

OPPOSITION TO CLEAN LINE DATA SYNOPSIS

1) NEED: **THERE IS NO PROVEN NEED FOR THIS PROJECT**

Clean Line has no customers in Arkansas, Oklahoma or Tennessee and no end users on the East Coast, their “target” market. The TVA, the supposed customer for 2,500 of the 3,500 megawatts Clean Line is producing, stated in their “2015 Integrated Resources Plan” that they do not foresee using this type of electricity until 2030. Congestion studies show no congestion in Arkansas or the Southeast Region which includes Clean Line’s target market.

2) JOBS: **ONLY 27 PERMANENT JOBS CREATED BY THIS PROJECT IN ARKANSAS**

According to the draft EIS, there will be approximately 100 local, direct, temporary hires in Arkansas for this project. All manufacturing job increases will be temporary, as will all indirect jobs. The only permanent jobs created in Arkansas from this project, at most, will be 27.

3) TAXES: **ALL FACILITIES IN ARKANSAS WILL BE TAX EXEMPT**

No taxes will be due from this project. The Southwestern Power Administration will own 100% of all facilities, including transmission lines and converter stations. As a federal government agency, SWPA is exempt from taxes, according to Doug Hart, Director of Financial Management/CFO of SWPA. In addition, there will be a decrease in the tax base for all of the affected counties due to a reduction in property values. 8,000 acres of land in Arkansas will be encumbered by this right-of-way.

4) EMINENT DOMAIN: **FEDERAL EMINENT DOMAIN OVERRIDING STATE’S RIGHTS**

The Arkansas Public Service Commission denied Clean Line public utility status and the right of eminent domain under state law in 2010. Clean Line is seeking, through a partnership with SWPA, to gain the right of federal eminent domain, thereby overriding our state’s right to determine the need and necessity of this project for the people of Arkansas. There are serious questions being raised by our entire federal legislative delegation, attorneys and corporate stakeholders regarding the authority under which eminent domain is being sought. People in Arkansas could be facing the specter of federal eminent domain for the next 15 years. It is almost certain there will be litigation on this issue.

5) HEALTH: **RISK OF INCREASED CHILDHOOD CANCER**

The EIS states repeatedly that the available research is not definitive and no conclusions can be drawn about the health effects of this project. Studies show an increase in childhood cancer. Are you willing to risk the lives of children on an unknown factor?

6) AGRICULTURE: **INTERFERENCE WITH LARGE FARMING ACTIVITIES IN EASTERN ARKANSAS**

The EIS states that aerial overspray of herbicides on the right-of-way would cause direct, adverse impact to agricultural lands. Also, soil compaction, permanent reduction of crop yield and introduction of invasive species are a concern. In addition, operation of irrigation equipment may be hindered. Farming operations in eastern area of Arkansas generate millions of dollars of commerce.

7) MINERAL DEVELOPMENT: **IMPEDIMENT TO FUTURE MINERAL DEVELOPMENT**

Southwestern Energy, the largest operator in the Fayetteville Shale, issued a public comment to the DOE strongly opposing this project due to its trajectory directly across their fields of operation. They state that additional mineral development could be impeded by this project. The natural gas industry provides at least \$18.5 billion to Arkansas in

annual economic activity and thousands of jobs. The Clean Line project is one and done and will generate a pittance in revenue, by comparison. There is also a risk to public safety to siting these towers close to gas fields.

8) ENVIRONMENT: DEVASTATING EFFECTS ON OUR UNIQUE, PROTECTED ENVIRONMENT

The EIS states that 31 federally protected or proposed special status species could be affected by this project. All woodlands cleared by this project will be permanently lost. The federal “Quadrennial Energy Review” warns of habitat fragmentation and the effect this type of project will have on various species. These include the migratory habits of birds in the Mississippi Flyway in Eastern Arkansas that generate millions of dollars in tourism revenue. Also affected could be the Ozark big-eared bat, an endangered species. In addition, the proposed route crosses the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission Frog Bayou Wildlife Management Area, among other sensitive, protected management areas.

9) VISUAL IMPACT: DESTRUCTION OF VISTAS ACROSS OUR ENTIRE STATE AFFECTING TOURISM

The federal “Quadrennial Energy Review” comments that these types of structures, in this case 200 foot high metal towers, are considered by many to be “visual pollution”. The proposed route for this line crosses two Arkansas Heritage Trails, six National or Arkansas scenic byways and two rivers designated as “Wild and Scenic Rivers” by the National Parks Service. All of these beautiful areas are sources of tourism dollars. Mr. Hurtado, Vice-President of Clean Line has stated that no one outside the right-of-way will be compensated, even if their property is damaged by this visual pollution.

10) NEPA PROCESS: CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The contractor hired to compile the EIS has a financial interest in the project. Therefore, the impartiality and validity of the EIS is in question. The sufficiency of other aspects of the process have also been called into question.

11) ALTERNATIVES: VIABLE ALTERNATIVES EXIST

Viable alternatives exist to this project. Those include offshore wind projects now underway on the East Coast to serve Clean Line’s “target market”. This is supported by eleven East Coast governors who want the energy produced locally. The BOEM recently leased thousands of federally owned acres for offshore wind projects in the Atlantic Ocean which will provide immediate access just off their shores to Clean Line’s target market.

12) GOVERNMENT OPPOSITION: FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OPPOSE PROJECT

The “APPROVAL” act has been introduced by Senators Cotton and Boozman in the United States Senate and by Representatives Womack, Hill, Westerman and Crawford in the United States House of Representatives. The “APPROVAL” act would return the right to determine the need and necessity for these type merchant transmission projects to the governors of the states and the state utility agencies. The Arkansas Senate passed SR 22 in opposition to the project. Act 842 was passed unanimously by the state legislature broadening the PSC’s abilities to determine the viability of these projects. The Arkansas General Assembly Joint Committee on Energy wrote Department of Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz in opposition to the project. Over half of the affected counties in Arkansas have passed resolutions in opposition to the project as well as several cities along the route. Federal litigation has been filed on behalf of Block Plains and Eastern Clean Line.

OVER 6,000 ARKANSAS VOTERS SUBMITTED COMMENTS IN OPPOSITION TO THIS PROJECT TO THE DOE DURING THE DRAFT EIS PHASE.