

20 February 2008

The Honourable Geoff Wilson, MP
Minister for Mines and Energy
PO Box 15216
CITY EAST Qld 4002

Dear Mr Wilson,

RE: Powerlink's proposed Woolooga – Eerwah Vale powerline and substation project

On 4 January 2008 Mr Gordon Jardine, Chief Executive Officer of Powerlink, wrote to you with regard to the concerns of a community group based in Eumundi – Powerlines Action Group Eumundi inc. (PAGE). PAGE has only just received a copy of his correspondence to you on January 26, 2008.

It is our expectation that we have the right to make representations to our elected representatives and be assured of genuine and open engagement in reply. It appears that Mr Jardine is attempting to subvert the consultation process and the communities' rights, by writing to you to suggest that you view correspondence from PAGE with a preconceived negativity. We object to Mr Jardine's behaviour in the strongest possible manner. PAGE is concerned that Mr Jardine's conduct may subvert the legislative purpose of gathering and properly considering the views of those most effected. Judge Skoein in *Bunnings v Redland Shire Council*¹ considered setting aside a decision of Council in relation to a town planning application where public consultation was prejudiced.

Powerlink has provided much basic, and at times irrelevant, information to those who the company considers to be 'affected' residents. However, the company has repeatedly declined to provide key information to assist the community to assess the validity of Powerlink's claims about its proposed powerline and substation project.

Questions that are not part of Powerlink's representatives' standard script for deflecting community concerns are ignored. Direct answers to direct questions about the other options Powerlink has considered and rejected for this project are not provided. The rationale behind the company's apparently significant over-calculation regarding the power required to service the Sunshine Coast into the future is not disclosed. Questions on why the company is persisting with building infrastructure with a 50 year horizon, when the most recent Federal Government policies on climate change have indicated that a mandatory decrease in emissions will be necessary in the medium term to meet the 2050 target, are ignored. Premier Bligh has repeatedly stated that your government will work in accord with its Federal counterparts on climate change policies and was instrumental in commissioning the Garnaut Review. However, there is no evidence to suggest that Powerlink has considered modern thinking on energy supply issues, and its representatives have consistently declined to engage with local residents on the potential issue of stranded infrastructure.

It is disappointing to note that, after 12 years in his position, Mr. Jardine appears to have developed little empathy or compassion for the communities his company devastates. His attempts to trivialise legitimate concerns by referring to them as "emotive" suggests a contemptuous disregard for the community. His claims that the company undertakes community consultation are patent nonsense. In fact, the company's representatives have done little other than inform the local community as to what is about to be imposed on it. There has been no genuine consultation on the options for the power supply infrastructure to the Sunshine Coast at all. There are clearly viable alternatives to Powerlink's proposal, but the company

¹ 2000 QPELR 193 @ 199

appears to have no interest whatsoever in considering them. Attempting to engage with seemingly old style bureaucrats, who see telling communities what their company is about to impose on them as 'consultation', and who decline to reveal key information on the apparent grounds that The Company Knows Best, has been frustrating and insulting. Further, we can only see Mr Jardine's efforts to predispose you to also trivialising our concerns as an attempt to misuse his access to you.

So we are not cut out of the process as it is being pushed through, PAGE has responded to the draft Terms of Reference and in time will contribute to the Environmental Impact Statement. A copy is available on the PAGE website. However, given the clear lack of genuine community consultation that occurred when Powerlink selected its proposed corridor, we contend that the process leading to the development of the draft Terms of Reference for this proposal was intrinsically flawed. The only 'consultation' Powerlink will allow – or has ever allowed – is for local residents to make representations on where they believe the final alignment of the power line should be within the corridor. This is not consultation.

