

# Community Partnership for Energy Planning

## Community Working Group - C

### Meeting Summary

Wildwood Community Center  
March 3, 2008

Time: 11:30 AM to 1:30 PM



## Attendees

<u>CWG Members Present:</u>	<u>Guests Present:</u>
Dwayne Carlton – Ellison Property Management	Gail Simpson – Progress Energy Florida
Kathy Judkins – SECO Energy	
Paul Kalv – City of Leesburg	
Paul Marraffino – Rainbow River Conservation	
Todd Martin – Florida Farm Bureau Federation	
Michael May – Marion County	
Chris McKendree – Florida Department of Environmental Protection	
Albert Peek – Ocala Development, Inc.	
Pete Tesch – Ocala/Marion County EDC	
Aimee Webb – Sumter County Board of County Commissioners	
Larry Watson – Progress Energy Florida	

The Community Working Group (CWG) for Progress Energy’s Community Partnership for Energy Planning held a meeting at the Wildwood Community Center on March 3, 2008. Bill Moye of STAR Group welcomed the CWG members and guests, reviewed the ground rules for the meeting, and reviewed the agenda.

The meeting began with a discussion regarding the Open House meetings that were held in Leesburg, Wildwood and Dunnellon. Members who had attended one or more of the meetings spoke favorably regarding the format and information presented to the public at the Open House meetings. One member remarked that the meetings provided an excellent forum for the public to have questions answered.

Some members asked about the decision not to show the general public the results of the work conducted at the Utility Search Conference (USC) and in particular, why the public was not shown the results of the corridor analysis that the USC participants had conducted. Chris explained that the Project Team had decided on this approach so that the comments received from



Open House participants would not be influenced by the results of the USC and would therefore provide the Project Team with an unbiased set of data.

Chris presented the CWG members with a compilation of the comments received from the Open House meetings. Highlights included the following:

- As of March 3, 2008, 211 Open House comment forms had been received
- Of the 211 respondents, 196 indicated that they were property owners in the area
- 181 respondents indicated that the Open House format was helpful in presenting the project, 9 said that the format was not helpful, and 21 said they were uncertain
- 159 respondents said that the need for the transmission project had been explained adequately, 20 said that the need had not been explained adequately, and 32 were uncertain
- Respondents ranked the 12 transmission corridor selection criteria from most important to least important as follows:
  1. Minimize the number of residences within a corridor and 250 feet from a corridor boundary
  2. Maximize length of corridor where public road right of way or established electrical utility corridors are available
  3. Maximize the length of a corridor where another utility line (such as water, sewer or natural gas lines) exists
  4. Minimize the corridor length through existing parks, recreation areas or other designated conservation lands
  5. Minimize number of parcels or lots crossed by the corridor
  6. Minimize the number of school properties within a corridor and 500 feet from a corridor boundary
  7. Minimize the length through cultural resources (such as historical and archaeological sites)
  8. Minimize length of forested wetlands crossed by a corridor
  9. Minimize number of protected species within a corridor
  10. Minimize herbaceous wetlands crossed by a corridor
  11. Minimize cost of construction for our overall customer base
  12. Minimize number of eagle nests within a half-mile of a corridor boundary
- Of the comments that expressed concerns about the transmission line corridors, 33 expressed general concerns, 3 respondents

specifically mentioned health concerns, 13 specifically mentioned concerns regarding property values, 14 expressed concerns regarding environmental impacts, 3 suggested avoiding populated areas and residents, 40 specifically requested that PEF use the southern corridor near Dunnellon, and 6 requested that PEF use the northern corridor near Dunnellon or some other corridor altogether

The group noted that the issues and concerns raised by the Open House attendees were very similar to those addressed by participants at both the USC and on the CWG. Members advised PEF that PEF will need to offer clear explanations regarding its corridor selection, particularly if the selection differs from the input provided by the USC participants and the Open House attendees.

Finally, members agreed to meet again in either May or June, with the date to be determined and circulated to the members in the next few weeks.

