

1.1 HumeLink Snowy Valley Community Consultative Group: 6th Meeting 14 September 2022

Time	5 -7:30pm
Date	14/09/2022
Attendees	<p>Chair: Brian Elton</p> <p>Secretariat: Ella Burgess</p> <p>Transgrid CCG members: Naomi Rowe</p> <p>Transgrid speakers: Daniel Burn, Carl Charlier, Nathan Rhodes</p> <p>Transgrid project member attendees: Tammy Sinclair, Cameron Walters</p> <p>Guest speakers: Brendan Nelson, Independent Peer Review, MacroPlan</p> <p>Community members: Rebecca Tobin, Lee Kigma, Ian Robson, Sarah Roche, Paul Sturgess, Bill Kingwill, Catriona McCaulliffe, Frank Galluzzo</p> <p>Deputy Landowner and Community Advocate (Observer): Barbara El Gamal</p> <p>Observers: Several observers were in attendance</p>
Apologies	Phil Clements, Hansie Armour, Pippa Quilty
Meeting location	Valmar Support Services
Meeting materials	Presentation
Purpose of meeting	Meeting 6

Item	Discussion Summary	To note
Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The meeting commenced at 5:03pm. - The Chair welcomed all and gave an Acknowledgement of Country. - The Chair asked the community CCG members and the team from Transgrid to introduce themselves and their role in the HumeLink project. 	
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"> - The Chair noted that due to the availability of speakers, the topic timings would not run as outlined in the agenda. 	
<p>HumeLink Progress Update</p>	<p>Nathan gave an overview of HumeLink’s progress</p> <p>See slide 12 of the presentation for an update on HumeLink’s progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regulatory space: The Australian Energy Regulator (AER) has approved early works funding of \$322 million. Transgrid has been working with the AER since the approval has been made. The approval is staged. This initial funding is for stage 1, early works, which is about 10% of the project’s total value. Stage 1 includes items such as procurement, geo-tech studies, early works etc. - Route Refinement: The 200m corridor for the majority of the route has been refined. Nathan noted that community engagement was factored into the route refinement decisions. There are three key regulators Transgrid must operate under the guise of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) who operate the energy market. Since the last CCG meeting, the ISP has been updated. AEMO is concerned about the security of the energy space and all larger energy infrastructure projects have been accelerated. HumeLink’s timeline has been accelerated by 6 months to completion in July 2026. o The Australian Energy Regulator (AER) is the economic regulator and ensures that HumeLink is delivered with the most prudent and cost-efficient outcomes for the project. o The Department of Planning and Environment requires the project to focus on people, place and the environment. - Route refinement is the intersection between all three regulators. The Red Hat Review, as conducted by MacroPlan, tested the trade offs that have been made in that process. It has been a worthwhile exercise with many learnings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -

	<p>Nathan noted that many communities welcomed the Red Hat Review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental Impact Statement (EIS): Field survey work is continuing, to inform the drafting of the initial chapters of the EIS. Community engagement on the EIS and technical studies has commenced. - Procurement: Transgrid has gone to the market for expressions of interest to identify a suitable major contracting partner. Nathan noted that given the number of large infrastructure projects in Australia, it is a heated market. Transgrid is very sensitive to choosing the right contractors who will operate in local communities with social license. Three firms will be shortlisted in approximately a fortnight. They will not be contracted on fixed prices as there are many complexities within Humelink that the contractors must work flexibly with. - Nathan noted that in 2022 dollars the cost of the project is in the order of \$3.7 billion. - Property: On 25 August 2022, Transgrid met with representatives from the Humelink Action Group (HAG), the Australian Energy Infrastructure Commissioner (AEIC) and some impacted landowners. The meeting identified that an update of the Option Deed and Property Management Plan was required. Over the last two weeks, Transgrid has been updating the Option Deed document and Property Management Plan as per the feedback received. The new document is a lot more straightforward. Any landowner who has received a copy of the Option Deed previously used will be issued with the new Option Deed and given the option to consider any changes made in the new Option Deed. - Engineering: Geotech, ground condition, studies will commence later in 2022. These studies are crucial to gain a deeper understanding of the ground conditions. 	
Undergrounding Report	<p>Dan gave an update on the undergrounding feasibility report.</p> <p>See slide 28 of the presentation for an update on the undergrounding feasibility report timeline.</p>	-

