

1.1 HumeLink Snow Valley Community Consultative Group: 4th Meeting 6 April 2022

Time	4:30pm – 6:05pm
Date	06/04/2022
Attendees	<p>Chair: Brian Elton</p> <p>Secretariat: Ella Burgess</p> <p>Transgrid CCG members: Elli Baker, Tim Edwards, Naomi Rowe</p> <p>Transgrid presenters: Daniel Burn, Sumaya Osman</p> <p>Community members: Lee Kingma, Hansie Armour, Pippa Quilty, Rebecca Tobin, Julia Ham, Paul Sturgess, Sarah Roche, Jessica Campbell, Daniel Brear</p> <p>Landowner and Community Advocate (Observer): Rod Stowe</p> <p>Deputy Landowner and Community Advocate (Observer): Barbara El-Gamal</p> <p>Observers: Dr Joe McGirr (State Member for Wagga Wagga), Deb Pobjie (Transgrid), Matt Pirie (Transgrid), Sherrie Anderson (Transgrid), Heather Wagland (Transgrid)</p> <p>A number of members of the Hume Action Group and local landowners were in attendance as Observers.</p>
Apologies	Phil Clements, Sue Bolger, Jonathan Caffery, Greg McLachlan, Matthew Suter, Dean Hawkins, Ian Robson
Meeting location	The Tumut Bowling Club
Meeting materials	Presentation
Purpose of meeting	Meeting 4

Item	Discussion Summary	To note
Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The meeting commenced at 4:30pm. - The Chair welcomed all and gave an Acknowledgement to Country. - The Chair particularly welcomed the new community members of the CCG. He welcomed community Observers, acknowledged the presence of Dr Joe McGirr, State Member for Wagga Wagga and reminded everyone of the protocols for Observer attendance. - Introductions, background from community, landowner and organisation 	

	<p>Community Consultative Group (CCG) members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introductions and involvement in the project from the representatives of the Transgrid HumeLink project team. 	
Minutes and Matters Arising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No comments made on the previous minutes. <p><i>The minutes of the previous meeting have been endorsed by the Chair and posted to the Transgrid website.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Matters arising were noted as being discussed in the agenda for the meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transgrid to circulate the link to the SEARs to the CCG. getContent (nsw.gov.au)
HumeLink Project Update	<p>Elli gave an update on the project milestones and timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See slide 5 for the timeline of the HumeLink project. - Transgrid has now received the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) that will inform the EIS. - The 200m corridor refinement has recently been announced, however small areas along the route still remain under analysis. Over the next few weeks conversations are commencing with landowners. <p>Elli gave an update on GHD's Options Assessment Report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transgrid received the results from the report a few weeks ago but did not disclose the results as they wanted to contact all landowners before the report was made public. The GHD report was made public on Friday 1 April 2022. - The scope of the report was to compare the routes at Tumut North, Blowering and Kosciuszko (Option 2F). <p>The Chair called for questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community CCG members noted their confusion associated with the social impact heads of consideration, the values and weighting placed on and about various aspects within the report. For example, prime agricultural land was labelled as a medium constraint while federal or state-owned land was labelled as a significant constraint. - An organisational CCG member commented that when you consider the route going through people's properties, the fact that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The link to the GHD Options Assessment report can be found here - The link to the fact sheets on each route refinement decision can be found here Tumut, Bannaby, Green Hills and Pejar Dam.

the preferred route is also the cheapest is insulting.

- A community CCG member noted that the report gives local towns a constraint score of 0. It was noted that towns extend beyond just the centre of the town but out to local landholders too. The member asked Transgrid how the social impacts have been measured.
- A community CCG member noted that none of the comments and feedback from landowners left on the interactive map have been reflected in GHD's report. It was suggested that the social impacts have not been accurately costed in line with indigenous and environmental considerations.
- ACTION: 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.
- A community CCG member questioned why Option 2F circles back upwards in the national park causing a "J" shape. It was suggested the route through public land has been unfairly mapped to skew it and make it longer.
- Elli noted that it was Transgrid's role to get the route to Wagga via the route of least impact.
- Community CCG members noted that there are different options including a route that was originally disputed between Maragle and Yass which was redundant.
- A community CCG member asked who agreed to the criteria and scope of the Option 2F study? Was HumeLink Action Group included in the scope of the study? There would have been a scope of reference that Transgrid provided GHD.
- A community CCG member noted that the terms of reference for the study was something the community has asked Transgrid for on multiple occasions. It was suggested that going forward Transgrid has to commit to being more transparent with these kinds of things.
- Sumaya responded that Transgrid did draft the scope of the report for GHD and it was

