

# CapX 2020

## MONTICELLO TO ST. CLOUD TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT ROUTING WORK GROUP MEETING 3

**Eagle Trace Golfers Club – Clearwater, Minnesota  
May 21, 2008 – 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.**

---

The meeting took place on May 21, 2008 from 11:00am to 12:00pm at the Eagle Trace Golfers Club in the City of Clearwater, Minnesota. Of the 87 invitees, 23 people had confirmed their attendance in advance for the meeting and 18 actually attended. Table 1 lists both the expected invitees and those who attended.

**Table 1. RWG Meeting Invitees/Attendees**

RSVP	Attended	Organization
Yes	Yes	Landowner
Yes	Yes	Minnesota Department of Transportation (MN DOT)
Yes	Yes	Landowner
Yes	Yes	Landowner
Yes	Yes	Fish Lake Association
Yes	Yes	Fish Lake Association
Yes	Yes	City of St. Cloud
Yes	Yes	City of St. Cloud
Yes	No	Landowner
Yes	No	Landowner
Yes	Yes	Landowner
Yes	Yes	Eagle View Flight-Line
Yes	No	Landowner
Yes	Yes	Landowner
Yes	Yes	Wright Soil & Water Conservation District
Yes	Yes	City of Clearwater
Yes	Yes	Landowner
Yes	Yes	Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
Yes	Yes	Landowner
Yes	Yes	Landowner
Yes	Yes	Landowner
Yes	No	Landowner
Yes	No	Landowner

The following agenda was used for the meeting.

<u>Time</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Presenters</u>
11:00 – 11:05	Welcome and Introductions	Tim Carlsgaard/Darrin Lahr
11:05 – 11:10	Review of Recent Activities	
11:10 – 11:15	Review of March Interactive Exercise	
11:15 – 11:20	Overview of Projects and Regulatory Processes	
11:20 – 11:25	Route Development Process	
11:25 – 11:35	Routing Challenges	Darrin Lahr
11:35 – 11:40	Monticello to St. Cloud – Proposed Routes	
11:45 – 11:45	Open Discussion – Areas of Interest	
11:45 – 11:50	Next Steps	Tim Carlsgaard/Darrin Lahr
11:50 – 12:00	Questions and Answers	

The meeting opened with a review of recent activities. Included in the review, was an explanation of the interactive exercise performed by participants in Routing Work Group 2 meetings and a summary of the results of this exercise. The presentation provided an explanation of the regulatory process for Minnesota, and a review of the criteria that is looked at in conjunction with the route development process. The presentation included discussion on routing challenges within the project area. This exercise helped illustrate some of the routing obstacles in the project area. Following this, the Monticello to St. Cloud proposed routes were presented. 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.

- What is the timeframe for when these lines will be needed?
- Would you put center lines on all remaining proposed routes in the application?
- Are you able to use the interstate for part of the right of way?
- What would be the value if you “buy the farm”?
- How much is the cost for the Monticello to St. Cloud line?
- Is it connecting to the Fargo Power Plant
- Would you ever build another nuclear power plant?

- Are the wind turbines only being used during peak times?
- Why aren't some of the wind turbines turning?
- Are people utilizing individual power sources for homes?

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 3 Meeting Comment Forms**

Organization	Comment(s)
Landowner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would like to receive all mailings. We have not received them before. Thank you in advance.</li> </ul>
Landowner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build more coal power plants</li> </ul>
Landowner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build more coal fired power plants!!!</li> </ul>
Landowner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please include my name on the mailing list.</li> </ul>