We sincerely hope that you will consider the issues we raise here and in response to Mr Jardine's points with more empathy for the extreme stress, and for some utter devastation, that Powerlink's actions are causing for this community. In January 2008 the Sunshine Coast was identified in an international survey (the fourth Annual Demographia Housing Affordability Survey) as the 8th *least* affordable real estate, relative to earnings, in the world. We trust you will better grasp our concern that taking any action to impose ugly and apparently unnecessary infrastructure in this region appears to be incredibly short-sighted.

In addition, we very much hope that you will consider the broader climate change issues and the Federal Government's, your own Government's and community expectations that infrastructure developments take into account contemporary thinking about sustainable, 21st century development options. There are clearly other viable and economic alternatives to the one being forced on the community by Powerlink.

PAGE and local community members have had no success in obtaining a full and frank engagement with Powerlink on this project. Given his correspondence's tone and content, it is clear that Mr Jardine does not approach the Eumundi community with goodwill or a willingness to consider other approaches. One can only wonder if this arrogant, patronising and dismissive approach to community groups legitimately voicing their concerns over Powerlink's activities is their usual modus operandi. If so, it is entirely improper. It appears that he simply will not countenance legitimate concerns, branding them as hyperbole, exaggeration and emotive– as you have seen.

Given the obviously expressed animosity of Mr Jardine to PAGE, *we now seek an urgent meeting with you*, to discuss our concerns and alternative options. Despite Mr Jardine's letter, we trust you have not been negatively predisposed towards us, and that you are open to genuinely considering modern thinking and expectations on the issue of power supply. Our response to Mr. Jardine's claims is necessarily long, as he has chosen to present only carefully selected information to you. We have endeavoured in this letter to provide a full and frank discussion of the communities concerns to you regarding the need and alternative options to this proposal. When you have reviewed our comments, we would welcome the opportunity to discuss these and other relevant issues with you at your earliest opportunity.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Powerlines Action Group', written over a red horizontal line.

For and on behalf of:

Powerlines Action Group Eumundi Inc

Response to Mr. Jardine's Specific Claims

Claim 1: PAGE says: *Powerlink is planning 12km of 65 m high power pylons error/misleading content.*

This is a thinly veiled attempt to confuse the public in relation to the impact of their development on the residents of Eerwah Vale. Since day one Powerlink have provided contradictory and vague information on the size of pylons and impact of the powerline development. Powerlink's planning has been sloppy and incomplete with the initial alignment being chosen on the basis of outdated maps and no more than the most rudimentary desktop research. As a result initial discussions between local residents and Powerlink employees and consultants resulted in information being provided that was vague and inconclusive.

On that basis PAGE can only assume that Powerlink is still not in a position to say how long the route will be, how many pylons will be erected, how high each pylon will be, how many will be over 45m, how many will be over 65m. Without the detail of the number of pylons above or below a height, PAGE has logically considered the worst outcome in the spectrum based on Powerlink's own information. We find it incredulous that Powerlink could place information in the public domain which was destined to have such a huge impact on peoples' lives without rigorous and thorough research and planning.

Claim 2: PAGE says: *Localities on Tourist Route 22 (Kenilworth Eumundi Road) will be "ruined forever" error/misleading content.*

The scenic amenity and environment of Eerwah Vale will be ruined forever if the powerline is constructed – in the eyes of those who call it home. People have chosen to live in this area because of its unspoilt beauty, undoubted cultural heritage, and peaceful tranquility. We beg to differ with Mr. Jardine's view from his suburban office and assure you that in the eyes of those who have chosen to call this home the construction of powerlines by Powerlink will ruin this area forever.

The Sunshine Coast Hinterland has been recognised in the *Maroochy 2000 Plan*, the *South East Queensland Regional Plan* and the Department of Infrastructure & Planning's *Scenic Amenity Guidelines (Sept 07)* as an area of outstanding natural beauty, consistently scoring extremely high ratings on the issue of Scenic Amenity. The State Government recognised the beauty of the specific area under consideration by designating the Eumundi-Kenilworth Road as Tourist Route 22. Given the planned location for the Eerwah Vale substation, the power lines can not help but be clearly visible from Tourist Route 22.

