

MEETING MINUTES

HumeLink Combined Community Consultative Group Meeting: 31 October 2023

Time	5:00pm – 7:00 pm
Date	31/10/2023
Attendees	<p>Chair: Brendan Blakeley</p> <p>Secretariat: Beatrice Hobson</p> <p>Transgrid CCG members: Naomi Rowe, Jeremy Roberts, Michael Johnson</p> <p>Transgrid project member attendees: Sumaya Osman, Katia Reviakina, Tammy Sinclair, Joel Annett</p> <p>Community members: Jess Reynolds, Carlie Porteans, Peter Lawson, Andrew Hamilton, William Kingwill, Lee Kingma, Andrew Hamilton, Hansie Armour, Andrea Strong, John McGrath, Pippa Quilty, Paul Sturgess</p> <p>A number of observers were in attendance</p>
Apologies	<p>Catriona McAuliffe (NSW Farmers), Daniel Brear (NSW Farmers), Clr Pam Kensit (Upper Lachlan Shire Council), Clr Sue Hanrahan (Wagga Wagga Shire Council), Clr Julia Ham (Snowy Valley Council), Clr Rod Kendall (Wagga Wagga Shire Council), Clr Adrian Cameron (Yass Council), Clr Nathan McDonald (Yass Valley Council), Serena Hardwick, Rebecca Tobin, Scott Montgomery, Rod Stowe, Phil Clements, Rene Lunardello</p>
Meeting location	Gundagai Council Chambers
Meeting materials	Presentation
Purpose of meeting	Meeting 14

Item	Discussion Summary
Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The meeting commenced at 5:03pm. - The Chair welcomed all and gave an Acknowledgement of Country. - The Chair noted apologies. - The Chair thanked the CCG members and observers for attending and outlined the agenda for the meeting. - The Chair asked that CCG members introduce themselves.
Minutes and CCG Action Register	<p>The Chair asked that CCG members read through the responses and raise any questions they have. The Chair noted that CCG members can also send through any further questions to the Secretariat after the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the item response on OpEx (operational expenditure) has been updated since the presentation was sent out. He noted that the Secretariat would distribute an updated version of the presentation following the meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>A CCG member asked about how much of the project expenditure was being put to biodiversity offsets, while the CCG member accepted that Transgrid cannot give an exact number, they asked for an estimated amount.</i>

MEETING MINUTES

- *Another CCG member noted that from their understanding there is an estimate of \$935 million for biodiversity offsets in the Project Assessment Conclusions Report (PACR).*
- *The CCG member responded that this number was prior to the increase in the cost of the project. The cost of the project has since increased 48% to \$4.892 billion and the CCG member noted that they want to know what proportion of that is biodiversity offsets.*
- Jeremy responded that that information will be available around the end of 2023.
- *The CCG member asked for a rough estimate and asked whether it is an equivalent percentage increase in biodiversity offsets or greater cost than originally indicated.*
- Jeremy noted that the biodiversity costs have gone down as Transgrid have refined the line and reduced the impact estimate. He noted that an exact figure will be available in early December.
- *The CCG member asked whether the cost has gone down from \$935 million.*
- Jeremy indicated that the cost has gone down below that figure.
- *A CCG member commented that they felt as though Transgrid was exaggerating the width and depth of trenches required for undergrounding. They referred to the action response on the final page regarding the width and depth of underground cabling for the Powering Sydney's Future project. The CCG member explained that this was being questioned after the inquiry as the figures quoted in the inquiry seemed to exaggerate the impact and costs of undergrounding which made the community feel as though they were being lied to. The CCG member noted that the community feels ignored and pushed aside during these discussions.*
- Jeremy responded that this feedback from the community has been provided back to the Transgrid senior leadership team. He also noted that the width of the trench for Powering Sydney's Future was for a single circuit 330kV HVAC which is different to the width of the trench discussed at the enquiry.
- *The CCG member noted that it felt like an exaggeration. The CCG member noted that Transgrid do not understand the impacts of overhead lines on the community as they are not physically impacted themselves.*
- *A CCG member asked why it was mentioned that there was a 2200 megawatt increase in transfer capacity from Canberra/Yass to Bannaby when Humelink is not linking into it.*
- Jeremy responded that there is a network planning requirement to look at overall network capacity and consider the complete system. Humelink will enable greater system capacity across the region. He continued that they consider load vs. generation in different areas of the grid.
- *The CCG member noted that Humelink has nothing to do with that particular section.*
- Jeremy responded that Humelink does contribute to the power flow within the region as a whole. He noted that when you are connecting in one line you have to consider all the other lines. They have to make a

MEETING MINUTES

calculation around the amount of power within the grid and the interrelationship between those lines.

- *A CCG member noted that in their action responses Transgrid state they wrote to all near neighbours advising them of the project. The CCG member noted that 2 of their neighbours did not hear from Transgrid and they are within the impacted area.*
- Naomi responded that she would need to take down the details of the neighbours and investigate whether they were contacted.
- *Another CCG member noted that residents on Cockatoo Road were also not informed.*
- TAKEN ON NOTICE
- **ACTION: Community members to supply addresses to Transgrid to determine whether community members were notified.**
- The Chair noted that queries relating to the notification of residents can be sent through to the Secretariat.

Project Update

The Chair invited Jeremy to give a project update.

See page 10 of the presentation slide.

- Transgrid are undergoing preparation of CPA2 which is the submission to the regulator for the approval of the project. This is well advanced and will be published in early December. The project needs to pass the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) feedback loop first. This is where AEMO does an assessment of the value of the project vs. the cost of the project. That is a go/no go process which will occur in late November or early December and AEMO will publish the results of that outcome.
- The procurement of the delivery partners is well advanced and Transgrid are in the final stages of negotiation. It is taking longer than was originally expected but should be announced soon. Procurement of Long Lead Equipment and Materials is also underway, Transgrid have ordered transformers, reactors and are close to ordering a conductor. They have also booked slots for Long Lead Equipment.
- The detailed design early works phase is the next phase and is progressing. This had to feed into the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the route corridor, tower configurations and access tracks. The community engagement is ongoing.
- The EIS exhibition period ended on October 10 and submissions analysis is now underway.
- The concept designs are completed as well as the preliminary investigations. Land negotiations are also ongoing and land acquisition is in progress for the Gugaa Substation.
- The total cost to date as at the end of September 2023 was \$192.2 million. The submission to the AER is due in December and an update on total expenditure will be published then.
- *A CCG member asked why the procurement process occurs ahead of project approval.*
- Jeremy responded that the long lead equipment has to be ordered early because of the timeframe and wait time. The lead time for transformers and other equipment can blow out from 12 to 24 months. There are

MEETING MINUTES

only a few manufacturers that build the equipment required. Transgrid went to the Commonwealth government to arrange that they underwrite the order so Transgrid could order equipment early to achieve the date for building the project which is AEMO's set date of 2026. Ordering the equipment early is a de-risking process to ensure it gets to Australia on time. It also means that they have a better idea of the design and price of the project, this means that in their submission to AEMO they are supported by market tested processes. Transgrid go to the market and engage contractors so they can submit to AEMO and give an accurate indication of how much the project will cost. Ordering the equipment early reduces the variability of the project cost.

