

1.1 HumeLink Upper Lachlan Yass Valley Community Consultative Group: 6th Meeting 14 September 2022

Time	12 - 2pm
Date	14/09/2022
Attendees	<p>Chair: Brian Elton Secretariat: Ella Burgess Transgrid CCG members: Naomi Rowe Transgrid speakers: Daniel Burn, Carl Charlier, Nathan Rhodes Transgrid project member attendees: Tammy Sinclair, Cameron Walters Guest speakers: Brendan Nelson, Independent Peer Review, MacroPlan Community members: Cr Adrian Cameron, Mayor Pem Kensit, Rene Lunardello, Andrea Strong, Russ Erwin, Catriona McCauliffe, Dan Banham Deputy Landowner and Community Advocate (Observer): Barbara El Gamal Observers: Chris Johnson (Transgrid)</p>
Apologies	Tyronne Bell
Meeting location	Yass Council Chambers
Meeting materials	Presentation
Purpose of meeting	Meeting 6

Item	Discussion Summary	To note
Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The meeting commenced at 12:03pm. - The Chair welcomed all and gave an Acknowledgement of Country. - The Chair asked the community CCG members and the team from Transgrid to introduce themselves and their role in the HumeLink project. - The Chair noted that Brendan Nelson from MacroPlan was supposed to be in attendance, however his flight had been delayed. Brendan has conducted an independent review of Transgrid's route alignment process. 	
Minutes and Matters Arising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No comments made on the previous minutes. 	

	<p><i>The minutes of the previous meeting have been endorsed by the Chair and posted to the Transgrid website.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A CWG member asked if the minutes can be published earlier. - The Chair noted the minutes would be sent out in an improved timeline and reminded the group of the process the minutes go through prior to being published on Transgrid’s website. - Naomi noted that there were many challenges, particularly with sickness and IT, that lead to a delay in the minutes being published from the last meeting. - Matters arising were noted as being discussed in the agenda for the meeting. - The Chair noted that due to the availability of speakers, the topic timings would not run as outlined in the agenda. 	
<p>HumeLink Progress Update</p>	<p>Nathan gave an overview of HumeLink’s progress See slide 12 of the presentation for an update on HumeLink’s progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regulatory space: The Australian Energy Regulator (AER) has approved early works funding of \$322 million. Transgrid has been working with the AER since the approval has been made. The approval is staged. This initial funding is for stage 1, early works, which is about 10% of the project’s total value. Stage 1 includes items such as procurement, geo-tech studies, early works etc. - Route Refinement: The 200m corridor for the majority of the route has been refined. Nathan noted that community engagement was factored into the route refinement decisions. There are three key regulators Transgrid must operate under the guise of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) who operate the energy market. Since the last CCG meeting, the ISP has been updated. AEMO is concerned about the security of the energy space and all larger energy infrastructure projects have been accelerated. HumeLink’s timeline has been accelerated by 6 	<p>-</p>

months to completion in July 2026.

- The Australian Energy Regulator (AER) is the economic regulator and ensures that HumeLink is delivered with the most prudent and cost-efficient outcomes for the project.
- The Department of Planning and Environment requires the project to focus on people, place and the environment.
- Route refinement is the intersection between all three regulators. The Red Hat Review, as conducted by MacroPlan, tested the trade offs that have been made in that process. It has been a worthwhile exercise with many learnings. Nathan noted that many communities welcomed the Red Hat Review.
- Environmental Impact Statement (EIS): Field survey work is continuing to inform the drafting of the initial chapters of the EIS. Community engagement on the EIS and technical studies has commenced.
- Procurement: Transgrid has gone to the market for expressions of interest to identify a suitable major contracting partner. Nathan noted that given the number of large infrastructure projects in Australia, it is a heated market. Transgrid is very sensitive to choosing the right contractors who will operate in local communities with social license. Three firms will be shortlisted in approximately a fortnight. They will not be contracted on fixed prices as there are many complexities within HumeLink that the contractors must work flexibly with.
- Nathan noted that in 2022 dollars the cost of the project is in the order of \$3.7 billion.
- Property: On 25 August 2022, Transgrid met with representatives from the HumeLink Action Group (HAG), the Australian Energy Infrastructure Commissioner (AEIC) and some impacted landowners. The meeting identified that an update of the Option Deed and Property Management Plan was required. Over the last two weeks, Transgrid has been updating the Option Deed document

and Property Management Plan as per the feedback received. The new document is a lot more straightforward. Any landowner who has received a copy of the Option Deed previously used will be issued with the new Option Deed and given the option to consider any changes made in the new Option Deed.

