

1.1 HumeLink Snowy Valley Community Consultative Group: 7th Meeting 11 October 2022

Time	5 - 7pm
Date	11/10/2022
Attendees	Chair: Brian Elton Secretariat: Ella Burgess Transgrid CCG members: Naomi Rowe, Nathan Rhodes Transgrid speakers: Daniel Burn, Carl Charlier, Transgrid project member attendees: Tammy Sinclair, Cameron Walters Community members: Pippa Quilty, Hansie Armour, Lee Kingma, Phil Clements, Ian Robson, Paul Sturgess, Clr Julia Ham, proxy for Rebecca Tobin Deputy Landowner and Community Advocates (Observers): Barbara El Gamal and Rod Stowe
Apologies	Rebecca Tobin
Meeting location	Tumut Golf Club
Meeting materials	Presentation
Purpose of meeting	Meeting 7

Item	Discussion Summary	To note
Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The meeting commenced at 5:05pm. - The Chair welcomed all and gave an Acknowledgement of Country. - The Chair asked the community CCG members and the team from Transgrid to introduce themselves and their role in the HumeLink project. 	
Minutes and Matters Arising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Previous comments received on the minutes were taken in account in the revised minutes from CCG meeting 6. <p><i>The minutes of the previous meeting have been endorsed by the Chair and shortly posted to the Transgrid website.</i></p>	
HumeLink Progress Update	<p>Nathan gave an overview of HumeLink's progress to date.</p> <p>See slide 7 of the presentation for an update on HumeLink's progress.</p> <p>Community Engagement: Several information sessions have been held to provide community members in various areas the opportunity to</p>	

speaking with the project team and developing a better understanding of the project. The sessions have provided a good opportunity for both questions and answers and feedback. Additional information sessions are planned for the near future.

Route Refinement: Final technical engineering analysis is occurring at both Tumut and Bannaby for alternate routes as suggested by the community.

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS): Field survey works have been continuing; however, the wet weather has caused delays.

There are ongoing conversations with the Department of Planning and Office of Environment and Climate Change who have provided positive feedback. Nathan recently met with the Department of Planning and Environment to discuss the EIS. The EIS is of critical importance for the project, and community engagement is a significant aspect of it.

Procurement: Transgrid has recently received approval to shortlist three delivery partners for both design and construction of HumLink. Nathan noted the importance that Transgrid has placed on selecting contractors who have experience in regional NSW as well as align with local community values.

Transgrid has engaged three reputable Tier 1 contractors. For probity reasons, the contractors cannot be announced but when the team is given approval the contractors will be publicly announced.

Property: The Special Benefits Payment has still not been announced by the Government, however Transgrid is awaiting this announcement with anticipation.

As noted in the previous CCG meetings, Transgrid has been working with the Australian Energy Industry Commissioner to ensure the documentation surrounding property is adequate and clear. Transgrid has taken on the feedback received about the documentation and worked to create clear and articulate documents. The Commissioner would like to share the newly revised documentation publicly, as it sets a positive example.

Nathan noted that there are a number of landowners along the route who have accepted the previous option agreements, they will be given the updated options to ensure there is alignment along the route.

Engineering: Geotechnical studies have commenced, however have been delayed by wet weather. All measures are being taken to minimise impacts to landowners and their properties.

Naomi provided a further update on community engagement.

- There is an ongoing plan for future community information sessions, including the inclusion of additional areas in the next round of community information sessions at Crookwell, Gunning and Tarcutta. The information session at Crookwell will be occurring on 24 October and information about the session will be distributed shortly.
- Naomi noted that the drop in sessions are suitable for people with various levels of understanding about the project. Impacted landowners are familiar with the project and have specific conversations they want to have with the project team. There are also new members to the community who may know little about the project and looking to gain an initial understand. The community information drop in sessions facilitate a forum for the various levels of understanding to gain value from the session.
- Transgrid has had feedback from the community information drop in sessions about how they can better distribute information along the route.
- Nathan further added that the sessions are designed to be a relaxed and comfortable space for everyone, so people can drop in as they please and not feel compelled to stay for the entire two hours.
- Naomi acknowledged the suggestions made and commented that Transgrid are trying to do the right type of engagement for each location and the different stakeholders.
- A Council CCG member asked what the numbers of attendees have been for the sessions and how the sessions were advertised in Yass.
- Naomi responded that details about the community information session were made available about two weeks prior to the sessions. To ensure the information

was thoroughly distributed, various channels of communication were used including, newspapers, radio, Facebook ads and an electronic invite via email. Naomi noted that for the next sessions, they will not be using radio and instead doing a letterbox drop as a result of feedback from the community. It was noted that most people who attended the information sessions received it via Facebook advertisements. Naomi further noted that Transgrid can work with the administrators of local community Facebook groups to promote the information sessions.

