitated By: STAR Group, LLC
www.stargroupconsulting.com



Attendees

CWG Members Present:	Guests:
Tom Aderhold – Keystone Civic Association	Gail Simpson – Progress Energy Florida
Ron Daniel – Pasco County	Karen Raihill – Golder & Associates
David Edwards – Pasco County	
Ming Gao - FDOT	
Chuck Geanangel – Audubon Society	
Tom Griggs – Newland Communities	
Ken Hoyt – KSH International	
Colleen Kruk - SWFWMD	
Jim Martin – Pasco County Energy Management	
Jerry Miller – Progress Energy Florida	
Ken Mathewson – Pasco County Utilities	
Marian Ryan – Sierra Club	
Melissa Seixas – Progress Energy Florida	
Larry Watson – Progress Energy Florida	

Chris Kenny and Regina Chavez of STAR Group welcomed the Community Working Group (CWG) members and guests, reviewed the ground rules for the meeting, and reviewed the agenda.

Gail Simpson gave an update of the Baseload Transmission Project noting that Progress Energy Florida (PEF) was in the process of reviewing all of the information gathered to date, including public input received from the Utility Search Conferences, Community Working Groups and Open House Meetings, in order to identify preferred corridor opportunity areas for the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) filing that will be made in June 2008. These opportunity areas will then be studied further to determine the actual corridor. Gail notified the group that the opportunity areas selected will be posted on



PEF's website and asked that members of the group offer suggestions to PEF on other means of notifying potentially affected stakeholders.

Gail reported that a call center was up and running and that additional meetings and presentations were being given to interested groups upon request. As part of the CWG's ongoing input into the public outreach process, Gail asked the group to provide recommendations to PEF on groups that PEF should contact directly regarding the project.

A question was asked regarding the one mile width of the corridor study and if PEF would be willing to provide maps depicting the various land use types. Gail replied that there were maps of the corridors on the PEF website and that PEF would also be willing to provide maps. Others in the group indicated that GIS and other public websites carried these types of maps as well.

A suggestion was made to have PEF consider coordinating planning efforts for the Baseload Transmission project and for future projects with the Tampa Bay Area Rapid Transit Authority (TBARTA). TBARTA currently is developing a regional (seven county) transportation plan. Other members noted that PEF should continue to work with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) on co-location opportunities.

Gail Simpson responded that co-location had been a recurring theme in the input received at the Utility Search Conferences, CWG meetings and Open House meetings and definitely would be part of PEF's corridor evaluation and selection process for the Baseload Transmission Project. She noted that the timing of TBARTA's regional planning efforts may not coincide with the decisions PEF needs to make on some aspects of the Baseload Transmission Project but that PEF would contact TBARTA to see what opportunities might exist for this project and for future projects. She also noted that PEF would continue to work with FDOT to identify possible co-location opportunities for the Baseload Transmission Project and would do so on future projects as well. All agreed that it was important for these and other regional planning and infrastructure entities to communicate with one another and be open to new opportunities for collaboration.

CWG members were asked to provide their feedback on the recently held Open House meetings that were held in Pasco, Pinellas, Polk and Hillsborough Counties. Several CWG members complimented PEF on the success of the Open Houses, noting that the meetings provided adequate outdoor signage, knowledgeable individuals at each of the workstations, and useful paper and GIS maps. Some CWG members expressed disappointment that their

questions were not answered sufficiently and that those staffing the workstations at times appeared to be disinterested in the issues and concerns raised.

Other observations made by CWG members included:

- PEF did a very good job of advising the public about the Open House meetings, as evidenced by the good turnout.
- While many who received letters inviting them to the Open House meetings may have been confused or unduly alarmed, sending these letters was a very positive step in keeping individuals informed about the project and giving them an opportunity to have input.
- Many Open House attendees seemed to be particularly concerned about Electro-Magnetic Fields (EMFs) and property value issues.
- Not In My Back Yard (NIMBY) was commonly heard.
- Some attendees offered to sell their property to PEF.
- PEF could have done a better job explaining pole height issues. Some attendees may have left the Open House meetings believing that all of the poles would be built to a 165' height, when in fact 165' represents the maximum pole height that would be necessary.
- It was good to have members of the CWG in attendance to answer questions as well as to hear attendees' concerns.
- Some members asked why the USC preferred corridor was not presented at the Open Houses. Chris reported that the Project Team had made a conscious decision to not show the corridor information developed at the USC so that information received by the Open House meeting attendees would not be biased in any way.
- Some potentially affected neighborhood associations expressed concerns about the project and about why they were not specifically asked to be a part of the outreach process prior to the Open House meetings. Gail Simpson and the PE project team are currently setting up meetings with these and other neighborhood association representatives.
- At some meeting locations there were not enough GIS stations to meet the demand, which PEF might have done a better job anticipating.
- It might have been helpful for PEF to have presented more information regarding the possible costs of the project and how the issue of project cost will factor into the final corridor selection.

Some members suggested that it might have been better for PEF to have narrowed down the selection to a single corridor before going out to the

general public via the Open House meetings; however, members generally agreed that because PEF wanted public input in order to narrow down the range of corridor options, getting public input now was the best way to go.

