

# MEETING MINUTES

## HumeLink Combined Community Consultative Group Meeting: 19 March 2024

<b>Time</b>	5:00pm – 7:00 pm
<b>Date</b>	19/03/2024
<b>Attendees</b>	<p>Chair: Brendan Blakeley</p> <p>Secretariat: Beatrice Hobson</p> <p>Transgrid CCG members: Kylie Cochrane, Jeremy Roberts, Tammy Sinclair, Michael Johnson</p> <p>Transgrid project member attendees: Cameron Whittington, Sam Willoughby, Rhys Stickler, Yvonne Varley, Carel Nagel, Adam Hoare, Alan Foote, Peter Cassuben, Jim Maniord</p> <p>Community members: Andrew Hamilton, Peter Lawson, Hansie Armour, Pippa Quilty, Carlie Porteous, Andrea Strong, Rene Lunardello, William Kingwill, Rebecca Tobin, Daniel Brear, Mayor Ian Chaffey (Snowy Valley Council), Barney Hyams, Rachael Purcell, Scott Churchill</p> <p>A number of observers were in attendance</p>
<b>Apologies</b>	Catriona McAuliffe (NSW Farmers), Clr Julia Ham (Yass Valley Council), Clr Rod Kendall (Wagga Wagga Shire Council), Clr Sue Hanrahan (Wagga Wagga Shire Council), Clr Adrian Cameron (Yass Council), Ross Hickey, Ian Robson, Paul Sturgess, Lee Kingma
<b>Meeting location</b>	Gundagai Public School
<b>Meeting materials</b>	Presentation
<b>Purpose of meeting</b>	Meeting 15

Item	Discussion Summary
<b>Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The meeting commenced at 5:03pm.</li> <li>- The Chair welcomed all and gave an Acknowledgement of Country.</li> <li>- The Chair noted apologies.</li> <li>- The Chair thanked the CCG members and observers for attending and outlined the agenda for the meeting.</li> </ul>
<b>CCG member discussion</b>	<p>Several CCG members presented. The first CCG member presented on social licence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>The CCG member noted that Transgrid had failed to earn social licence for the project. They noted that they believe Transgrid has misled community members and are not adequately compensating community members for their land. The member stated that at the parliamentary inquiry into undergrounding Transgrid provided information which differed from that provided to the community. They continued that they believe Transgrid has not provided sufficient information on visual amenity to the community. They stated that information provided does not mention the 55m by 105m crane pad carved at every tower or the 250-tonne crane lifting the</i></li> </ul>

## MEETING MINUTES

tower (information the CCG member got from the Project Assessment Conclusions Report). They noted that information on access tracks were provided with their option agreement and that landowners are not adequately compensated for the impact of the access tracks. The CCG member continued that they believe Transgrid has not listened to landowners and deliberately misled landowners by telling landowners they will have options despite this not being the case. The member commented that the high turnover of project managers and changes in project team is an indication of the poor management of the project. The CCG member stated it is a conflict of interest that a Transgrid solicitor is also deputy chair of the NSW biodiversity conservation trust. The CCG member concluded that Transgrid has failed in its ability to gain social licence for Humelink and has failed in its obligations to the community.

The second CCG member presented on consultation.

- *The CCG member noted that public consultation is defined as "a process by which members of the public are asked for input on public issues." The CCG member explained that the CCG meetings have been characterised by Transgrid dictating to the community rather than genuinely consulting with the community. The CCG member continued that consultation should be a two-way process, but that Transgrid has failed in its requirements to consult. The CCG member continued that as a member of the CCG since its inception they joined in hope that this would provide a platform for communities to be heard. They noted that Transgrid has had no genuine consideration for people, the communities impacted or the environment. There has been a failure to listen, failure to respond positively to communities to better the project as is the requirements of consultation. The CCG member noted they believe Transgrid has failed in its requirements to consult.*
- *The CCG member noted that one of the objectives in the EIS is gaining community and stakeholder acceptance to develop and operate Transgrid's electricity network and to provide:*
  - o *fair, reasonable and timely consultation,*
  - o *fair, robust and transparent route selection, and*
  - o *fair and equitable compensation for landowners.*
- *The member noted there has been no evidence of this.*
- *The CCG member noted that over the last four years, there has been no fairness from Transgrid and all they have seen is emotional, personal, financial, and physical impacts before the project has even been built. The CCG member noted that the community have always been agreeable to an undergrounding solution, but Transgrid have chosen to defy and deny communities.*
- *The CCG member explained that they feel as though Transgrid has failed to present the facts to CCG members. The CCG member provided the example of Transgrid not using the NEARA tool as a 'real' visual tool, the CCG member noted the community asked to see the images of construction and operation however were denied any real imagery. The CCG member noted that the EIS presented them with information they had never seen before. For example, they recently asked Transgrid where the 110- and 130-metre-wide*

*easements would be and whether they would occur on the CCG member's property. They were told this is where the transpositions occur. The CCG member noted that if they had not specifically asked about the transposition, they would have remained unaware that this was a part of the project and would be affecting their property. The CCG member discovered that 7 transpositions would be placed along the route. The transposition has greater visual and industrial impact and had been hidden from the community. This admission is further failure of Transgrid's ability to consult. The CCG member was given an explanation that the transpositions were a process of changing the order of conductors along the towers to balance transmission losses over the length of the line. This was a strategy needed to manage the losses that plagued overhead AC infrastructure. The CCG member noted that experts in HVDC have stated all along that HVDC substantially reduces the losses to overhead.*