- A CWG member asked if the number of attendees varied between sessions.
- Naomi confirmed that in some communities numbers were greater at the beginning of the timeslot and slowed towards the end, others were more consistent. The largest session had 13 people attend. That shows Transgrid they need to investigate other means of contacting community members and also determine optimal times. Naomi noted it was also a challenge finding venues that did not serve alcohol.
- A community CCG member noted that at the Crookwell Bowling Club, they were given \$10 from Voconiq.
- Naomi replied that Voconiq is an organisation that performs local voice research. They are a company that has derived from the CSIRO and have been undertaking surveys across communities that currently have Transgrid assets and those where assets are proposed to be. As part of the surveys, they have been contacting landowners and doing community outreach.
- Naomi noted that Transgrid does not offer cash payments to anyone to attend an information session. The payment being referred to was only to complete the Voconiq survey.
- A CCG member asked who the procurement partners are.
- Nathan responded that due to probity issues, they cannot be disclosed at this point in time but when available, they will be disclosed.

- A CCG member asked how the partners fit with GHD as the owner's engineer.
- GHD's role is to ensure that the contractors are meeting the requirements that Transgrid expect on the project. GHD sit alongside Transgrid to manage the technical matters. Transgrid is hoping to announce their partners soon.
- A CCG member asked Transgrid what is happening regarding route refinement.
- Nathan noted he has received independent advice around the three different regulators – the Australian Energy Market Operator, Australian Energy Regulator and the Department of Planning and Environment. Nathan noted that he wanted to validate the consultation piece with the Department and their requirements. The independent advice has provided some recommendations for both the Tumut and Bannaby areas. Transgrid are currently going through technical and legal checks along those routes.
- A CCG member commented that the same process should be done in the Yass Valley area.
- The Chair noted that the independent advice being referred to is that of Brendan Nelson from MacroPlan. Brendan presented at the Snowy Valley CCG meeting in September.
- A CCG member asked when Transgrid will tell landowners where towers are going to be located.
- Nathan noted that Transgrid has a concept design of where the towers will be located, however the locations need to be validated by technical investigations.
- Nathan commented that Transgrid has been working with landowners along the line and they have been having some successes with optimisations across the route alignment. Nathan noted that if landowners would like to have individual conversations about tower locations they would be able to.
- Nathan noted that it is essential an engineer, place managers and land access

managers are part of Transgrid's conversation with landowners about tower locations to ensure Transgrid develops an understanding about the ways they can support landowners.

- A CCG member commented that tower locations were also discussed at the September CCGs and proactively telling landowners along the route the location of the towers. It is very hard for landowners if they do not know the location of the towers at all, even just at the concept stage.
- Naomi responded that the current process is for landowners to request the concept location of the towers.
- A CCG member commented that landowners should already have the information about tower locations, and it should have been provided from the outset.
- Naomi noted that the action from the last CCG to better communicate tower locations has revealed a gap in Transgrid's process, and they are working through it can be done in a more proactive sense. Transgrid needs to be able to capture all the available information which has taken longer than expected. All the preliminary information about the concept tower locations needs to be recorded and passed on so the design process can be confirmed, that process is yet to be confirmed.
- Nathan noted that tower location conversation occurs during the land acquisition process. Information won't be shared until landowners have received a letter of offer.
- A CCG member commented that all the information and the processes are spoken about is very vague. It was noted the CCG member had received a letter of offer and a confusing desktop map, and yet Transgrid has not had a conversation about tower locations.
- The Chair asked when Transgrid will more generally reveal tower locations.
- Naomi responded that she needs to further understand the recording

mechanism that feeds into the design process.