Chris presented CWG members with a summary of the survey responses received from Open House meeting participants, noting that members should be careful not to draw too many definitive conclusions from the survey results as the results were not intended to be statistically valid. Of the 1001 survey responses received to date:

- 81% reported that the format of the Open House was helpful. Others who indicated they did not like the format said they wanted a presentation and some indicated they simply didn't like the Project.
- 73% said the Project need was adequately explained, those who didn't indicated it depended on which corridor was chosen, and again, some said they didn't like the Project.
- Corridor Criteria Ranking was set with 1 as the highest or most important criteria and 12 was least important. "Minimize the number of residences in the corridor" received the highest or most important ranking followed by "Maximize the length in the ROW", "Maximize the linear facilities", "Minimize the number of schools near the corridor", and "Minimize the number of parcels crossed". The criterion with the lowest ranking was "Minimize Construction Cost".
- Of the written comments received:
 - 20% indicated that PEF should use existing corridors
 - 15% said PEF should avoid populated areas
 - 13% of the comments were general in nature (could not be definitively categorized or were neutral)
 - 11% said they needed more information in order to comment
 - 11% identified themselves specifically as "NIMBY" or indicated that they didn't care where the project was built as long as it wasn't anywhere near them
 - 9% expressed concern over property values
 - 9% expressed concerns regarding environmental impacts from the project
 - 5% specifically addressed health concerns
 - 4% expressed support for the project
 - 2% expressed support for alternative energy

CWG members noted that the survey data generally were consistent with the issues identified at the USC and by the CWG. Some members questioned the ability of survey respondents to understand clearly the definition of some of

the terms used in the survey (such as “cultural resources,” “conservation lands,” “forested wetlands” and “herbaceous wetlands”).

The group then turned to the “next steps” in the outreach process. In response to a question asked by one of the members, Gail Simpson noted that PEF’s Project Team will evaluate all of the information it has received to date in order to select the preferred corridor opportunity areas by June 2008. The filing that will be made with DEP will be rather large but will be available on PEF’s web site.

The group made the following recommendations regarding the selection process and PEF’s announcement of the final corridors:

- If the final corridor is different from the corridors presented at the USC or at the Open House meetings, PEF will need to be very clear in its explanation as to why an alternative corridor was identified and selected.
- Regardless of the corridor selected, PEF should be prepared to give a detailed explanation as to the criteria used and its reasons for selecting identified corridors.
- At a minimum, PEF should mail notices to everyone within the selected corridor with information regarding the opportunities the public will have for further input. As a courtesy, PEF should also consider mailing a notice to all who received invitations to the first round of Open Houses, indicating that their corridor was not selected for further evaluation.
- PEF should consider taking out a full-page ad in local newspapers announcing their final corridor decision.
- PEF should be certain to keep elected officials informed as soon as the final corridors are selected, as elected officials will begin receiving phone calls as soon as the announcement is made to the public.
- This is very unclear. PEF should be prepared to provide meaningful public input during the route selection process, to include additional Open House meetings that take into account the suggestions made by the CWG for improving PEF’s Open House meeting format.

The group was then asked to provide input regarding the topics to be addressed at future CWG meetings. Some indicated there was value in obtaining the CWG’s continued input during the final route selection process. Others identified the role that the CWG might play in working with PEF on specific issues, such as the possibility of developing wildlife habitats along transmission line corridors and pursuing the means by which PEF and other regional agencies could develop a protocol for more comprehensive

infrastructure planning and communication. Others mentioned the role the CWG could play in ensuring meaningful public input during all phases of the project, including the construction phase. Generally speaking, the group felt that their involvement to date was worthwhile and that the group should continue meeting on some type of regular basis to address these and other topics. Chris asked members to provide additional input on this matter via email.

Finally, the group agreed that the next meeting should be held in late April or early May, with the specific date forwarded to the members as soon as practical.



Community Working Group Roster (Pasco, Pinellas, Hillsborough and Polk)

Category	County	First	Last	Organization	City
(A) Business	Hillsborough	Kenneth	Hoyt	KSH International, Inc. Pasco-Hernando	Tampa
(A) Business	Pasco	Randy	Stovall	Community College Malphus & Son	Dade City
(A) Business	Hillsborough	Wilbert	Malphus	General Contractors Keystone Civic	Tampa
(A) Civic Groups	Hillsborough	Tom	Aderhold	Association Coalition 4 Responsible Growth Inc.	Tampa Lutz
(A) Civic Groups	Hillsborough	Dee	Layne	Pinellas County Utilities Environmental Lands Acquisition and Management Program	New Port Richey
(A) Environmental/Alternative Energy Advocates	Pasco	Annemarie	Hammond		
(A) Environmental/Alternative Energy Advocates	Pasco	Ronald	Daniel		New Port Richey
(A) Environmental/Alternative Energy Advocates	Polk	Marian	Ryan	Sierra Club	Winter Haven
(A) Environmental/Alternative Energy Advocates	Pasco	Ken	Mathewson	Pinellas County Utilities Florida Department of Transportation District 7	New Port Richey
(A) Governmental	Hillsborough	Elba	Lopez		Tampa
(A) Governmental	Pinellas	Kenneth	Herd	Tampa Bay Water	Clearwater
(A) Governmental	Pasco	Jim	Martin	Pasco County	New Port Richey
(A) Governmental	Pasco	David	Edwards	Pasco County Hillsborough City - Public Works Right of Way	New Port Richey Tampa
(A) Land Use Planners	Hillsborough	Juan	Lopez		
(A) Land Use Planners	Hillsborough	Paul	Flora	Hillsborough County Planning Commission	Tampa
(A) Land Use Planners	Hillsborough	William	Lambo	Hillsborough County District School Board of Pasco County	Tampa
(A) Large Energy Users	Pasco	John	Soler	Longleaf Development Company	New Port Richey
(A) Large Landowners	Hillsborough	Frank	Starkey		Odessa
(A) Large Landowners	Hillsborough	Thomas	Griggs	Newland Southeast Southwest Florida Water Management District	Tampa
(A) Large Landowners	Pasco	Colleen	Kruk		Brooksville
(A) Utility	Hillsborough	Larry	Watson	PEF	Lake Mary
(A) Utility	Pinellas	Nancy	Loehr	PEF	Clearwater
(A) Utility	Polk	Jerry	Miller	PEF	Lake Wells