- *In the Senate Committee Inquiry Yolande Strengers, Associate Dean (Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion) Monash University was asked if a community understands the issues and options and they have universally concluded that they want the transmission line undergrounded, should undergrounding occur? The response was "Yes, in that situation, if it's at all possible, I would be attempting to support the communities wishes". The CCG member explained there are 365km of story all in the path of Humelink, each one different and important. If Transgrid's consultation was as it should be, these stories would matter in the equation.*
- *The CCG member noted that it is not just about those that are directly impacted, but also the 4322 people that are indirectly impacted which Transgrid indicated they would door knock - and yet most still do not know about the project. The CCG member noted that many neighbours are only aware because of their own advocacy, and in some cases are even more visually impacted than those deemed directly impacted. The CCG member continued that Transgrid is failing regional communities and that Transgrid has failed in their consultation.*
- *The CCG member noted that along with several other CCG members they dedicated 13 months as community representatives to the Steering Committee on the GHD undergrounding study. They noted that they were privy to the mistakes, learnings and misinformation made by Transgrid along the way and the misinformation and misrepresentations made by Transgrid in both inquiries.*
- *The CCG member commented in the Inquiry they stated they seek the advice of experts and mentioned GHD as a leading expert they seek out. This should have meant that the study by GHD in conjunction with STANTEC, worth in excess of \$300, 000 should be particularly meaningful to Transgrid. However, the CCG member noted they have continued to disregard the information in that study and misrepresent undergrounding. The GHD study had a trench for undergrounding Humelink with a width of 2.1m, in some examples even smaller. Transgrid stated under oath in the inquiry that a 50m trench would be required.*
- *In the Standing Committee Inquiry Transgrid stated there was no risk of overhead lines starting a bushfire, while the GHD report states "overhead lines increase the risk for bushfire ignition. Overhead lines*

*can restrict access for bushfire fighting as opposed to underground lines, which would have no or negligible impact'. They go on to say that while it is rare for overhead 500kV lines to experience faults causing bushfire ignition, the risk is not zero. While rare, 300kV lines are known to have caused bushfire ignition'. Transgrid continue to state transmission lines do not cause fires however the community have witnessed this occur with 330kV lines. In the latest Inquiry Transgrid were asked about the damage to 330kV assets, in your GHD report it states the reason we should be putting these assets underground... 'Full undergrounding of all circuits results in there being negligible potential for above ground bushfire to impact and damage undergrounded assets'. The CCG member noted that Transgrid continues to use 'cost' to consumers as the terms of reference to attempting to put "undergrounding to bed", but undergrounding is actually considering consumers protecting them from the long term recuperation costs of damage to overhead assets which is a risk in every weather and fire event.*

- *The CCG member continued that Transgrid suggests that difficult terrain is problematic for undergrounding, however at no point does GHD's study suggest this, it states the terrain to be easy to medium in topography, with no reference to 'difficult' as a measure.*
- *The CCG member commented that Transgrid only quote the costs of undergrounding found in this report, and even go further to suggest GHD costs are under what they should be. The CCG member explained that the independent review by Amplitude Consultants found that the costs from the GHD study were severely inflated and flawed. The CCG member noted that the independent study stated the costs of undergrounding are 1.1 to 1.5 x the costs of overhead lines. The CCG member noted that the community did not endorse the GHD report as they had 52 outstanding issues. The CCG member noted when Transgrid are ignoring their own 'expert' in GHD, not only does it make a mockery of the time the community spent on this study but is an insult to GHD and STANTEC themselves.*
- *The CCG member noted that Transgrid claim 'sterilisation' issues when overseas scientific studies shows there is no reduction in crop yields above underground transmission lines. The expert states you can plough to a depth that no plough is capable of on top of underground lines. While on the other hand, overhead lines impede on aerial spraying and fertilising and restrict access for large machinery. For safety reasons and for agricultural operations, undergrounding is a better option.*
- *The CCG member noted that Murraylink is a 180km HVDC option and is known for only requiring the removal of two trees. Transgrid insist that undergrounding will result in more damage but there is a 70m easement for overhead lines compared to a 12m wide easement for undergrounding. As per the Amplitude Review, we are talking 2 x 1.5 m wide trenches, to a depth of 1.2m, in comparison to the clear felling 70 m wide easements, 50m X 70m crane pads, massive cement tower pads, and footings buried in concrete to a depth of up to 25m, and a visual and physical impediment to the environment for 80 years.*
- *The community member noted that Transgrid discussed the use of thermal backfill and noted that while the GHD report makes*

## MEETING MINUTES

reference to it, the Amplitude report states it is not necessary and direct burial is possible. The CCG member noted that in the latest Inquiry, SuedLink was mentioned, this was originally a 750km overhead proposal and after a 6-year fight, it is now going underground and it will be double the size and capacity of Humelink. The CCG member concluded that Suedlink is not a fair comparison as it is 4000MW while Humelink is 2200MW.

- The CCG member noted it was stated in a Transgrid Advisory Council meeting minutes, where a question was posed by Craig Memery from PIAC to Brett Redman TG CEO, 'On Undergrounding, do you have any thoughts on what you could have done in 2022 to put it to bed? Are you disappointed that we are still having conversations on undergrounding after the report was released?'... which in itself is exactly the agenda and premise of said undergrounding study, to in make the community go away.
- The CCG member continued that Transgrid told the community they were advocating for undergrounding, and this was misleading as at the inquiry they were working against the community rather than with the community. The CCG member noted that they believe Transgrid have failed to consult, failed to seek better alternatives, failed to advocate for the community and failed to consider undergrounding. The CCG member concluded that Transgrid cannot be trusted to reassess what is best for Humelink and regional Australia. The CCG member noted that they should not have had to spend their time researching and pointing out Transgrid's failings because of their ignorance to the validity and feasibility of undergrounding. The CCG member asked that Transgrid admit fault and apologise for what they have inflicted and continue to inflict on CCG members.

The third CCG member presented on the undergrounding studies.