- *A CCG member asked how much money Transgrid will have spent if the project is denied.*
- Jeremy responded that approximately \$125 million will have been spent. By December this will increase, with an estimated \$150 million by then. Jeremy noted that if the project is not approved there will be a number of commitments that would need to end and be written off. There would be offramps associated with commitments to delivery partners.
- *A CCG member asked what he means by offramps.*
- Jeremy responded that if you have engaged delivery partners, you may have to pay to cancel those contracts. There will also be costs associated with redistributing the equipment as the design of a transformer may be unique. Jeremy explained that you may be able to reconfigure transformers and reuse them for other projects.
- *A CCG member noted that Jeremy was talking about booking for infrastructure building and asked whether Transgrid have paid for booking slots.*
- Jeremy responded that Transgrid has paid for booking slots and has ordered some equipment.
- *A CCG member asked under what measure the Commonwealth has paid for this.*
- Jeremy responded that the Commonwealth office did not have to provide any money but underwrote the order, so they were just a guarantor. He noted that Transgrid have since gone to the regulator as well which was how they covered the \$227 million for the transformer and conductors.
- *A CCG member tabled two reports:*

Humelink Undergrounding: Review of Transgrid Report and Costing of HVDC Alternatives by Amplitude Consultants

- *The CCG member noted that this report was an independent expert review of the GHD Transgrid undergrounding report funded by the community and the Softwoods Working Group. In this review, 2 undergrounding options are considered. Option 2A-1 from the GHD undergrounding study and Option 1C-new addendum to the PACR. It is a point to point option from Maragle to Bannaby. It is defined as a credible option that meets the needs of the project. 1C-new was \$5.46 billion, a small amount more than the \$4.892 billion of the overhead lines. The cost of Option 2A-1 was \$7.3 billion. The cost quoted by GHD of Option 2A-1 was \$11.35 billion which is 58% more than the independent expert review found. The \$7.3 billion is 1.5x the cost of the*

overhead option. \$5.46 billion is 1.1x more than the overhead option. It is not 25x the amount which is what Transgrid said in their submission to the parliamentary inquiry. Amplitude think the price for converter stations in the GHD Transgrid Humelink undergrounding report seemed reasonable but the major difference was in the installed cable cost. Instead of being \$11.5 million per kilometre, Amplitude believe it should be \$6.42 million per kilometre which is an 82% difference. The CCG member noted that they believe the misrepresentation of the costs of the undergrounding option is even more damning when it is understood the Amplitude costs are estimated in August 2023 and Transgrid GHD costs were estimated in 2022. With undergrounding there are significant offsetting benefits meaning the operating expenses (OpEx) is reduced. Transgrid have assumed a 0.5% OpEx/CapEx, but if we assume a 1% OpEx/CapEx (which is what AEMO requires), this would mean operation and maintenance is \$35 million per year for overhead lines and the underground option is \$15 million. It is predicted that the 1C-new option would be more like \$10 million a year for OpEx.

- The CCG member noted that there are significant benefits to undergrounding including environmental and biodiversity benefits, not impacting matters of national environmental significance, bushfire advantages, advantages to productive efficiency of agriculture and tourism. The report shows that Transgrid's decision to dismiss undergrounding was based on incorrect information. The CCG members ask that Humelink is reassessed under the Regulatory Investment Test for Transmission (RIT-T) and the RIT-T be reapplied to include undergrounding. The community is asking for Transgrid in the next 21 days to review the Amplitude report and announce to the Australian Energy Regulator (AER) they will be reapplying the RIT-T. This report is another material change for Humelink, others include the cost, delay of Snowy 2.0, decrease in transfer capacity of HumeLink and the 2 open cycle gas stations that weren't assumed to be operating but have now been committed. The CCG member noted that when they agreed to go on the Humelink undergrounding steering committee, from their understanding, Brian Elton made a commitment that if undergrounding was feasible that Transgrid would reapply the RIT-T. The community is asking that that commitment be honoured.
- Naomi noted that they would need to go back through the minutes from the Steering Committee meetings however she noted that Brian would not have had the authority to commit to reapplying the RIT-T.
- The Chair noted that he would seek a review of the steering committee minutes regarding this claimed comment.

Stop, Rethink HumeLink Undergrounding Transmission: The Best Option

- The CCG member noted that this report discusses the Amplitude report and corrects the misinformation around undergrounding. The CCG member noted that Stop, Rethink Humelink is an overarching community group. It has summarised the findings from the Amplitude report and commented on the environmental externalities that have been left out of the RIT-T process, the non-market benefits of undergrounding and the non-market costs of overhead lines.
- A CCG member asked whether with Snowy 2.0 delays, Transgrid has given any consideration to staging the works, by doing the North/South link first and the Maragle link later?

MEETING MINUTES

- Jeremy responded that with the way the delivery partners are structured and the mobilisation of the workforce it is better to do it all at once.
- *The CCG member commented that this was irrelevant to the cost and was a decision for Transgrid to make before the delay was announced.*
- Jeremy responded that with the way the project was structured with mobilisations, it is better for the project to keep being delivered all at once.
- *The CCG member asked whether there has been a cost benefit analysis done?*
- *Another CCG member noted that it is raised in the PACR as an option to do Maragle to Bannaby first and the reason it was dismissed by Transgrid is that they said the environmental approval would be too difficult if they were staging the works. The CCG member noted that the cost benefit has been partly considered by the addendum to the PACR.*
- *The CCG member noted that if Transgrid knew Snowy 2.0 was going to run so late they would have built the Wagga to Bannaby link first. That way they would not have been building a \$1 billion substation 5+ years before they need it. Even if it's only two years prior, it is a large amount of money.*
- TAKEN ON NOTICE
- **Action: Transgrid to ensure the cost benefit analysis was done to consider impact of delaying the building of the Maragle link on project cost.**
- Jeremy also noted that in the years 2026-2028 there are plans for significant build out of the network resulting in a huge demand for resources. He noted that there are around 5 huge projects being done at the same time (VNI, CWO REZ, CopperString, etc.) which means 5x the amount of resources with specific skills will be needed resulting in potential benefits from building the transmission lines early and being able to utilise those resources.

EIS Public Exhibition Engagement Outcomes

Katia presented on the EIS Exhibition and Engagement Outcomes.

See pages 11-15 of the presentation slides.