circulated to HumeLink Action Group. The scope only showed the unique study area and mandated GHD to find the optimal route between Maragle and Yass. The idea of the study was for it to be as independent of Transgrid as possible. Transgrid has been assessing the Tumut to Blowering route for some time so that information that is publicly available and was made available to GHD.

- Community CCG members commented on other possible routes that seemed more direct than what Transgrid was presenting as part of the GHD report.
- Elli noted that the reason all three routes are comparable is because all three options end in the same point in Wagga Wagga that provides the same link to Wagga Wagga.
- A community member asked that given the recent changes in legislation regarding the co-purpose of renewable infrastructure, why has Transgrid not chosen to traverse through public land. The change in question refers to amendments to section 59 and 60 of the NSW Forestry Act 2012.
- A community CCG member commented that the devaluation of the surrounding land has not been taken into account.
- Community CCG members requested for Transgrid to ask GHD for the value of the multiplier to explain how the figures for each route were determined.
- ACTION: Transgrid to ask GHD for the value of the multiplier used in the options report.
- A community CCG member showed an image of transmission lines super imposed onto images of a local landowner's property.
- Community CCG members noted that vulnerable landowners and community members who are less willing to speak up are being severely impacted.
- Elli responded that the numbers in the report are GHD's numbers. Although Transgrid's numbers and GHD's number do differ, they both have the same result.
- Elli noted that GHD have consistently used their same framework across the three routes. Elli stated that she has full

confidence in the fact that GHD looked at each of the routes with the same level of detail and same assumptions. Elli noted that there is no change in value between a specific tree in a national park compared to that tree being located on private land.

- A community CCG member noted that the Tumut Wetlands have a high rating of 100 but they are not included on the route. It was suggested that this level of inaccuracy raises doubt across the whole report.
- ACTION: confirm the constraints assessment inclusion of the Tumut River v's the Tumut Wetlands

Elli gave an update on Transgrid's route refinement process.

- The GHD report has partly informed Transgrid's decision determining the preferred route.

Route refinement decision – Tumut

- See slide 9 for an overview of the Tumut route refinement decision.
- Transgrid has determined that the Tumut North option is the preferred route. Landowners now not included in the preferred route as well as those now included in the preferred route have been contacted.
- Broadly, Transgrid took three categories into consideration; social license, network resilience and cost.
- Transgrid has analysed the number of residences within 500m of the corridor as well as chosen a route that would have a lesser bushfire risk.
- Elli explained the concept behind network resilience and explained that there is greater risk when all lines are paralleled instead of including some differentiation between the lines to lessen the risk.
- Elli noted that at this stage the costs that Transgrid has determined for the route options are estimates. The costs across the three options have been completed on the same basis so all options can be compared.

Route refinement decision – Bannaby

- See slide 10 of the presentation for an overview of the Bannaby route refinement decision.

- Similar to the decision made regarding Tumut, an option was requested by locals and landowners to be explored that went through more national park. Taking this route would result in moving away from a particular group of residences, however would impact a similar number of residences elsewhere. The alternate route also had higher environmental and bushfire risk. The costs for the two routes were the same.

Route refinement decision – Pejar Dam

- See slide 11 for an overview of the Pejar Dam route refinement decision.
- Transgrid made the decision to move the transmission line north instead of traversing through the middle of the dam. This has benefited the local recreation users of the dam and well as local residences. The cost of this decision was higher but Transgrid noted the significant benefit the decision would have for the community.

Route refinement decision – Green Hills

- See slide 12 for an overview of the Green Hills route refinement.
- The decision to alter the route through the State Forest has resulted in 0 residences being impacted instead of 5. Again, the decision will cost Transgrid more, but they see greater value in impacting 0 residences rather than 5.