- The CCG member noted there were two studies done by consultants, a study by GHD done for Transgrid and a review of that study by Amplitude consultants. The GHD study involved a Steering Committee which three CCG members were part of. The CCG members were assisted by Amplitude as independent consultants. The initial report was released publicly in June 2022 with a cost of \$18.7 billion. The Steering Committee received the final report before it was released. Amplitude consultants said they did not agree with the costs in the report and organised a meeting with Transgrid to discuss this. That evening Transgrid released the report publicly. Transgrid later retracted it. There was a Steering Committee meeting on the following Monday to resolve the disagreement over costs between GHD/Transgrid and Amplitude. To resolve the disagreement about the costs in the report the Committee decided to get the opinion of a third independent expert, Transgrid's own undergrounding expert, and his numbers aligned with Amplitude's. There was then a revised report in August 2022 with a cost of \$11.5 billion. In two months, Transgrid wiped \$7 billion off the cost of undergrounding Humelink. The CCG member explained that the issue was this cost still exaggerated the costs of undergrounding 60% above what Amplitude and Transgrid's own undergrounding expert thought the cost would be. The CCG member's position is that the GHD/Transgrid study was flawed and unbalanced and that it misrepresented the cost and should not be relied upon for making

## MEETING MINUTES

*decisions about undergrounding Humelink. Several other independent experts said that Transgrid exaggerated the costs of undergrounding HumeLink.*

- *The community decided along with the Softwoods Working Group to fund the Amplitude review. This looked at two options:*
  - o *Option 3C Maragle – Wagga – Bannaby which came up with a cost of \$7.3 billion (1.5 times the cost of overhead), and*
  - o *Option 1C Maragle – Bannaby which was \$5.46 billion (1.1 times current cost of overhead option).*
- *The CCG member noted that Chris Bowen said if undergrounding was 2x the cost he would look at it and at 1.1 times it is well below that. Transgrid gave the community a commitment that if it was feasible they would reapply the Regulatory Investment Test for Transmission (RIT-T). The CCG member asked that Transgrid honour this commitment. The CCG member noted that they believe the undergrounding option is being dismissed on misinformation and needs to be reassessed looking at the triple bottom line. This is required for efficient outcomes in the National Electricity Market and for maintaining the right balance between investing in infrastructure and protecting the environment. The CCG member noted that while we cannot put wind farms and solar farms underground, we can, and we should put transmission lines underground.*
- *The CCG member also raised issues with the Australian Energy Regulator approval process. They noted that there are rules in the market about a material change in circumstance and there have been 5 material changes in circumstance for HumeLink, these include:*
  - o *The cost blowout from \$1 billion in January 2020 to \$4.92 billion in December 2023. This is nearly a 5x increase in cost. The cost of \$4.92 billion was cited in the contingent project application stage two. Transgrid said they saved \$237 million by going with a variable contract rather than a fixed contract, \$787 million saved from synergies with VNI west and Project Energy Connect and \$498 million saved on biodiversity loss. If these "savings" are wrong, the cost could actually be \$6.4 billion.*
  - o *The second material change in circumstances is the delay of Snowy 2.0 from July 2025 to 2029.*
  - o *Thirdly the reduction in transfer capacity from 2,570MW to 2,200MW.*
  - o *Fourthly the commitment to have additional peaking generators in the system. Due to Kurri Kurri and Tallawara B HumeLink will be needed less for pumped hydro from Snowy 2.0.*
  - o *Finally, that undergrounding HumeLink is feasible according to the Amplitude review.*
- *The CCG member concluded that because of the 5 material changes in circumstances, HumeLink must be reassessed, and undergrounding must be reassessed. The CCG member noted that Transgrid has shown with the GHD undergrounding study and the undergrounding inquiry they cannot be relied on to fairly assess*

## MEETING MINUTES

*options for HumeLink so it must be assessed by the government and independent experts.*

*Another CCG member introduced a motion, they acknowledged that the CCG meeting was not a decision-making forum but noted that they wanted to consult with the broader CCG and stakeholder in the room and gauge their opinions.*

- *The CCG member asked for a showing of hands that the RIT-T be reapplied to HumeLink and include the undergrounding options and all direct and indirect costs of the project.*

All hands raised.

- *The CCG member asked that an assessment of HumeLink be taken off Transgrid and a cost benefit analysis be done by the government.*

Majority hands raised.

### Project Update

The Chair introduced Jeremy, the project director for Humelink, to give a project update. Refer to pages 10-18 for more information on the Project Update.

- Jeremy outlined the EIS was put on public exhibition in late 2023 and Transgrid have been in the process of responding to submissions. In December Transgrid signed a contract with the delivery partners who Transgrid will introduce to CCG members at this meeting. In late December Transgrid submitted their CPA2 and passed the AEMO feedback loop that allowed them to submit their CPA2 to regulation. it is currently on exhibition and CCG members are encouraged to provide feedback.  
<https://www.aer.gov.au/news/articles/communications/consultation-open-humelink-stage-2-contingent-project-application>
- Transgrid also undertook a material change in circumstance (MPCC) which has been published on their website. Communities can provide feedback on that until 3 April 2024 by emailing [humelink@transgrid.com.au](mailto:humelink@transgrid.com.au).
- Transgrid are continuing site investigations in the community and doing further surveys and geotechnical works. They will soon be releasing the submissions and amendment reports and going through a determination with the regulator for a funding request. Following that a financial decision will be made by the Transgrid board and then they will seek Commonwealth and State environmental approval. If environmental approval is received Transgrid will begin work including setting up camps, site lay down areas and anything else that can be commenced before Property Management Plans (PMPs) are in place. In early 2024 Transgrid is expecting the start construction.
- Transgrid are well advanced with the procurement of long lead equipment, the transformers and reactors have been ordered. They are working with delivery partners for the procurement of steel, the detailed designs and the management plans. Community and stakeholder engagement is ongoing with discussions recently focusing on the amendment report. The concept designs are nearly complete with some things to be finalised before the next phase of design. The land option agreements are ongoing, and negotiations are ongoing.

