

# CapX 2020

## FARGO TO MONTICELLO TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT ROUTING WORK GROUP MEETING 2

**Holiday Inn – Alexandria, Minnesota  
March 5, 2008 – 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.**

The meeting was conducted on March 05, 2008 from 11:00am to 1:00pm at the Holiday Inn in the City of Alexandria, Minnesota. Of the 135 invitees, 12 people had confirmed their attendance in advance for the meeting and 25 actually attended.

The following agenda was followed for the meeting.

<u>Time</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Presenters</u>
10:00 – 10:05	Welcome and Introductions	Tim Carlsgaard/Darrin Lahr
10:05 – 10:10	Review of January Routing Work Groups	
10:10 – 10:25	Interactive Exercise	
11:25 – 11:00	Overview of Projects and Regulatory Processes	Tim Carlsgaard/Darrin Lahr
11:00 – 11:15	Break	
11:15 – 11:25	Review of January Criteria Exercise	Darrin Lahr
11:25 – 11:35	Review of Criteria and Route Development Process	Tim Carlsgaard/Darrin Lahr
11:35 – 11:45	Monticello – St. Cloud Potential Route Alternatives, St. Cloud – Fargo Refined Corridors	
11:45 – 11:50	Next Steps	
11:50 – 12:00	Questions and Answers	

The meeting opened with group introductions and a review of recent activities. The attendees were asked to participate in an interactive exercise. Each group, lead by a facilitator, was asked to participate in routing a line on a fictitious map. This map had many of the same characteristics and land features as the Fargo to Monticello project area. For example, it depicted farmland, center pivot irrigation, airports, wildlife areas, lakes, highways and towns. The groups worked together to discuss their preference for the route and what they chose were recorded by the facilitator. The exercise lasted approximately 15 minutes.

Following the interactive exercise, an overview of the projects and regulatory processes, as well as a review of January criteria exercises were presented. Also presented was a review of the criteria and the route development process where it was explained how the project was split into two pieces. The St. Cloud to Monticello piece was presented as a way to understand the routing methodology that is being used and the subsequent steps that develop the route options

to be included in the applications to the individual states. The presentation concluded with a discussion of the next steps in the project process, as well as a question and answer session.

Questions and comments during the meeting, as transcribed by a representative of the project team, are listed below.

- Who are the people putting together the routes, and are they qualified?
- How do you know what wildlife areas are more important than others?
- You will have unhappy neighbors if you run on private properties vs. federal land or wildlife areas.
- Politics and power industries; public service commission is the way to go.
- All of the people who are concerned about the project, aren't included in the mailing list.
- Does the state determine where the lines are located?
- How much are you (CapX) paying for each transmission line, and is it a one-time payment?
- Are there copies of the maps to give attendees?
- Tax credits are for people exporting power back to utilities.
- How do you (CapX) know which wildlife is more sensitive than others?
- What is part of the 115 split? Would it contain the same kind of construction?
- Does the sold land go on the landowner's tax debt?
- Please construct lines around wetlands.
- How far out of the ROW can you (CapX) construct the line around I-94?
- State highways vs. interstate ROW is preferred if the routes differ.
- Seems like following the existing line would be best.
- What do you (CapX) pay the landowners to use their land?
- Use section lines to route the lines.

Following the meeting, comment forms were returned from nine attendees. A summary of the comment forms are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2. Routing Work Group Meeting 2 Questionnaire and Comment Form**

Comment(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanks for trying to come up with a logical, fair formula to make decisions regarding the potential sites.</li> <li>• Hopefully the state will replicate your process</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well prepared meeting.</li> <li>• Your project team was able to defuse some potential</li> </ul>

argumentative situations.

- If possible, use straight section lines even through wildlife
- Conducting public meetings is the right way to go.
- The I-94 corridor from St. Joe to Sauk Centre has very little in common with the I-90 corridor.
- Work Group 2 was very informative
- The routing exercise was helpful to discuss issues and the problems the routes may incur.