- A CCG member asked what the recording mechanism is that is causing the issue.
- Naomi responded that the tower locations are indicative where assumptions are made around distancing. Information is then collected from landowners about specific operations or needs they have. That information is exchanged via the place managers. Transgrid needs to be able to track and record what is happening on particular properties to be fed into consideration for the design on each property.
- A CCG member commented that it would be useful for all landowners to have the preliminary information informing the tower locations. In the Finkle Review, the importance of open government data was discussed. Through making the information available to landowners, they can then respond. There will be some landowners who have not engaged with the process at all yet, but through making the information available landowners will get in touch to discuss the tower locations. Being secretive about the tower locations prevents the opportunity to engage with landowners who have not yet been forthcoming. Build an understanding with landowners about where they do not want the locations and qualify it.
- Naomi responded that what has been said is helpful, however it is important to note that if one change occurs, it will impact the locations of all the following towers. It is important to ensure there are enough caveats around the location.
- A CCG member commented that landowners are not stupid and they understand that moving a tower will have flow on effects and you can explain that when you release the data.
- The Chair outlined a basic process that Transgrid could follow to better communicate with landowners:
 1. Transgrid to provide indicative tower locations to landowners
 2. Transgrid to meet with landowners, and create a mechanism obtain

	<p>further information/data to inform the design process</p> <p>3. Ensure the feedback loop with landowners is closed and explaining why if a certain action cannot be delivered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A CCG member commented that they would have through Transgrid would have already had a mechanism to capture that data. - Naomi noted that there is a mechanism to capture it, however, there needs to be a better process to anchor it to the tower locations. 	
<p>CCG Review and Update</p>	<p>CCG Review and Update</p> <p>The Chair noted that it has been one year since the inception of the Humelink CCGs, and noted the opportunity to review the CCG process.</p> <p>Independent Landowner Advocate, Rod Stowe gave a review of the CCG process to date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Independent Landowner Advocates (the Advocates) have been revising the recommendations in the Stowe Report, one of which was the establishment of the CCGs. - The Advocates have been talking to all involved stakeholders and the groups are generally viewed as a well structured forum, however they have not been utilised to their full potential. This could be due to the many changes in Transgrid's personnel on the project and not all groups have the right people involved in the meetings. There is a need to ensure dialogue is occurring between the formal face to face meetings. There is a feeling that the meetings provide information but the feedback given to Trasngrid from the community is not utilised as much as it could be. Often critical parts of the project happen after the opportunity for the CCGs to have input. It is important to ensure that the meetings reflect what members want to see in them. - It was further noted that the agendas of the meetings need to align with what is happening on the project itself. It would have been useful for the CCGs to have input and be told about the Voconiq surveys before they went live. It would have also been useful for the CCGs to provide input on the compensation 	

package before it was made public, this would have saved a lot of angst and time. It is important to look ahead and make the sure the CCG meetings are aligned.

- The Chair noted that in the Terms of Reference, it states that major project decisions would be tested with the CCGs.
- The Advocates further noted that when there is urgency there is still the ability to communicate with the CCGs outside of session.
- It was noted that there are people outside of the CCGs who would like to be involved without formally having to join the CCGs. The gallery format of observers in the Snowy Valleys CCG works well and could be replicated in the other CCG meetings.
- The Advocates noted that many landowners do not know about the CCGs nor where to find the minutes of the meetings. There is useful information in the meeting minutes and there is potential for misinformation if people are receiving information second hand.
- A CCG member commented that there is a sense amongst the community that the CCGs are a charade. Transgrid is doing their job but the community members are fighting for their lives. There is a sense of inevitability, nothing can be said or done because all decisions have been made. Members attend the meetings because they want to keep an eye on happenings, but on the whole the CCGs are a box ticking exercise.
- The Chair commented that Transgrid did not set up the CCGs. The CCGs occurred as a result of the Stowe Report. The Chair noted that the CCGs have been able to improve processes such as the conversation about tower locations. There have been important break throughs in thinking that have been generated by community members in the CCGs. The exchange with the CCGs has lifted the bar. It may not change the end result, but it will change the process.
- A CCG member expressed frustration at the last minutes and noted the community members are busy. It should be up to the independent Chair to keep the minutes honest. The most significant

item was that the revised project cost to \$3.7 billion was missing.