More recently (January 2008) the Sunshine Coast was identified in an international survey (the fourth Annual Demographia Housing Affordability Survey) as the 8th *least* affordable real estate, relative to earnings, in the world. It is nonsense to suggest that placing power line infrastructure for many kilometres through this region will not have an extremely adverse impact on its scenic amenity.

Mr Jardine claims that "there are numerous thriving and growing towns and locations throughout Queensland where a transmission line is much closer to a major road than this one, and has been for years". In seeking to dismiss the heartfelt view of the local residents, he is careful to avoid admitting that these "other towns and locations" are not at all comparable to the Sunshine Coast Hinterland in terms of being officially designated areas of High Scenic Amenity or as having a significant real estate values which result from the area's beauty.

Powerlink's own literature, *Screening Your Home From Powerlines*, states "... most of us find that the powerlines and structures used to distribute electricity are not attractive". Given the officially recognised outstanding natural beauty of the Sunshine Coast Hinterland, a suggestion that the scenic amenity and real estate values of the area will not be affected by the intrusion of a large power line and a commensurately large substation appears to be disingenuous at best.

Claim 3: PAGE says: *Wildlife corridors will be destroyed ... error/misleading content.*

Powerlink representatives have advised local residents that a 60m wide easement will be purchased by Powerlink for the entire length of the corridor. The company's own literature, *Screening Your Home From Powerlines*, states "... planting should not be undertaken within power easements". Elsewhere, the company's pamphlet *Easement Co-Use* states "low growing (less than 3.5m high) crops would generally be permitted" and with permission and a possible fee for a site assessment "smaller shrubs and trees can be planted".

Local residents have sought specific and less contradictory detail on precisely what will happen to vegetation in the easement – and thus the wildlife corridors that have been carefully nurtured and maintained by local residents for many years. After some questioning, company representatives have indicated that all vegetation in the easement will be cleared for a distance of 20m around each tower structure and that directly under the lines all vegetation over 4m in height will be cleared.

When further questioned on the logistics of such an exercise, company representatives and literature have revealed that the most expedient manner of clearing easements, and the practice used and favored by Powerlink, is to use a bulldozer set at a 100mm height from the ground² and "initial clearing to a nominal 22 m width in sensitive vegetation, and a maximum of 50 m i.e. 25 m either side of the transmission line" as illustrated in a previous EIS³. Mr. Jardine has been careful in his phrasing to you that "transmission lines built to modern day standards do not destroy wildlife corridors". The actual extent of vegetation clearance for *this* project is expected to be significant based on previous projects. It is difficult to see how the expected level of clearing as articulated to us will not destroy all wildlife corridors in its path.

Claim 4: PAGE says: *The line...can only decrease property values throughout the area - for some properties by a massive amount error/misleading content.*

The most common method of property valuation undertaken by registered property valuers and real estate agents to determine the market value of a property is to directly compare it with comparable properties in the area. It is common sense that if several property values decline, other property values in the area will also decline. Real estate agents and valuers contacted by PAGE have indicated that it is a nonsense to suggest that power pylons crossing a property will not have a significant adverse impact on that property's value, and a negative flow on effect to its neighbours.

In a meeting with Powerlink representatives in October 2007, one local resident attempted to relate her personal experience in having power lines and their pylons imposed on her property in another area. Her property was devalued by 75% and took six years to sell, with real estate agents advising that this was a direct result of the power lines and pylons impacting on her property. Unfortunately, the Powerlink representatives at this meeting did not listen to this resident's story, choosing to chat among themselves while she spoke. Their breathtaking show of contempt for her was, unfortunately, only a sign of things to come when local residents have attempted to discuss land devaluations with company representatives.