- Engineering: Geotech and ground condition studies will commence later in 2022. These studies are crucial to gain a deeper understanding of the ground conditions.

The Chair called for questions.

- Andrea asked what index the 2022 figures were based on.
- Nathan answered they were based on CPI.
- ACTION: Transgrid to supply the exact number the 2022 figures were based on.
- Carl noted that the AER determines how the numbers are determined, it's not Transgrid's decision. There is a review every 4 years of the determination and the AER take submissions.
- Dan noted that the calculation is separate to the project estimate cost, it's a regulated return and how the regulator treats the capital money determines how much Transgrid can charge back to consumers.
- Carl noted that when Transgrid determines the project cost, they look at the wage index, prices of steel and materials etc. When the regulator looks at the cost of the project, they look at CPI. The community representatives on the Steering Committee assert that it is not technically correct to escalate a project cost by the CPI number and that a producer price index is required
- In terms of procurement, a community CCG member asked what Transgrid believes social license is.
- Nathan responded that it is vital their selected contractors support the community in a way that is support by the community, especially when it comes to local employment.

- A community CCG member asked how social license comes into play in the design stage.
- Nathan said Transgrid considers what impact operations will have on a community and how those considerations can be incorporated into the actual operation.
- A community CCG member noted that it seems as though Transgrid has not taken undergrounding into account in the procurement process, and any consideration of undergrounding has been false and seems to be a box ticking exercise.
- Nathan responded that the contractors are being engaged via a flexible agreement, where they can adapt should the scenario change. Currently, Transgrid must move forward within the parameters as outlined by the regulators.
- The Chair commented that if the regulators and government removed the time and cost barriers through a policy change, the contractual agreements would be flexible enough to accommodate undergrounding.
- A community CCG member noted that Transgrid does not appreciate the barriers local people will become to overhead and the argument about time will not be valid.
- A community CCG member asked if Transgrid has considered the end consumer, there may be a change where they would accommodate an increase in cost if they knew the impacts of where their energy was coming from.
- Naomi responded that this has occurred through a customer panel. Studies have shown that the end user is concerned with an increase in their bills above all else.
- A community CCG member reinforced the importance of maintaining local landscapes.
- A community CCG member asked when the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is due.
- Naomi noted they are currently in the development phase of the EIS. There are community information sessions available

	<p>to ensure the community can access and understand the technical reports before the EIS goes on public exhibition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is estimated the EIS will go on public exhibition in April 2023. 	
Undergrounding Report	<p>Dan gave an update on the undergrounding feasibility report.</p> <p>See slide 28 of the presentation for an update on the undergrounding feasibility report timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dan noted that since the last CCG meeting, the Undergrounding Report has been finalised by GHD. - Transgrid have published the report, Transgrid's response and the Steering Committee's response on their website, which can be found here: https://www.transgrid.com.au/projects-innovation/humelink - Dan noted that ultimately, the cost of undergrounding HumeLink is estimated to be at least three times more expensive than the entire project's current cost of \$3.3 billion. Based on the current AER framework, undergrounding is not deemed economic. - The other factor Transgrid deems making undergrounding unfeasible is the time it will take to underground the cables along HumeLink, hence not complying with AEMO's determination to accelerate the project. - The Chair noted the work Andrea Strong had contributed to the HumeLink Undergrounding Steering Committee. - The Chair noted that the community representatives on the Steering Committee and their independent advisor, Les Brand from Amplitude Consultants, issued Transgrid with a separate letter to which has been published on the website. https://www.transgrid.com.au/media/mwafmnbb/ccgsc-position-on-humelink-undergrounding-study_20220824.pdf - There are a number of concerns outlined in the letter that Transgrid need to respond to. For that reason, the Chair suggested the Steering Committee continues to round out the remaining 52 issues that community Steering 	-

Committee members have with the finalised undergrounding report.