## MEETING MINUTES

- Jeremy introduced the delivery partners including:
  - o UGL and CPB who will be the delivery partners for Humelink West (Wagga through the transition to Maragle).
  - o Acciona and Genus who will be the delivery partners for Humelink East (the transition point north to Bannaby).

Jeremy introduced Jim Maniord the project director for Humelink West.

- Jim noted that UGL Engineering and CPB Contractors are part of the CIMIC Group. UGL is a 100-year engineering technical provider which started in water and has been doing electrical work for a number of years. They have joined with CPB contractors who is a large tier one contractor with over 12, 000 people. Jim noted they are well known throughout Australia in what they deliver and are committed to delivering safe projects. He noted they are sensitive to environmental issues and want to work with the community. Part of the delivery partner approach through partnering with Transgrid is trying to create positive outcomes including generating jobs, access to local education, training and employment for local communities. They will focus on careers for students in the construction industry and trying to generate a positive legacy from what they are doing.

The Chair introduced Carl from Acciona as the project director for Humelink East.

- Carl noted that he works for Acciona Genus Joint Venture (AGJV) which consists of two joint venture partners. Acciona is a large local leader in renewable energy infrastructure solutions. They are involved in large infrastructure projects that are ongoing. Genus is a specialist power infrastructure provider with many years of experience across Australia. Carl noted that with a project with two contractors there is a risk that the community is unclear on who is responsible for sections of the project, he noted that they have committed as joint venture departures to always align and ensure there is no confusion or blaming. He noted that they are both there to ensure the success of the project.
- As part of the delivery partner commitment with Transgrid, AGJV are committed to ensuring they engage with the community at all levels, this may include providing opportunities for businesses participate in some of the works. AGJV have met with businesses a few weeks ago and listened to feedback from smaller businesses about engaging in larger projects and have come up with solutions for engaging with smaller businesses on large projects such as this. As part of this, AGJV also heard how they should not be in competition with smaller businesses for things such as accommodation. Transgrid have ensured they capture those learnings.

The Chair invited CCG members to ask some questions about the regional approach to the workforce.

- *A CCG member noted that they represent the forestry industry which is a \$3.81 billion industry per year. The CCG member noted that they struggle to find skilled labour whether civil operators, electricians, diesel fitters, labourers or health and safety officers. \$3.81 billion per year is 11,829 regional jobs in this region, and they struggle to fill those jobs as it is. The CCG member noted that they want to know the delivery partners have a plan in place to ensure they can*



## MEETING MINUTES

*maintain their industry which has been a long-term industry and ensure workers won't be enticed by a short-term project. The CCG member commented that they would love to see Transgrid come into schools and educate younger people but noted that their industry is also looking for graduates to come into their industry. The CCG member continued that they would like to have a conversation with Transgrid and the delivery partners about how they can work together to not exacerbate the problems they currently face and to talk about tapping resources that haven't previously been used, such as the long term unemployed. The CCG member also noted that their industry spent a lot of time and money to ensure the roads are safe and suitable for communities and ask that Transgrid are proactive in working with them on this. TAKEN ON NOTICE.*

- **Action: Transgrid to convene a discussion with the CCG member representing the forestry industry about managing competitive employment pressures within a limited local workforce.**
- *Another CCG member noted that the presentation did not address the impacted landholders. They asked about how the projects are working with landholders to maintain farming productions. The CCG member noted they have spoken to representatives who say the easement goes through lambing paddocks, they noted that landholders take many precautions to ensure they do not disturb livestock and they noted that a crane will cause significant disturbance to livestock. The CCG member noted that while the delivery partners are buying social licence in the broader community the impacted landholders are carrying the real burden of the project.*
- Carl responded that as part of the delivery process there is a commitment from both delivery partners that biosecurity is an important consideration. This will begin with a handover from Transgrid once the necessary approvals are received and the delivery partners are given authority to engage with landholders. The delivery partner will then consult with landholders and understand what the landholder needs are which looks different for everyone, and the delivery partners understand that. In the scenario presented by the CCG member, Carl noted it is not uncommon to have requests for delivery partners to work within a landholder's schedule when they are lambing or spraying. Carl noted that he cannot give specifics at this stage but confirmed that they have committed with Transgrid to supporting landholders.
- *A CCG member asked about the name of the project undertaken on farming land where the delivery partner worked with landholders.*
- Carl gave an example of MacIntye Wind Farm in Queensland. He noted that UGL has also worked in this region.
- *A CCG member asked about the subcontractors they employ and how the delivery partners hold them to account?*
- Carl responded that during the project delivery people will be unable to distinguish between the responsible contractor and subcontractors, he noted that they are one team that will work under one set of guidelines.
- *A CCG member commented that on other Transgrid projects this is not happening and there are real concerns from landholders about*

## MEETING MINUTES

*this. The CCG member noted that there are risks with bringing in products from overseas and ensuring they are adequately sterilised.*

- Jim responded that sea protocols will be established, and that biosecurity is a high priority for the delivery partners.
- *A CCG member commented that landholders that are directly impacted need to be key in every consideration made.*
- Jeremy noted that information on landholder requirements will be captured in the individual Property Management Plans (PMPs). He continued that they will be very prescriptive in how the land is used and each individual property will have a PMP through the negotiation process. He noted that they need each individual landowner to talk about the biosecurity processes in place to ensure it is addressed in the environmental application.

### Planning Approval Update

The Chair introduced Sumaya to provide an update on the planning approvals. Please refer to pages 19-29 of the presentation slides for more information.

