

Water Team
Essential Services Commission
Level 37, 2 Lonsdale Street
Melbourne Vic 3000

From
Alanna Moore

3/4/2018

Dear Sir/Madam

Coliban Water 2018 water price review submission

I am a customer of Coliban Water and I was dismayed to read of the roll-out of digital smart meters for water as a component of the water price review. With no provision for opting out of such, one wonders if we are living in a fascist regime!

As an electro-sensitive person, I have experienced suffering caused by the installation of an electrical so-called smart meter in my home (installed without my consent, while I was overseas). This gave me sleeping and concentration difficulties, headaches and anxiety, and other classic symptoms of electro-sensitivity.

These days I live in a low radiation environment and I want to keep it that way. That means I don't have a mobile phone, wifi and the like. To have such a toxic device as a 'smart' water meter forced upon me, for no good reason, would be an invasion of my right to enjoy my home environment.

There is nothing smart about increasing levels of electro-smog in the environment. As a building biologist I know that it is crucial to keep environmental electromagnetic levels as close to natural as possible. The Kyoto Protocol insists on using the Precautionary Principle for such impacts. In other words - if you don't really need it, don't do it!

Coliban has not exactly spelt out the nature of the meter technology for all to comprehend. I'm sure if they asked people if they wanted more pulsed

microwave radiation in their home environment, where they are trying to sleep or raise little children with thin, vulnerable skulls, they would not have a bar of it! So the community feedback process just looks like a cynical 'we're-going-through-the-motions' type of process.

Really I cannot see any benefits from this technological approach, when anyone can already monitor water use by reading their harmless analogue meter.

So why do it? It seems that the plan is to sneak in Time of Use pricing onto unsuspecting customers. Such a pricing system would be unfair, unpopular and completely unnecessary. Water restrictions and pricing for over-use are sufficient for saving water, assuming that is the main aim, not just profiteering. Or perhaps they want the ability to remotely cut off non-paying customers and leave them without water supply? The mind boggles at what social harm this type of technology could lead to.

So in conclusion I would say, save the \$5 million (which will probably escalate to a higher cost, as is the usual scenario) and spend that on improving the water infrastructure and leave us customers in peace, please!

Yours,

Alanna Moore

Building Biologist