- It was agreed the Steering Committee would continue until Transgrid has issued a response.

Andrea Strong, community representative on the Steering Committee gave an overview of the community position on the published undergrounding report.

- The community representatives on the Steering Committee do not endorse the report. There are 52 of 100 outstanding comments in the report, the main concern being with the costings that GHD used in the final report.
- Transgrid initially released GHD's report in June. The main issue was with the cost per kilometre that had been used in the report. The GHD report estimated the cost to be \$21 million per kilometre. As well as the community members had a meeting with Transgrid and GHD, expressing huge concern with these numbers and yet Transgrid still published the report with the incorrect dollar figures per kilometre. The numbers outlined in the initial report well exceeded the numbers that Amplitude Consultants had calculated. A few days following the publication of the report in June, Transgrid retracted the report from the website which was appreciated by the community members on the Steering Committee.
- In a meeting with GHD and the Steering Committee, it was decided that an independent expert would be appointed to review the numbers in GHD's report.
- Peter Robinson, the independent expert calculated that undergrounding would cost \$6.5 to \$7.5 million per kilometre in worst case terrain, numbers similar to what Amplitude Consultants calculated.
- A major frustration with the report is the large amount of extra overhead that has been added on to the undergrounding cost when independent experts maintain their costs per kilometre already include all overheads calculated into the cost of undergrounding compared to that of overhead.
- The undergrounding report assumes no efficiencies that result from running two

cables next to each other. Andrea stated that Amplitude have estimated those efficiencies could have a significance value of up to 50%.

- The numbers used for undergrounding were costed using 2022 numbers. Throughout the study Andrea noted the community members on the Steering Committee were told that all prices across the industry had significantly increased in 2022. It is the Steering Committee's view that the overhead costs should also be calculated using costs relevant to environments in 2022 to calculate a meaningful understanding of the difference in cost of overhead and underground. Producer price indexes indicate electrical manufacturing prices have increased 20 to 25 per cent in the last 12 months.
- Dan responded that for overhead costing, this is a few hundred million dollars of the total cost.
- Andrea noted the community Steering Committee members also had issues with the route assessment. It was known from the outset that undergrounding would cost more than going overhead, however the brief asked for an investigation into the non-market benefits which was not outlined in the final report.

Les Brand, Amplitude Consultants and expert advisor to the community Steering Committee members, gave an overview of the community's position on the published undergrounding report.

- Les noted his dissatisfaction with the report. When the Steering Committee was formed, it was stated they were the ultimate client, not Transgrid. Les noted that he does not believe a professional organisation should produce a final piece of work with 52 of 100 comments left outstanding from the client.
- Les also noted that many of the responses that were given by GHD, were not given by an expert which is unsettling when considering the validity of the report.
- Les noted the methods used for costings in such an expensive and long study were surprisingly vague, particularly when two overseas examples were cited for

undergrounding. Amplitude believes the costings should have been done using a bottom up approach.