- Katia noted that there was a broad range of community channels and activities throughout the exhibition stage. This started with pre EIS engagement in 2022 where Transgrid had ongoing meetings with stakeholders, councillors, a series of community information sessions and webinars and the purpose of the sessions was to familiarise community members and stakeholders with the EIS. To support the engagement activities Transgrid prepared a range of communications such as emails and monthly newsletters. Just before the EIS went on public exhibition, Transgrid met their regulatory requirements including formally notifying landowners of the exhibition period, this was supported with additional online and printed ads, newsletters distributed digitally and via hard copy and advertisement on indoor community boards. Once the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) placed the EIS on public exhibition a digital EIS and hard copies were made available, USBs were available, Transgrid developed fact sheets and guides on the topics, these were available online as well as at in person community sessions. There was ongoing community engagement including a series of in person and online community sessions to provide

MEETING MINUTES

landowners, communities and local government with information about the EIS and submission process. These sessions provided information on how to make a submission and the channels available to make a submission. Transgrid had three additional drop in sessions organised exclusively for CCG members to engage with the project team. Overall, they had a total of 19 in person community information sessions and 3 webinars across 11 locations. They had a total of 57 community members attend the sessions. It was originally scheduled to run for the first 2 weeks however when DPE announced an extension of the exhibition period, they announced additional locations in Yass and Tumut which were traditionally the most visited spots. There were 3 webinars held during the period with 14 attendees in total. The focus was to provide information on EIS topics as well as how to make a submission.

- Katia outlined the key themes discussed at the sessions which included:
 - o General EIS process – submission process, how to make a submission, timeframe and approvals process, next steps, resources available.
 - o Engagement – stakeholders and community members enquiring about broader community engagement, neighbours, aboriginal stakeholders and local council areas.
 - o Bushfires and bushfire risk – concerns about bushfire risk.
 - o Construction methodology – mostly raised by those attending community sessions in western section of the alignment, expressed interest in upgrades required to substation, construction timeframes, methodology and the process for selecting tower locations.
 - o Green Hills announcement – very popular in the western section of the alignment, questions around how the preferred route was determined, route refinement works, additional assessment that needs to be done for the route.
 - o Other topics include general route identification process, undergrounding, biodiversity, bio impact assessment, visual impacts, workforce and worksite accommodation, cumulative impacts, local business opportunities, landowner compensation and contractor announcement.
- There was positive feedback from landowners, community members and DPE on the digital EIS. It had 18 000 views and 1700 active users. A user was counted as any visitor to the site, users are unique and were only counted once, regardless of return visits.
- The most common topics viewed on the digital EIS included biodiversity, aboriginal heritage and visual amenity.
- Katia noted that their metrics show the first week of the public exhibition was the most popular one from the digital EIS. Many visitors mentioned at community sessions they had had a look at the digital EIS and were attending to discuss topics in more detail.

The Chair asked CCG members whether they have any questions on the engagement program to support EIS.

- *A CCG member noted that it said Transgrid contacted landowners however they know their neighbours were not contacted, the CCG*

MEETING MINUTES

member noted that they believe this is a major failure in contacting all neighbours.

- Naomi requested that the CCG member sends through the details of the address for Transgrid to look into.
- *Another CCG member noted that they have not had a good experience with communications about the substation and neighbours have contacted them with concerns. They noted that neighbours were not aware of it until the EIS and as a result, the CCG member had to call the Rural Fire Service chaplain to go and visit the neighbour and check in. The CCG member said he has had many phone calls from people asking about the substation and wondering why they didn't tell the community. The CCG member noted that it is not their job to tell the community, it is Transgrid's job.*
- Naomi commented that she will need to go back and check the landowner details and identify if there has been an error in terms of anything Transgrid can identify.
- *A CCG member asked what classifies someone as a neighbour to the transmission line.*
- *Another CCG member responded that it is two kilometres from the transmission line. It is only a dwelling that they count as affected infrastructure and not the whole property.*
- Naomi confirmed that for notification purposes it is dwellings.
- *A CCG member commented that the property owner still pays a rate notice on the block of land, so the land is still affected if it is within 2km of the transmission line. The CCG member also noted that landowners may want to build a house on the land they own near the line in the future.*
- *A CCG member asked what the process is for analysing the submissions from the public exhibition. They noted that they are very interested in bushfire risk, they asked how the responses and topics are ranked and how much 'weight' is given to certain concerns.*
- Sumaya responded that this information will be covered in the next section of the presentation.

Next Steps – Response to Submissions

Sumaya presented on the response to submissions.

See pages 16-20 of the presentation slides.

- Transgrid received 152 total submissions, the DPE portal says 142 as they still need to check the submissions are loaded correctly and are not duplicates. Transgrid are completing this process with the department now. The submissions include 18 agency submissions, and 5 council submissions. Transgrid did not receive a submission from Gundagai Council so will follow up with them when they have their meeting with them. They received submissions from 12 special interest groups including the Softwoods Working Group, APA and others. They received 119 community submissions.
- They have noticed in some of the submissions provided there are multiple items in the one PDF so they are working through those now to ensure all the submissions are accounted for.

MEETING MINUTES

- *A CCG member asked what the process is for going through the submissions.*
- Sumaya responded that they have all been put on the website. Transgrid will then prepare a submission report. They will provide a specific tailored response for each agency and council submission. Community submissions will be responded to by theme. Key themes coming out are undergrounding, bushfire risk, visual amenity, biodiversity, agricultural practices and compensation. For councils the recurring concerns are roads, dilapidation and worker accommodation.
- This has been expressed consistently throughout consultation with the various interest groups. The submissions report will then be placed on the DPE planning portal. Transgrid are aiming for this to occur early next year. There is a team currently working through categorising the submissions and getting responses from across the Transgrid team to respond to the submissions.
- Together with the submissions report there will be an amendment report published at the same time. There were a number of things that came out of the CCGs feedback where they requested more information from the EIS. The amendment report will include nothing new in terms of the scope but will include some more information including the Green Hills route full assessment in the amendment report.
- *A CCG member asked whether the community will be able to make submissions on the amendment report.*
- Sumaya responded that DPE make that decision. She continued that if DPE think Transgrid have not engaged enough, they may request that submissions are allowed, otherwise it will just be for information.
- *A CCG member asked about the timeframe for publishing the amendment report.*
- Sumaya responded that it will be early next year around April. She noted that even though there are only 152 submissions, some are complex, there is additional detail and reports and Transgrid want to release the submissions report and amendment report at the same time as they reference each other.
- *A CCG member asked whether the submissions report means there will be general responses or whether specific questions and information will be addressed.*
- Sumaya responded that everything will be addressed. She noted that where similar questions are asked there will be a table capturing responses. There will not be individual responses on a submission by submission basis for community submissions.
- *A CCG member commented that the submissions report and amendment report feels like a 'tick box' exercise for Transgrid. The CCG member asked when Transgrid will make changes as a result of community feedback. The CCG member noted that Transgrid does not go back to the government and acknowledge that they will take on the community feedback and make changes as a result.*
- Sumaya responded that people will understand from the submission responses how their feedback is being addressed.
- *A CCG member asked whether community will read the submission report and the amendment report and find out about things that were*

MEETING MINUTES

not included in the EIS. The CCG member noted that the rumours are breaking the community apart. The CCG member asked when Transgrid will talk to the government about the project and when the government will be presented with all the information the community has provided via their submissions.

