Scoping Summary Report

Great Northern Transmission Line Environmental Impact Statement

Prepared for
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability
Washington, DC 20585

Minnesota Department of Commerce
Energy Environmental Review and Analysis
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
Saint Paul, MN 55101

Cooperating Agencies:
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

November 2014

Scoping Summary Report

September 2014

Contents

1.0 Introduction 1

1.1 Overview 1

1.2 Joint Federal and State Environmental Review 3

1.3 Public Outreach 3

1.4 Cooperating Agencies 4

1.5 Participating Agencies 5

1.6 Workgroup 5

1.7 Project Chronology to Date for the Federal/State EIS Scoping Processes for the Project 7

1.8 Purpose and Need 8

1.9 Applicant's Project Description 9

2.0 Scoping Comments 10

2.1 Alternative Route Segments/Alignment Modifications Proposed during Scoping 26

List of Tables

Table 1-1 Summary of Scoping Meetings 4
Table 2-1 Summary of Scoping Comments Received by DOE and DOC-EERA 11
Table 2-2 Directory of Stakeholder Comments 20

List of Figures

Figure 1-1 Project Regional Map 2
Figure 2-1 Summary of Requested Alternative Route Segments and Alignment Modifications 27

List of Appendices

Appendix A Federal Register Notice
Appendix B Newspaper Advertisements and Affidavits
Appendix C Public Scoping Meeting Transcripts
Appendix D Scoping Comment Letters
Appendix E Summary of Workgroup Meetings
Appendix F Requested Alternative Route Segments and Alignment Modifications Figures

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AC	Alternating Current
ATF	Advisory Task Force
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CON	Certificate of Need
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
EERA	Energy Environmental Review and Analysis
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EMF	electric and magnetic fields
EO	Executive Order
kV	kilovolt
LUG	Local Unit of Government
MW	megawatt
MnDNR	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
MN PUC	Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NOI	Notice of Intent
NWI	National Wetland Inventory
PPSA	Power Plant Siting Act
ROW	Right-of-way
SNA	Scientific and Natural Area
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
WMA	Wildlife Management Area
WMMPB	Western Mesabi Mine Planning Board

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Overview

On April 15, 2014, Minnesota Power, an operating division of ALLETE, Inc., applied to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) for a Presidential permit[1] for a new 235-270 mile long, 500-kilovolt alternating current (AC) high-voltage transmission line that would cross the border between the United States and Canada in Roseau County, Minnesota. After crossing the border, the transmission line would connect into the Minnesota Power Blackberry Substation near Grand Rapids, Minnesota (Figure 1-1). The DOE's National Electricity Delivery Division, in the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability (OE-20), is responsible for issuing Presidential permits. The Presidential permit for Minnesota Power (OE Docket Number PP-398), if issued, would authorize Minnesota Power to construct, operate, maintain, and connect the U.S. portion of the project.

On the same date, Minnesota Power also filed an application for a route permit with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (MN PUC). Under the Minnesota Power Plant Siting Act (PPSA), the MN PUC must determine the route for any proposed transmission line of 100 kilovolt (kV) or more and greater than 1,500 feet in length. As part of the route permit, the MN PUC will also list any conditions it will require for constructing, operating and maintaining the project. The MN PUC found the route permit application complete on July 2, 2014.

Through a separate Certificate of Need (CON) process, the MN PUC must also determine whether there is a need for a transmission line, and establish the size, type and required end points of the Project. Minnesota Power filed its CON application for the Great Northern Transmission Line (GNTL) Project with the MN PUC on October 22, 2013, and anticipates a decision by May 2015.

A project overview is provided in Section 1.9, and additional project details are provided in Minnesota Power's April 15, 2014, application letter to DOE. All of these documents are available on the DOE/DOC project website at http://www.greatnortherneis.org, the Minnesota Department of Commerce (DOC) e-dockets website (https://www.edockets.state.mn.us/EFiling/edockets/searchDocuments.do?method=showeDocketsSearch&showEdocket=true), docket number E015/TL-14-21), the DOC-EERA website (http://mn.gov/commerce/energyfacilities/#ui-tabs-3, docket number 14-21), and additional project information is also available on the Minnesota Power's website at http://greatnortherntransmissionline.com. Figure 1-1 shows the two major route alternatives proposed by Minnesota Power.

[1] In accordance with Executive Order (EO) 10485, as amended by EO 12038, and the regulations codified at 10 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 205.320 et seq. (2000), "Application for Presidential Permit Authorizing the Construction, Connection, Operation, and Maintenance of Facilities for Transmission of Electric Energy at International Boundaries."

1.2 Joint Federal and State Environmental Review

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), when considering an application for a Presidential permit the DOE must take into account possible environmental impacts of the proposed facility. DOE has determined that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is the appropriate level of environmental review. Therefore, an EIS will be prepared in compliance with NEPA and DOE's implementing regulations, 10 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 1021.

In addition, under the PPSA, the MN PUC must also determine the route for the proposed line and any conditions it will require for construction, operation, and maintenance. As part of this MN PUC Route Permit decision-making process, a state EIS must be prepared.

In order to avoid duplication, DOE and the Minnesota DOC-Energy Environmental Review and Analysis (DOC–EERA) will prepare a single EIS to comply with environmental review requirements under NEPA and the PPSA. DOE will act as federal joint lead agency with DOC-EERA acting as state joint lead agency per 40 CFR 1501.5(b). DOC–EERA prepares EISs for proposed high-voltage transmission lines pursuant to Minnesota Statute Section 216E.03, Subdivision 5.

DOE and DOC-EERA have implemented a joint planning and scoping process to encourage agency and public involvement in the review of the Project, and to identify the range of reasonable alternatives. The public outreach process is designed to facilitate public discussion of the scope of appropriate issues to be addressed in the EIS.

1.3 Public Outreach

On June 27, 2014, DOE published in the *Federal Register* its Notice of Intent (NOI) to Prepare an EIS and to Conduct Public Scoping Meetings; Notice of Floodplains and Wetlands Involvement for the Great Northern Transmission Line (79 FR 36493). The NOI, provided in Appendix A, explained that DOE would be assessing potential environmental impacts and issues associated with the Project and reasonable alternatives. The NOI was sent to interested parties including federal, state, and local officials; agency representatives; stakeholder organizations; local libraries, newspapers, and radio and TV stations; and private individuals in the vicinity of the proposed transmission line. Issuance of the NOI commenced a 45-day public scoping period that ended on August 15, 2014. However, the NOI did note that comments submitted after the deadline "would be considered to the extent practicable."