- Les noted that he whole heartedly does not endorse the final undergrounding report.
- Recently, Les was in Paris for a technical conference where he spoke with several undergrounding HVDC experts. Les recounted that in every conversation he had with these HVDC experts, they were flawed with the high numbers outlined in GHD's undergrounding report.
- Les further noted, when two trenches of cabling are paralleled with each other, the cost per km does not double as stated in GHD's report and shows a complete lack of understanding of the installation of cables. There are many efficiencies that come from paralleling cables which have not been accounted for.
- Les noted there are many HVDC experts in Australia and overseas who are concerned this inaccurate report is in the public domain. If this report is used as a reference for future undergrounding, it will delay efforts to underground on a global scale.
- Naomi noted that Transgrid has received the specific letter from the Steering Committee outlining all their concerns. Transgrid is putting together a response.
- Naomi commented that Transgrid respect the contribution of the Steering Committee, however there will still be a difference of opinion in many instances regarding the final report.
- Nathan noted that the undergrounding report was a key topic when they met with the AEIC. There are a number of factors that must be taken into consideration from both the economic regulator, the AER and the timeframe regulator, AEMO. Based both frameworks, the report doesn't meet the economic or time constraints, even if Amplitude's reviews are further taken into consideration.
- Nathan commented that the project is in its early stages, there are many things that need to be considered, for example ground conditions. Australia's costs do not

benchmark well globally. There are many issues with a bottom up approach from a costing perspective. Overall, Nathan noted that the numbers do not meet the economic and timing parameters of the regulators.

- Nathan noted that if there are technology changes in the sector, undergrounding may prevent some of those technological advancements.
- ACTION: Nathan to check internally if the above is true.
- ACTION: Transgrid to respond to the community Steering Committee's letter in 3 to 4 weeks.
- Dan noted that there are residual items in GHD's report, some bigger than others. In terms of costing, Dan noted he does not disagree with the statements made by the Steering Committee members, however GHD have stood by them and there are some points that are more so a difference of opinion.
- A community CWG member commented that it is not a matter of opinion but fact.
- Dan noted that in his experience, when various independent consultants are involved, it is not unusual to have a difference of opinion. However, GHD were appointed the consultant to perform the study and used Stantec for expert advice. The report is their professional opinion, and when pushed they have stood by it.
- The Chair noted that this may be the case, but there are still outstanding items that have not been addressed at all by GHD.
- Dan responded that GHD have said they are happy to publish the report, even knowing about the issues, it is their opinion they have been addressed.
- Dan further noted that when making the final decision on undergrounding, Transgrid took both costing considerations into account.
- A community CCG member commented that the whole study feels as though it has been a box ticking exercise. Regardless of the outcome, the community has felt that Transgrid was never going to take notice of what the

independent consultants put forward. It was further noted that the whole study seems as though it has been a huge waste of money and time and ground works have not even been included.

- Dan responded that groundworks were taken into consideration, as a factor on top.
- A community CCG member commented that in recent conversations with Angus Taylor, he confirmed that Transgrid has plans for extra transmission lines, will they be undergrounded?
- Dan noted that is to do with future projects. In the Yass/ Upper Lachlan area, he did not think there are plans for future transmission lines. There are plans to connect lines for example project VNI to connect Western Victoria to Wagga Wagga. There are 500kv lines planned for Bannaby to Sydney, but they are not in this geographic region.
- A community CCG member noted that in the Transmission Cost Report, on page 37 [page 42 of the Transmission Cost Report (page 35-36 of the Draft Transmission Cost Report)] there are two options where new lines parallel HumeLink <https://aemo.com.au/-/media/files/major-publications/isp/2021/transmission-cost-report.pdf?la=en>.
- Les commented that GHD and Transgrid have a duty to the industry to be certain what they are publishing is accurate because the numbers have the potential to be extremely damaging. Regardless of the outcome, there is a duty to address the outstanding issues raised by the Steering Committee.
- Les noted in terms of bottom up costing and terrain, the size of the trench needs to be determined and then needs to be referred to Rawlinson's handbook which gives a cost per cubic metre. The costings of the handbook were last updated in June 2022. When Amplitude was calculating their costs, they used a bottom up approach assuming the worst case scenario. No matter how many worst case assumption were made, they could not reach the approximate \$11 million per

km that GHD have outlined in the final report.