- The Chair noted that the Department of Planning undertakes the assessment independent of Transgrid. For specialist matters they take advice from other agencies and may also at times engage their own experts. The Department will ask Transgrid to respond to the issues raised in submissions and put forward ideas or changes to address these issues. Ultimately it is the Department that makes the decision to approve or not approve the project and if approved set out the conditions of consent.
- Sumaya responded that Transgrid have weekly meetings with DPE who have been briefed.
- *A CCG member asked when changes are made to the project as a result of the submissions. They noted that they want to know the government and Transgrid are supporting the community and that it is not just a tick box exercise for Transgrid.*
- Sumaya responded that Transgrid is following the legislated process, they provide all the information received including the EIS, submissions and amendment report to the department who will assess the information.
- *A CCG member asked whether Transgrid will be fixing errors in the EIS such as referring to a dirt, single lane road as a 2 laned bitumen road.*
- Sumaya asked if the CCG member included it in their submission.
- *A CCG member responded yes.*
- Sumaya acknowledged that on a project of this scale there will unavoidably be some mistakes in the EIS. She noted that it is a huge project with a technical report and noted that if Transgrid have made mistakes they will address the errors.
- *A CCG member asked whether Transgrid can explain the process of the government reviewing submissions.*
- Sumaya noted that the department has all the submissions and will independently review them. The department has their own nominated assessing officer which includes a team of people who will go through the submissions independently.
- *A CCG member commented that over the three years of engagement with landowners a major impact seems to have not been discussed with landowners which is the exceedance of the environmental protection authorities' noise level requirements in certain weather conditions.*
- Sumaya responded that Transgrid have presented on the corona noise issue at a previous CCG and can share more information as there are noise fact sheets on the website.
- **Action: Transgrid to share information on the noise and vibration levels including corona noise.**
- *The CCG member noted that every landowner in a dwelling that is impacted has had no information that these noise limits will be exceeded at their dwellings.*

MEETING MINUTES

- *Another CCG member commented that they hadn't heard anything about the noise limits until the EIS and even then it was only that someone had picked it up deep within the EIS.*
- *Another CCG member commented that they found out in the EIS that there will be a telecommunications line but it is not part of their compensation. They continued that the EIS does not show where the tension towers are placed. The EIS is referring to the route but does not accurately address the environmental impact when it is not showing where the bigger pads are and the access tracks.*
- Sumaya noted that the EIS is based on the concept design and that more specific placement is dependent on delivery partners. The EIS is intentionally conservative and looks at a bigger area and assumes that within this area there could be towers. As the project progresses the level of detail will become greater and Transgrid will share this information with the community when it becomes available.
- *A CCG member noted that the EIS should be the final sign off, not just a rough line on the map as people were making very important decisions without a lot of information.*
- *Another CCG member noted that they were only just informed that there will be four extra double towers. The EIS has a section with a picture which explains what it will look like, this is a useful image which should have been provided to landholders. Landholders have just been told they have towers being put on their property. There is a lot of detail within the EIS that provides much more detail than the more general description being provided for property and land management agreements. While this detail is in the EIS it is up to people who are already busy to seek it out. Transgrid should be much more forthcoming in providing this detail in landowner discussions.*
- The Chair noted that the concept level of the EIS was a subject discussed at a number of previous CCG meetings. The Chair asked Transgrid to explain the process and timeline for when people will have a greater level of detail.
- TAKEN ON NOTICE.
- **Action: Transgrid to outline process and timeline for when people will have a greater level of detail on tower location and access tracks.**
- *A CCG member commented that the access tracks should be outlined in the EIS.*
- Sumaya responded that the access tracks are linked to where the towers are and Transgrid do not currently have all the detailed answers until the delivery partners are confirmed.
- *A CCG member commented that the landholders have limited time left before compulsory acquisition but they still do not know where the towers are going which seems unfair. Particularly given the clock was ticking on compulsory acquisitions.*
- *Another CCG member commented that they own the land where a telecommunications tower is at Kilimacat. They noted that they asked their property manager about a little green line on the Transgrid maps of the route and they were told it is where workers will access the tower. They asked why workers could not use the tracks which already*

MEETING MINUTES

exist. The CCG member continued that it is not acceptable to find out in the EIS that it is a telecommunications tower and asked why they couldn't be just told about this. The CCG member noted that the community is fighting for their livelihood and are not being properly informed. We have between 14 and 8 towers mentioned in different letters – this is confusing yet we are being asked to sign away things with very little information to base a decision on. The CCG member noted that Transgrid is requesting they do their property management plan more quickly without providing them with support. The CCG member noted that landowners are under enormous pressure and are feeling pressured by Transgrid to complete this information while also finding things out about their property impact through an EIS. The CCG member noted that the engagement with landholders and the community has failed. The CCG member noted that they feel as though Transgrid does not understand the impact on community member's lives. The CCG member noted that the landholders work on these farms for their livelihood and Transgrid staff drive Teslas and go to an office to work. The CCG member noted that it is appalling that only dwelling are considered in Transgrid's notifications as people come onto the property to work and will be working under the transmission lines. The CCG member noted that they have one employee who doesn't want to continue to work because of the transmission lines. The CCG member noted that they cannot put that into a compensation figure, they noted that \$1 million is an insult when they are working so hard and cannot be told exactly how they will be impacted.

- *A CCG member asked why Transgrid has started physical work without the EIS, they noted that from their understanding Transgrid was doing core sampling on a total fire ban day and earth sensitivity tests.*
- Sumaya responded that she cannot talk to the specifics of the works, however noted that some preliminary surveys have to be done to inform the EIS and design. Soil samples are taken to inform the EIS, preliminary investigations are needed to inform the design. This work is allowed under legislation because it isn't specific construction works.
- *The CCG member noted that Transgrid do not know where the towers are going yet they have done earth sensitivity tests.*
- Sumaya responded that Transgrid have indicative locations, but do not have final locations.
- *The CCG member noted that Transgrid are doing physical work, including core sampling and earth sensitivity tests, before the EIS has been approved.*
- Sumaya responded that it is to inform the design development. She noted that you cannot write an EIS without any preliminary information to inform the design.
- *A CCG member asked about the compound at the Snowy Mountains Highway and asked whether it has started. They noted there is a large pad and it could be seen on the EIS. The CCG member noted it is near Tumbarumba Road.*
- Sumaya noted that Transgrid has undertaken no work on starting to build compounds as they have no approval for such works. Sumaya responded that if the CCG member can provide the exact location, they can investigate it.