In his correspondence to you, Mr. Jardine appears to be careful in his phrasing in claiming that "Powerlink is not aware of any evidence to suggest that the development of new transmission infrastructure has any sustained material impact on the value of nearby properties". It obviously has a direct impact on properties over which an easement is located. "Nearby" property values will also be affected, without compensation. It is likely that Powerlink has no evidence to suggest there is any sustained material impact on the values of nearby properties because it *simply has not sought this evidence.*

² Powerlink Queensland Nebo to QR Mindi 132 kV Transmission Project Environmental Impact Assessment Statement 2005 p17

³ Powerlink Queensland Spring Gully to Braemar 330 kV Transmission Line Project Interim Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Management Plan Volume 3 p13.

A number of residents have raised the issue of placing the power lines underground, if there really is no choice as to where the corridor should be placed. Powerlink is immediately dismissive of this option. Costs cited for under-grounding range from four times higher to 20 times higher, depending on who provides the information. Apart from the social and visual amenity concerns over this project, the compensation payable to resume real estate in the 8th least affordable area in the world would be significant, if the true value was accepted. In the most recent residential estate developed on the outskirts of Eumundi, land is currently selling for \$1.5 million per acre.

The significant adverse impact on visual amenity (and hence resale value) for directly impacted properties and those “nearby” who would otherwise have a clear view of the corridor would be appreciably lessened if the power line corridor was underground and invisible. An easement would need to be cut across these properties for the over or below ground option, and to that extent compensation would be required. But viewing a grassed easement will not have the same visual impact as viewing a trail of power pylons. The savings from making lesser compensation payments in this very expensive part of the world may well outweigh the costs of under-grounding the corridor. This option would also satisfactorily deal with the broader community’s concerns over scenic amenity.

However, Powerlink has indicated that the cost of compensation does not enter into its calculations when considering the overall cost of the project, and on those grounds any discussion regarding the potential savings by under-grounding it are dismissed out of hand as having no relevance. Powerlink appears to have undertaken no research whatsoever into this option in the Eerwah Vale corridor. Its claim that compensation payments are not part of the construction budget, and therefore do not count when calculating the overall cost of a project, is a nonsense that amounts to no more than sleight of hand in terms of hiding the true costs to taxpayers – and to the Government - of Powerlink’s infrastructure developments.

Claim 5: *PAGE says: The health of local residents could be harmed by EMFs (Electric and Magnetic Fields) error/misleading content.*

There are two issues to address when considering Mr Jardine’s claims to you on this point:

Firstly, Mr Jardine states that “based on the current proposed alignment, there are only two (2) houses in the Eerwah Vale area within 100m of the line.” In fact, on the current alignment there are five houses within 100m of the line within the study corridor. Powerlink representatives have admitted in meetings with local residents that the company has relied on data three years old when selecting its first alignment, which resulted in the line going directly over people’s houses. Repeated requests for company representatives to discuss why Powerlink has relied on such out-dated data when making its decisions have proved fruitless for local residents. Perhaps you, Minister, will have more success in getting a straight answer on this. We would appreciate being copied in to any responses Powerlink agrees to give you on this issue.

Secondly, on the broader issue of EMFs, Australian and international studies released in the last 3 years suggest that living close to the electro-magnetic fields emanating from high voltage power lines increases the risk of cancer. Powerlink refers repeatedly to the safety for individuals living 100m from high voltage power lines, when the most recent research suggests “those who had lived [within 300m of a power line] aged 0–5 years had a fivefold increase in risk”⁴ of developing cancer. Earlier studies⁵ have reached similar conclusions.

⁴ R. M. Lowenthal, D. M. Tuck, I. C. Bray (2007) Residential exposure to electric power transmission lines and risk of lymphoproliferative and myeloproliferative disorders: a case-control study *Internal Medicine Journal* 37 (9), 614–619

⁵ Childhood cancer in relation to distance from high voltage power lines in England and Wales: a case-control study Gerald Draper et al, honorary senior research fellow, Childhood Cancer Research Group University of Oxford. Published in the *British Medical Journal* 4 June 2005.

