

From: [Gary Mareschal](#)
To: [Congestion Study Comments](#)
Subject: NIETC and Eminent Domain Issues
Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2014 11:58:31 AM

To whom it may concern,

I am opposed to the use of NIETC's and the use of federal eminent domain to condemn private land to establish them.

I reside in the state of Missouri and have unfortunately become involved with the Grain Belt Clean Energy Express Line and the Missouri Public Service Commission, which has not yet ruled on the application before them from Grain Belt to obtain a certificate of convenience and necessity. It was fairly clear from the Missouri Public Service Commission meetings that there is scant support for Grain Belt and their attempt to obtain the right to eminent domain for their own gain. The concept of NIETC can only encourage such behavior to continue from other group. It's fairly clear now that Grain Belt (Clean Energy Partners) are well financed, well groomed, and have been at the forefront of this "opportunity" to help power the United States.

It's also fairly clear that this is an opportunity for Grain Belt and Clean Line Energy Partners to obtain private land for their own benefit, and I assume other private groups would have the same interest.

It is only common sense to understand that energy generation is most efficiently done locally, and not over extended distances that takes private land from citizens, and carves up property that can have little to no further use other than what it is currently being utilized for. Regardless of what real estate agents and Grain Belt contend the current value of the land will be substantially diminished even if it continues to be used as it is now. And the payment that Grain Belt intends to make where they plan to place their towers and run their easement, is a pittance of the revenue they will generate. It is inequitable to the property owners who will be forced to deal with such a ruling. At one of the Missouri Public Service Commission meetings a comment was made that hydro-electric power could be generated in conjunction with some of the lock and dam structures on the Mississippi River that could assist in providing power to that region utilizing existing infrastructure. Likewise, as I drive through the metropolitan St Louis, MO area I see a number of wind-generating turbines that have been installed by private companies, solar panels on roofs throughout many areas, utilization of geothermal installations in homes and business. Biomass is being increased and encouraged, along with bio-fuel production. Although clearly not major steps independent of each other, all these processes and changes are green and assist in reducing pollution and dependence upon fossil fuels.

Even more than the issue of equity in payment if the land is condemned are the changes to the communities through which the towers and easements will run. From strictly a visual standpoint, as a Missouri resident I do not want to see 200 foot easements clear cut across our state, and I don't believe towers placed anywhere from 4-7 per mile up to 200' high with lights at night can be considered anything other than repugnant. Those towers, power lines, and easements will disrupt farm operations throughout the areas in which they run. They are clearly a safety concern for anyone working around them or traveling through areas where they

exist.

What about the power the lines will be carrying? Is it guaranteed to be safe to humans who must continue to reside and work in the areas where the power lines as part of the NIETC are installed? Is it safe for the livestock and wildlife that will be required to co-exist with it? Who will be responsible for payments to address health issues that may arise after the fact? There is no power this substantial being transmitted in the U.S. at this time and I suspect it's safe to say it doesn't occur in many places in the world from which health studies can be adequately documented.

My understanding is that when Clean Energy Partners was seeking customers some time ago, a number of Governors on the East Coast indicated they had no intention of purchasing energy from Grain Belt and/or the other energy lines involved and prefer to utilize their own sources to generate their own energy for their own use. I believe that to be a common sentiment among families and communities that would have to live alongside an unwanted power source from an unwanted provider.

Renewable power is good and necessary and I don't believe many folks arguing against NIETC's would disagree. I believe the areas of disagreement relate to some of the current plans and process to deliver that power and the necessity for doing so. And at what expense to the citizens that own the land through which the NIETC's would pass. This is a bad idea for anyone that has to live in or along these corridors. Just as in the Missouri Public Service Commission Hearings, the only groups that are clearly in favor of the Grain Belt line are those that would benefit without cost. In many of those meetings the Sierra Club, the IBEW locals, and a few businesses, and not for profit agencies and county commissioners were in favor of Grain Belt's plan because of the benefits it would bring to them. And they are giving up exactly what themselves for this benefit?

The answer is, their neighbors. But hey, that's their neighbors' problem. And I expect that same situation to be applicable throughout the NIETC corridors. I urge you to not establish any National Interest Energy Transmission Corridors.

Respectfully yours,
Gary and Theresa Mareschal
540 Timberidge Dr.
St. Peters, MO. 63376