MEETING MINUTES

- *There was discussion amongst CCG members that these may be works being done by Council.*
- TAKEN ON NOTICE.
- **Action: CCG member to provide Transgrid with address for compound on Snowy mountains highway to investigate cause of works.**
- *A CCG member noted that they have some questions on the process for consultation with the Department Secretary. The CCG member noted that the secretary probably will not read all the submissions but will be provided with a brief. The CCG member suggested that if any brief to the Secretary should be shared with the CCG members.*
- Sumaya responded that this part of the process was the Departments to run. CCG members would need to address any such requests to DPE as it is not Transgrid's decision.
- *The CCG member noted that they would like to understand through a flow chart what information is provided to DPE and who the key decision makers are in the consultation process. The CCG member noted that in Victoria they went through a process with a ministerial advisory panel in a similar situation where the Deputy Secretary and key stakeholders looked through the feedback and advised the minister. The CCG member noted that that is a well-used process so as a minimum the advice to the secretary should be made public. The CCG member noted that proper engagement such as that is something they would welcome.*
- The Chair noted that the EIS process is not controlled by Transgrid. The Chair suggested that the CCG member contact the nominated assessments officer with this request.
- *The CCG member commented that a flow chart of the process would be useful.*
- TAKEN ON NOTICE
- **Action: Provide a flow chart of the assessment approvals and the key decision makers in the consultation process.**
- *A CCG member asked about the green lines on the map in the EIS.*
- Sumaya responded that they are either access tracks or underground fibre connections to existing substations. Sumaya noted that the different lines should be clearly demarcated and noted that they are mostly access tracks. Existing substations we have to plug into underground fibre connection.
- *A CCG member noted that the map on the Humelink website does not include the same level of detail that used to be available.*
- Naomi responded that in the digital EIS you can get the same level of detail.
- *The CCG member noted that they did not want to be considered an additional number for Transgrid to say people were visiting the EIS website so Transgrid can use it to say they are engaging well.*
- Sumaya confirmed that each users visiting the website will only be counted once no matter how many times they visit the pages.
- *A CCG member noted that in the EIS there is reference in some places to access tracks outside of the footprint. They asked how this works?*

MEETING MINUTES

- Sumaya responded that if they are existing tracks, they will not be included in the footprint. The Amendment Report identifies a number of additional access tracks. In the EIS a large number of access tracks that are identified are existing, needing upgrade or new ones. In the EIS they were identified by two categories: improved and unimproved. If CCG members need assistance finding that level of detail Transgrid can help.
- *A CCG member asked if there were access tracks outside the easement on the property, how will Transgrid use the tracks.*
- Sumaya responded that as part of the acquisition discussion, Transgrid will talk through additional access that may be required outside of the easement to access the easement.
- *A CCG member noted that they do not know where the towers are going and where the access tracks will be, but people are getting contacted about acquisition.*
- The Chair summarised the preceding discussion as follows - landowners feel pressured that the clock is ticking on acquisitions and at the same time they are being asked to make decisions without a firm understanding of the detail of how it will impact them and their operations.
- *A CCG member noted that if it is unknown, landowners should be compensated for the highest possible use of their land.*
- *A CCG member noted that the letter they received with the offer has just the straight corridor with no mention of access tracks and the amount of hectares doesn't include anything outside the corridor. The member commented if there are access tracks required how can that be part of the conversation if it isn't mentioned. They noted that Transgrid must know what access tracks will be needed.*
- *Another CCG member commented that from their understanding if landowners sign that option agreement Transgrid can go anywhere over your property and whatever they deem as an access track. They commented if landowners sign the option agreement, once Transgrid finish the line, you have no recall for any damage they do on your property. He recommended that landowners withhold from signing any agreement.*
- *A CCG member commented that they are interested in the tracks and wondered in which technical study of the EIS they will find the detailed maps.*
- Sumaya responded in the noise map, traffic and transport section.
- *The CCG member asked whether the map had a legend. The CCG member requested that Transgrid needs to provide the community with the detailed maps showing the lines including a legend.*
- *Another CCG member noted that they have had discussions with Sumaya that were not part of the meetings so no minutes were taken. They also noted they have had a number of discussions with Naomi that were off the record. They noted that even when they look at the minutes from the meetings, they are very general. There is a discussion around what was said but they are not detailed. The CCG member noted that this leads to a lack of accountability. The CCG member noted that if every community member wants to ask Sumaya questions this cannot*

MEETING MINUTES

be fit into the meeting. When it is not taken down in the minutes then there is no accountability for what was said.

- Sumaya noted that if CCG members have specific questions they can be emailed through to Transgrid and they will be responded to. Any specific questions should be sent through.
- The Chair requested if a map of the project should be sent through to CCG members with a legend explaining what each line indicates. Also suggested that this should refer to the sections in the EIS where detailed maps can be found.
- **Action: Transgrid to send CCG members a map of the line including a legend and reference to section of the EIS that contains the detailed maps.**
- *A CCG member commented on people being asked to consider the compensation when they are not completely aware of all the project impacts. The CCG member requested that there is a commitment from Transgrid to not force these decisions on landowners until the detail is known.*
- *Another CCG member queried whether Transgrid not knowing where things go is the truth or is it just that they do not want to provide that information at this stage.*
- The Chair summarised that the issue has been raised and noted in the minutes. The Chair noted that Transgrid can come back when the minutes are being finalised and Transgrid has been able to have a discussion about the concerns.
- **Action: Transgrid to respond to CCG members via the minutes about their concerns on landowners being asked to respond to compensation when they have not been provided with detail on the impact.**
- Sumaya outlined the process for the next steps of the Amendment Report. She noted that Transgrid have identified additional information that is now available as well as responding to additional assessments for Green Hills and other minor route refinements in response to submissions received during the public exhibition of the EIS. The Amendment Report will be submitted to DPE alongside the Submissions Report.
- The Amendment Report will include route refinements such as Green Hills and other minor refinements, access tracks, transmission line and substation design refinements, accommodation facilities and construction compounds and construction methodology.
- Naomi noted that if there are additional questions, Transgrid can take them and include them in the detail so they can be shared more broadly. She noted that while questions might relate specifically to an individual there will likely be broader implications making them relevant to all landowners.
- *The CCG member noted that the questions are in their submission.*
- Sumaya continued that for the accommodation facilities and construction compounds, some locations will not be used. 14 locations have been assessed and only around half of them will be needed. Transgrid have been in discussion with landowners about having the compound on their property and will share soon where the proposed

MEETING MINUTES

locations are. There is 1 location proposed in Tumberumba, Council have been sharing concerns around worker accommodation and no capacity in the towns and there will be a large workforce in peak moving across the whole route. As a result, Transgrid have identified the need for additional accommodation facilities which they will be able to share more detail about in the future.

