

From: [Jim Liebhart](#)
To: [Plainsandeantern](#)
Subject: Opposition to "Clean" Line
Date: Monday, July 13, 2015 8:04:03 PM

Dear Secretary Moniz,

I am in opposition to the proposed "Clean" Line proposal.

A survey of the Comments reveals an over whelming opposition to the project. A number of factors have been cited including,

- does not meet the requirements stipulated under Section 1222 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005
- the lack of need for the power now and in the future, noting a TVA report from April 2015; has not been found to be needed by any regional reliability organization
- a misuse of federal authority for the use of eminent domain in the manner being described (i.e., granting eminent domain to a private company for private gain)
- the destruction of private property (immediately impacting 17,000 acres across three states),
- the permeant loss of property value (the application notes the purchase of the property, and that immediately surrounding, where the line will be run; this does not contemplate the negative impact of the structure on the total acreage or those surrounding). The May 13, 2015 Comment by Laurie Smith provides strong commentary on the negative implications on property value that a project of this sort creates
- negative impact on the environment, eyesore, constant humming sound
- potential adverse health impacts, impact of electro magnetic fields, structures of this nature banned in some countries in densely populated areas
- potential hazards due to proximity to other structures (e.g., gas plants)
- complications to existing practices (e.g, aerial spraying)

Some Comments in opposition have been very thorough. Examples include the May 25 and June 2, 2015 Comment from Cynthia Callahan (detailed, explicit data refuting the need for the project; the July 7 and 8, 2015 Comment of Luis Contreras does a nice job of discussing the fallacy of the project. There are others but the Comments from these two individuals alone should be sufficient to terminate the project. That said, and as noted above, the opposition is large and vastly out numbers those voicing favor. But then, perhaps that makes a part of the broader point made by many of the "opposed" Comments - this is a project in which a large number of citizens will be negatively impacted while a select few will be enriched.

In my own case, the proposed high-lines will cross property that I have spent years developing wildlife centric habitat, enhancing existing populations while establishing others. It is intended to be a family legacy. The proposed project will greatly diminish this effort. I strongly suspect that the vast majority of land owners that will be impacted by this project, if approved, have their own set of dreams.

In summary, the evidence suggests that the "output" of the project is not needed, that it does not meet the requirements of relevant law, will require an extra-ordinary application of federal law if approved, will result in significant loss of property value and has a well informed opposition. I strongly request that this project be denied.

Sincerely,

Jim Liebhart

Waukomis, Oklahoma