

From: Response Report <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, 12 November 2021 2:55 PM
To: EES ECCS Electricity Infrastructure Roadmap Mailbox
Subject: Your form "Electricity infrastructure roadmap policy consultation" got a response

Categories: Reg Coord team to response

Your form "Electricity infrastructure roadmap policy consultation" has received the following response:

Submitted on: 12/11/21 14:55:17

Completion time:

Your details Submission type
- Individual

Other

Author name
Ross Smith

Organisation

Author title

Email
[REDACTED]

Stakeholder group
Network infrastructure provider

Other (please specify)
(Landholder)

Questions Question 1: Do you agree with the proposed guiding principles? Are there additional principles that should be considered?

The Electricity planning should be completed by a body who have nothing to do with construction of power lines.

Question 2: What are your views on the proposed approach to defining classes of network infrastructure?
Not qualified to comment

Question 3: Are there any risks to the effective delivery of a REZ if the necessary system strength services are not included as a class of network asset under the EII Act?
Not qualified

Question 4: Does the proposed method appropriately balance the transparency of costs recovered through the Scheme Financial Vehicle against the certainty needed to conduct preparatory activities and development works to deliver timely REZs?

TransGrid have obviously not conducted their preparatory activities in a sensible manner because they keep changing the routes. How can we have any faith in what is actually required if they don't appear to have any idea?

Question 5: What information relating to network options do Long-Term Energy Service Agreement and access right tender participants require to provide sufficient certainty and confidence to participate in the bid processes?

Not qualified

Question 6: What eligibility criteria should apply for Network Operators that may be authorised to carry out a REZ network infrastructure project?

They should be able to put infrastructure in place, having nothing to do with the pre planning, since they will always look out for the best result for their shareholders, having no sympathy for those impacted by the project.

Question 7: What factors should be considered by the Consumer Trustee in recommending that the Minister direct, and by the Minister in directing, a Network Operator to carry out a REZ network infrastructure project under the EII Act?

In this day & age all power transmission should be underground. TransGrid would not want to do this because of the reduced income from future maintenance. It should be noted that most impacted landholders would not be chasing as much compensation if they won't be impacted as much.

Question 8: How can consumer and stakeholder input be considered in the TET and revenue determination processes?

Consumers should pay the actual cost of power without subsidies for renewables. Then we might see a clearer indication of what people want not wish.

Question 9: Is clarification required with regard to the principles to be taken into account by the Regulator and the Objects of the Act, and are there any additional principles that should be considered by the Regulator?

As stated before, cost of projects would be cheaper if they were planned, then delivered by the trusted company, not allow them to plan a delivery system that will enhance the bottom line of their shareholders.

Question 10: What views do you have on these elements and is there any other guidance that should be included in the TET Guidelines to be developed by the Regulator?

Ditto from Q 9

Question 11: Should financeability concerns be addressed in the NSW framework?

If the project can't be afforded then it probably shouldn't go ahead. I see the ugly solar farms & wind turbines & consider that they should never have been allowed to be built in regional areas. Cities want renewable energy therefore they should be built in or near cities to save on extra transmission lines. That would reduce the cost in dollars & mental health.

Question 12: What views do you have on these elements and is there any other guidance that should be included in the Guidelines regarding the revenue determination to be developed by the Regulator?

Not qualified

Question 13: Are there any elements of the AER's approach to assessing and setting regulated revenue requirements which should be modified or added to when considering the framework that will be applied under the EII Act in NSW?

Not qualified but reiterate that my taxes should not subsidise others power bills. Everyone should pay their fair share, if they can't afford it there is the option to turn something off.

Question 14: What do you think about an incentive scheme to ensure the availability of projects and the timely connection of generators to a REZ by Network Operators? How could that be designed?

Don't like it, as incentives only cause shortcuts somewhere else

Question 15: Do you agree there should be limited circumstances in which the Consumer Trustee directs the Regulator to review and remake a revenue determination outside of the five-yearly cycle?

Not qualified

Question 16: Do you agree with the proposed circumstances that the Regulator may adjust a revenue determination during the five-yearly cycle?

Not qualified

Question 17: Is there a need to clarify the process for transitioning of assets between the NSW and national frameworks?

Not qualified, but any lines transmitting power to another state should be paid for by that state, not Federal Govt

Question 18: Is there a need to clarify the circumstances by which a transfer of network infrastructure from a Network Operator to another person may occur under the EII Act?

Not qualified

Confidentiality and submission publication preferencesPlease indicate your publication preferences (select one option only

Option 1: Non-confidential submission