Minnesota Power placed advertisements in 11 local and regional newspapers along the Project corridor to invite the public to local scoping meetings and to announce their times and locations. Copies of newspaper tear sheets and affidavits are included in Appendix B and are available at the DOC e-dockets website (https://www.edockets.state.mn.us/EFiling/edockets/searchDocuments.do?method=showeDocketsSearch&showEdocket=true, e-dockets number 14-21, document ID 20149-103236-01).

During the public scoping period, DOE and DOC conducted eight scoping meetings (Figure 1-1). Table 1-1 provides the dates and locations where scoping meetings were held.

Table 1-1 Summary of Scoping Meetings

Meeting Date and Time	Location	Number of Attendees
July 16, 2014, 11:00 AM	Roseau Civic Center, Roseau, Minnesota	22
July 16, 2014, 6:00 PM	Lake of the Woods School, Baudette, Minnesota	6
July 17, 2014, 11:00 AM	Littlefork Community Center, Littlefork, Minnesota	12
July 17, 2014, 6:00 PM	AmericInn, International Falls, Minnesota	4
July 23, 2014, 11:00 AM	Kelliher Public School, Kelliher, Minnesota	7
July 23, 2014, 6:00 PM	Bigfork School, Bigfork, Minnesota	17
July 24, 2014, 11:00 AM	Sawmill Inn, Grand Rapids, Minnesota	19
July 24, 2014, 6:00 PM	Sawmill Inn, Grand Rapids, Minnesota	20

The meetings provided the public with the opportunity to learn more about the project and to provide comments on potential environmental issues associated with the project. A total of 46 people gave oral comments at the meetings, and their comments were transcribed by a court stenographer.

Transcripts of the oral comments at the scoping meetings scoping meetings are provided in Appendix C and are available at http://greatnortherneis.org, the DOC e-dockets website (https://www.edockets.state.mn.us/EFiling/edockets/searchDocuments.do?method=showeDocketsSearch&showEdocket=true, e-dockets number 14-21), and the DOC-EERA website at http://mn.gov/commerce/energyfacilities//resource.html?Id=33954. DOE and DOC received scoping comments in the form of 122 written letters, emails, or website submittals from private citizens, government agencies, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).

The comment letters received during the scoping period and written materials submitted for the record at the scoping meetings are provided in Appendix D and are also available at http://greatnortherneis.org, the DOC e-dockets website (https://www.edockets.state.mn.us/EFiling/edockets/searchDocuments.do?method=showeDocketsSearch&showEdocket=true, e-dockets number 14-21) and the DOC-EERA website at http://mn.gov/commerce/energyfacilities//resource.html?Id=33954. DOE and DOC's Draft EIS will also contain a subsection that summarizes the comments received during the scoping period.

1.4 Cooperating Agencies

DOE has invited several federal agencies to participate in the preparation of the EIS to ensure that it satisfies those agencies' environmental requirements and to engage their specialized expertise. The federal cooperating agencies are the St. Paul District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Region 5 of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Twin Cities Ecological Field Office (Region 3) of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

The following outlines each agency's requirements for the EIS:

USACE. The USACE will use the EIS in their decision making for the permits that would be required under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. In accordance with 33 CFR Part 325 Appendix B (8)(c), the USACE will coordinate with DOE to ensure the project EIS in supports USACE's decision making requirements on the Section 10 and Section 404 permit application by Minnesota Power.

USEPA. Under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, the EPA is required to review and publicly comment on the environmental impacts of major federal actions. EPA also has responsibilities under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. In addition, the EPA administers various statutes and regulations, including, but not limited to, the Safe Drinking Water Act; the Pollution Prevention Act; the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act; and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act.

EPA involvement as a cooperating agency will include: 1) participation in relevant project meetings and calls and 2) review and comment on preliminary documents to the extent that staff resources allow. However, EPA will exercise its independent review and comment authorities on the Draft and Final EISs consistent with EPA responsibilities under NEPA and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

USFWS. The USFWS role as a cooperating agency will include evaluation of environmental impacts on fish and wildlife, in general. They will also evaluate potential environmental impacts on federally listed threatened and endangered species and designated critical habitat and might issue a Biological Opinion based on a potential Biological Assessment prepared for the project.

1.5 Participating Agencies

Other federal agencies may participate in the EIS process, although not as Cooperating Agencies under NEPA (as defined in 36 CFR 1501.6).

1.6 Workgroup

Pursuant to the PPSA the MN PUC may appoint an advisory task force (ATF) as an aid to the environmental review process (Minnesota Statutes 2014, section 216E.08). An ATF must include representatives of local governmental units in the project area. An ATF typically assists DOC-EERA staff with identifying specific impacts and alternative routes and sites to be evaluated in the EIS for the project. An ATF expires upon designation of alternative routes to be included in the EIS (Minnesota Rules, part 7850.2400).

In its July 2, 2014, Order (DOC e-docket number 20147-101165-01) accepting the Route Permit Application as complete the MN PUC authorized the formation (structure and charge) of an ATF.

Subsequently the MN PUC concluded that for this docket an alternative approach to the ATF for gathering public input was necessary (see the DOC e-dockets website https://www.edockets.state.mn.us/EFiling/edockets/searchDocuments.do?method=showeDocketsSearch&showEdocket=true, document ID 20149-103259-01). The MN PUC amended its previous order (https://www.edockets.state.mn.us, e-dockets number 14-21, document ID 20144-98464-01) to remove

the ATF structure and charge, and approved instead the workgroup process. The purpose of the Workgroup is primarily to provide an additional opportunity for local government representatives to discuss their concerns, develop potential alternative route segments, review potential zoning conflicts, and ensure local input necessary for informed decision-making.

The MN PUC requested the DOC-EERA to conduct a minimum of two workgroup meetings and consult directly with local units of government (LUGs) within the project area. The DOC-EERA held two four-hour Workgroup meetings in Grand Rapids Minnesota on September 30 and October 29, 2014. In addition to the two meetings, Workgroup members were provided a scoping questionnaire designed to assist Workgroup members in identifying ordinances, land use planning, or zoning issues. Workgroup meeting agendas and minutes as well as LUG/NGO Scoping Questionnaire responses are provided in Appendix E.

The primary concerns expressed by Workgroup members at the outset of the Workgroup meetings were related to the routing process and potential impacts on the Workgroup members' constituents. Through discussion during the two Workgroup sessions, the following issues and themes were identified:

- Roseau County representatives expressed the Roseau County Board's preference for Minnesota Power's proposed route through Roseau County. They indicated an understanding of the constraints Minnesota Power faces at the border crossing and expressed support, given these constraints, for Minnesota Power's proposed amended border crossing. In addition, they expressed opposition to alternative route segments proposed for the Roseau County area during scoping due to human settlement and private property use (particularly agricultural) impacts associated with these alternative route segments.