- Sumaya noted that the EIS was on public exhibition from late August until October. They received 158 submissions and are responding to these in a submissions report which will be provided to the Department of Planning Housing and Infrastructure. In parallel with the submissions report Transgrid are working through an amendment report which captures several changes to the project following the EIS. Some of these changes are a result of the delivery partners and some new information is being considered from the submissions. The Green Hills route realignment has now been fully assessed within the amendment report and some other changes include as a result of submissions and suggestions which have been taken onboard.
- The amendment report will include the Green Hills route realignment and other minor changes to the transmission line corridor, the construction of the accommodation facilities (there was originally going to be one in Tumbarumba however there will now be 5 which is partly due to feedback received about the strain on local workforce and accommodation facilities), increased access tracks (changed because of the number of construction compounds and accommodation facilities meaning increased vehicle numbers on the road), additional fibre cable connections to existing substations and a number of other route refinements.
- Noise and vibration: the key changes to the amendment report are the changes resulting from selecting the Green Hills route. It will be further from the residential receivers which is a positive outcome. There are also noise considerations around the accommodation and construction compounds, these are temporary noise impacts but could be for up to 2.5 years. There is a focus on mitigating those impacts on sensitive receivers. Transgrid will look to provide suitable measures including flexibility around working hours, proposals to work not only during the daytime but also out of hours. Both delivery partners will be producing an out of hours work proposal to demonstrate how those impacts can be managed.
- Potential visual impacts: the main changes are a result of the Green Hills route modification. While it is no longer on private land and will be less visible from Batlow it may be seen in various locations. The

## MEETING MINUTES

clearing of the easement will create change, with a more heavily vegetated area needing to be cleared for the easement.

- If you are a private landholder with a change in view, land access officers and place owners will be in contact to show what that looks like for people. For people who have asked for visual pictures, updated photomontages can be shared.
- The maximum height in the EIS was 76m, the detailed design will be ongoing, once it is finalised there may be more locations where tower heights could increase. This is not currently finalised but once it is finalised, if it directly affects landholders, they will be informed.
- In terms of Aboriginal heritage there were 184 heritage sites located in the amendment footprint. The heritage consultants have produced two sensitivity models for avoiding and minimising impacts as they go through the detailed design. If there are higher sensitivity areas protocols will be put in place which may include cordoned off areas to prevent allowance from contractors. Transgrid will be working closely with registered Aboriginal parties and Traditional Owners to actively involve them in the next stage of the project. They will be pulling on the years of data collection that was undertaken for the EIS and the amendment report.
- For land use and property, the biggest changes have been around areas of agricultural and forestry land impact because the project size has increased overall because more access tracks are needed. The main impact is on forestry land with an additional 645 hectares that could be impacted because of the Green Hills route change.
- *A CCG member noted that Transgrid will need an enormous amount of water for the project and asked about where Transgrid will get their water from. They noted that there is not enough water available in Batlow.*
- Sumaya responded that Transgrid have identified the need for water supply for construction activities mainly, for the EIS they have looked at existing water uses and sources but have not specifically identified where the water will come from. Sumaya noted that the delivery partners will need to consider where it will come from. Transgrid are not proposing new bores at this stage as that is a long process, they will be looking at licenced and existing water sources.
- *The CCG member noted that the Batlow reservoir would not provide enough, and Yass doesn't have enough water.*
- *A CCG member asked whether any land options agreements for residential and material compounds have been signed, as they had heard none of them are in concrete.*
- John responded that Transgrid are still in discussions.
- *The CCG member noted that there was no mention of transpositions in their letter, they continued that they are a neighbour to a transposition and have not been informed about it. **TAKEN ON NOTICE.***
- **Action: Transgrid to determine who has been informed about transposition impacts.**
- *Another CCG member noted that they are impacted by a transposition and were informed 6 weeks ago which is long after*

## MEETING MINUTES

*they could have signed their Offer Letter. The CCG member noted that Transgrid are pressuring landholders into signing the Offer Letter when they have not been fully informed about what the impact may be.*

- The Chair asked Transgrid to explain what the process is for negotiating with landholders when there are changes to how they will be impacted.
- Jeremy responded that it has still been in concept design and as the design is finalised landholders will be advised of the changes.
- *A CCG member responded that Transgrid cannot negotiate with landholders before landholders are aware of the full impact.*
- The Chair asked if there is an opportunity to renegotiate once the final design is complete and the landholders are aware of all impacts.
- John noted that if there is a greater impact than what was originally compensated for, landholders can renegotiate.
- *A CCG member asked who decides whether there is a greater impact?*
- John responded that Transgrid reengage the valuers and ask for a reassessment to take into consideration the change. John noted that there is a provision in Option D, if there are material changes after Option D is signed, they can reconsider the compensation.
- *A CCG member noted that this is something most people will never have to go through in their life. The CCG member continued that most community members have never spoken to lawyers before now and are having to seek legal advice. They noted that when Transgrid keep changing things it adds to the confusion and noted that Transgrid do not seem to understand the gravity of the effect the changes have on people.*
- *Another CCG member commented that Transgrid say they do not know where the towers will be until the design is completed and the CCG member has now received an update with new access tracks however you can see from looking at the EIS indicative locations back in 2022 it was clear where the access tracks would be going. The CCG member continued that Transgrid's design team has been working on this for a long time, it is disingenuous to say you cannot provide the details of the tower and access track locations to landholders because it is clear where they are going. The new access tracks are now coming a few metres from the CCG member's house across the tennis court, across the new garage and within 20m of the bedrooms. The CCG member noted that it looks like a redundant track and seems completely unreasonable.*
- Jeremy responded that when a final assessment is done final locations can be provided however when the desktop assessment is done for the EIS, this only provides indicative locations.
- *A CCG member commented that they are sure the team doing the desktop analysis would be aware of their situation given they have had close conversations with Transgrid about it.*
- *A CCG member asked if Transgrid now need to resubmit the EIS due to the project changes not captured in the EIS.*

