

Appendix K - Summary of Public Comments

The Applicants engaged interested members of the public in a comprehensive public outreach process to discuss Project route segment alternatives. The Applicants encouraged public participation and comment through the entire routing process. Stakeholders used a number of communication tools to provide comments to the Applicants including email, fax, telephone, in-person meetings at open houses, mail, CapX2020 website and comment cards.

A public comment database was developed to organize Project comments received throughout the routing process. The Applicants tracked the comments by issue, contact information and comment follow-up. Table K-1 identifies the number of public comments received by issue. The majority of the comments received were during the open house meetings. The Applicants worked diligently to respond to all public comments in a timely manner.

**Table K-1
Number of Public Comment by Issue**

Comment Issue	Number of Comments	Percent of Comments Received
Aesthetics	16	4
EMF	5	1
General	113	29
Land use	16	4
Need	7	2
Property values	22	5
Public participation	24	6
Routing	78	20
Information requests	72	18
ROW	4	1
Substation	36	10
Total	393	100

* General routing comments include: general project questions, project concerns near personal property, identification of local landmarks and explanation of the state routing process

The following information provides a summary of the type of public comments received at each stage of the Project.

First Open House

The majority of the comments received near the time of the first round of open house meetings were general information requests. Stakeholders were interested in understanding the need and potential impacts of the Project. Some of the common themes of the meetings included comments on routing options, impacts to property value and proximity of Project to residents, environmental resources including river crossings, bird migration and conservation lands and health and safety concerns regarding effects of EMF and stray voltage. The Applicants also received comments regarding how the new transmission

facilities would facilitate generation development in the wind-rich area of the Buffalo Ridge. The Applicants provided information to the public, as requested.

Second Open House

Comments received near the time of the second round of open house meetings were similar to earlier comments received. Stakeholders generally agreed that the Project purpose and need was well explained. Along with comments listed above, people expressed concerns regarding the impacts of residents living outside of the 150 ft ROW from whom an easement will not be acquired, but who may be indirectly impacted by the Project. The Applicants provided information to the public, as requested.

Third Open House

During and shortly after the third round of open house meetings, most of the stakeholders were mainly concerned about the final routing locations and whether a route would be located in proximity to their residences. The maps used at the third round of open house meetings identified two and three routes, depending on location (Refer to Figure 4-5). Several individuals questioned the difference between the two routes. Residents proposed several routing options, which are described in Section 10.4. The Applicants provided maps to several landowners after the third round of open house meetings, as requested and responded to other questions received.

Work Groups

The Applicants held two rounds of work group meetings during the routing process of the Project. The first round of work group meetings provided the public an opportunity to understand the Project and identify routing criteria for different communities along the route. The second round of work group meetings primarily focused on the route options. Please refer to Appendix J for work group meeting information including materials provided to the attendees prior to the meeting and for a list of common themes and meeting minutes.