- Concerns were raised by a number of Workgroup members regarding visual impacts to the Big Bog State Recreation Area. The Waskish Township/Big Bog State Recreation Area representative advocated for the EIS to include an assessment of impacts to the Big Bog State Recreation Area and boardwalk as well as detailed discussion of mitigation measures to address impacts in this area.

- The benefits of following existing transmission corridors and the feasibility of following existing corridors through Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR) Scientific and Natural Areas (SNA), including the Red Lake Peatland SNA was considered at length.

- Impacts to outstanding natural resources including the Bear-Wolf Peatland (MnDNR Minnesota Biological Survey preliminary site of high biodiversity significance) were identified as a concern. These issues as well as minimizing habitat fragmentation through corridor sharing were highlighted, particularly by the Izaac Walton League representative.

- Lawrence and Balsam Township representatives expressed their opposition to the Orange Route and emphasized the significance of potential impacts to these communities and their residents if the Orange Route is permitted.

- Concerns were raised over potential impacts to mining resources. Through the Trout Lake township representative, Western Mesabi Mine Planning Board (WMMPB) communicated their position that siting and other aspects of Project development should consider WMMPB's objective of allowing future mining without encumbrance, delay, or cost.
- In a number of areas, minor adjustments to alternative route segments or alignment modifications proposed during the scoping period (detailed in the meeting minutes in Appendix E) were suggested to minimize overall impacts to residents.

Workgroup efforts culminated in the development of a Workgroup resolution, putting forth the following five recommendations that reflect the group's consensus:

- This is a public purpose project and should therefore be routed as much as possible on public land, minimizing impact to human settlement and private property use.
- As much as practical and feasible, the route should follow existing infrastructure corridors.
- At this time the Workgroup prefers the Blue Route (as modified by Minnesota Power's amended border crossing) over the Orange Route.
- The Workgroup would like the DOC-EERA to investigate the legality of following an existing transmission line corridor through an SNA as an alternative route. If routing through an SNA is a legally viable option, the Workgroup proposes an alternative route segment following the existing Northern States Power 500 kV line through the Red Lake Peatland SNA and the Lost River Peatland SNA and recommends analysis of this additional route alternative in the EIS.
- The Workgroup would like to put forth two alternative routes for consideration during scoping.

1.7 Project Chronology to Date for the Federal/State EIS Scoping Processes for the Project

The following timeline summarizes the scoping process events previously described:

April 15, 2014	DOE received Minnesota Power's application for Presidential permit.
April 15, 2014	DOC-EERA received Minnesota Power's application for a route permit.
April 18, 2014	MN PUC issued a notice seeking comments on if the route permit application was complete and if an ATF should be appointed.
June 27, 2014	DOE issued *Federal Register* NOI (79 FR 36493) to prepare an EIS. Federal EIS scoping starts.
July 2, 2014	MN PUC released its Order on the completeness of the route permit application and authorized the DOC-EERA to establish three ATFs.
July 16 to 24, 2014	Eight public scoping meetings held in various locations in Minnesota (Table 1-1).

August 8, 2014	DOC-EERA requested the MN PUC reconsider question of ATFs.
August 15, 2014	Scoping comment period ended.
August 22, 2014	MN PUC comment period on need for ATFs ended.
September 11, 2014	MN PUC reconsidered the question of ATFs.
September 30, 2014	DOC-EERA conducted the first Workgroup meeting in Grand Rapids.
October 29, 2014	DOC-EERA conducted the second Workgroup meeting in Grand Rapids.
November 4, 2014	DOC-EERA requested comments from the Workgroup members on the write-up and figures that summarize the two Workgroup meetings.
November 6, 2014	Workgroup comment period ended.
November 7, 2014	Scoping Summary Report released.

1.8 Purpose and Need

Manitoba Hydro has excess electricity capacity that is available for export to the United States. The underlying need for this transmission line project, therefore, is to increase the amount of electrical capacity that can be delivered from Manitoba Hydro's hydroelectric stations in Manitoba to Minnesota Power and other utilities in the United States. The project would also improve grid reliability on both sides of the border.

In its CON application, Minnesota Power states that the project is needed to deliver 383 megawatts (MW), including the 250-MW PPA and the 133-MW Renewable Optimization Agreement, of hydropower and wind-storage energy products to serve Minnesota Power. The project is also needed to provide additional hydropower capacity and energy to other utilities, thereby meeting long-term state and regional energy needs. While large hydropower transfers like this do not satisfy the current renewable energy mandates in Minnesota, such a hydropower transfer could support compliance with future carbon regulations as well as help meet renewable energy requirements for utilities in Wisconsin and other states.

To meet this underlying need, Minnesota Power proposes to construct, operate, and maintain an approximately 220-mile, overhead, single-circuit, 500-kV AC transmission line between the Minnesota-Manitoba border crossing northwest of Roseau, Minnesota, and a new Blackberry 500/230/115 kV Substation near Grand Rapids, Minnesota. The project is described in detail in its April 15, 2014, application letter to DOE which is available on the DOE project website at http://www.greatnortherneis.org. Minnesota Power has determined that the original proposed border crossing is no longer feasible and on October 29th Minnesota Power submitted a letter to DOE and DOC-EERA amending their proposed border crossing (Figure 1-1).

In its CON process, the MN PUC is responsible for determining whether the project is needed, as well as the size, type and required end points of the project. Minnesota Power filed its CON application for the

Project with the MN PUC on October 22, 2013, and anticipates a decision by May 2015 (see http://mn.gov/commerce/energyfacilities/Docket.html?Id=33608). Although the EIS will include an analysis of a "No Action" alternative, it will not assess alternative ways to meet the underlying project need. These issues will be determined in the Minnesota CON process.

1.9 Applicant's Project Description

The project would be located on all new right-of-way (ROW) that would be approximately 200-feet wide, with a wider ROW required for certain spans at angle and corner structures, for guyed structures, or where special design requirements are dictated by topography. Steel lattice tower structure (free-standing towers constructed in a crisscrossed pattern of steel beams) types and configurations would be considered for the project to accommodate variations in terrain and land use including a self-supporting lattice structure, a lattice guyed-V structure, and a lattice guyed delta structure. Minnesota Power currently estimates approximately 4 to 5 structures per mile of transmission line with towers spaced approximately 1,000 to 1,450 feet apart, with shorter or longer spans as necessary.

The type of structure in any given section of transmission line would be dependent on land type, land use, and potential effect on the surrounding landscape, and would typically range in height from approximately 100 feet above ground to approximately 150 feet above ground. In some instances, such as where the project crosses an existing transmission line, taller structures would be required. In cultivated lands, Minnesota Power would use self-supporting lattice structures so as not to interfere with existing land use.