- *A CCG member commented that they had an uninformed, unmarked vehicle approach them. The person did not introduce themselves and did not explain what they were doing. They asked for a phone number, and asked what they were doing, the person said they are trying to find 10 acres for Transgrid to build some accommodation. They had meant to be next door but were in the wrong place, they then continued to the next house and said the same thing. Transgrid need to think about the process of doorknocking and asking for phone numbers and need to reconsider doing with people who are not in uniform. The residents are getting impacted again and would like Transgrid to understand it is not a nice experience.*
- Naomi responded that this is the first time they have heard of this happening. She acknowledged that this would be a confronting experience and was sorry that this occurred. She noted that Transgrid have an expectation that the team are clearly identified and conduct themselves professionally. They should clearly state what they are there to do and respond to questions honestly. She noted that if someone needs to find information they may need to come to someone's door and ask questions however she acknowledged that this needs to be done properly.
- The Chair asked how long ago the incident occurred.
- *The CCG member responded that it was 6 weeks - 2 months ago.*
- *Another CCG member noted that this is not the only occurrence of this kind. They noted that it was discussed at the last council meeting and community members raised how frustrated and angry they were at being disrupted and not knowing what is happening with the accommodation and how they are being impacted. The CCG member noted they do not feel it is an appropriate way to go about finding accommodation. They noted that there are a range of issues such as waste water and infrastructure that needs to be built to manage this. They noted that septic tank and waste cannot be carted across the road. They commented that council roads should not be used in this manner.*
- The Chair suggested that a complaint be made directly to Transgrid after an incident occurs. The Chair noted that the sooner a complaint is made, the more that can be done.
- *The CCG member confirmed that they made a complaint via the Humelink email but did not receive a response.*
- *A CCG member asked who is responsible for the accommodation construction and responsibility for upkeep.*
- Sumaya noted that what is being looked at is temporary accommodation, but there may be opportunities to repurpose the accommodation for other uses in the future.
- Naomi commented that with other projects there have been a number of different opportunities where accommodation has been repurposed.

MEETING MINUTES

- Sumaya outlined that in terms of the transmission line and substation design requirements, we have identified two locations where towers may be slightly higher than in the EIS. This includes two locations where the height may need to be 77 metres not the 76 meters that was quoted originally. Transgrid need to speak to landowners and ensure it is correct there were many questions about the 76 metres in the EIS.
- *A CCG member requested that Transgrid provide CCG members with the locations within a week.*
- TAKEN ON NOTICE.
- **Action: Transgrid to provide the two locations to CCG members where the towers may be slightly higher than in the EIS (77 metres).**
- There have been no changes in Gugaa substation but tweaks in the equipment within the substation footprints will be outlined in the Amendment Report.
- There will be more information provided in the Amendment Report including on whether they will do blasting, water supply and what enabling works look like. These are all talked about in the EIS but there is not a lot of detail, Transgrid will look to provide more detail on those aspects as well.

Amendment Report – Engagement Approach

Kat presented on the Amendment Report – Engagement Approach

See slides 21 and 22 for more information.

- The engagement approach has been underpinned by different scale levels depending on the topic. Transgrid will continue to determine engagement opportunities at all levels including the individual level which will include one on one engagement with land access officers. Where the primary impacts are localised the engagement approach includes small group meetings and access community hubs. For larger community groups and potential impacts to local specific towns there will be broader engagement such as community information sessions, webinars and CCGs, for projects happening across the broader specific footprint.
- Some of these activities are not exclusive, some may involve individual consultation and regional at the same time. For example with the location of access tracks, there may be consultation not just with direct neighbours but a broader level of engagement by talking to council.
- *A CCG member asked what the status of the Green Hills alternative is that will be in the amendment.*
- Sumaya noted it will be in the Amendment Report and that information about Green Hills has been shared in the newsletter.
- *A CCG member asked if there is going to be a decision made on the route?*
- Sumaya noted that the Green Hills route is preferred and Transgrid will need to demonstrate the benefits of using this route. Transgrid believe this decision will stack up but the investigation needs to be fully completed.
- *A CCG member asked how people will be able to make a submission on the Amendment Report and the Green Hills proposal.*

MEETING MINUTES

- Sumaya noted that it will not be a formal submissions process unless DPE decide it is a requirement.
- Naomi noted that Transgrid will be seeking specific feedback and may ask community members to answer surveys. There will be different levels of engagement depending on what community members are wanting to contribute to and the significance of it.
- The Chair asked the CCG members how they would like to be engaged.
- *The CCG members responded that every time the line is moved it puts significant pressure on landowners and the community.*
- *A CCG member noted that it is worrying how much pressure it is putting on people and their families. They noted that they have heard people are reluctant to use the Transgrid counselling services as they do not want to go to the source of the problem for a solution.*
- Naomi noted that there is an alternative one called RAHMP and they are completely independent from Transgrid but were at the majority of the community information sessions with the EIS the outreach officers there attended those sessions. There was a representative at the sessions in Yass and they spoke to landowners. They have various locations including Wagga and Yass. There are other outreach officers that are completely independent and they have been providing the regional support by attending as part of their outreach.
- The Chair noted that RAHMP have been working on other very sensitive projects and both community members and the agencies thought very highly of the organisation.
- Naomi commented that Transgrid can connect people with support services that are relevant to them depending on what is going on.
- *A CCG member noted that it raising false expectations in people's minds if they are expecting that their submissions will result in meaningful change. The member continued that at the undergrounding inquiry the government listened and did not change their position. They noted that while it is a shame, it does not seem as though undergrounding will be pursued as an option. The CCG member noted that Transgrid have a responsibility to make sure landowners understand this.*
- *Another CCG member responded that the parliamentary inquiry did not indicate that undergrounding was not the right option, it said that because of the regulations and because it had not been looked at to this point they were not going to pursue it. There is another inquiry which is ongoing.*
- *A CCG member responded that from their understanding undergrounding is not going to be an option. They noted that they have not gone and gotten the pricing and cables for transformers, they noted that even if it is costing an extra \$10 million but it will not pass the RIT-T.*
- *Another CCG member asked whether there will there be an independent planning commission hearing? They noted that if 50 independent submissions were received there is supposed to be an independent planning commission and they noted Transgrid has not discussed this at the meeting today.*
- Naomi responded that they confirmed in the council meeting as this is critical state development infrastructure the independent planning

MEETING MINUTES

commission does not have a role. She noted that there are different levels of planning and if there are a certain number of submissions received that raise concerns about it, it can be escalated. As Humelink is categorised as critically state significant infrastructure, there is no trigger for an independent commission to undertake a review. In this instance the decision is to be made by the Minister on the advice of their Department.