- The Chair replied that over the last year, every attempt has been made to keep the minutes honest and accurate, which is the reason the minutes are circulated to the members as a draft before they are finalised if there have been any omissions on technical conversations that are contested. If the minutes have a mistake in them on occasion, it is not manipulation simply a mistake.
- A CCG member commented that if the CCGs are to be improved, the responsibility should be on the Chair to ensure the minutes are accurate. It was noted the September minutes were the first minutes the member had read.
- The Chair confirmed it is the role of the Chair to ensure that, which is why the minutes are circulated to keep the process as transparent as possible.
- The Advocates noted that the Secretary is also independent, not a Transgrid employee. The members have the ability to review the minutes.
- The Chair commented that without the meeting minutes being a transcript it can be difficult to pick up everything.

Frequency, location and timing of future CCG meetings

The Chair noted that the number of Humelink CCGs will remain, however the frequency will be slightly increased to occur once every 6 weeks. There is a need for a refresh to ensure that the right people are in the room.

- Naomi noted the distribution of the CCGs splits the route into thirds the coverage feels about right, however Transgrid is open to revisiting this if the need arises.
- A CCG member asked if Bannaby could be used a location for the ULYV meetings, or if a fourth CCG group could be set up there or in Crookwell. People may be more inclined to engage if a CCG was in one of those locations.
- Naomi noted that feedback.

Location

- A CCG member noted that works well at the CCG meetings in Tumut is the ability to have a gallery of observers. Evenings work well for farmers, meetings during the day is limiting.
- The Chair noted that observers are welcome, however it works well when

notice is given in advance so the facilities can cater for an increase in numbers of people.

- The Advocates noted that one of the benefits of having a gallery in the Tumut meetings is the ability for observers to ask questions of the project team.

Membership

- The Chair noted that interest in the CCGs seems to be waning, for example there is little First Nations representation, no environmental groups etc.
- It was noted that for 2023 there will be a fresh call for nominations.
- It was noted that Council could put forward anyone including from the Executive, particularly those who represent infrastructure planning.
- The Chair noted that the State Government is refreshing the guidelines as for how the CCGs operate.
- ACTION: refreshed guidelines to be circulated.
- The Chair noted that he will be transitioning away from his position as the Independent Chair of the HumeLink CCGs. Brendan Blakely has been put forward for consideration as the Independent Chair for 2023.
- A CCG member raised the possibility again of having a CCG meeting in Crookwell or Gunning.
- Naomi responded that Gunning does not have the facilities to cater for the amount of people, nor the technology available. Transgrid is more than happy to consider other locations to host the meetings.
- The Chair noted that by the November meetings, the shape and frequency of the meetings for 2023 should be roughly determined and shared with the group.
- ACTION: placeholder dates, locations and timings of the next CCGs to be determined and shared at the November meeting.
- The Chair noted that there needs to be a review to ensure that the community members have the right resources to ensure to act as a conduit to the rest of the community. The CCG is important to giving Transgrid guidance as to what will work in the local area.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tim noted this would be his last meeting as a special advisor to Transgrid. 	
<p>Agenda setting for future meetings</p>	<p>Agenda setting for future meetings</p> <p>Naomi gave an overview of what Transgrid would like to see covered at future meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Field work, geotechnical studies and how they will continue. One of the biggest challenges is the wet weather and how studies are done without impacting properties. Transgrid may need to come back and talk about the different possible options so the program can progress. The information is very important because it informs the tower locations. - There will also be another round of community information drop in sessions. For those who cannot make the sessions, online webinars will also be hosted. - EIS – talk the to CCGs about the upcoming program of technical reports and give them access to technical specialists who can talk to the reports ahead of the EIS going on public exhibition. - Procurement – more information about the three major contractors, local procurement. - Nathan noted that regarding the EIS, it is vital to share what is going into it so there are no surprises as well as updates on the regulatory process and how its changing. - The Chair noted that there was an action from earlier CCGs to provide the CCGs with a diagram to explain the regulatory process. - Tim responded that was an action from when he was the Project Director of Humelink. Transgrid provided a timeline of the different work streams, however the feedback was that the milestones did not show the inter-relations between milestones. The action taken away was to improve the communications to create better transparency. - The advocates noted that the diagram would be helpful for the wider community. <p>Community member topics</p>	

