

Mom read for daughter 2-11-14 @ Roseau
1 of 3

I am not supporting the building of the Great Northern Transmission Line because as the next generation to inherit the land in the proposed area where the line will be built, I do not want to see this decreasing the value of a fourth generation family farm, negatively affecting area agriculture or deal with any of the safety hazards associated with increased voltage.

Other possible complications are associated with the building of this transmission line that are of great concern to me, and these include the following:

- Cell phone service in Northern Minnesota has never been great, and with the possibilities of corona discharges, the transmission line could even make cell phone service, radio signal and television signal even worse. Each of these signals is very important in a farming community especially during harvest season in order for people to establish an efficient and safe work schedule.
- Interference with the GPS signals associated with farm equipment is also a great concern to farmers. The GPS units/Auto Steer units inside each piece of equipment can cost over \$10,000. Since the cost of these devices are extremely high, interference with the signal would not allow for the device to be used to its full effect, and would not allow farmers to get the full benefits of a device they paid for. And even though it states on the website that the interference with a GPS system is minimal, any interference with a GPS unit would mean a farmer would have to continually reset his device in hopes that it would regain signal. Trying to reset a GPS unit while moving interrupts the pace and can greatly distract the driver—which can ultimately lead to increased safety risks, especially if this were to happen multiple times in one field.
- The EMF (electric and magnetic fields) is also a great concern for our family, especially since one of our close relatives has a pacemaker and farms year round. Any extra added risk of interfering with a medical problem this serious should be completely avoided, especially since people usually operate equipment by themselves, without others close by. Other studies have shown that EMF's have been associated with increased risk of developing leukemia and other cancers—things that NOBODY wants to have a chance of developing.
- Stray voltage and induced voltage are other concerns, especially since the line would be going through fields that are being continuously occupied throughout the year by people, livestock and equipment. Although the website says necessary precautions would be taken to prevent these, it's impossible to know the overall effect of the possibilities of what some stray or induced voltage could produce. ESPECIALLY since weather conditions aren't always perfect and farmers sometimes have to leave all their equipment in their fields as lightning and rain passes. This possibility would NOT be favorable to any of the people and EXPENSIVE equipment in the area.

- The added noise from the line would also be a safety hazard to farmers. Farmers are constantly listening to their machines for any possible noises that would be associated with a mechanical problem. Farming equipment is already noisy enough, and any increased noise in a field area would only decrease a farmer's ability to notice certain mechanical problems on his/her equipment.
- Construction is another area of concern. Construction never goes as planned and more than likely takes longer than the estimated time to complete. With that in mind, this would affect a farmer's ability to access fields. And with a decreased ability to access fields, this would cause farmers to fall behind in planting and harvesting which results in poor crop yield, or unused land. Farmers and ranchers would also have to make up for the extra traffic which would decrease access to pastures, ditches, roads and fields. So, either way, the farmer is at loss.
- Even though the overall goal is to increase emission free energy, why is there no concern over all the added power lines and infrastructure? These added structures would go on land that is home to people, wildlife, livestock, forests and farm land. Northern Minnesota has beautiful, flat land that is home to species of animals that don't exist elsewhere. So, even though the hopes are to reduce emissions, the well-being of the land MUST be taken into consideration too! It's ridiculous to overlook what added infrastructure will add to land used to grow crops, especially when food needs are steadily increasing and farmers are trying to produce as much as possible in order to feed an increasing population.
- The wildlife also need to be considered in this project, along with their natural habitats. If any destruction occurs to untouched land, this project could ultimately do MORE harm to the environment. The cutting down of trees, rutting up of land, and making roads and trails where they never existed before can't be any better for the land than emissions. And since this type of infrastructure could be permanent, there's no going back, no growing more trees where they've been cut, and wildlife and livestock are forced to live in new habitats that won't necessarily be more sustainable for them.
- And the added emissions from constructing this line are not mentioned on the website which is a bit suspicious—especially since large equipment uses a lot of fuel, and constructing the line would take years.
- Science and technology will continue to advance, and before this project would even be completed, we should consider other options that don't include added lines and power structures on land that is untouched with buildings and infrastructure.
- What if it doesn't work? What happens when the expected reduction on emissions is not met? What happens when higher voltage causes problems in certain areas? Would it even be possible to remove these structures and power lines if a problem occurs? How often will people have to upkeep these structures and access farm land, pasture

land and wood lands? Continual upkeep of the line would be required, and access to the lines during spring, summer and fall months would cause much hassle to farmers and ranchers. Although the winter would allow for easier access due to less traffic, the snow and extreme weather conditions would also be a huge problem if upkeep is needed. If it takes so long to build this project, and then the projected idea doesn't meet the expectations, everyone is at a loss. And the risk of building this line would do more harm than good.

- I feel that the people behind this project have not experienced or researched enough regarding the effects the line could have on agriculture, wildlife and livestock. No research, statistics or statements have been posted on the website that allow concerned land owners to evaluate how this could affect their land, farms, wildlife, livestock, forests and community. This has led me to believe this line project is completely unnecessary and could have a negative impact on agriculture and communities in Northern Minnesota. And the most important thing to remember is agriculture affects EVERYTHING and EVERYONE. And since agriculture is what defines a majority of the Northern Minnesota communities, the building of this line should be HIGHLY AVOIDED.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to my concerns regarding this matter.

Alyssa Langaas
12208 State Hwy 11
Greenbush, MN 56726

(E-015/CN-12-1163)