

# Community Partnership for Energy Planning

## Joint Meeting of the Leadership Team and Community Working Group – A

(Pinellas, Pasco, Hillsborough, Polk)

## Meeting Summary

Residence Inn – Lutz, FL  
May 20, 2008

Time: 8:30 AM to 10:00 PM

Facilitated By: STAR Group, LLC  
[www.stargroupconsulting.com](http://www.stargroupconsulting.com)



## Attendees

LT and CWG Members Present:	Guests:
Tom Aderhold – Keystone Civic Association	Gail Simpson – Progress Energy Florida
Ron Daniel – Pasco County	Bob Bellemare – UtiliPoint International, Inc.
David Edwards – Pasco County	
Paul Flora - Hillsborough County Planning Commission	
Tom Griggs – Newland Communities	
Ken Hoyt – KSH International	
Colleen Kruk - SWFWMD	
Susan Latvala - Pinellas County Board of County Commissioners	
Dee Layne - Coalition 4 Responsible Growth	
Jim Martin – Pasco County Energy Management	
Steve McGlocklin - Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners	
Jerry Miller – Progress Energy Florida	
Ken Mathewson – Pasco County Utilities	
Melissa Seixas – Progress Energy Florida	
John Soler - District School Board of Pasco County	
Larry Watson – Progress Energy Florida	

Chris Kenny and Bill Moye of STAR Group welcomed the Leadership Team and Community Working Group (CWG) members and guests, reviewed the ground rules for the meeting, and reviewed the agenda.



Gail Simpson gave a presentation to the group concerning the preferred corridor for the Baseload Transmission Project, which was announced publicly this morning. Gail noted that Progress Energy Florida (PEF) had determined the preferred corridor for the project based on technical requirements and the information gathered to date, including public input received from the Utility Search Conferences, Community Working Groups and Open House Meetings. The preferred corridor will be presented as part of the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) Site Certification Application filing that will be made in June 2008. Gail notified the group that PEF's final corridor selection is posted on PEF's website. Two different letters went out yesterday – to those within/near the corridor and to those who fall outside the corridor but had previously participated or received some prior communication about the project in the past (nearly 100,000 letters). Gail asked that members of the group offer suggestions to PEF on other means of notifying potentially affected stakeholders about the final corridor selection.

Gail pointed out that ninety percent of the preferred corridor is within existing rights of way. The width of the preferred corridor does vary. Most is narrow because the proposed line will be placed in existing rights of way. However, there are about 20 miles of new right of way needed (about 10 percent of the project) and in these areas the preferred corridor study area can be as wide as 1-mile.

In Hillsborough County, the plan is to replace an existing 115-kV lattice tower design with a 230-kV monopole design. Based on comments received at the Open House Meetings, PEF hopes that people may view this as a visual improvement over the current structures. The existing easement in Hillsborough County generally is 100 feet wide and will be able to accommodate the proposed line upgrade; however, some additional right of way may be required in limited instances, possibly in the eastern portion of the corridor.

PEF has also determined that no new construction is needed for the Baseload Transmission project in Pasco County. Ongoing analysis of forecast data led Progress to conclude that the existing transmission lines from its Brooksville West substation to Tarpon Spring substation have sufficient capacity to support the additional power generated by the 2 proposed nuclear units in Levy.

Members asked about the state easement requirements and pole heights for a 230-kV line and for a 500-kV line and whether PEF could upgrade the 230-kV line in Hillsborough to a 500-kV line in the future. Gail responded that a 230-



kV line may be constructed within the existing 100-foot right of way through Hillsborough but that a 500-kV line would need approximately 200 to 250 feet, so the proposed 230-kV line could not simply be converted to 500-kV in the future. She also noted that while a utility company does not rule out future upgrades, PEF does not have any plans to upgrade the Hillsborough line beyond the proposed 230-kV line that would be constructed as part of the Baseload Transmission Project. In response to a member's question, Gail affirmed that once the Site Certification Application is submitted to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in June, PEF cannot change the corridor locations or expand the widths without undertaking an amendment to the application.

The pole heights will be impacted by the distance between the poles (in general, the closer they are spaced together the shorter the pole; conversely, fewer poles generally means that each of the poles would need to be relatively taller) and also the state-mandated EMF levels at the edges of the right of way (Florida is one of the few states in the country that has set maximum EMF levels for utility rights of way).

A question was asked about the precise right of way that PEF uses for its existing 69-kV line along State Road 54 in Pasco County. PEF will provide members with the answer to that question.