- Les further noted that the current schedule in the report determines 6.5 years for HVDC. Amplitude's determination is that it would take 4 years for delivery and 1 year for procurement. There are also questions surrounding commissioning, Les noted it will not take 6 months to commission but rather 2 to 3 months.
- Les noted that most of the outstanding issues in the report can be grouped into two main categories, cost and timing.
- There are items that need to be addressed such as what values were used to scale the number to determine costing.
- Les noted that a lot of the comments have been ignored and it is worrying GHD cannot clarify what numbers were used to scale the costings.
- A community CCG member commented that they get the feeling Transgrid was never comfortable with undergrounding. It seems the best option from Transgrid's point of view was always overhead. Will any sections of the route be undergrounded?
- Dan responded that to underground portions longer than 40km you need additional equipment to put HVDC in. The straight up costs for complete HVDC converter stations is about \$3 billion. If you are segmenting sections of the route, you need to convert which is a significant cost. HVDC becomes more cost efficient the longer the route is that you are installing. Transgrid has undergrounded certain sections such as Powering Sydney's Future. There are without doubt benefits to undergrounding, the major hinderance is the cost.
- A CCG member asked why importance is given to metro areas when considering undergrounding compared to productive rural land and added if technological upgrades are prevented by undergrounding, why upgrades would be any different to overhead if the NBN is running through decades old copper.

- The Chair stated that he encourages Transgrid to make sure that all 52 outstanding items are responded to.
- It was agreed there is value in the continuation of the Steering Committee until Transgrid has responded to all 52 outstanding issues.
- Andrea stated that the community does not accept Transgrid making a decision based on the flawed GHD report. Internationally Governments are coming to conclusions that holistically, undergrounding is the cheapest option. Globally, engineers are looking on at Australia in disbelief at the decisions being made about undergrounding. The Steering Committee wanted Transgrid to consider undergrounding fairly. The community has consistently been told that costs have been inflated in 2022, yet that has not been reflected in the overhead prices. It was noted that if undergrounding is going to take too long, that is Transgrid's problem, and that should have been taken into consideration from the outset. As a result of this report, undergrounding has been dismissed and the Humelink project will take a lot longer than undergrounding would have as landowners will dig their heels in and put up a strong fight against overhead lines.
- Dan acknowledged Andrea's comments and noted that the report did not address the impacts of undergrounding on farming operations.
- A community CCG member noted that overhead transmission lines will transform a rural shire into an industrial shire.
- Naomi noted that because of the study, undergrounding is now on the public agenda and further conversation will be convened with the Steering Committee.
- The Chair noted that this same conversation is now being had at higher levels of government.
- A community CCG member requested that Transgrid does not make any further public comment on undergrounding until Transgrid has issued their response to the community.

- Naomi responded that Transgrid cannot agree to that, as part of the broader policy. Naomi noted she will personally try to navigate a path in between acknowledging that there are still existing items, however she cannot stop Transgrid from talking more broadly about undergrounding.
- A community CCG member noted that the release of the report, even as it is, is extremely disappointing.
- The Chair thanked the community members on the Steering Committee and Les from Amplitude Consultants for the many hours they have put into the study and their response.
- The Chair noted that creation of the Steering Committee with an independent advisor would result in a final report which everyone agreed upon, however it is clear that is not the case. It is now up to Transgrid to respond to the outstanding issues and the community's letter.
- Les commented that Transgrid's decision was based on cost and timing, both of which the Steering Committee has several outstanding concerns with. If Transgrid were to begin undergrounding today, they could be finished by 2027.
- Les noted that from the outset, everyone knew undergrounding would be more expensive, at what cost would Transgrid have agreed to actually underground?
- Nathan noted that while cost is an important factor, AEMO has stated HumeLink must be complete by July 2026.
- Les questioned if Transgrid would be able to install a double circuit 500kv line above ground line in that time and stated Amplitude believe it is possible to install undergrounding cables in that time.
- Les also made comments about the HVDC versus AC loss calculations.
- Dan noted that the study has driven positive conversation, the multiplier to the cost is now 2 to 3 times, not 11.
- The Chair noted there is an ongoing conversation at all levels and the body of