## MEETING MINUTES

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Sumaya responded that these are captured in the amendment report.</li><li>- <i>A CCG member commented that they feel that once the Option Agreement is signed there can be no changes made. The CCG member noted that they feel the only option is to not sign the Option Agreement. They noted that they will not sign until Transgrid agrees to underground the line.</i></li></ul>
<b>Bushfire Management</b>	<p>The Chair introduced Adam Hoare from the operations part of Transgrid to provide an update on bushfire management. See pages 31-36 of the slides for more information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Adam noted how he grew up in the region and is aware of the concerns from the community. He was deployed to Bega during the 2019 fires and spent 6 weeks there during the recovery efforts. Adam outlined the compliance obligations and risk management approach. He noted that Transgrid are under very strict obligations and must act in a way that is demonstrably risk mitigative. There are a number of controls they implement, which form part of their rigorous process to managing risk. The business undertakes an internal governance approach, and they have external parties that review them on an annual basis. AS 5577 Electricity Network Safety Management is a standard which Transgrid follows which focuses on safety to the public and bushfire related risks. They have a rigorous process undertaken to develop their Bushfire Management Plan. They are also regularly reviewing the effectiveness of their systems through internal and external auditing.</li><li>- <i>A CCG member commented that Transgrid claim they have a vegetation management plan however when you have 40 years of poorly maintained easements, with large amounts of debris and fuel left by Transgrid contractors, a factor of further worry and fear for us when the Dunn's road fire came through. The CCG member noted that the debris thankfully did not burn due to the hard work of the CCG member's family and local people on the ground, because if it had they would have had an even larger battle than was already at hand. The CCG member continued that Transgrid's promises to do better, but these are only words, when 40 years of evidence of poor management is what they know and expect will continue.</i></li><li>- <i>Another CCG member commented that they believe the 2003 riverbend fire started under a 330kv transmission line. The CCG member noted that this can be read about in the A Nation Charred: Inquiry into the Recent Australian Bushfires senate inquiry submission 175. <b>TAKEN ON NOTICE.</b></i></li><li>- <b>Action: Transgrid to confirm if the 2003 riverbend fire start under a 330kV transmission line.</b></li><li>- Adam continued that Transgrid manage over 13, 000km of transmission lines across NSW and ACT and that 33% of this network runs through bushfire prone land. Transgrid are serious about managing that risk. As part of this risk management, they run helicopter flights several times a year and profile for vegetation under those lines which is part of the process for mitigating trees falling and making contact with transmission lines. They conduct aerial helicopter inspections looking at high resolution imaging of lines which informs maintenance. This maintenance also includes</li></ul>

## MEETING MINUTES

climbing inspections to make sure anything not seen through aerial photography is captured. There are billions of dollars spent on upgrades and risk reducing as far as possible for example replacing wood poles with concrete. The upgrading and maintenance is a continuous effort that never stops.

- The team produces a report which goes to the Executive and the Board, this forms part of the pre-season preparedness. There are 6 benchmark categories the business uses to prepare for the fire season.
  - o Bushfire risk modelling
  - o Detection and monitoring (linked into the Rural Fire Service, direct information from bureau of meteorology)
  - o Continuity of service
  - o Pre-bushfire season maintenance program
  - o Emergency response and coordination (raise a crisis management team in the event an incident does occur, exercised by the business multiple times throughout the year)
- Pre-season preparedness is a rigorous process and there is scrutiny applied to that process.
- Adam showed a summary of information provided on a bushfire management fact sheet, it is general in nature and is informed by an industry body called Electricity Networks Australia (ENA). This guidance is a collection of information that informs safe practice in and around transmission lines for firefighting agencies. Some of these directly target the themes from the undergrounding inquiry and from the Humelink EIS submissions.
- Adam noted that lines will be always be treated as live, even if you think it is deenergised, it cannot be treated as dead until Transgrid has attended the site and confirmed.
- Adam noted that water bombing can occur whenever needed. If the RFS need to waterbomb overhead assets there are no restrictions placed on them from Transgrid.
- *A CCG member noted that there is a risk to people waterbombing as they are flying through thick smoke and around transmission lines.*
- Adam responded that there have been numerous examples where they have used fire retardant and water in the vicinity of transmission lines.
- Adam continued that they must maintain a 25-metre separation from live transmission lines when active fires are burning under or directly adjacent to an easement.
- Adam also noted that it is very unlikely egress routes will be impacted by transmission line flashover during a bushfire. The greatest risk is close proximity to the fire.
- *A CCG member commented that everyone in the meeting has faced fires around transmission rooms and would not be seen within 25 metres of the transmission lines. They noted that when there is a fire approaching a transmission line there is no way for them to escape.*