The Chair called for questions.

- A CCG member noted that may be the case, but the route will still impact several farms when it exists the State Forest. The option has a dog leg that parallels the existing line which impacts one landowner along 4.5km of their property.
- Elli responded that Transgrid has not changed anything at the Wagga Wagga node.
- A community CCG member stated that Transgrid has created a dog leg through the State Forest where they could have taken a more direct route.
- Sumaya noted that Transgrid investigated going through a larger proportion of the State Forest, however if you did so you would still be impacting landowners only in a different area.

- A community CCG member noted that this change that Transgrid has made to the route option through Green Hills has been very well received by the local landowners who were impacted.
- ACTION: Transgrid to check the figures in change on the Green Hills route.
- ACTION: Transgrid to request from GHD the difference in value between agricultural land compared to State Forest.
- Elli noted that there are two aspects to the costings – one being the values placed on agricultural compared to environmental lands and the cost of easements.
- A community CCG member asked why prime agricultural land was not valued more and questioned when the calculations were made.
- ACTION: Transgrid to request from GHD how the valuation of prime agricultural land was costed and what time period this valuation came from
- Elli noted that the calculations are always iterative and Transgrid will continue to update their numbers, particularly as more data becomes available to inform the EIS.
- An organisational CCG member asked how impacts to production and operations for landowners are calculated. It was also asked how the estimations were made for compensation and land value?
- Elli noted that there are two parts to land value, the first being compensation and the other being how prime agricultural land is valued in the net impact scenario. There is mapping available to inform estimates for compensation.
- A community CCG member stated that if you build power lines over grazing country the graziers will not want to look at it but if you put the line through a pine plantation, they lose operation in that area.
- A community CCG member noted the impact that transmission lines would have on aerial spraying for their property. The member stated they calculated they will lose approximately \$65,000 per year simply from an inability to aerial spray. Concern was noted on decisions being made via algorithms not made by people who have an understanding about agriculture and its

	<p>true costs which do not seem to be being factored in.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An organisational CCG member stated that NSW Farmers has been having issues with government supplied agricultural data as there are flaws in the baseline data. It was suggested that ground truth production data needs to be attained to inform these kinds of reports and documents. - A community CCG member noted that the numbers and analysis need to be supplied and stacked up accurately because the high level large numbers as they stand mean little. 	
<p>Update on Planning and Approvals</p>	<p>Sumaya gave an update on the planning and approvals process and timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See slide 16 for an update on the approvals process and timeline. - Transgrid is currently preparing the EIS, taking into account the guidelines of the SEARs which have just been received. - The SEARs were noted as being fairly standard, with some details from various governmental agencies including Heritage NSW etc. - The EIS will be a large and complicated document and Transgrid is interested to hear what the CCG would like to hear about within the EIS report and the technical studies that will inform the report. - The EIS is an open process in which the public can provide comments on at any stage. Feedback can be given through place managers, the HumeLink hotline 1800 317 367, humelink@transgrid.com.au as well as a formal process that occurs when the EIS goes on public exhibition for six weeks. The feedback received during this time goes directly to the Department and Transgrid must prepare a report of responses. - The key general aspects of the SEARs are outlined on slide 17 of the presentation. - Naomi noted that leading up to the formal EIS process, Transgrid's goal is to incorporate the informal commentary as well. Transgrid would appreciate the CCG's advice about which briefings would be pertinent on certain technical studies to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Link to the Department of Planning HumeLink site can be found here - HumeLink Planning Portal - Department of Planning and Environment (nsw.gov.au)