Powerlink will not explain why, other than to note that it is not conducive with the company's long-held position that EMFs 100m from a home are safe. In a Letter to the Editor of a local newspaper Mr. Jardine claims that EMFs 50m from a high voltage power line are comparable with those found in a typical house. He goes on to suggest that EMF levels can in fact be higher in hairdryers held close to the head and electric blankets. He neglects to mention that there is no research whatsoever to suggest that there is a spike in cancer diagnoses for women using hairdryers, or for people sleeping on electric blankets, when there is very recent research that points to cancer spikes in children living near high voltage power lines.

Further, Powerlink's newsletter in October 2007 states "even directly under the proposed transmission line, the fields would be well within current guidelines set by the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council." Mr Jardine has neglected to mention that these guidelines are in fact interim guidelines issued in 1989, stating that significant additional research was required into this issue. The interim guidelines have been rescinded by ANHMRC and responsibility passed to ARPANSA, who are due to issue new guidelines in mid 2008. Given that Powerlink is relying on interim guidelines that were issued almost 20 years ago, coupled with disturbing research findings issued in 2007, we note this does not conform to the well intentioned principle of prudent avoidance. Mr Jardine's dismissal of legitimate community concerns over their and their families' health is, in the community's opinion a serious matter.

Minister, we ask you to satisfy yourself that Powerlink is correct in its assertion that there is little or no danger from electro-magnetic fields? PAGE and the local residents would very much appreciate hearing the grounds on which you consider the most recent research on this topic.

Claim 6: *PAGE implies: EMFs pose a similar health risk to cigarette smoking and asbestos error/misleading content.*

Mr. Jardine has misinterpreted PAGE's claims on this issue. PAGE has made an analogy with Powerlink's claims regarding EMFs, in the face of the most up-to-date research available on this topic and the company's consistent refusal to acknowledge or incorporate these findings into its activities. In suggesting that PAGE claims a similar health risk from EMFs as is found in cigarettes and asbestos, Mr. Jardine has erred. –PAGE does claim and has stated that "experts" for the asbestos and tobacco industry claimed their products safe. Those claims are debunked. It is prudent to view and investigate the latest research on these risks.

Claim 7: *PAGE says: Powerlink's plans will lead to a 500% increase in the power supply to the Sunshine Coast error/misleading content.*

It is telling that Mr Jardine does not state that this figure is incorrect, merely noting that it is "speculative". It is speculative! PAGE has repeatedly requested definitive information on the increase in capacity being transmitted to the area, but to date Powerlink has declined to provide this information other than in the most cursory manner that is impossible to properly interpret. PAGE has some technical expertise available to it, and has advised Powerlink representatives that if the company would not provide this information we would make reasonable assumptions in calculating this and other figures. Perhaps you, Minister, will have more luck than PAGE – and the local community - in extracting this information from Powerlink. We would very much appreciate receiving a copy of any information Powerlink agrees to provide to you.

PAGE has some appreciation of Powerlink's regulatory obligations, including the N1 requirements, and our research indicates that the company has options to meet these requirements in this area with solutions that avoid the new easement and line as proposed. A viable alternative could involve addressing the immediate issues at Gympie and then the northern Sunshine Coast requirements as part of the transmission augmentation further south. It is clear that the full impact of the present proposal was not apparent to the company when it selected this corridor as a result of its use of significantly outdated aerial photos. Now that the extent of residential development in the area is clear, together with other issues such as the high level of importance State and Local Governments place on its scenic amenity and its very high real estate prices, it is not unreasonable that Powerlink becomes more creative in considering other options to meet its requirements.