- *The CCG member noted that they have contacted the independent commission and they said they will undertake a review.*
- The Chair asked whether the CCG member has spoken to the independent planning commission.
- *The CCG member confirmed they have. They noted that on the consideration of undergrounding the select committee is in process, they commented that it is not appropriate to be judging what the findings of that will be.*
- *A CCG member commented that the select committee has only one sitting this year and that is on the November 27 everything else is in the next year and doesn't finalise until 31 March. The community, Humelink Action Group and Alliance want to advise Transgrid that they will not be negotiating any further on land access and option agreement until the select committee makes its recommendations on 31 March because landholders need that time to put submissions in.*
- *Another CCG member noted that since the EIS went out, they have had phone calls and that people nearby the substation have been getting phone calls from energy developers looking at options for battery storage and solar farms. The CCG member asked what Transgrid are telling people or whether they are getting all their information from the EIS?*
- Naomi responded that the information is out there and these developers would be getting their information from the network overview documents that AEMO produces. They would have set their radar as to future development opportunities and they would have seen the information in the EIS and that would have narrowed a field of scope. They would be looking at specific sections. Naomi noted that they cannot speak to the calls that CCG members and their neighbours are specifically getting however on other projects such as rail/road/energy projects you will see developers take advantage of that publicly available information. There are a number of different developer opportunities and generally they have land agreements in place before they come to Transgrid. It is up to individuals to engage with them as much as they want to or don't want to.
- *A CCG member asked about biodiversity stewardship agreements. They noted that in Tumut they were talking about how Transgrid would engage with the community in general business and economically and talked about how Transgrid would like to engage with landowners to extend that same type of opportunity to a small business or trades company and there were going to be webinars and supporting people with the stewardship process.*
- Naomi responded that she relayed the conversation she had had with the CCG member around the administrative burden and the hurdles of participating in the stewardship agreements and how the CCG member had compared them to navigating the NDIS. At the moment Transgrid

MEETING MINUTES

have had a targeted approach of being able to assess areas with the highest value for SAS to be obtained. Specific conditions, plant types needed in areas, we will talk to people in those areas we are up to broadening that out and working with landowners beyond those specific targeted areas and look at that from there. We need to initially identify where opportunities exist, someone may want to participate in a BSA but may not be in an area targeted. We need to do the matching element.

- Sumaya noted that they have had landowners contact them saying they are interested. She commented that Transgrid has had to have their biodiversity assessments complete first. There is a way Transgrid can engage with affected landowners. Transgrid have visited properties, conducted additional spot checks, even if you have one threatened species, we need a certain amount of credits. To date there are not a lot of overlap or existing opportunities
- *A CCG member asked whether the engagement process has started yet.*
- Sumaya responded that it has been a targeted approach first. She noted that they have worked with a consultant to prepare a report that identifies areas of likely potential.
- *A CCG member noted that it would have been good to have that document as they noted they have been wondering how it has been going. They also asked about business opportunities for small businesses?*
- Sumaya asked whether she meant for procurement processes?
- *The CCG member confirmed she meant suppliers.*
- Naomi responded that Transgrid have spoken about supplier opportunities on the Humelink website. The critical step is signing on delivery partners and having their roll out of the packages and being able to work through determining what the barriers might to participating. This process has been delayed by the delay in finalising the contract with delivery partners.
- *The CCG member asked whether the webinars have occurred yet.*
- Naomi responded that the webinars have not occurred yet.
- *A CCG member asked whether any properties have been purchased for biodiversity offsets?*
- Sumaya responded no, no yet.
- *A CCG member asked why Transgrid cannot parallel the existing 03 330kV transmission line from West of Yass to Chidowla? They noted that paralleling Humelink to the 03 330kV transmission line can easily be achieved by bringing Humelink into line with the 03 330kV transmission line from structures either 267 or 266. They noted that Humelink is 200 metres from the 330kV transmission line at this point. They noted that previously Transgrid have said they cannot do it because it runs through Burrinjuck State Park or because of the Jeremiah Wind Farm however this is untrue.*
- TAKEN ON NOTICE.
- **Action: Transgrid to provide information on whether Humelink can parallel the existing 03 330kV transmission line from West of Yass to Chidowla.**

MEETING MINUTES

Other business and next meeting

- *Another CCG member noted that they had the 2f option along the 02 power line and they put it up and negotiated to the landholders and came to Transgrid who said they could not do it because the environmental offsets were too much going through forestry country. 100 hectares of private pine plantation that it all of what it would have taken out. They noted there was political direction to stay away from communities and use public land.*
- The Chair provided an update on the future of the CCG.
- The Terms of Reference for the CCG states the groups (originally conceived as three groups) would run throughout the planning stages of the project. The project has reached a significant planning milestone with the submission of the EIS and conclusion of the exhibition period.
- Transgrid is going to look at the submission and respond to them in detail before a determination is made, as such there will not be a lot more information for the CCG during this time.
- Subject to the outcome of determination, new community advisory forums will then be convened to provide a community perspective on matters related to project delivery within the conditions set out by the determining authority.
- There will be one more meeting in February 2024 where we will look at an update on the assessment process, the Amendment report and potentially introduce the delivery partners.
- Following that we will look to conclude the current CCG process, terms of reference and membership following this meeting with a view to convening new forums if and when the project approval comes through and there is a more defined scope.
- The new forums will consider the East/West organisation of work, have terms of reference relevant to the delivery phase and a much firmer scope as subject to approval the scope will be defined within the conditions of consent.
- This has been tested with landowner advocate Rod Stowe who has agreed with the process.
- Transgrid will still maintain engagement with landowners and more intensive engagement with landowners as there are more in depth discussions on individual properties. They will continue engaging with council and other stakeholders throughout this time.
- *A CCG member responded that this is okay as long as the delivery partners are underground cabling delivery partners.*
- *A CCG member asked whether when the refinement of the tower replacements are released there will be another EIS. The CCG member noted they feel there should be another report done on any changes in impact due to line refinements. They noted it should be submitted to the government before construction, it should be redone.*
- *An observer asked whether workers will be police checked, they noted that there are single women living on properties where people will be working and in close proximity to proposed accommodation camp locations and this presents a personal and community safety risk. They noted the workers should be police checked.*
- TAKEN ON NOTICE

MEETING MINUTES

- **Action: Transgrid to respond to community members on whether workers will have to undergo a police check before coming onto properties.**