Minnesota Power proposes to expand the site of its existing Blackberry 230/115 kV Substation near Grand Rapids, Minnesota, to incorporate a new Blackberry 500 kV Substation, which would be constructed adjacent to and east of the existing substation. The 500 kV Substation would accommodate the new 500 kV line, existing 230 kV lines, and all associated 500 kV and 230 kV equipment. Additionally, the project would require construction of a new 500 kV Series Compensation Station, which would be located within or adjacent to the final route approved by the State of Minnesota, and would include the 500 kV series capacitor banks necessary for reliable operation and performance of the proposed transmission line, and all associated equipment.

The final location for the 500 kV Series Compensation Station would be determined by electric design optimization studies and final route selection. The Applicant has initiated the electric design optimization studies to identify generally what would be a preferred location of the 500 kV Series Compensation Station along the final route permitted by the state. Based on these studies, candidate sites in Minnesota include the overall midpoint of the line and at one-third of the overall transmission line distance from Blackberry to the existing Dorsey Substation in Manitoba, Canada. Minnesota Power will provide more information on these studies and the preferred location of the 500 kV Series Compensation Station when available.

2.0 Scoping Comments

Minnesota Power's two proposed routes largely avoid farms and residences by following existing transmission corridors through forested wetland and upland areas. Therefore, many comments on the scope of the EIS focused on ways to minimize unavoidable conflicts with forested areas and the associated natural resources. Other comments focused on potential conflicts with airports or seaplane landing areas on nearby lakes. Many commenters, particularly those with property in the more populated area near Grand Rapids, proposed alternative route segments or mitigation on one route or another that could reduce or eliminate visual, health or other impacts that they believe would impair their quality of life or their use of their a specific property.

DOE and DOC-EERA will consider the content of all comments in determining the scope of the EIS.A summary of the comments received during the scoping period is provided in Table 2-1, which identifies the major issues raised, arranged by general topic. Table 2-2 presents a list of the individuals or organizations who submitted scoping comments along with the date each comment was received by DOE, DOC-EERA, or MN PUC.

The Draft EIS will also contain a subsection that summarizes the comments received during scoping. For the purposes of this Scoping Report, the comments are paraphrased and condensed from the actual comments; however, the environmental analysis included in the EIS will rely on the full text of the comments as submitted by the commenters.

Table 2-1 Summary of Scoping Comments Received by DOE and DOC-EERA

Subject Area	Comment Summary
Regulatory Process	*Purpose and Need*. Seven commenters questioned whether the project was really needed for various reasons, including that capacity of the line is larger than required for Minnesota Power's purchase agreement, that Minnesota Power has already met its statutory renewable energy goals, and that there is another transmission system option that might meet the need instead. One commenter pointed out that the need issue is determined through the MN PUC CON process, and encouraged citizens to participate in that process if they are concerned about whether the project is needed. *EIS Process:* Seven commenters, including state and federal agencies, commented on their expectations for the EIS and related regulatory processes, including requesting details on alternative route screening criteria, requesting that the process be transparent, and requesting clarification of the roles of the Applicant and the various agencies involved. The EPA pointed out they have a review role for a federal EIS under the Clean Air Act. One commenter specifically requested information on whether the MnDNR could on its own change or request review of routes already screened out by Minnesota Power in its route permit application. *Permits*. Ten commenters either identified that permits that will be required or requested information about how and what type of conditions can be included in the state route permit. The MnDNR and the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) provided information about their permits and permit requirements. Other commenters requested information about the state route permit as well as the applicability of local zoning in that process. One comment asked if and how the route could be made more specific that the allowed route width, and another comments suggested the route permit application did not contain the information required by the applicable rules. C*onnected Action.* One commenter asked that the EIS include an analysis of the environmental impacts of future transmission lines to Wisconsin or Michigan that may rely on this project to move the power to connecting substations. That commenter also requested an analysis of how the energy will be in states to the east of Minnesota Power's service area, such as Wisconsin or Michigan.

Subject Area	Comment Summary
Proposed Action and Alternatives (Alternatives, Route Preference)	*Alternatives Analysis*. Thirty-three commenters proposed modifications to one or both of the Applicant's two proposed routes. However, some of these proposed alternative segments were in Canada, which is outside the jurisdiction of both the State of Minnesota and DOE. These proposed alternative route segments include construction in or adjacent to existing transmission line and utility corridors, highway ROWs (e.g., Highway 7, 65, or 53), using mostly non-private lands (federal, state, county, businesses), or along the Canadian side of the border. Several commenters generally suggested that the route should go through western Minnesota, but these commenters did not propose a specific route. Seven commenters noted that the EIS should identify and evaluate alternative border crossings for the transmission line, evaluate constraints at the border crossing, and discuss the process and factors used by Minnesota Power to narrow the range of alternative routes and border crossing locations, specifically why certain alternatives have been carried forward for NEPA analysis while other alternatives and border crossing locations were eliminated. Two commenters noted that the EIS should evaluate the concept of distributed generation and double-circuiting as a way to reduce the need for transmission lines.

Subject Area	Comment Summary
Biological Resources (Environmental Impacts, Forest Service Lands, Soils, State Lands, Vegetation, Wildlife)	*State/Federal/Protected Lands*. Eight commenters expressed concern regarding impacts to State Administered Lands, Sites of Biodiversity Significance (including preliminary sites), SNAs, Watershed Protection Areas, Wildlife Management Areas (WMA), old growth forest on state lands (Ecologically Important Lowland Conifers and Lowland Conifer Old Growth), Minnesota Biological Survey calcareous fens, Important Bird Areas, National Natural Landmarks, State Recreation Areas, High Conservation Value State Forest, Great Gray Owl Management Area, USFWS Interest Lands, and Reinvest in Minnesota Lands. Five commenters suggested the route should pass through SNAs in the existing corridor or on other state land. *Wildlife*. Thirty-three commenters expressed concern about impacts to wildlife species including wood bison, wolf, birds, deer, poweshiek skipperling, northern long-eared bat, bald eagle, osprey, goshawk, moose, and/or Canada lynx, as well as issues related to wildlife habitat/fragmentation, including mitigation for potential habitat/fragmentation impacts. *Vegetation*. Thirteen commenters expressed concern over clearing trees/forest in general and/or in old growth forests, particularly cedar forests. One commenter noted that the EIS should provide information on ROW maintenance, with regard to identifying danger trees falling into the ROW, and whether it's possible to have a harvestable product at the time of ROW maintenance intervals in forested areas. Four commenters expressed concern of invasive species, including plants and earthworms, and that the EIS should discuss potential mitigation efforts for those impacts. Three commenters expressed concern of impacts to rare plant species and recommended that a rare plant survey be completed. *Other Topics*. Two commenters noted that the EIS should discuss other environmental related topics including impacts related to compression of peat soils and watershed level impacts.
Visual Resources (Aesthetics, Viewshed/Scenery)	*General*. Seven commenters noted that the EIS should address general aesthetic and viewshed impacts. *Impact Analysis*. Five commenters noted that the EIS should address aesthetic and visual impacts at specific locations, including Voyagers National Park, Roseau River WMA, Itasca County Bass Lake Park, Bear Lake, and Bigfork River. Three commenters noted that the EIS should address aesthetic and visual impacts at Big Bog State Recreation Area, with one of these commenters noting that the EIS should include a viewshed analysis (with scaled visual renditions on what one would expect to see) for the Big Bog State Recreation Area's Fire Tower and Bog Walk boardwalk. Two commenters noted that the EIS should address impacts to viewsheds and aesthetics associated with forest clearing.