In addition, Powerlink continues to state that the electricity demand in the region has increased by over 500% in the last 40 years. The continued justification made by Powerlink for this project is the “ever increasing demand for electricity”. The clear assumption here is that future demand will grow in the same manner as past demand. This is a flawed approach that takes little or no account of changes in Local, State and Federal Government policy on climate change, emission caps, carbon pricing, increases mandated for renewable energy or the clear potential of demand management. Despite signing the *Network Demand Management Roadmap for Queensland*, comments in Powerlink’s December 2007 Newsletter that state “the responsibility for whether households use more or less electricity rests with individuals” clearly indicates that its management appears not to be serious in pursuing demand management. It is fortunate this approach was not endorsed in the area of water, where genuine commitment from all stakeholders has resulted in savings of over 50% in Brisbane through public information campaigns and the appropriate incentives. This has been a particularly notable achievement of your government.

In his cursory dismissal of PAGE’s attempts to understand Powerlink’s rationale for what appears to be a significant planned over-supply of power for the region’s actual needs, Mr Jardine has neglected to advise you on Powerlink’s lack of participation in demand management activities. Such activities can often be the most appropriate and least cost planning approach for investment in matching demand and supply requirements. Powerlink has declined requests to provide full disclosure of the company’s detailed demand forecasts and assumptions, with particular emphasis on the contributions to be made by demand management and renewable energy. PAGE would very much appreciate your assistance in obtaining this data so that the public “consultation” can be meaningful.

Claim 8: *PAGE says: Population projections indicate that only a 30% increase in electricity supply will be necessary into the future error/misleading content.*

PAGE acknowledged this was an incomplete quote, where technical information was lost in translation for a lay-audience, and amended this statement on its website some time ago.

Claim 9: *PAGE implies: The new powerline may be needed to power to the much-opposed Bridges industrial Estate error/misleading content.*

Mr Jardine’s comment that “such suggestions fit the classic mould of conspiracy theories” is driven by Powerlink’s failure to clearly articulate the future uses to be supplied. The local community has repeatedly sought to engage with Powerlink to understand why there needs to be a massive increase and apparent over-supply of power coming into the Eerwah Vale area. In recent times the State Government has indeed supported the creation of an industrial estate in the nearby area of Bridges. In the face of Powerlink’s consistent failure to provide transparent information on the size of the additional capacity being installed at the Eerwah Vale substation, the community naturally sought to make some sense of this proposal. A robust and detailed planning process would take account of potential increases in demand from future commercial and industrial users within the area being serviced. This again calls into question the adequacy of the demand forecast process undertaken by Powerlink unless of course the size of the infrastructure being proposed is so large that it will cope with any and all future developments. We have now taken Powerlink’s assertion at face value and informed the community that the infrastructure has no connection with the “Bridges” proposal.

Powerlink has resisted providing clear, open and transparent information and to entering into *genuine* consultation processes that respect local communities. Were the company to adopt a contemporary approach to community consultation, this would go a long way to allowing the community to develop a full understanding of the requirements and possible solutions to the energy issues facing the area. The key words here are “genuine consultation processes”. There has never been a hint of this in Powerlink’s dealings with the community, with the company doing nothing more than informing residents of the solution it has decided on. The claim of ‘consultation’ apparently stems from the fact that residents may comment on

the placement of the final alignment of the corridor. Repeated requests to engage on the issue of the rationale behind the corridor selection and apparent over-supply of power have been ignored.

Claim 10: PAGE says: *"A potential desalination plant at Peregian has also been rumoured" error/misleading content.*

The Department of Infrastructure & Planning is actively considering potential sites for desalination plants in South East Queensland, and the speculation regarding Peregian as a potential site has been in the public domain for several months. There have been a number of media reports on this issue and the State Member for Noosa, Mr. Glen Elmes⁶ has certainly been regarded by the local community as a reliable source when it comes to this information. Had Mr. Jardine chosen to consult with PAGE over its openly stated concern on this issue rather than dismissing it as "conspiracy theory #2, PAGE would have been happy to assist him in his enquiries. This is an issue we and many others in the wider community are keen to see resolved.