Meeting close

The meeting closed at 7:17pm

MEETING MINUTES

Action	Status or comment
HumeLink EIS and SEARs to be circulated to CCG members	Completed
Transgrid to provide the CCG with technical information explaining how the structural integrity of the transmission lines is maintained in windy conditions.	Completed
Transgrid to respond to the Steering Committee’s letter and the 52 outstanding issues within 4 weeks of the meeting.	Complete
Transgrid to supply the exact number the 2022 undergrounding figures were based on	Completed
Transgrid to check the parameters for covering ecology studies for landowners	Completed
Transgrid to supply their proposed biosecurity processes for the geotech investigations.	Completed
Transgrid to supply revised Option Deed	Completed
Transgrid to supply the revised Property Management Plan	Completed
Transgrid to outline how the procurement process will minimise impact on local communities	Completed
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.	Completed
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.	Completed
Transgrid to determine if there are barriers to technological advancements with undergrounding cables	Underway
Secretariat is to follow up with members on administrative details including signed Code of Conduct Agreements and sharing of contact details.	Completed
Transgrid to institute the \$50 reimbursement for eligible members	Completed
Transgrid to request the value of the multiplier from GHD used in their report.	Completed
Transgrid to supply the difference in route length between the original Bannaby to Tumut option and the alternate option that was considered	Completed

MEETING MINUTES

Transgrid to email confirmation that Transgrid will not be doing an official review of the route in Yass.	Completed
November meeting minutes to include further detail regarding the biodiversity offset process.	Completed
Transgrid requested to provide summary slides for each topic of the EIS	Completed
Transgrid to provide the CCG with an example of a noise and vibration catchment	Completed
Transgrid to provide an explanation of the noise monitoring process and how the noise machines work	Completed
Transgrid to answer if the noise monitors will remain post construction of the route	Completed
Transgrid to dedicate an agenda item during a CCG in 2023 to noise and bring an acoustic expert in	Completed
Transgrid to determine if the Neara modelling will be ready in time for when the EIS is on public exhibition	Completed
Transgrid to provide a chart of all the different companies involved in Humelink and what they do.	Underway
Transgrid to provide more information on the tower details	Completed
Transgrid to send through the map outlining the 65 outages that occurred during the Dunns Rd fire and confirm that there were 65 outages.	Completed
First Nations Humelink stakeholder list to be shared with the CCG	Completed
Pre-reading material will be provided at least a week before each meeting.	Completed
Transgrid to confirm the number of requests for power lines to be turned off during the Dunns Road fire.	Completed
Transgrid to re-distribute correct route map identifying East and West sections of the line.	Completed
Transgrid to review fact sheets reportedly displaying 330kV lines in place of 550kV lines.	Completed
Can landowners be paid for the time spent developing their PMPs?	Completed
Chair to review the questions sent through on the Yass route refinement.	Completed
All future CCG meetings held as combined meetings and open to the public.	Completed
Transgrid to provide the CCG with an update on progress with AEMO at the next CCG	Completed
Transgrid disclose how many lobbyists they have working in Sydney and Canberra.	Completed

MEETING MINUTES

Transgrid to show images to CCG members of different visualisation tools, including NEARA to compare visual representation and different tool options. The presentation must provide a large selection of NEARA images where NEARA provides an accurate visual representation and where it does not with a comparison to photomontage.	Completed
Transgrid to attempt to obtain more detailed information on fighting fires under transmission lines and on ability to evacuate where there is a 25 metre exclusion zone due to smoke. This includes documenting where there is no evacuation route for landowners because of transmission lines, in the case of a bushfire.	Completed
Transgrid to provide greater detail on the Yass Valley route refinement.	Completed
Transgrid to review questions sent through by CCG member on the Yass Valley route refinement.	Completed
Transgrid to respond to community on where WSP's study to assess undergrounding overseas is up to.	Completed
Transgrid to discuss with Rod Stowe to determine if there will be a replacement for Barbara El Gamal as Landowner Advocate.	Completed
Transgrid to clarify the percentage of op-ex over cap-ex assumed in the RIT-T and that if assumptions have changed to explain the implications of this for the overall project viability in terms of net benefit/net cost.	Completed
Transgrid to provide an update on the AEMO review when completed.	Completed
Transgrid to provide an update on route in the Yass region and what route will be in the EIS.	Completed
Transgrid to confirm that no tower in HumeLink will be higher than 76 metres.	Completed
Transgrid to provide the height of the towers of the 550kV transmission lines between Bannaby and Mount Piper.	Completed
Transgrid to provide some clarification around how creeks or crossings will be managed by contractors.	Completed
Transgrid to provide CCG members with the depth and width of trench required for the underground cabling done for the Powering Sydney's Future project.	Completed
Transgrid to find out what agricultural expertise they have, including the certifications of individuals to determine what agricultural activities can be undertaken above and in proximity to underground lines.	Completed
The recent Transmission Expansion Options report has HumeLink with a transfer capacity of 2200 megawatts, it was previously 2570 megawatts. Transgrid to confirm the transfer capacity of HumeLink.	Completed
Transgrid provide the amount they will get for maintenance of HumeLink in regards to the easement.	Completed

MEETING MINUTES

How much of the \$4.892 billion is biodiversity offsets?	Completed
Jeremy to report back to Transgrid senior leadership team on community feedback including that the community feel as though Transgrid are choosing figures to exaggerate the cost/impact of undergrounding.	Completed
Transgrid to consider advocating for an extension to the EIS exhibition period.	Completed
Transgrid to provide a full schedule on where they will be in the community to assist people during the EIS exhibition period.	Completed
Transgrid to consider whether they can provide CCG members with a hard copy of the EIS.	Completed
Transgrid to confirm who is being doorknocked as part of the project and whether any of the 4322 indirectly impact residents are being doorknocked.	Completed
Transgrid to identify the 70% of the line that was walked as part of the biodiversity and aboriginal heritage work done for the EIS.	Completed
Will Transgrid pay for the legal and valuation expenses if the transmission lines go underground?	Completed
Will Transgrid pay for property management consultants who do property management plans?	Completed
Transgrid to consider whether the next CCG meeting will be in September during the exhibition period.	Completed
Community members to supply addresses to Transgrid to determine whether community members were notified about the project.	
Transgrid to outline process and timeline for when people will have a greater level of detail on tower location.	
Transgrid to outline process and timeline for when people will have a greater level of detail on access tracks.	
Transgrid to respond on whether any work has been completed on compound on Snowy mountains highway.	
Transgrid to send CCG members a map of the line including a legend and reference to section of the EIS that contains the detailed maps.	
Transgrid to respond to CCG members via the minutes about their concerns on landowners being asked to respond to compensation when they have not been provided with detail on the impact.	
Transgrid to provide the two locations to CCG members where the towers may be slightly higher than in the EIS (77 metres).	
Transgrid to provide information on whether Humelink can parallel the existing 03 330kV transmission line from West of Yass to Chidowla from structures 267 or 266.	

MEETING MINUTES

Transgrid to respond to community members on whether workers will have to undergo a police check before coming onto properties.	
Provide a flow chart of the assessment approvals and the key decision makers in the consultation process.	
Transgrid to share information on the noise and vibration levels.	
Transgrid to ensure the cost benefit analysis was done to consider impact of delaying the building of the Maragle link on project cost.	