- Response to the Steering Committee letter
- The Chair noted that rather than leaving the letter to stand, there will be a facilitated conversation with the Steering Committee and Transgrid regarding the letter and Transgrid's response.
- Tower locations
- Impacts for people who are adjacent to the line, not immediately impacted. Transgrid should start putting pressure on politicians to consider the positions of impacted landowners as well as those adjacent to the line.
- Biodiversity offsets, benefits and impacts on the project.
- A CCG member asked what Transgrid is doing to address the issues that neighbours to the line will face.
- Nathan commented that he will speak to the Corporate Affairs team before he can comment.
- A CCG member noted that at the first CCG meeting Tim stated he would contact all the people who neighbour the lines. There was an issue at the time because brochures with no images were sent out to the community and it caused great angst.
- Tim responded that his recollection of the conversation would be around communications in general. There was a strong desire for the focus to be broadened from landowner only communications to be broadened to neighbouring properties. It seems there is a concern around neighbouring properties and how action can be taken beyond improving communications. Effectively, Transgrid is the transport proponent who is guided by the regulators, the guard rails are being broadened outside of Transgrid's remit. The government is who sets the guardrails that determine Transgrid's remit. Impacts to neighbours and what Transgrid can do about them, is a position the NSW Government needs to determine.
- A CCG member noted they understand the guardrails that exist. The Just Terms Act does not require Transgrid to

compensate neighbours, however as a good corporate citizen, the very least Transgrid can do is inform them as well as the community. In the Stowe Report, it was alluded that there has been a failure by Transgrid to see neighbours will lose value in their properties.

- Tim responded that the action here is voice. If Transgrid is hearing that this is a concern they may not be able to address in the same light as undergrounding, what they can do is create a voice for it to engage stakeholders such as the NSW Government.
- The Chair noted there has been an issue with communications in general, now improved communications with neighbouring properties and tower locations needs to be addressed.
- A CCG member noted that creating a dialogue around the tower locations and their impacts on all people would be comforting.
- Dan commented that Transgrid is trying to do what they can. Transgrid is about to sign a contract for a 3D modelling solution for the transmission lines which they believe will be they will be able to make public for with the tower locations so people can get an idea of what the lines and towers will look like from various points.
- Dan added that it will cover any point on the route, similar to a Google Maps street view. The visualisations will be a render of an aerial photograph, different to a photomontage. It will be a holistic model of the route, a trial for Transgrid. It will still be another 6 months before the software is ready for public use.
- A CCG member asked if this is what Wind Planner is.
- Dan responded that this software is more advanced and will be able to do a lot of the behind the scenes work and manage the landholder feedback data. The lines can be moved in real time with weeks work engineering being done in seconds.
- A CCG member said this is something farmers would be prepared to engage with and look at their own properties.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A CCG member asked if visual amenity is taken into account for transmission lines to the same extent that it is for windfarms. - Naomi, responded that is but its different. Visual amenity is part of the EIS. The EIS is not a landowner only study, it takes into account whole of community planning. - A CCG member commented that the previous modelling done by GHD to determine the route disregarded visual amenity. Could this modelling be used to determine the route at Bannaby and Tumut? - Dan noted they will be able to use this software to visualise the line straight away. 	
<p>Other Business</p>	<p>Other Business</p> <p>Naomi noted the meeting with the RFS Commissioner on 20 September was productive and explored all the ways in which Transgrid can help and support the RFS. Learnings have been taken from the Underground Steering Committee and creating a bushfire focussed Steering Committee is being explored.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A CCG member made comment on the recent Canberra Time article which stated that Transgrid is no longer considering undergrounding through Kosciuszko National Park. It was noted that if Transgrid is not even consideration undergrounding for a pristine area for 9km then any hope for undergrounding is gone. - Dan responded that he was involved in that decision and it is a separate piece of work. Due to the terrain in the area the impact of undergrounding was almost as bad as overhead. Undergrounding would be approximately 75% of the footprint of overhead due to the huge elevations. - A CCG member commented that the article referenced the pressure on Transgrid to meet deadlines as well as budgets to ensure Snowy was delivered on time. - Dan said he was involved in those discussions and the comments came from Hydro, not Transgrid. Transgrid are being paid to build it for Snowy Hydro. They 	

	<p>currently have State approval and are waiting on Federal approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A CCG member commented that the costing per km for this particular piece of work is not the same as HumeLink as it is AC not HVDC. 	
Meeting close	<p>The next meeting will be held on 23 November.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 7pm.</p>	

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

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

Meeting minutes endorsed by the HumeLink CCG Chair 21/11/22.