

To whom it may concern,

I am writing as part of the public feedback request on Transgrids Humelink contingent project. I am writing not only as an energy consumer but also an Australian owned impacted business.

I would like to raise the below concerns and issues that remain outstanding and need to be addressed before the next stage of the development process occurs:

1. Transgrid have not outlined costs appropriately in their report in relation to requesting millions be covered by consumers. Transgrids failures to consult with local communities and land holders should not be the cost of tax paying Australians but rather their own. Consultation at this point is not improving with most of the public failing to see their errors. With most recent examples of Transgrid losing landholders feedback on impacts to route selections, transgrid passing blame on CCG volunteer reps for their failures in consultation, and not recording meetings in full or disclosing minutes on meetings in a timely fashion.
2. Consultation costs will continue to climb as a result of Transgrids failures with this project already taking over 2 years on failed Consultation.
3. Transgrid were happy to support undergrounding studies during this consultation process but are yet to let the public know that undergrounding Humelink, especially in High risk bushfire areas, is feasible (more environmentally friendly and less long term costs that is, little to no easement management) and as their sole role in Australia is 'easement management' they are in direct conflict with Australia being a world class leader in electrical technological advancements. (for successful undergrounding options see America's latest 1000 mile's underground to reduce bushfire risk).
4. Some of the route selection is through Tier 1 areas (high bushfire prone) which will create higher long term costs in relation to bushfire damage abs easement management requirements.
5. The whole electrical infrastructure process needs a royal commission into the lack of progression in Australia, in particular the acquisition of land which will see landholders lose kms of land for a mere 55k per tower, where as hosting renewables earns landholders annual payments of over 100k. How is the long term loss of land to above ground infrastructure (especially prime agriculture land that Australia needs to feed mouths) not recognised in today's society as the same contribution as someone hosting renewables??

Thank you for consideration of the above. I await your response eagerly.

Kind regards,