## MEETING MINUTES

- Adam responded that this is one example, he noted it is very unlikely there would be a risk for firefighters egressing under the transmission lines.
- *A CCG member noted that their father has been fighting fires for a long time and during the Dunn's Road fire witnessed the 330kV line (along with others) arc. They noted that witnessing this has them even more concerned for the safety of not only ourselves but all fighting personnel. The CCG member continued that when the powerline sparks a fire, or a fire is active in and around transmission lines it is the landholders that will be fighting the fire and risking their lives, not Transgrid. The CCG member also mentioned the massive amount of money that is spent fixing infrastructure damaged from fire and weather. The CCG member noted that Transgrid rather than passing on cost to consumers in every fire or weather event for the next 80 years should take the money spent on upgrading and fixing the lines and put the transmission lines underground to safeguard the assets.*
- Adam continued that machinery should be limited to 4.3 metres in height, he noted that there is no risk for machinery at 4.3 metres.
- *A CCG member commented that in Victoria they have changed their regulation around what machinery can go under and it is 3.1 metres, the CCG member asked why it would vary from State to State. The CCG member continued that it was in the EIS, different regulations, or limits on what can pass under transmission lines in accordance with Victorian regulation.*
- Adam responded that Victoria has 220kV lines.
- *The CCG member responded that these were 330kV lines. **TAKEN ON NOTICE.***
- **Action: Transgrid to respond to why Victoria has a lower height allowance for machinery under transmission lines.**
- *A CCG member asked what fire mitigation measures Transgrid has in place if the towers collapse?*
- Adam explained they operate in fast protection schemes if they collapse. The timeframes to cut that power off automatically are very fast and in most cases the power is cut before the transmission lines hit the ground.
- *A CCG member asked if Adam could guarantee that it would not cause bushfires?*
- Adam said he cannot provide an absolute guarantee that they would not cause a bushfire.
- The Chair asked what the process is for CCG members to elevate their concerns if they have questions around bushfire management.
- Adam responded that these concerns should be elevated through the project team specifically. Once in operation Transgrid will have public consultation groups that run. There will also be phone numbers and emails to direct queries to.
- *A CCG member noted that in the EIS around bushfire management it appeared as though Transgrid only cared about their workers and assets as it was solely focused on evacuation. The CCG member*

## MEETING MINUTES

*noted that they attended a bushfire management meeting back in 2022 and they received no answers. They continued that there were no minutes taken and they learnt that de-energising a line means there is still a risk to human life because of the residual power. They learnt that even if one line is de-energised there can be a transfer of power between the lines. They also learnt that it takes a long time for Transgrid to get people to the ground and switch off the line at the source and noted that Adam had said it would not take much time.*

- Adam clarified that he was talking about automatic actions which is automated to cut the power out if there is a line fault of collapse to ground. Adam noted the CCG member is talking specifically about the disconnection under RFS request.
- *The CCG member commented that they have heard that when a line goes down/damaged ,automatically the systems go to re-energise the lines, basically sending surges of power into the line to get it rectified, which poses more risk to those around the infrastructure.*
- Adam responded that it attempts to re-energise once and then is shut out. He noted that depending on the situation it may take some time for people to get to site and make sure it is safe. This is why Transgrid specify that you cannot treat the asset as de-energised that can occur not just in a parallel line but if there are two lines in a transmission.
- *The CCG member commented that they have heard that when a line goes down or is damaged, the systems automatically go to re-energise the lines. This sends surges of power into the line to get it rectified, which poses more risk to those around the infrastructure.*
- Adam responded that the RFS have provisions where they can de-energise the lines, it is a combination of assessing the risk on the ground and the reliability of taking out critical lines in the network. If demonstrated as required and the RFS and Transgrid agree it has to happen.
- *Another CCG member responded that one of Adam's counterparts said it would not be turned off because of the risk to the eastern seaboard when power is cut.*
- Adam responded that this is not true.
- *A CCG member commented that it is hard to trust Transgrid when they say this.*
- *Another CCG member commented that in their experience as bushfire captain for 37 years with ringing up and making requests through the RFS to turn powerlines off, the lines have never been turned off. The CCG member continued that even when there is upwards of 100 000 acres and threatened pine forest the lines were not de-energised. They also noted that at the bushfire management committees a Transgrid representative has never attended the meeting.*
- Adam responded that he cannot comment on individual cases.
- *A CCG member asked if Transgrid has ever asked the RFS if they need extra resources when building substations?*



## MEETING MINUTES

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Jeremy responded that he is not aware of this being offered although they have had conversations with RFS.</li><li>- <i>A CCG member commented that they were at a meeting when someone suggested that Transgrid give the RFS a new tanker or sprinklers and the CCG member's response was that by giving them the equipment to fight the fire you are endangering them rather than attempting to stop the issue from occurring in the first place. The CCG member commented that Transgrid should be putting this money into undergrounding.</i></li></ul>
<b>Community Investment and Benefits Program</b>	<p>The Chair introduced Michael Johnson to talk about the community investment and benefits program. See page 38 of the slides for more detail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Michael noted that the Material Change in Circumstance (MCC) is currently open for consultation. He noted that information and feedback presented today from the community can be provided as feedback for the MCC. Another document that is currently open for consultation is CPA2, the AER is running that consultation.</li><li>- Michael continued that engagement is ongoing even through this is the final CCG meeting. There is engagement with landholders through the land access officers and the 1800 number. With the introduction of the delivery partners the 1800 number will remain the same. Transgrid will continue to respond to feedback through the EIS submissions and engage on the amendment report. Michael noted that Transgrid encourage the community to reach out to Transgrid for face-to-face information and noted Transgrid are happy to confirm what was discussed in writing following any face to face discussions.</li><li>- <i>A CCG member noted that there was an action response saying neighbours along Brungle Road were contacted. The CCG member noted that they were referring to Brungle Creek Road and were not just talking about whether or not newsletters were delivered but were talking about access through a landholder's property on Cockatoo Road. They noted that Transgrid has not spoken to the landholder. <b>TAKEN ON NOTICE.</b></i></li><li>- <b>Action: Transgrid to confirm landholders on Brungle Creek Road were contacted about access through a landholder's property.</b></li><li>- <i>Another CCG member noted that they have raised concerns about noise to Transgrid several times and been told that it will not be an issue. The CCG member noted that the EIS specifies the noise is above EPA allowances at some dwellings. The CCG member said they followed up with a place manager who said they did not know about it. The CCG member asked if Transgrid has told every house identified as being possibly exposed to this level of noise about the potential impact, particularly where the transmission lines have recently been moved, they asked why the place managers did not know about it when the CCG member asked.</i></li><li>- Jeremy apologised to the CCG member for their experience and noted that this does not sound like the standard approval process that Transgrid follows.</li><li>- <i>A CCG member asked what the process is.</i></li></ul>

