Community Partnership for Energy Planning

Community Working Group - C

Meeting Summary

Wildwood Community Center
January 7, 2008
Time: 11:30 AM to 1:30 PM
Chris Kenny of STAR Group welcomed the Community Working Group (CWG) members and guests, reviewed the ground rules for the meeting, and reviewed the agenda.

Chris advised the group that the possible new members to the CWG that were identified at the November 27, 2007 meeting had not yet been reached but would be contacted as soon as possible. Individuals who sought to join the CWG would be evaluated based on several factors, including their ability to represent a broad stakeholder interest (vs. their own, very narrow interest) as well as the degree to which they bring a stakeholder perspective not presently represented on the CWG.

Members discussed the need to revise the dates and locations for the Informational Open House meetings and decided on the following locations (each Open House would be held from 4 – 8 p.m.):
The CWG agreed that email is the most effective communication method for updates, meeting notices, etc., but members said they would appreciate a reminder call prior to each CWG event.

Gail Simpson reviewed the Open House format. For the Group C area over 10,000 property owners will be invited who fall within the 1-mile width corridors under study. Advertisements will be made in local newspapers. Notifications will also be provided to:

- City/County Planning Departments
- Local Elected Officials
- Water Management Districts
- Regional Planning Councils
- Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)
- 1000 Friends
- Audubon Society
- Sierra Club
- Nature Conservancy
- City & County Clerks
- All USC nominees and participants
- Business owners (not just landlords)

The CWG agreed the invitation should come from both Progress Energy and the Community Partnership for Energy Planning.

The format and content of the Open House was discussed. Members of the CWG offered the following suggestions:

- The Leadership Team and CWG members should be identified by their organization and city.
- Dual-use opportunities for Right of Ways (ROW) should be included as an open house topic and an expert on the topic should be present at the Open House. Gail committed to put together a one-page handout on the multiple use of ROW.
- Information on the actual construction timeline should be available (in anticipation of the question: “When will you be coming thorough here with the lines?”) also be included.
• There is a need to address the question: How will PEF be keeping people informed after the open house meetings?
• There is also a need for extensive information on undergrounding including subjects such as cost, operational impacts, environmental impacts, and equipment life.
• It was also felt that cost information be provided on the project itself and the difference between overhead and underground construction.
• From the USC event the topic of distance requirements (homeland security) would be very important to present.
• The CWG felt some important things to bring up about the community input process itself:
  • It will be important for community members to know that representatives from their local distribution utility participated in the USC event.
  • Need to present the criteria developed by and used by the USC participants in determining their recommendations.
  • The wide variety of stakeholders represented in the process.
  • Be certain the communication to different groups is identical (at least consistent).

The results of the Open Houses will be brought back to the next CWG meeting and Progress Energy will have representatives from their transmission group and their outside siting consultant, Golder, to review the Open House results with the CWG.

The topic of the Transmission Planning Organization (TPO) was discussed because it was one of the highest priority items from the USC. The CWG provided the following input:

• Be sure PEF planning includes/engages existing agencies in this geographic area. There are many existing planning groups that can be coordinated with.
• Although the USC recommended the formation of an entirely new TPO, the CWG felt it was more practical and desirable that PEF become more involved with existing planning agenciesorganizations.
• When considering a major project, PEF needs to conduct an analysis internally to determine which local agencies should be involved for the specific project.
• Given the diversity of the CWG, the CWG may fulfill the purpose of the recommendation that a TPO be formed.
• PEF also needs to keep up consistent communications with local and regional planning agencies.
• PEF needs to define what information PEF needs/wants from local governments.
• PEF needs to participate in the local and regional planning process on an ongoing basis, not just whenever it plans to build something. By remaining active, PEF and the planning agencies can work together to anticipate needs.
• PEF needs to be communicating with DCA’s.
• PEF might be able to significantly improve communications outside of the formal regulatory process, particularly since there is no formal channel from the FRCC to the local planning agencies.

The next CWG meeting will be held at the Wildwood Community Center on March 3, 2008 from 11:30 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

CWG members are encouraged to attend and participate in the Open Houses. It would be helpful if CWG members could help direct people to the right information station and be there to discuss the community involvement process.

Finally, the group went through the “Plus/Delta” exercise about today’s CWG meeting:

Plus
  + Good interaction/communication
  + Defined open house (date, content)
  + Clarified TPO recommendation
  + Clarified CWG membership

Delta
  △ Need more carrot cake