

Mr. Navecky,

In this letter I would like to address the overpasses proposed in the GLB Project.

My concerns are:

- * Additional farm land that would be required for borrow pits. Restoration of these sites will not bring them back to previous productivity.
- * The additional damage that will be done to the farmland to construct these overpasses.
- * The overpasses will need to be sloped, here again destroying more farmland.
- * Access for farms and homes adjacent to the overpass
- * The plans (or lack thereof at this point) for roads that intersect with the overpasses, for example the BC Townline Road and Hwy 140 crossing in Rock County.
- * Movement of farm implements to and from the elevated road from farms adjacent to the overpass
- * The farm field accesses from the road to the field will be affected by elevation of the roadway for the proposed overpasses. Will they even be allowed? Will this cause additional land-locked fields?
- * The increased dangers in accessing/leaving the highway from or to a sloped driveway, especially with large farm implements or a semi truck loaded with grain.
- * Left hand turns from the affected driveways will be exceedingly dangerous due to decreased visibility and need to cross a lane of traffic.
- * If left turns would be disallowed it would seriously affect a farmer/home owner's convenience. It would increase the miles farm implements have to travel on public roads.
- * Complete alteration of the visual aesthetics on rural roads and small towns (Emerald Grove, WI is a good example here).
- * Drastically altered water flow caused by elevated overpasses
- * The visual impact for homes and farms near and adjacent to the overpasses.

This list is limited due to the lack of information available and the fact that the "route is likely to change" as Mr. Patton has stated numerous times.

I would respectfully request that the EIS considers these concerns and the short, long, and cumulative effects they will have on families and communities affected by the proposed GLB project, for all the proposed overpasses in Indiana, Illinois and Wisconsin

In closing, I would like to reiterate that I do not believe that the EIS can be a legitimate study for reasons outlined in my previous letter.

I am adamantly opposed to the GLB project, the necessity and public convenience of which has not been properly vetted by the STB. This new rail has not been suggested in any long-term freight movement study at the state or federal level. There is no support from the Class I railroads, two of which have publicly stated so. Canadian National has spend billions on their own bypass around Chicago and is not likely to use a "toll rail line".

Mirjam Melin

Clinton, WI 53525