



Submission to electricity transmission company land access Statement of Expectations

Submission received through Engage Victoria

From 24 March to 19 April 2022, the commission accepted submissions on our draft Statement of Expectations for electricity transmission company land access via [Engage Victoria](#). On the 4 April 2022 we hosted a public webinar on the project, followed by a meeting with industry representatives on 5 April 2022. We have used these submissions to inform our final decision.

Date submitted: 12 April 2022

Name: [REDACTED]

Stakeholder/interest group: I live next to current Bulgana powerline and proposed AusNET new line

Q5. What has worked well in relation to prior instances of land access?

Planned in-person visits to farm by Technical Experts, where written information is supplied prior (generates Q's). SMS messages about access times/availability and our very short term whereabouts (eg. rain/storms = sheep movement or fence repair)

Q6. What key challenges have you faced under current land access arrangements?

The Shire council should have known about the expanded need for additional powerlines in our corridor and informed us on the House Build Permit they issued in 2016. The nearby Wind turbines were planned 2009, built by 2012. Now we face living less than 100m from an EM source which statistically can cause negative health outcomes.

Q7. What information do you consider you need prior to land access to feel comfortable with an exercise of a right to access land?

Where they intend to build within 300m of a dwelling, what their priority rationale is - eg. Ecology over farmer health, Cultural Heritage over Farming productivity etc. Obvious they have to tell us the intention of the visit, what types of vehicles will be used, how many staff, their relevance to the work/inspection (experience/training), if those staff have criminal backgrounds, if ground disturbing activities will be undertaken or not, how and whether all staff are prior informed about our farm stock whereabouts and sensitivities. How do I know what their education levels concerning weeds

and plant species are and whether they will stay to the tracks. How would they act if coming across a distressed farm animal?

Q8. Do you think the principles of the draft Statement of Expectations on land access address issues of concern to you?

Somewhat. This is just land access - but it tends to build the early bullshit from the 'Community Consultants' these companies hire first in the process. Issues of powerline design, location are of greater concern to us than just access. But they get all cagey if we want to speak with those doing the work/inspection, and dont understand out unique security risks on remote properties. No is my answer overall, cause after 3 years of bullshit and really poor public announcements, we still dont know if we will have to move the whole house 250m further to the north away from the proposed line.

I am really concerned that the methods of communication in the pandemic became ZOOM/TEAMS and verbal statements made by Powerline consultants are never documented - we get rhetoric and appealing verbal comms that fall short when the legal letters and negotiated compensation offers roll around much later.

Q9. What information do you think we should collect about a transmission companies' performance in relation to land access and frequency?

They should present to each landowner an annual log (report) of access with details of - Reason for access, No of vehicles, No of staff, time in & time out and any ground disturbing works undertaken. Also if out of daylight hours, why need for access in those times. Performance metrics around method of comms used for each access, advanced notice time for access, unnecessary request for access not used.

Q10. Is there anything else you want us to consider when finalising this Statement of Expectations?

If they are accessing anyones land for purposes to propose, or scope a new powerline, they must have a list of matters that have to be raised with the landowner(s). This list must include the uncertainty around negative long term health impacts of EM fields on humans if they reside/work within 300m of that EM source. And background measurements of EM levels (especially magnetic) need to be taken so that comparison can be made post powerline construction and use. Landowners have the right to know the WHO and other science bodies cant explain why the statistics are such, but that if the powerline is built near them their may be long term physical or mental harm. PS. They should not describe these landowners as "Community" - we (the impacted corridors) are a subset of that only, and it is poor to say community consultations happen when Pandemic restrictions mean a real community in-person interaction is not possible. So they should commensurably call us "Affected Landowners"

Q11. Submission documentation provided

Yes – document provided is an image of home location and will not provided as per submitters request.

Q12. I agree to the collection notice on this page.

Yes

Q13. I'd like my name or other identifying information withheld when published.

Yes

Q14. I'd like my submission to be treated as confidential.

No