

EXHIBIT NUMBER: NIV-012
File Name: BIPOLE III
Date: Oct 26, 2021
Received by: [Signature]
(Commission Secretary)

Hi, my name is Timothy Wiens. I first learned about bipole 3 project from a concerned neighbor sometime in 2010. We attended the Steinbach Landowner information centers on sept 27 2010 and clearly stated that we would not be interested in housing these towers on our land, and working under these high voltage lines as we already have to deal with existing diagonal lines. We clearly made our position felt. We also met with mb hydro's property representative lately and were very clear that we still do not want to be a part of this project. Then we sent a letter feb 6 2012 still not agreeing on taking on these towers. Our interpretation of the responses given by property representatives, minister responsible for Manitoba hydro and the environmental specialist was this: any delays could hold up this project, and it is a race to finish. No one will stand in our way. This is bullying

We are against this route for many reasons.

Loss of agricultural land has been immense in this area the past few years. Urban sprawl has led the way by changing the productive heavy clay land into commercial and residential structures. Because of the rapid growth rate, town lagoons need to be expanded, also taking up prime agricultural land. Let us not forget where our food comes from. And I'm hoping that no one will say "from the supermarket".

The consequences will be great for this poor decision. Every person who uses hydro will be affected by much higher hydro rates. Unfortunately the people whose lives are underneath these lines will have the highest drawback. My family is one of them. To my knowledge there is insufficient research on health issues with these types of DC lines. The research has been short term, which will not indicate long term effects. No one here can stand up and guarantee me that my family or livelihood will not experience negative effects, health or other side effects, from this mega project. Manitoba hydro states, "there are no known adverse health effects". The Ford Pinto was concluded to be a safe car, was it really?

Smoking was completely accepted, and marketed and encouraged making tobacco companies very profitable. Now tobacco companies are having to pay for damage it has done to people's health. Our health care is also paying. Is hydro willing to pay for human damages caused by this high voltage line?

What does any compensation do for me or my family if one of us falls ill because of this overpriced, over travelled electric monster of a line. We will live excessively close (practically under) these lines.

Asbestos is yet another example of insufficient knowledge and research being completed before using it in many applications. Human lives and families were broken because of a poor, unwise decision that something was deemed to have no side effects. It is clearly the smart wise decision to put more thought and research into this project before potentially putting family's lives at risk.

Having these skyscraper towers of power over top of dairy facilities is also not advisable. Responsible Electricity transmission for Albertans published a fact concluding an average decrease of a bout 5% in milk yield and 16.4% decrease in milk fat among Holstein cows in Quebec. More side effects include breathing problems, higher mortality rates, undersized heifers, some afflicted with hemorrhages or abortions and 10% loss in milk. In this case French civil court ruled in the family's favor and ordered the power company to pay for the damages. I have no interest in putting my lively hood at risk due to an impulse improper, incorrect plan of Bipole III.

Producing field crops will also be very difficult with these lines. Any areal work will not be possible, and avoiding these lines is difficult with large equipment ^{especially during} ~~and sometimes~~ long working hours. We ~~will~~ must make the most progress when the weather allows us to. My suggestion has been to explore the east side more thoroughly. The facts are that the land is more ^{or} ~~marginal~~, better suitable for this type of project, less populated meaning its safer for Manitobans. It is much lower overall cost, meaning lower hydro rates to all Manitobans. And lastly, history reviles less hazardous weather on the east side. Why risk human health, or expropriate some of the best agricultural land in Manitoba used to grow the food we eat.

impulse improper, incorrect plan of Bipole III

My suggestion has been to explore the east side more thoroughly. The facts are that the land is more