

Steve Rice

From: TPCallin [TPCallin@mfe.govt.nz]
Sent: Sunday, 30 September 2007 9:34 p.m.
To: rice-resources-ltd@clear.net.nz
Subject: FW: Grid Upgrade Submissions

RECEIVED ON

30 SEP 2007

0406

From: anonymous@createhosting.net.nz [SMTP:ANONYMOUS@CREATEHOSTING.NET.NZ]
Sent: Sunday, September 30, 2007 9:30:54 PM
To: boisub@notowers.co.nz
Subject: Grid Upgrade Submissions
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Catherine Brennan
Phone: 07 827 7622
Email: kate@lifestyleblock.co.nz
Yes: I/we wish to be heard in support of my/our submission at the public hearing, and expect I will need between one and two hours to present my evidence. I would like the location of the portion of the hearing which will receive my evidence to be held in a local venue near to where I live.
submitter: Catherine Brennan
A: copy of this submission has been emailed to Transpower.
Scope: This submission covers all notices of requirements and applications for resource consents relating Transpower's applications that will be heard by this Board of Inquiry. The references are NORs 27619, L07089, DES0011/07, RMR200621, DN/0006/07, 240/021, RM070209, and resource consents 34102, 34370, 34372, 34373, 34711, 34712, 116902, 116903, 116904, 116905, and any other NORs or resource consent applications that may subsequently be filed or altered. We oppose all of these NORs and applications for resource consent.
Re: This submission relates to the notices of requirement and/or applications for resource consent, lodged by Transpower New Zealand Ltd for the North Island Grid Upgrade Project, and identified above.
Remote Name: 219.88.144.45
Date: 30 September 2007

Address:

Grey Rd

RD 4

Cambridge

Reasons:

I am completely opposed to Transpower's intention to build this un-needed line, as the demand growth projections of the Electricity Commission (2007 SOO) do not justify its construction. The scale and capacity of this proposed 400kV capable line is completely out of alignment with the expected requirements for transmission capacity into Auckland to meet demand growth in the next 40 years. The potential new generation capacity likely to be constructed in the Auckland region in the next 40 years has been grossly underestimated in an attempt to justify this line as one of national significance and urgency.

I reject the flawed EC decision that the proposal represents the best value for money solution for Auckland and the Upper North Island transmission needs. There is no evidence that adequate compensation and other property costs have been anticipated in the economic analyses so far. The EC refused to address environmental cost and easement issues, deferring that consideration to the RMA process.

The proposal is unlikely ever to be approved to be energised at 400kV as it will not

meet Grid Reliability Standards or Good Electricity Industry Practice. Therefore the size of the pylons and resulting environmental impacts are completely unnecessary.

Transpower's lack of good faith throughout the consultation process and arrogance render it unfit to warrant the role of system operator and grid planner.

During the consultation process it has become apparent that a significant body of scientific evidence exists that HVAC lines are a serious threat to health. Once again, the EC deferred consideration of the health issues to the RMA process.

Better, equal-benefit alternatives to this proposed line are available that have a much reduced environmental impact, such as more generation in the Auckland region, duplexing and reconductoring of the Whakamaru A, B and C lines, use of HVDC transmission technology which will be less obtrusive and easier to underground, more extensive use of undergrounding of HVAC lines, and consideration of new conventional small scale 220kV transmission lines.

I oppose this line being built on a 65 metre wide easement, when a 600 metre wide easement, free of houses and workplaces, should be required as a precautionary principle to reduce future health risks and environmental impacts.

I oppose large scale HVAC transmission lines being built on narrow 65 metre wide easements because of the EMF emissions and ionized particle emissions that will come from this line, which have been proven to cause numerous diseases, including childhood leukaemia.

I oppose these applications because Transpower has falsely (and perhaps criminally) tried to justify the need for this line being built by using out of date and inaccurately high demand growth forecasts (2005 SOO), have not included the cost of environmental impacts in their justifications, and are providing misleading and inaccurate costings of the real alternative options to this line that should be considered.

Therefore:

I seek the following decision from the Board of Inquiry. That the application for Notices of Requirement and Resource Consents should be turned down completely, and Transpower directed to investigate generation, conservation and transmission alternatives that will avoid this line being built under any circumstances.

I explicitly do not want the Board of Inquiry to approve the applications subject to conditions - I want the applications turned down in whole.