

Plainsandean

From: Ron Hairston <ron.hairston@ph-clan.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 09, 2015 1:18 PM
To: Plainsandean
Subject: DOE Getting the "Cart Before the Horse" - Issue #4
Attachments: Public Comments 3-min 150219.pdf

Plains & Eastern Clean Line remains silent on a multitude of questions. For this reason, DOE's decision regarding Clean Line's application should be withheld until outstanding issues are resolved and been given an adequate opportunity for debate and cross examination by qualified representatives of the opposing property owners. DOE should appoint, with property owner endorsement, "ad-litem" legal and technical representation to ensure property owners get fair consideration on the plethora of issues attending this complex project.

Another issue that has never been properly addressed relates to the missed opportunity to route the transmission line across public land. Doing so will diminish negative impact of the lives and property of the public. With thoughtful study, this option has the potential to create positive outcomes for agencies that manage public lands and the public who may use that land for recreation. Please consider the points (attached) that were raised during my public comment on February 19, 2012.

DOE needs to be diligent and make sure that all issues that remain a concern for property owners are investigated in a manner that protects their rights as property owners. To do otherwise creates a violation "...by arbitrary seizures of one class of citizens for the service of the rest." James Madison

Ron Hairston
1786 County Road 3456
Clarksville, AR 72830-9276

479-754-0134

ron.hairston@ph-clan.com

**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
Plains & Eastern Clean Line Transmission Project
Public Comments**

February 19, 2015

Dr. Jane Summerson
NEPA Document Manager
Plains & Eastern EIS
216 16th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, CO 80202

Dear Dr. Summerson,

My name is Ron Hairston and I live in Clarksville, AR. I'm a retired electrical engineer with 35 years of design, sales, management, and strategic planning experience in the energy industry. I hold both Bachelor and Master degrees. I rely on as many facts and numbers as I can assemble to lead me to conclusions.

I deeply care about the environment and support clean energy initiatives. I believe it's in our national interests, and that mankind has been given a sacred trust to care for this planet. My comments this evening may create controversy, but my hope is that any angst stirred will also stir our thoughts leading to a broader understanding of the issues we face and appreciation of a greater truth.

Let's first establish the fact that Clean Line will upturn many lives in its wake. There may be \$100 million dollars or more of uncompensated financial loss born by property owners under or near the line. For example, corona noise pollution has the ability to completely destroy the value of a home because no buyer would make an offer once he hears a constant hissing & crackling noise emanating from the overhead wires.

Now, let's make the argument that Clean Line should cross federal lands wherever possible to minimize disruption and financial upheaval of the lives of private citizens. The land taken by the right of way could be leased by the government. The rate established could be based on a fixed dollar amount, on the quantity or value of kilowatt-hours transported, or on a combination of these.

So what are the benefits?

- The lease income generated could be returned to the affected government agency to be used for maintaining and creating new recreational areas.
- The small amount of timber removed in the narrow right of way could be sold and used in a like manner.
- The right of way and access roads created during construction would have value as fire breaks and could provide additional access for campers and others.
- Agencies such as the US Forest Service would be better able to provide oversight of environmental issues such as the spraying of chemical herbicides than private landowners would be.
- And, the cost to establish and transport clean wind energy would be lower because leasing the land from the government reduces upfront capital investment thereby enhancing Clean Line's financial model.

We should expect the government to welcome construction on public lands because after all, the EIS does describe (and Clean Line advertises) just how clean the project is. Furthermore, this proposal creates three winners: the public, private industry, and the federal government.

Let me ask this question: What is the difference between private and public forested areas as it pertains to the preservation of wildlife and other natural resources? After all, much of the private land currently in the path of Clean Line is a virtual extension of forested government land. My land has owls and bats that are likely one or more of four endangered species. Drainage from my land affects streams and a nearby lake.

In conclusion, we must understand that we can't have it both ways. Either:

- Clean Line is as clean as claimed in the EIS and suitable for crossing forested land both private and government owned or,
- It's too dirty to place on federal land and therefore too dirty for similar private lands.

If this creates a conundrum for anyone, then maybe our eyes are not yet fully open. Arguably, private property should have more protection than public lands simply due to the added human toll.

Sincerely and on behalf of my neighbors,



Ron Hairston
1786 CR 3456
Clarksville, AR 72830-9276

479-754-0134

ron.hairston@ph-clan.com

April 18, 2015

Plains & Eastern Clean Line EIS
216 16th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, CO 80202

There has been total silence and lack of transparency when it comes to comparing the potential use of public lands to the routes currently proposed by Plains & Eastern Clean Line. Why is that data being hidden from public view? Why is it more acceptable to take away and destroy the value of property held by hard working citizens than to route the transmission line along nearby public lands such as the national forest where there will be much less adverse impact?

To do a reasonable and fair cost analysis, other currently hidden costs need to be included. For example, the cost to property owners that reaches far beyond the right-of-way has been ignored. The true extent of financial impact borne by them has to take into account how 55 dBA corona noise may degrade or destroy property values 1,000 to 2,000 ft on either side of the transmission line. The intrusive noise levels generated from line voltage that is five (5) to ten (10) times greater than typical will propagate across unprecedented distances making affected homes impossible to sell and building sites useless. Towers that are two (2) to four (4) times taller than typical will have an unprecedented four (4) to sixteen (16) times visual impact on property values. This will permanently mar irreplaceable scenic land and degrade property values to the extent that the towers can be seen.

I ask you to remove the cloak that hides the cost of using public lands for routing this transmission line. I ask you to uncover and present the true costs borne by property owners who will be negatively impacted by corona noise and visual pollution. I ask you to present a true and completely honest picture of costs for all routing options.

As long as Clean Line and the EIS continue to hide the costs for alternative routing on public land, and to cover up the full and honest impact of the proposed project, I and my neighbors will fight vigorously against its approval.

On behalf of my friends and neighbors,



Ron Hairston
1786 County Road 3456
Clarksville, AR 72830-9276

ron.hairston@ph-clan.com

479-754-0134