	<p>knowledge on undergrounding in Australia has been advanced.</p>	
<p>Compensation</p>	<p>Carl Charlier introduced himself as the Commercial Manager for Humelink and gave an update on compensation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On 25 August 2022, Transgrid met with representatives from the Humelink Action Group (HAG), the Australian Energy Infrastructure Commissioner (AEIC) and some impacted landowners. The meeting identified that an update of the Option Deed and Property Management Plan was required. Over the last two weeks, Transgrid has been updating the Option Deed document and Property Management Plan as per the feedback received. The new document is a lot more straightforward. Any landowner who has received a copy of the Option Deed previously used will be issued with the new Option Deed and given the option to consider any changes made in the new Option Deed. - A community CCG member commented that they have heard in the community Transgrid are objecting to paying the full payment of surveyors and legal representation. - Carl responded that Transgrid will cover reasonable costs, the issue that has come up is what is considered reasonable. In some case the fees of some solicitors and valuers have been in the magnitude of well and above what is reasonable. Transgrid is giving feedback to those firms that their fee estimate has been unreasonable. - Nathan noted that operations on farms can be very different. Transgrid appreciates that in some cases it will be an intricate process for a valuer to value certain complexities on various farms. - Carl noted that ecologist fees would not be covered by Transgrid unless the property already had or was in planning to get a Biodiversity Service Agreement. - A community CCG member stated that if an ecologist comes onto a property and identifies an area of high biodiversity 	

	<p>offset value, Transgrid should be reimbursing that cost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nathan noted that biodiversity offsets fall under the Just Terms Act, which is flawed in itself. - ACTION: Nathan to check internally within Transgrid the parameters for covering ecology fees. - Carl noted that Transgrid is planning an Expressions of Interest program with landowners along the route to create a Biodiversity Stewardship on their land, which Transgrid would be interested in acquiring for the project. However, under the Just Terms Act the only possible reimbursement for an easement is if the property owner has an existing Biodiversity Stewardship. - A community CCG member noted that if Transgrid is removing an area of high biodiversity value, that is an asset to the farmer that is being removed. - A community CCG member noted that some legal firms have been approached and recognised that they will not be able to service impacted landowners and directed them to other firms. - Naomi noted that Transgrid encourages that. Transgrid has provided landowners with a list of accredited firms along the route. - Carl noted that Transgrid is not telling landholders which firms to approach, but rather providing general advice. 	
<p>Geotech and tower locations</p>	<p>Dan gave an overview of the geotech investigations.</p> <p>See slide 7 of the presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Geotech investigations (ground surveys) are expected to occur between late September 2022 through to mid March 2023. - Naomi noted that all efforts are being made to minimise impact by limiting crew size, work hours and footprint as well as ensuring stringent biosecurity measures are abided by. - Dan noted that testing will include either a borehole rest or a penetration test – which has less impact. 	

- The borehole testing is done using a truck mounted machine and a smaller track mounted machine is used where the area is less accessible.
- A community CCG member noted that not all impacted landowners have been told where the towers will be located which is causing concern.
- Dan noted that Transgrid has given some landowners structural locations, however all locations are subject to change in the final design. If landowners ask for the concept location Transgrid will provide it.
- A community CCG member asked how communications is being managed with landholders. It was noted that landholders are feeling very uncertain being kept in a holding pattern.
- Carl noted that this is the reason the Transgrid team are working hard to have the final route refined. Land access managers have been working to communicate with landowners. It was further noted that no landowner has received a compensation letter where a tower location has not been determined.
- It was noted the community members in the CCG disagreed with this statement.
- A community CCG member stated that landowners need to know they can request the concept locations of the towers.
- Carl noted that this would be best done in person.
- The Chair commented the advantage of not delivering this information in person is that the same information is delivered at the same time.
- A community CCG member noted that communication is always the biggest failing of any major project. Communication is the key to getting the local communities on board. Major difficulties will arise when landowners are angry and lock their gates to Transgrid, project timelines will blow out as a result.
- Barbara noted that the Independent Landowner Advocates have completed a round of interviews with landowners and a major stress for landowners was that they could not get a valuer to complete a