	<p>inform the local community as best as possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A community CCG member noted that Transgrid need to prove that they considered alternate options. - Sumaya responded that is a standard aspect of the EIS to explain how the decision has been made. - An organisational CCG member noted that their local LandCare organisation provided Transgrid with information and Transgrid have not made any actions to meet with LandCare. - ACTION: Transgrid to reach out to LandCare. 	
<p>Lee Kingma Presentation</p>	<p>Community CCG member Lee Kingma gave a presentation comparing compensation between wind turbines and transmission lines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please see slides 1 – 3 of the Lee Kingma presentation for an overview of the compensation assumptions for Humelink, compensation assumptions for Bango Windfarm and a comparison table between wind turbines and transmission lines. - A community CCG member noted that if Transgrid could offer what those with windfarms are offering landowners that would be an option they would consider, however what Humelink is proposing is not an option. - Lee noted that the land is a resource they as landowners have ownership over and there should be a better and more valuable conversation over the issue. - A community CCG member expressed thanks to Lee for his presentation. It was noted that farmers are constantly meeting with renewable infrastructure providers and conversations are constantly developing. - Elli responded that as stated at previous CCG meetings, Transgrid is not a commercial enterprise and they cannot decide what their revenue is, unlike a windfarm who is a private entity making a commercial decision. Transgrid is in a different regulated environment to those that supply windfarms. The external regulator sets Transgrid's process, and they only allow Transgrid enough revenue to cover what they deem Transgrid's costs to 	

be. The Australian Energy Regulator determine what prices Transgrid can charge their consumers and in what context, Transgrid are forced to follow what is set as a compensation regime.

- Transgrid has had legal advice informing them they do not have any restrictions paying in annuity instead of one upfront amount. This is only possible through negotiation and will not be possible if negotiations end up in compulsory acquisition with the valuer general.
- Elli restated Transgrid is not a wind nor solar business, hence cannot determine their own prices.
- A community CCG member responded that Transgrid need to make a submission to the AER for a regulated period in which Transgrid puts forward all the actual costs of the project. All the true costs and impacts need to be factored into the AER submission for the four-year regulatory period that will determine the costing. If the wrong costings are given to the AER, the wrong outputs will be determined. Transgrid needs to have a position at the table and advocate for the communities they are impacting.
- Lee stated that the landowners need Transgrid to voice the concerns of the impacted communities and landowners. Regarding submissions to the ISP, there was an obvious delay because of landowners, there may be a cost to consumers but there are legitimate arguments that need to be made.
- The Chair noted that this is a discussion happening at a national level. On another Transgrid project of a similar nature, Transgrid put forward a figure for community and landowner compensation that was dramatically reduced by the regulatory body.
- Lee responded that those landowners who could speak up for themselves, about 10% of them, got a lot more than they deserved while other landowners were walked over.
- The Chair noted that this concern can be addressed offline.

Update on the Undergrounding Feasibility Report

Dan gave an update on the Undergrounding Feasibility Report.

- See slide 14 of the presentation for an update on the Undergrounding Feasibility Report.
- GHD presented their technical findings to both Dan and Amplitude on the morning of the 6th of April 2022 ahead of the meeting with the wider Steering Committee on 12 April 2022.
- Dan noted there are several technical items that GHD need to address. The meeting between GHD, Dan and Amplitude was aimed at ensuring the solution will be what the community wants for them to then work through the costs and impacts.
- The route options in the Undergrounding Report are similar to those outlined in the route refinement slides.
- The final report is due on 10 May 2022.
- The Chair reminded the CCG of comments made at the CCG in February the undergrounding study is running in parallel to the project as it advances. If the outcomes of the undergrounding study produce a better option than the current option, Transgrid will be obliged to consider it.
- Dan noted that the process of the Steering Committee has led to what the group has felt as a balanced input, so whatever the outcome is, we trust that it will be balanced. Amplitude Consultants worked hard to revise the scope and rewrite it ahead of it going to market.
- A community CCG member, also on the Steering Committee, noted that having Amplitude as advisors has helped the community members on the Steering Committee enormously and helped them engage in the discussions.
- A community CCG member, also on the Steering Committee expressed concern with Amplitude's approach to social and environmental impacts.
- A community CCG member asked if there has been any thought about using the existing easements?
- A community CCG member, also on the Steering Committee stated that looking at