Subject Area	Comment Summary
Land Use and Infrastructure (Airports, Traffic/Transportation, Land Resource Management, Private Property/Land Use)	*Airports*. Thirteen commenters noted that the EIS should address the proximity of the Project to existing aviation facilities (runways, air strips, and water takeoff/landing areas), including the Piney Pinecreek Border Airport, Waskish Airport, William Gray Airfield, Deer Lake, and Lawrence Lake. Four commenters noted that the EIS should address impacts on future planned runways and air strips. One commenter noted that the EIS should address effects of crop dusting flight paths on wild rice leases. One commenter noted that the EIS should address Life Flight Air Ambulance landing sites. *Traffic/Transportation*. One commenter noted that the EIS should address project effects on transportation systems, including highway maintenance and expansion, as well as compliance with the MnDOT's Utility Accommodation Policy. One commenter noted that the EIS should address noise, traffic, and road condition impacts on Diamond Lake Road. *Land Resource Management*. One commenter noted that the EIS should address project impacts on existing MnDNR plans for prescribed burns in the Roseau Lake WMA, as well as project potential for igniting wildfires and the necessary response actions. One commenter noted that the EIS should address impacts of herbicide runoff onto adjacent lands associated with transmission line maintenance. *Private Property/Land Use*. Five commenters noted that the EIS should address impacts associated with the project's proximity to existing and planned residences. Five commenters noted that the EIS should address impacts to private land-based livelihoods (such as farming, hunting, foraging, recreation, and artistries). Three commenters noted that the EIS should address the applicability of eminent domain related to the project. Three commenters noted that the EIS should address impacts on property values. Two commenters noted that the EIS should address impacts to privacy, including private roadway access. Two commenters noted that the EIS should address general impacts to private property and residential areas. Two commenters noted that they would like their land to be purchased if crossed by the Project, and two noted that they would like to trade lands with Minnesota if their property is impacted. One commenter noted that the EIS should address impacts associated with different route alignments on potential future expansion of the Balsam Bible Chapel. One commenter noted that the EIS should use current land ownership maps.
Cultural Resources (Historic/Cultural, Tribal Issues	*Transmission Line Cultural Resources*. Four commenters noted that the EIS should evaluate the impacts of construction on historic resources along the transmission line route, including Conservation Corps Camp 53, logging camps, Big Fork River historic and cultural areas, and cultural resources affected by the construction of the dam to support hydroelectric power development in Manitoba, Canada. Two commenters noted that documentation needs to be developed regarding Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, which includes but is not limited to, consultation with the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office, the potentially affected tribes, and Tribal Historic Preservation Officers.

Subject Area	Comment Summary
Health and Safety (Health and Safety, National Security)	*General Health and Safety*. A total of twenty-three commenters expressed concern about various health and safety issues, including electric and magnetic fields, effects on animals, airplane and helicopter operations, snowmobile safety, hunting safety, pacemaker operation safety, grid security issues from intentional attacks at substations, and potential for increased lightning strikes. *Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMFs).* Most comments regarding health and safety focused on EMF concerns and requested information on the health effects on children and others, such as effects on immune systems or potential relationship to increasing cancer rates. Stray voltage issues were also raised by two commenters. *Cardiac pacemakers*. Two commenters requested a complete investigation of the potential interference with pacemakers due to the electric fields from the line. *Airports, airplane and helicopter safety*. Two comments specifically expressed concerns about a conflict with the Bill Gray airstrip near Little Fork; two others requested analysis of how hospital (particularly near Balsam Lake Township) and other helicopter operations might be affected by the various routes under consideration. *Hunting*. Three commenters requested a review of how a route might increase hunting in the cleared ROW, thereby increasing the potential for accidental hunting accidents near the new line. One comment expressed concern that hunters might accidentally shoot transformers or the line if they are too near duck hunting areas.
Air Quality and Noise (Air Quality, Noise)	*Air Quality Analysis*. Two commenters raised concerns about air quality. One commenter requested that the EIS address the net effect of the project on air pollution and greenhouse gas production including an evaluation of net greenhouse gas production/sequestration associated with terrestrial carbon cycle impacts. This commenter also requested an analysis addressing the project's potential effect on all criteria pollutants and any significant concentrations of hazardous air pollutants particularly in the context of the protection of public health. *Noise*. Five commenters mentioned concerns about noise and three of these comments focused on substation noise. In particular, it was requested that the EIS identify existing noise levels in the project area, particularly at proposed substation locations, assess increases in both short-term and long-term noise levels associated with the project, and identify mitigation measures that will be implemented to address project related noise.

Subject Area	Comment Summary
Water Resources (Water/Wetlands)	*Water Quality*. Six commenters expressed concern over impacts on water quality resulting from herbicide spraying during ROW maintenance, use of hazardous solvents during construction and maintenance, and construction related erosion and sedimentation. One commenter noted that the EIS should identify impaired waters and whether project activities would negatively contribute to the impairments. One commenter noted that the EIS should address issues related to and mitigation for work that would occur in an identified wellhead (drinking) protection zone. *Surface Water and Wetlands*. Eight commenters expressed concern over impacts to streams, lakes, and wetlands and suggested that the EIS assess direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to water resources. One commenter noted that the EIS should discuss potential impacts to calcareous fens and USFWS Waterfowl Production Areas and impacts to other native plant communities associated with Wetland Conservation Act provisions. In addition, this commenter also noted that potential impacts to vegetation and wetlands should be addressed as part of an overall vegetation management plan and included in the EIS. One commenter noted that use of the USFWS National Wetland Inventory data may underestimate the areal extent of wetland impact. This commenter also noted that the EIS should include an analysis using the existing transmission line ROW in order to minimize wetland impacts. *Mitigation.* Two commenters noted that the EIS should discuss how the project will comply with wetland permitting requirements. Two commenters noted that the EIS should consider functional losses of wetlands (particularly forested wetlands) when determining wetland mitigation and compensation and that the EIS should include a draft wetland compensation mitigation plan.
Environmental Justice (Environmental Justice)	*Environmental Justice*. One commenter recommended that an environmental justice analysis should be completed for the EIS including a characterization of communities along the transmission line routes, including minority, low-income, and tribal populations at a census block level as well as characterization of potentially disproportionate impacts to these communities from construction, operation, and or maintenance of the project.

