

**Transmission going on your land?
You can force the utility to buy you out!**

It's called "BUY THE FARM"

Minn. Stat. § 216E.12 EMINENT DOMAIN POWERS; POWER OF CONDEMNATION.

Subd. 4. **Contiguous land.** When private real property that is an agricultural or nonagricultural homestead, nonhomestead agricultural land, rental residential property, and both commercial and noncommercial seasonal residential recreational property, as those terms are defined in section [273.13](#) is proposed to be acquired for the construction of a site or route for a high-voltage transmission line with a capacity of 200 kilovolts or more by eminent domain proceedings, the fee owner, or when applicable, the fee owner with the written consent of the contract for deed vendee, or the contract for deed vendee with the written consent of the fee owner, shall have the option to require the utility to condemn a fee interest in any amount of contiguous, commercially viable land which the owner or vendee wholly owns or has contracted to own in undivided fee and elects in writing to transfer to the utility within 60 days after receipt of the notice of the objects of the petition filed pursuant to section [117.055](#). Commercial viability shall be determined without regard to the presence of the utility route or site. The owner or, when applicable, the contract vendee shall have only one such option and may not expand or otherwise modify an election without the consent of the utility. The required acquisition of land pursuant to this subdivision shall be considered an acquisition for a public purpose and for use in the utility's business, for purposes of chapter 117 and section [500.24](#), respectively; provided that a utility shall divest itself completely of all such lands used for farming or capable of being used for farming not later than the time it can receive the market value paid at the time of acquisition of lands less any diminution in value by reason of the presence of the utility route or site. Upon the owner's election made under this subdivision, the easement interest over and adjacent to the lands designated by the owner to be acquired in fee, sought in the condemnation petition for a right-of-way for a high-voltage transmission line with a capacity of 200 kilovolts or more shall automatically be converted into a fee taking.

**Transmission going on your land?
You can force the utility to buy you out!**

It's called "BUY THE FARM"

Minn. Stat. § 216E.12 EMINENT DOMAIN POWERS; POWER OF CONDEMNATION.

Subd. 4. **Contiguous land.** When private real property that is an agricultural or nonagricultural homestead, nonhomestead agricultural land, rental residential property, and both commercial and noncommercial seasonal residential recreational property, as those terms are defined in section [273.13](#) is proposed to be acquired for the construction of a site or route for a high-voltage transmission line with a capacity of 200 kilovolts or more by eminent domain proceedings, the fee owner, or when applicable, the fee owner with the written consent of the contract for deed vendee, or the contract for deed vendee with the written consent of the fee owner, shall have the option to require the utility to condemn a fee interest in any amount of contiguous, commercially viable land which the owner or vendee wholly owns or has contracted to own in undivided fee and elects in writing to transfer to the utility within 60 days after receipt of the notice of the objects of the petition filed pursuant to section [117.055](#). Commercial viability shall be determined without regard to the presence of the utility route or site. The owner or, when applicable, the contract vendee shall have only one such option and may not expand or otherwise modify an election without the consent of the utility. The required acquisition of land pursuant to this subdivision shall be considered an acquisition for a public purpose and for use in the utility's business, for purposes of chapter 117 and section [500.24](#), respectively; provided that a utility shall divest itself completely of all such lands used for farming or capable of being used for farming not later than the time it can receive the market value paid at the time of acquisition of lands less any diminution in value by reason of the presence of the utility route or site. Upon the owner's election made under this subdivision, the easement interest over and adjacent to the lands designated by the owner to be acquired in fee, sought in the condemnation petition for a right-of-way for a high-voltage transmission line with a capacity of 200 kilovolts or more shall automatically be converted into a fee taking.

What does the Minnesota Supreme Court have to say about “Buy the Farm?”

(Minn. Stat. §116C.63 is now §216E.12)

The enactment of §116C.63, subd. 4 reflects a creative legislative response to a conflict between rural landowners and utilities concerning HVTL right-of-ways. Opponents of the utilities, resisting further encroachments upon the rural landscape and fearing the effects upon the rural environment and public health, not only challenge the placement and erection of high voltage transmission lines, but question whether the rural community’s sacrifice to the commonweal serves a greater social good. The legislature, sensitive to these concerns but perceiving the occasion as demanding the construction of additional power-generating plants and high voltage transmission lines, enacted §116C.63, subd. 4 in partial response.

Section 116C.63, subd. 4 requires as a condition precedent to the exercise of the power of eminent domain delegated to utilities, the additional purchase from landowners electing under the statute of any property contiguous to easements condemned for the purpose of a HVTL right-of-way. The statute defines such acquisitions to be for a public purpose. In this manner, the legislature affords landowners not wishing to be adjacent to such right-of-ways the opportunity to obtain expeditiously the fair market value of their property and go elsewhere. The statute, in so doing, responds to parties most affected by the operation of high voltage transmission lines; the statute eases the difficulties of relocation by shifting the transaction cost of locating a willing purchaser for the burdened property from landowner to utility.

Cooperative Power Ass’n ex rel. Bd. Of Dirs. v. Assand, 288 N.W. 2d 697, 698 (Minn. 1980).

Prepared by:
Carol A. Overland
Attorney at Law
www.nocapx2020.info

What does the Minnesota Supreme Court have to say about “Buy the Farm?”

(Minn. Stat. §116C.63 is now §216E.12)

The enactment of §116C.63, subd. 4 reflects a creative legislative response to a conflict between rural landowners and utilities concerning HVTL right-of-ways. Opponents of the utilities, resisting further encroachments upon the rural landscape and fearing the effects upon the rural environment and public health, not only challenge the placement and erection of high voltage transmission lines, but question whether the rural community’s sacrifice to the commonweal serves a greater social good. The legislature, sensitive to these concerns but perceiving the occasion as demanding the construction of additional power-generating plants and high voltage transmission lines, enacted §116C.63, subd. 4 in partial response.

Section 116C.63, subd. 4 requires as a condition precedent to the exercise of the power of eminent domain delegated to utilities, the additional purchase from landowners electing under the statute of any property contiguous to easements condemned for the purpose of a HVTL right-of-way. The statute defines such acquisitions to be for a public purpose. In this manner, the legislature affords landowners not wishing to be adjacent to such right-of-ways the opportunity to obtain expeditiously the fair market value of their property and go elsewhere. The statute, in so doing, responds to parties most affected by the operation of high voltage transmission lines; the statute eases the difficulties of relocation by shifting the transaction cost of locating a willing purchaser for the burdened property from landowner to utility.

Cooperative Power Ass’n ex rel. Bd. Of Dirs. v. Assand, 288 N.W. 2d 697, 698 (Minn. 1980).

Prepared by:
Carol A. Overland
Attorney at Law
www.nocapx2020.info