Of course, Powerlink would no doubt, be aware of its request for contingency funding approval from the Australian Energy Regulator, which states "...the AER considers that a contingent project should be included for transmission works associated with additional desalination plants in SEQ."⁷.

Claim 11: PAGE says: *"Residents on the eastern side of Eumundi also face the prospect of giant power pylons cutting a swathe through their land, together with residents in Doonan and Verrierdale...this appears inevitable" error/misleading content.*

Consumers have no interest in distinguishing between Powerlink and Energex when considering infrastructure development. It is clear from the South East Queensland Regional Plan that an additional significant powerline is planned between the Eumundi area to the vicinity of Coolum. Whether this is completed by Powerlink or Energex is irrelevant from an end user or landholder's perspective. Mr. Jardine's comments, berating the community for seeing no difference in the end result – additional infrastructure development - and insisting there is a difference based on whether Energex or Powerlink builds this infrastructure is mystifying. More effective consultation with the community would have ensured that Powerlink was not so completely out of touch with community concerns and would have allowed them to explain why infrastructure imposed by Energex is not the same as infrastructure imposed by Powerlink. As an aside, it is worth noting that to date our consultations with Energex on this issue have shown that organisation to be helpful, forthcoming and apparently committed to minimizing the impact of its activities on local communities. Energex appears to actively consider under-grounding its projects to take into account bigger picture social and aesthetic needs, and does not dismiss such considerations as less important than profit.

One final point on the issue of consultation: In Powerlink's first Newsletter it stated "there will be lots of opportunities for affected landowners and members of the community to find out more about the project and provide their input on matters important to them. Our communication activities aim to provide opportunities for two-way information exchange." This bright promise appears to have related only to information regarding the alignment of the powerline corridor selected by Powerlink, and nothing else. For example, a copy of the Corridor Selection Report was sought but this was refused. A subsequent Freedom of Information request has also been refused on the grounds that the report relates to "commercial activities" – a somewhat unusual reason for denial given that Powerlink will be publishing the report in the Environmental Impact Statement. In November 2007 a copy of the *Network Demand Management Roadmap for Queensland*, was also sought and despite assurances that this request would be dealt with in a timely manner, the provision of this document was eventually declined on February 15, 2008, despite previously agreed target dates being missed. These are just three examples of the lack of co-operation displayed by Powerlink in its dealing with the local community with whom it is supposed to be having a "two-way information exchange". It appears that the exchange of information is only if it suits Powerlink. Rather than

⁶ <http://www.glenelmes.com/pdf/DeSal%20Another%20Secret%2012%20Nov%2007.pdf>

⁷ AER Decision—Queensland transmission network revenue cap 2007–08 to 2011–12 p52

writing to you to make claims of scare-mongering by PAGE, perhaps in the future Mr. Jardine's time would be more productively spent ensuring that Powerlink provide sufficient information to allow the community to make informed assessments of his company's plans and activities. To date, Powerlink has proved entirely resistant to this concept.

Claim 12: PAGE says: *"Save Eumundi" error/misleading content.*

The suggestion has never been made that the powerline or the substation will be visible from the Eumundi township, although it is indeed true that many properties in the 4562 postcode area (immediate Eumundi surrounds) will have a clear view of this corridor. In addition, the Eerwah Vale substation will be located within 300m of the suburb of Eumundi – reference the Sunshine Coast UBD. The substation is closer to Eumundi than any other population centre.

What is erroneous and misleading is Powerlink's attempt to name the Eerwah Vale substation 'Cooroy South'. In his correspondence to you dated 4 January 2008 Mr Jardine is perpetuating this myth by referring to the "Woolooga-Cooroy South powerline". There is no suburb, community or locality called Cooroy South. From the earliest days of its information provision to the local community, Powerlink has been challenged on its misleading use of the name 'Cooroy South' when in fact the substation will sit squarely in Eerwah Vale.