Subject Area	Comment Summary
Socioeconomics (Economic, Property Values, Quality of Life, Taxes)	*Economic Impacts*. Fifteen commenters raised economic concerns particularly related to potential impacts on commerce in the Balsam and Bigfork areas, particularly impacts on local timber, tourism, and mining industries. Several commenters requested an assessment of potential impacts on job creation and employment and one commenter emphasized the need for a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis for the project. A number of commenters also requested additional information regarding county, state, and local tax impacts of the project, for example, having to pay these taxes on unusable land and what are the implications of loss in tax revenue resulting from decreasing property values. *Property Values.* Seventeen commenters identified property value impacts and lack of compensation for lost property value as a concern. Property value concerns were largely linked to impacts on the character/relatively isolated wilderness of the impacted properties. *Quality of Life.* Eleven commenters identified impacts to quality of life as a concern. These concerns center around the impact of the Project on certain qualities that define the "sense of place" in the project area including such things as solitude, remoteness, isolation, wilderness, independence, and absence of disturbance and development.
Land Based Economies (Agriculture, Mining/Minerals, Tourism)	*Agriculture.* Four commenters noted that the EIS should address general impacts on farming, including productivity. Three commenters noted that the EIS should address the project's potential to restrict or obstruct farming and grazing activities. Three commenters noted that the EIS should address impacts associated with weeds in the project area spreading onto farmland. One commenter noted that the EIS should address the project's effects on crop dusting operations. One commenter noted that the EIS should address impacts of herbicides associated with transmission line ROW maintenance on organic farmland. *Mining/Minerals.* Two commenters noted the EIS should address the project's potential to affect viability of current and future mining resources. One commenter noted that a "Mining and Minerals" section be included in the EIS and that the EIS should address the likelihood and consequence of mineral resources/transmission line conflict for known and undeveloped resource areas and on state lands. *Tourism.* Four commenters noted that the EIS should address impacts to tourism.
Recreation (Recreation)	*Recreation*. Five commenters noted that the EIS should address impacts on recreational hunting lands. Three commenters noted that the EIS should address project effects on snowmobile and all-terrain vehicle trails. Three commenters noted the EIS should address proximity to public parks, lakes, rivers, and WMAs, as well as access to these resources. Three commenters noted the EIS should address project proximity to city parks, businesses, and services.

Subject Area	Comment Summary
Cumulative Impacts (Cumulative Effects)	*Cumulative Impact Analysis*. Six commenters noted that the EIS should evaluate the impacts of other past or planned linear projects in same corridor between lakes near Grand Rapids such as transmission lines, pipelines, and other projects that have impacted or could impact the area adjacent to the Project. Two commenters specifically requested that the EIS include a clear map of existing high-voltage transmission lines in the project area so they could more easily see where the proposed line could parallel existing lines. Several commenters near Grand Rapids, MN, expressed fatigue over all the linear projects built or proposed to be built in the area and requested an analysis of whether following existing ROWs always results in the least impact. Commenters identified some specific negative impacts that past power plant or linear projects have already had on their quality of life.
Mitigation (Design Criteria/Mitigation Measures)	*Mitigation Measures*. Nine commenters noted that the EIS should consider all appropriate mitigation measures to avoid and reduce impacts to sensitive aquatic and terrestrial habitats; habitat fragmentation; ecological functions; threatened, endangered, and special concern species; soil disturbance; and socioeconomic impacts. Four commenters noted that the EIS should assess methods of reduced forested wetland clearing, reduced use of herbicides for transmission line ROW maintenance, use environmental monitors during construction, appropriate Best Management Practices, reduced upland tree losses, use of clean diesel fuel during construction, and compliance with comply with MN Rules 6135. Two commenters noted that the EIS should include additional information on system reliability, towers, tower lights, separation distances, and potential impacts of having two or more parallel transmission lines damaged at the same time by high winds or lightening. In addition, all mitigation proposed by the Applicant should be further evaluated in the EIS. Three commenters were concerned about a variety of detailed transmission engineering and construction issues, including conductor sizing, placement of structures within the highway ROWs, maintenance of access roads, “line loss” due to transmission of electricity over such long distances, and the need for the planned capacity of the transmission line. One commenter noted that the EIS should identity and discuss the rationale for potential locations for the proposed new 500-kV series Compensation Station associated with each route alternative. In addition, impacts associated with the siting, construction, operation and maintenance of each route alternative's proposed new 500-kV Compensation Station location(s) should also be assessed and disclosed in the EIS with mitigation measures identified.

Subject Area	Comment Summary
Other Issues (Other, No Specific Comment)	*Renewable energy*. Five commenters discussed renewable energy and the project's relationship to Minnesota Power's progress toward meeting the Renewable Portfolio Standard. *MNPUC Process.* Several commenters requested additional information about the timeline for the MN PUC process, availability of information regarding existing transmission line routes, public involvement, interactions between the project proponent and the MN PUC. *ATF*. Four commenters mentioned a need for a citizen ATF under Minnesota Statute 216E.08 and Minnesota Administrative Rules 7850.2400. *Other topics*. These topics included one comment regarding increased risk of terrorist attack, one comment on frequency of easement compensation, one comment related to route adjustments made in the Bigfork area during Minnesota Power's routing process, one question regarding existing capacity at the Minnesota/Ontario boarder, and comments from five agencies related to coordination and communication, information sharing/information sourcing, and timing of decision-making steps.

Table 2-2 Directory of Stakeholder Comments

Stakeholder Name and Affiliation			Comment Date and Source	
First Name	**Last Name**	**Affiliation**	**Date**	**Received Via**
Federal Agencies				
Tamara	Cameron	USACE	12/10/1013[2]	Mail
Peter	Fasbender	USFWS	7/1/2014	Mail
Lisa	Mandell	USFWS	8/14/2014	Mail
Patricia	Trapp	National Park Service	8/15/2014	Mail
Kenneth	Westlake	EPA	8/14/2014	Mail and Email
State Agencies				
Stacy	Kotch	MnDOT	8/14/2014	Mail
Ryan	Reed	MnDNR - Grand Rapids	7/17/2014	Oral - Littlefork July 17, 11:00 am
Ryan	Reed	MnDNR - Grand Rapids	7/17/2014	Oral - Littlefork July 17, 11:00 am
Ryan	Reed	MnDNR - Grand Rapids	7/23/2014	Oral - Bigfork July 23, 6:00 pm
Jamie	Schrenzel	MnDNR	8/1/2014	Email
Jamie	Schrenzel	MnDNR	8/15/2014	Email
Local Government Agencies				
Balsam Township	Balsam Township	Balsam Township	7/23/2014	Mail
Troy	Beckner	Balsam Volunteer Fire Dept.	8/6/2014	Mail
Itasca County Board of Commissioners	Itasca County Board of Commissioners	Itasca County Board of Commissioners	5/13/2014	Mail
Lawrence Township	Lawrence Township	Lawrence Township	7/16/2014	Mail
Casey	Venema	Lawrence Township	5/8/2014	Email
David	Leonhardt	Waskish Town Board and Citizen Advisory Committee for the Big Bog State Recreation Area	7/16/2014	Oral - Baudette July 16, 6:00 pm

[2] The USACE December 2013 letter included content relevant to EIS scoping and USACE concurrence points that are concurrent with EIS scoping.