Members discussed PEF's proposed communication plan for the current week as well as the project and regulatory review schedule through 2016. The group was asked to provide feedback on today's presentation and on how PEF should continue the outreach and offered the following:

- Providing information on PEF's rights of way widths and voltage along State Road 54 and in Hillsborough County will be critical.
- PEF must be prepared to discuss why they chose the Hillsborough corridor over State Road 54, since State Road 54 is mainly commercial, and the Hillsborough corridor is primarily residential.
- PEF should be sure to emphasize (1) construction will take place within existing rights of way and (2) in Hillsborough County, PEF will be replacing its existing lattice structures with monopole structures.
- Be sure to focus on why the proposed corridors are better for the community.
- Be prepared to address safety, health, and property values – these are the primary areas of concern for citizens.
- Put detail on the web about what's being built now and whether what's being built now can be upgraded to 500-kV (and why or why not)

- PEF needs to conduct its planning using a much longer time horizon (such as 75 years). As this area continues to grow and fewer and fewer new corridors are available, where will additional lines be built?
- The solution offered by PEF does not break new ground on co-location with other facilities or DOT corridors, so is this selection really looking at the long haul? However, definitely understand why the selection was made because it has the least cost and least impact.
- Health issues. Some members suggested calling a USF health expert or other independent third party to discuss the EMF issue.
- Response time to community inquiries will be very important.
- Pasco – get out the “No Impact” message, as this is a very positive message for this area.
- Be sure to communicate that there are no new corridors being proposed through conservation lands.

Members identified several other possible organizations to which PEF should consider direct contact, being sure to provide these organizations with at least 2 weeks’ notice:

- Thonotosassa Civic Association
- Thonotosassa –Mango Civic Association
- Sterling Heights Civic Association
- Lake Thonotosassa Civic/Homeowners’ Association
- Keystone Civic Association
- David Ash – Hillsboro County and Shannon Edge with the City of Tampa
- Northdale Civic Association

PEF will communicate with Leadership Team and the Community Working Group when the filing with the DEP is made in June 2008. STAR Group and/or PEF will be back in contact within the next few weeks to schedule the next Community Working Group meeting.

**Leadership Team Roster (Pasco, Pinellas, Hillsborough and Polk)**

<b>First</b>	<b>Last</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>City</b>
W. Elizabeth	Blair	Pasco County Attorney's Office	New Port Richey
Jim	DeGennaro	Central Florida Development Council	Bartow
Deveron	Gibbons	Amscot Financial	Tampa
Stewart	Gibbons	Terrabrook Developers	Land O' Lakes
Ann	Hildebrand	Pasco County Board of County Commissioners	New Port Richey
Susan	Latvala	Pinellas County Board of County Commissioners	Clearwater
Steve	McGlocklin	Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners - Staff	Tampa
Jerry	Miller	Progress Energy Florida	Lake Wales
Manny	Pumariega	Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council	Pinellas Park
Melissa	Seixas	Progress Energy Florida	Clearwater
Mary Jane	Stanley	Pasco Economic Development Council	Lutz
Chris	Steinocher	Tampa Bay Partnership	Tampa
Kevin	White	Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners	Tampa
Mark	Wimberly	Progress Energy Florida	Clearwater



## 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	Pinellas County Utilities Environmental Lands Acquisition and Management Program	New Port Richey
(A) Environmental/Alternative Energy Advocates	Pasco	Ronald	Daniel	Pinellas County Utilities Environmental Lands Acquisition and Management Program	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 Bay Water	Tampa Clearwater
(A) Governmental	Pinellas	Kenneth	Herd	Pasco County	New Port Richey
(A) Governmental	Pasco	Jim	Martin	Pasco County	New Port Richey
(A) Governmental	Pasco	David	Edwards	Hillsborough City - Public Works Right of Way	New Port Richey Tampa
(A) Land Use Planners	Hillsborough	Juan	Lopez	Hillsborough County Planning Commission	Tampa
(A) Land Use Planners	Hillsborough	Paul	Flora	Hillsborough County District School Board of Pasco County	Tampa New Port Richey
(A) Land Use Planners	Hillsborough	William	Lambo	Longleaf Development Company	New Port Richey Odessa
(A) Large Energy Users	Pasco	John	Soler	Newland Southeast Southwest Florida Water Management District	Tampa Odessa
(A) Large Landowners	Hillsborough	Frank	Starkey		Odessa
(A) Large Landowners	Hillsborough	Thomas	Griggs		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