

# CapX 2020

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

**Eagle Trace Golfers Club – Clearwater, Minnesota  
March 6, 2008 – 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.**

The meeting was conducted on March 06, 2008 from 11:00am to 1:00pm at the Eagle Trace Golfers Club in the City of Clearwater, Minnesota. Of the 93 invitees, 12 people had confirmed their attendance in advance for the meeting and 14 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.

- How are the sensitivities compared?
- Does double circuiting come into consideration during the route process?
- Can CapX go back to the state once a decision has been made by the PUC?
- Does someone go out and actually verify the routes on the field?
- Are the irrigation pivot systems a priority to avoid?
- What is the physical impact of the line?
- What about EMF's?
- What about ground current?

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

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

<b>Comment(s)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please keep me informed on progress of St. Cloud to Alexandria (Stearns County)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Give me some idea of where the lines are going with fewer meetings.</li> </ul>