Stakeholder Name and Affiliation			Comment Date and Source	
First Name	**Last Name**	**Affiliation**	**Date**	**Received Via**
David	Leonhardt	Waskish Town Board and Citizen Advisory Committee for the Big Bog State Recreation Area	7/23/2014	Oral - Kelliher July 23, 11:00 am
David	Leonhardt	Waskish Town Board and Citizen Advisory Committee for the Big Bog State Recreation Area	7/23/2014	Oral - Kelliher July 23, 11:00 am
Non-Governmental Organizations and Individuals				
Gary	Bailey	Private Citizen	7/23/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Balsam Bible Chapel	Balsam Bible Chapel	The Board of Elders	7/29/2014	Mail
Thomas	Beadle	Private Citizen	5/28/2014	Mail
Thomas	Beadle	Private Citizen		Mail
Thomas	Beadle	Private Citizen	7/16/2014	Oral - Baudette July 16, 6:00 pm
Dr. Erwin	Berglund	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Email
Tom	Boland	Private Citizen	7/23/2014	Oral - Bigfork July 23, 6:00 pm
Tom	Boland	Private Citizen	7/23/2014	Oral - Bigfork July 23, 6:00 pm
Kathryn and Joseph	Boyle	Private Citizen	5/15/2014	Email
Kathryn and Joseph	Boyle	Private Citizen	8/18/2014	Email
Jim	Bulera	Private Citizen	8/3/2014	Email
Cheryl	Bunes	Private Citizen	5/16/2014	Email
Cheryl	Bunes	Private Citizen	5/12/2014	Mail
Michael	Bunes	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Mail
Michael and Cheryl	Bunes	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Mail
Michael	Bunes	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 6:00 pm
Cheryl	Bunes	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 6:00 pm
Toni	Burbie	Private Citizen	6/23/2014	Mail
Wanda	Burbie	Private Citizen	5/29/2014	Mail
Tammy	Card	Private Citizen	5/19/2014	Mail
Tammy	Card	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 6:00 pm
Linda	Castagneri	Private Citizen	8/11/2014	Mail
Linda	Castagneri	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am
David	Christiansen	Private Citizen	1/15/2014	Email

Stakeholder Name and Affiliation			Comment Date and Source	
First Name	**Last Name**	**Affiliation**	**Date**	**Received Via**
Joanne	Cockrum	Private Citizen	8/11/2014	Mail
Joanne	Cockrun	Private Citizen	7/17/2014	Oral - Littlefork July 17, 11:00 am
Luis	Contreras	Private Citizen	8/14/2014	Email
Ross	Dally	Private Citizen	7/16/2014	Oral - Baudette July 16, 6:00 pm
Robert and Janet	Delich	Private Citizen	8/18/2014	Mail
Robert and Janet	Delich	Private Citizen	5/13/2014	Mail
Robert and Janet	Delich	Private Citizen	5/8/2014	Mail
Robert and Janet	Delich	Private Citizen	5/7/2014	Mail
Brad	Dokken	Private Citizen	8/12/2014	Mail
Brad	Dokken	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
John	Dunn	Private Citizen	8/14/2014	Email
Mark	Elton	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Marlin	Elton	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Mail
Marlin	Elton	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Marlin	Elton	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Email
Curtis	Erickson	Private Citizen	5/2/2014	Email
Byron	Fiedler	Private Citizen	7/17/2014	Oral - Littlefork July 17, 11:00 am
Nick	Francisco	Private Citizen	7/16/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Jerry	Freaks	Private Citizen	5/14/2014	Email
Brian	Fredrickson	Private Citizen	7/27/2014	Email
Brian	Fredrickson	Private Citizen	7/28/2014	Website
William	Gary	Private Citizen	7/17/2014	Oral - Littlefork July 17, 11:00 am
Carl	Gibson	Bear Lake Cabin Owners Association	8/12/2014	Email
Cora	Gray	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Email
Ron	Gustafson	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am
LeRoy	Hagrle	Private Citizen	5/19/2014	Mail
Dave	Hancock	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Mike	Hanson	Northstar Electric	7/17/2014	Oral - Littlefork July 17, 11:00 am
Darin	Heller	Private Citizen	5/30/2014	Website
Darin	Heller	Private Citizen	8/13/2014	Email
Darin	Heller	Private Citizen	7/16/2014	Oral - Roseau July 16, 11:00 am
D	Hosel	Private Citizen	5/27/2014	Mail
James	Johnson	Private Citizen	4/27/2014	Email

Stakeholder Name and Affiliation			Comment Date and Source	
First Name	**Last Name**	**Affiliation**	**Date**	**Received Via**
James	Johnson	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Email
James	Johnson	Private Citizen	4/27/2014	Email
Jeff	Johnson	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Website
Jeff	Johnson	Private Citizen	5/15/2014	Email
Cavour	Johnson	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am
Cavour	Johnson	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am
Patrick	Kvien	Private Citizen	8/12/2014	Website
David	Leonhardt	Private Citizen	7/16/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Richard	Libbey	Private Citizen	4/15/2014	Email
Richard	Libbey	Private Citizen	8/14/2014	Email
Richard	Libbey	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Email
Richard	Libbey	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Email
Richard	Libbey	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Email
Richard	Libbey	Private Citizen	5/15/2014	Email
Richard	Libbey	Private Citizen	5/15/2014	Email
Richard	Libbey	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am
Richard	Libbey	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am
Richard	Libbey	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am
Richard	Libbey	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 6:00 pm
Larry	Lindholm	RGGS Land & Minerals Ltd. L.P.	5/19/2014	Email
Lindner		Private Citizen	10/15/2014	CON Hearing – Grand Rapids October 15
Mark	Lofgren	Private Citizen	5/6/2014	Mail
Mark	Lofgren	Private Citizen	5/29/2014	Mail
Mark	Lofgren	Private Citizen	7/28/2014	Mail
Mark and Colleen	Lofgren	Private Citizen	7/3/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Mark	Lofgren	Private Citizen	7/23/2014	Oral - Bigfork July 23, 6:00 pm
Mark and Beth	Mandich	Private Citizen	6/3/2014	Mail
Joel	Mattfield	Private Citizen	5/4/2014	Email
Meloy	Mattfield	Private Citizen	5/21/2014	Mail
Meloy	Mattfield	Private Citizen	8/7/2014	Mail
Meloy	Mattfield	Private Citizen	5/12/2014	Mail
Meloy	Mattfield	Private Citizen	4/12/2014	Mail
Norman	Mattfield	Private Citizen	5/13/2014	Mail