	<p>valuation purely because they were unsure of tower locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A community CCG said it was important that the location of towers along the length of the route be emailed asap to all landowners, with the qualification that the tower position is still subject to change. - A community CCG member asked if Transgrid will be entering properties where the owner has not signed an agreement. - Dan confirmed Transgrid would not be entering those properties for the geotech studies. - Naomi noted that the biosecurity process will be a "clean come, clean go." - ACTION: Transgrid to supply their proposed biosecurity processes for the geotech investigations. - Naomi noted that staff will be supervising the project team. - A community CCG member asked if Transgrid has been working with the Local Land Services. - Naomi responded that they have been working with the Local Land Services more broadly in line with the EIS. There has been a dedicated conversation with them around the geotech investigations and the provisions of the plan will be circulated. - A community CCG member noted that the properties Transgrid will be entering in the Southern Highlands will be in serrated tussock seeding time, even within a property Transgrid staff will have to wash down due to Serrated Tussock. 	
Bushfires	<p>Naomi gave an overview of bushfire management. See slide 26 of the presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 27 July a pilot Bushfire Management Workshop took place. Due to COVID and several plane cancellations, there were limitations to the workshop. - Transgrid has taken learnings from the workshop and will be including them in the EIS. - Transgrid will be making more of an effort to work with the RFS at all levels. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nathan has a meeting scheduled with the RFS Commissioner. - A community CCG member asked if Transgrid has ever de-energised a line. - Naomi responded that it occurs rarely due to the serious consequences. - A community CCG member noted that Transgrid has not taken into account the serious cost of a bushfire, and it is a further reason why the route should be undergrounded. - A community CCG member asked for more information to be supplied about the integrity of the towers in cyclonic conditions – TAKEN ON NOTICE. 	
<p>Agenda setting for subsequent meetings</p>	<p>Next meetings</p> <p>October</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tuesday 11 or Wednesday 12 <p>The Chair noted the October meeting will mark one year since the establishment of the HumeLink CCGs. The next meeting will be an opportunity to reassess processes, functionality, protocol etc.</p> <p>It was noted the next ULYV meeting could be held in Gunning.</p> <p>November</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wednesday 23 or Thursday 24 <p>December</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tuesday 6 or Wednesday 7 	
<p>Meeting close</p>	<p>The meeting closed at 2:05pm.</p>	

Action	Status or comment
Secretariat is to follow up with members on administrative details including signed Code of Conduct Agreements and sharing of contact details.	Ongoing
Transgrid to institute the \$50 reimbursement for eligible members	Ongoing
Transgrid to provide CCG members with a diagram presenting how planning and regulatory processes relate	Underway
Transgrid to provide a timeline/diagram of HumeLink progress as it currently stands and a timeline of HumeLink progress if undergrounding or Option 2F are deemed feasible	Underway
HumeLink EIS and SEARs to be circulated to CCG members	Underway
Transgrid to follow up with GHD for more insight into their value scoring methodology and reasoning, including the difference in value between agricultural land compared to State Forest.	Underway
Transgrid to follow up with GHD for more insight into the social and environmental matters included in its model InDeGo (Infrastructure Development Geospatial Options), how they are weighted and the scoring methodology.	Underway
Transgrid to request the value of the multiplier from GHD used in their report.	Underway
Transgrid to provide the CCG with technical information explaining how the structural integrity of the transmission lines is maintained in windy conditions.	Underway
Transgrid to confirm with the CCG if any of the transmission 500kv lines between Bannaby and Bayswater have come down.	Underway
Transgrid to confirm with the CCG if any of the transmission 500kv lines between Bannaby and Bayswater have come down.	Underway
Transgrid to determine if there are barriers to technological advancements with undergrounding cables	Underway
Transgrid to respond to the Steering Committee's letter and the 52 outstanding issues within 4 weeks of the meeting.	Underway
Transgrid to supply the exact number the 2022 undergrounding figures were based on	Underway
Transgrid to check the parameters for covering ecology studies for landowners	Underway

Transgrid to supply their proposed biosecurity processes for the geotech investigations.

Underway