	<p>existing easements is part of the scope. Credit was given to Dan following the meeting with GHD that morning who challenged the consultant to produce more direct routes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A community CCG member, also on the Steering Committee expressed concern that the undergrounding has not yet come to fruition but the 200m corridor has been announced and the feeling that Transgrid is pre-empting a result which is not engagement. It was not understood why Transgrid could not wait for the undergrounding study to go public before communicating with landowners. - Tim responded that in the STOWE report, one of the recommendations Transgrid accepted was around delaying the narrowing of the corridor, which was to give time to improving the engagement and conversations. With energisation scheduled for 2026, there is little room to delay the narrowing of the corridor any further. - Elli noted that the project has a mandated energisation date in December 2026 and if the undergrounding study produces a better result, that will have to impact the project. However, as coal is coming off the grid earlier and earlier, there is increased pressure on HumeLink to be completed. 	
<p>Update on the HumeLink Engagement Strategy</p>	<p>Naomi gave an update on updated engagement collateral.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It was noted that the engagement strategy workshop following the CCG meeting would not occur following the Snowy Valley CCG and would occur separately to the CCG meeting. - ACTION: Naomi to organise a separate CCG engagement workshop - The Transgrid team have heard from landowners and community members around bushfires, easement compensation and electric and magnetic fields. - This information has informed new factsheets on each subject available on the Transgrid website. - Bushfires – LINK - A community CCG member commented that bushfires are a huge risk, many of the CCG members and observers have been 	

burnt out in previous fires. It was asked what does the situation look like in a bushfire and how are landowners expected to manage it?

- ACTION: Naomi to organise a bushfire briefing with technical experts, CCG members and local community bushfire experts.
- A community CCG member said the fact sheets are more so around minimising the risk of bushfires which is not adequate information for local landowners.
- The Chair noted that this will be a topic for the next CCG meeting if the fact sheets are deemed inadequate by the CCG.
- A community CCG member noted that this is crucial information that the community has been asking for. The community cannot wait for two months until the next CCG meeting to gain understanding of such critical information.
- A community CCG member commented that their farm was severely burnt out in fires in 2020 because the transmission lines on their farm prevented them from being able to fight the fire.
- An organisational CCG member noted that the obligation is on Transgrid to provide the adequate information that the CCG members and community have been asking for. There is a lot of lived trauma from bushfires.
- An organisational CCG member noted that these are whole community issues and people with the right expertise to talk about them should be in the room.
- A community CCG members noted that there is not enough public education around the technical studies behind the HumeLink project.
- An organisational CCG member noted that the community are about to have to go through a detailed EIS, with a six-week period to respond. Transgrid needs to respect what that imposes on landowners. Transgrid need a strategy to ensure that landowners are supported and understand key aspects of the EIS so they can make informed submissions.
- Naomi noted that the EIS will not go on exhibition until early next year and there is

	<p>an opportunity for Transgrid to go through certain technical aspects of the EIS before it is submitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A community CCG member asked if those who understand agricultural operations from the project team can be involved in the process. - Easement compensation - Electric and magnetic fields – LINK - Naomi gave an update on the upcoming community engagement activities which are outlined on slide 22 of the presentation. 	
<p>Agenda setting for subsequent meetings</p>	<p>Next meetings</p> <p>June</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tuesday 28 <p>October</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tuesday 11 <p>December</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tuesday 6 <p>The Chair noted that the current CCG membership guidelines state that if a member’s property comes out of the refined corridor they must resign from the CCG. The Chair would like to ask that members have a conversation with him before resigning from the CCG as those members are still impacted by the corridor in some way or can contribute meaningfully to the CCG. This was agreed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A community CCG member reiterated the list of actions outlined at the end of the meeting and confirmed Transgrid had taken note of each action. - A community CCG member expressed disappointment that her private details has been shared as an avenue to provide information on the HumeLink project. - The Chair reiterated that it is not the role of the CCG members to be the source of information and engagement, they are representatives of their community in the CCG. - ACTION: Transgrid to investigate the incident. 	
<p>Meeting close</p>	<p>The meeting closed at 6:42pm.</p>	

Minutes endorsed by HumeLink CCG Chair, Brian Elton on 16/05/22.

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 used in their report.	Underway
Transgrid to check the figures in change on the Green Hills route.	Underway
Transgrid to reach out to LandCare.	Underway
Transgrid to organise a bushfire briefing with technical experts, CCG members and local community bushfire experts	Underway
Transgrid to investigate the incident regarding the confusion in the role of the CCG members.	Underway