Stakeholder Name and Affiliation			Comment Date and Source	
First Name	**Last Name**	**Affiliation**	**Date**	**Received Via**
Meloy	Mattfield	Private Citizen	7/23/2014	Oral - Bigfork July 23, 6:00 pm
Meloy	Mattfield	Private Citizen	7/23/2014	Oral - Bigfork July 23, 6:00 pm
Warren	McQuay	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 6:00 pm
Gary and Jeanne	Messiner	Private Citizen		Email
Multiple Landowners	Multiple Landowners	Private Citizens, landowners	8/15/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Richard	Myers	Private Citizen	8/10/2014	Mail
Richard	Myers	Private Citizen	5/27/2014, 5/6/2014, 5/4/2014	Mail
Dick	Myers	Private Citizen	7/16/2014	Oral - Baudette July 16, 6:00 pm
Steve	Nelson	Private Citizen	7/17/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Steve	Nelson	Private Citizen	7/17/2014	Oral - International Falls July 17, 6:00 pm
Bob	Nick	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am
Brent	Ostlund	Private Citizen	7/16/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Brent	Ostlund	Private Citizen	7/16/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Brent	Ostlund	Private Citizen	7/16/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Brent and Orin	Ostlund	Private Citizen	6/25/2014	Mail
Brent and Orin	Ostlund	Private Citizen	5/12/2014	Mail
Brent	Ostlund	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 6:00 pm
Carol	Overland	RRANT Representative	7/23/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Carol	Overland	RRANT Representative	8/15/2014	Mail
Carol	Overland	Private Citizen	7/23/2014	Oral - Bigfork July 23, 6:00 pm
Carol	Overland	Private Citizen	7/23/2014	Oral - Bigfork July 23, 6:00 pm
Carol	Overland	RRANT Representative	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am
Carol	Overland	RRANT Representative	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am
Robert	Oveson	Private Citizen	8/9/2014	Website
Robert	Oveson	Private Citizen	8/9/2014	Email
Robert	Oveson	Private Citizen	7/17/2014	Oral - Littlefork July 17, 11:00 am
Robert	Oveson	Private Citizen	7/17/2014	Oral - Littlefork July 17, 11:00 am
Lyle	Pearson	Private Citizen		Email
Beth	Pederson	Private Citizen	5/15/2014	Email

Stakeholder Name and Affiliation			Comment Date and Source	
First Name	**Last Name**	**Affiliation**	**Date**	**Received Via**
Candace	Perry	Private Citizen	5/16/2014	Mail
Patrick	Perry	Private Citizen	5/16/2014	Mail
Don	Peterson	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Email
Kevin	Peterson	Private Citizen	7/16/2014	Mail
Kevin	Peterson	Private Citizen	8/11/2014	Mail
Kevin	Peterson	Private Citizen	7/17/2014	Oral - International Falls July 17, 6:00 pm
Roy	Procopio	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Roy	Procopio	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 6:00 pm
Brian	Rice	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Gregg	Rice	Private Citizen	7/27/2014	Email
Kirby	Rice	Private Citizen	8/12/2014	Website
Sheldon	Rice	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Website
Steven	Rice	Private Citizen	5/2/2014	Email
Stuart	Rice	Private Citizen	7/22/2014	Website
Stuart	Rice	Private Citizen	7/31/2014	Website
Stuart	Rice	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Stuart	Rice	Private Citizen	8/12/2014	Website
Randy	Robb	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Dave	Roerick	Private Citizen	8/15/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Dave	Roerick	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am
Larry	Rukevina	Private Citizen	5/22/2014	Mail
Jamie	Schrenzel	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 6:00 pm
Sally	Sedgwick	Private Citizen	7/23/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Dean	Sedgwick	Private Citizen	7/23/2014	Oral - Bigfork July 23, 6:00 pm
Sally	Sedgwick	Private Citizen	7/23/2014	Oral - Bigfork July 23, 6:00 pm
Dean	Sedgwick	Private Citizen	7/23/2014	Oral - Bigfork July 23, 6:00 pm
Carol	Seisland	Private Citizen	7/22/2014	Public Scoping Meeting
Warren	Stoe	Private Citizen	5/29/2014	Email
Strand	Dan and Elizabeth	Private Citizen	10/15/2014	CON Hearing – Grand Rapids October 15
Strand	Dan and Elizabeth	Private Citizen	11/4/2014	Mail
Steve	Takaichi	Private Citizen	7/22/2014	Email
Harvey	Wahlquist	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am
Mark	Walsh	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am

Stakeholder Name and Affiliation			Comment Date and Source	
First Name	**Last Name**	**Affiliation**	**Date**	**Received Via**
Bob	Walsh	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am
Robert	Ward	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 6:00 pm
Roger	Webber	Private Citizen	7/23/2014	Oral - Bigfork July 23, 6:00 pm
Roger	Webber	Private Citizen	7/23/2014	Oral - Bigfork July 23, 6:00 pm
Roger and MaryJo	Weber	Private Citizen	8/16/2014	Mail
Darrell and Delores	White	Private Citizen	7/30/2014	Mail
Delores	White	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am
Darrell	White	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am
Darrell	White	Private Citizen	7/24/2014	Oral - Grand Rapids July 24, 11:00 am
Tim	Williamson	Private Citizen	7/23/2014	Oral - Kelliher July 23, 11:00 am
Richard	Yuenger	Private Citizen	5/17/2014	Email
William	Yuenger	Private Citizen	7/23/2014	Oral - Bigfork July 23, 6:00 pm

2.1 Alternative Route Segments/Alignment Modifications Proposed during Scoping

The alternative route segments and alignment modifications proposed during scoping are identified in Figure 2-1. These alternative segments and modifications were developed by reviewing comments received during the scoping process. In some areas, multiple commenters suggested avoiding the same issue (e.g., residential areas or protected natural areas) or one modification mitigated several issues raised by commenters (e.g., sensitive lands, houses, following existing corridors). Detailed figures showing the requested alternative route segments and alignment modifications that were developed from the scoping comments for analysis in the EIS are provided in Appendix F.