## MEETING MINUTES

- Michael acknowledged that this was a bad experience for the landholder, he noted that that is not the process that Transgrid requires and noted that they will need to find more information on what happened.
- *A CCG member asked if everyone has been told about the changes.*
- Michael replied that he will need to understand who the CCG member is asking about and speak to the place managers to ensure they have been advised. **TAKEN ON NOTICE.**
- **Action: Transgrid to speak to place managers and ensure landholders are aware of changes to the transmission line route.**
- *Another CCG member asked why Transgrid sent out details on access tracks and towers to some landholders and not others. The CCG member asked why some information has been omitted from landowners.*
- Michael responded that he is happy to find out more information and that he is not aware of the specific details at this time. **TAKEN ON NOTICE.**
- **Action: Transgrid to ensure all effected landholders have received updated information on access tracks and towers.**
- *A CCG member asked why Transgrid has not provided maps and detail of access tracks to landholders.*
- Jeremy responded that as previously discussed the access tracks and tower placement are still in concept design phase, where the access tracks need to be off the easement they are still being refined. This is being done with the delivery partners to try and reduce the number of towers needed. Jeremy noted that some will not move but some will need to move.
- *The CCG member noted that Transgrid are acquiring the land and have not told CCG members where the access tracks are. The CCG continued that they feel that Transgrid has lacked integrity from the beginning of the process. They noted that the high turnover of staff is proof of poor management within Transgrid.*
- *Another CCG member commented that Michael said they encourage face to face meetings, but the Softwoods Working Group has asked for face-to-face meetings and Transgrid has not agreed yet. The CCG member noted that they are in Sydney next week and have the minister in the region next week. They note that they are concerned about the 400 hectares of land being cleared and are asking for a face-to-face meeting. **TAKEN ON NOTICE.***
- **Action: Respond to CCG member from the Softwoods Working Group requesting a face-to-face meeting with Transgrid.**
- *Another CCG member commented that for the delivery partners and Transgrid they need to ensure the CCG does not finish today. The CCG member noted that engagement needs to continue to ensure landholder voices are heard. The CCG member noted that the members are still committed to pursuing undergrounding as an option, and they noted they would like to see the networks continuing after the meeting. They continued that the public need to*

## MEETING MINUTES

	<p><i>know the issues, challenges and potential outcomes that the CCG members are presenting to get the energy transition done.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Another CCG member commented that this should be a consultative process rather than Transgrid just speaking to community members. They noted that three speakers presented today and Transgrid did not respond to the speakers. They continued that Transgrid then presents what they want and call it community consultation.</i></li> <li>- <i>A CCG member noted they believe Transgrid said in the May 2023 CCG that they would speak face to face with the 4322 directly impacted landowners. The CCG member noted that from their understanding none of them have been contacted in person, the CCG member asked that Transgrid commit to contacting those and looking at compensation for those people. <b>TAKEN ON NOTICE.</b></i></li> <li>- <b>Action: Transgrid to review May meeting minutes for confirmation that Michael said Transgrid would speak face to face with 4322 directly impacted landowners. Transgrid to confirm who has been contacted in person.</b></li> <li>- <i>A CCG member commented that Transgrid today is presenting delivery partners for Humelink as though the decision has been made. The CCG member noted that the decision has not been made. The AER is still assessing the material change in circumstance, and there has not been a determination on the contingent project application stage 2; and NSW Planning has not yet determined the HumeLink project has a net benefit to the State of NSW.</i></li> <li>- <i>The CCG member noted the community would be interested in meeting the delivery partners again, when they are skilled and qualified in undergrounding.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Next Steps</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Chair noted that this is the final CCG meeting and thanked all CCG members for their participation over several years in the CCG and thanked them for the time and commitment they have put into the group.</li> </ul>
<b>Meeting close</b>	The meeting closed at 7:10pm

## 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.	Completed
Transgrid to outline process and timeline for when people will have a greater level of detail on tower location.	Completed
Transgrid to outline process and timeline for when people will have a greater level of detail on access tracks.	Completed
Transgrid to respond on whether any work has been completed on compound on Snowy mountains highway.	Completed
Transgrid to send CCG members a map of the line including a legend.	Completed
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.	Completed
Transgrid to provide the two locations to CCG members where the towers may be slightly higher than in the EIS (77 metres).	Completed
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.	Completed

## MEETING MINUTES

Review whether there was a commitment made by Brian Elton that if undergrounding was considered feasible Transgrid would reapply the RIT-T.	Completed
Transgrid to respond to community members on whether workers will have to undergo a police check before coming onto properties.	Completed
Provide a flow chart of the assessment approvals and the key decision makers in the consultation process.	Completed
Transgrid to share information on the noise and vibration levels.	Completed
Transgrid to ensure the cost benefit analysis was done to consider impact of delaying the building of the Maragle link on project cost.	Completed
Transgrid to convene a discussion with the CCG member representing the forestry industry about managing competitive employment pressures within a limited local workforce.	
Transgrid to determine who has been informed about transposition impacts.	
Transgrid to confirm if the 2003 riverbend fire start under a 330kV transmission line.	
Transgrid to respond to why Victoria has a lower height allowance for machinery under transmission lines.	
Transgrid to confirm landholders on Brungle Creek Road were contacted about access through a landholder's property.	
Transgrid to speak to place managers and ensure landholders are aware of changes to the transmission line route.	
Transgrid to ensure all effected landholders have received updated information on access tracks and towers.	
Respond to CCG member from the Softwoods Working Group requesting a face-to-face meeting with Transgrid.	
Transgrid to review May meeting minutes for confirmation that Michael said Transgrid would speak face to face with 4322 directly impacted landowners. Transgrid to confirm who has been contacted in person.	