- Dan noted that since the last CCG meeting, the Undergrounding Report has been finalised by GHD.
- Transgrid has published the report, Transgrid's response and the Steering Committee's response on their website, which can be found here: <https://www.transgrid.com.au/projects-innovation/humelink>
- Dan noted that ultimately, the cost of undergrounding HumeLink is estimated to be at least three times more expensive than the entire project's current cost of \$3.3 billion. Based on the current AER framework, undergrounding is not deemed economic.
- The other factor Transgrid deems making undergrounding unfeasible is the time it will take to underground the cables along HumeLink, hence not complying with AEMO's determination to accelerate the project.
- The Chair thanked Rebecca Tobin for the work she had contributed to the HumeLink Undergrounding Steering Committee.
- The Chair noted that the community representatives on the Steering Committee and their independent advisor, Les Brand from Amplitude Consultants, issued Transgrid with a separate letter to that which has been published on the website. There are a number of concerns outlined in the letter that Transgrid needs to respond to. For that reason, the Chair suggested the Steering Committee continues its work until Transgrid has responded to the community members letter. There was a request that Transgrid's include a response to the 52 outstanding issues mentioned in the letter.
- It was agreed the Steering Committee would continue until Transgrid has issued a response.

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

- Les noted his dissatisfaction with the report. When the Steering Committee was formed, it was stated they were to be

considered as the client for the Study. Les noted that he does not believe a professional organisation should produce a final piece of work with 52 of 100 comments left outstanding from the client.

- Les also noted that many of the responses that were given by GHD, were not given by an expert which is unsettling when considering the validity of the report.
- Les noted the methods used for costings in such an expensive and long study were surprisingly vague, particularly when two overseas examples were cited for undergrounding. Amplitude believes the costings should have been done using a bottom up approach.
- Les noted that he does not endorse the final undergrounding report.
- Recently, Les was in Paris for a technical conference where he spoke with several undergrounding HVDC experts. Les recounted that in every conversation he had with these HVDC experts, they were flawed with the high numbers outlined in GHD's undergrounding report.
- Les further noted, when two trenches of cabling are paralleled with each other, the cost per km does not double as stated in GHD's report and shows a complete lack of understanding of the installation of cables. There are many efficiencies that come from paralleling cables which have not been accounted for.
- Les noted there are many HVDC experts in Australia and overseas who are concerned this inaccurate report is in the public domain. If this report is used as a reference for future undergrounding, it will delay efforts to underground on a global scale.
- Naomi noted that Transgrid has received the specific letter from the Steering Committee outlining all their concerns. Transgrid is putting together a response.
- Naomi commented that Transgrid respect the contribution of the Steering Committee, however there will still be a difference of opinion in many instances regarding the final report.

- Nathan noted that the undergrounding report was a key topic when they met with the AEIC. There are a number of factors that must be taken into consideration from both the economic regulator, the AER and the timeframe regulator, AEMO. Based both frameworks, the report doesn't meet the economic or time constraints, even if Amplitude's reviews are further taken into consideration.
- Nathan commented that the project is in its early stages, there are many things that need to be considered, for example ground conditions. Australia's costs do not benchmark well globally. There are many issues with a bottom up approach from a costing perspective.
- Overall, Nathan noted that the numbers do not meet the economic and timing parameters of the regulators.
- Dan added that GHD have said they are happy to publish the report, even knowing about the issues, it is their opinion they have been addressed.
- Dan further noted that when making the final decision on undergrounding, Transgrid took both costing considerations into account.
- Les commented that GHD and Transgrid have a duty to the industry to be certain what they are publishing is accurate because the numbers have the potential to be extremely damaging. Regardless of the outcome, there is a duty to address the outstanding issues raised by the Steering Committee.
- Les noted in terms of bottom up costing and terrain, the size of the trench needs to be determined and then needs to be referred to Rawlinson's handbook which gives a cost per cubic metre. The costings of the handbook were last updated in June 2022. When Amplitude were calculating their costs, they used a bottom up approach assuming the worst case scenario. No matter how many worst case assumption were made, they could not reach the approximate \$11 million per km that GHD have outlined in the final report.

- Les further noted that the current schedule in the report determines 6.5 years for HVDC. Amplitude's determination is that it would take 4 years for delivery and 1 year for procurement. There are also questions surrounding commissioning, Les noting it will not take 6 months to commission but rather 2 to 3 months.
- Les noted that most of the outstanding issues on the report can be grouped into two main categories, cost and timing.
- There are items that need to be addressed such as what values were used to scale the number to determine costing.
- Les noted that a lot of the comments have been ignored and it is worrying GHD cannot clarify what numbers were used to scale the costings.
- Les commented that Transgrid's decision was based on cost and timing, both of which the Steering Committee has several outstanding concerns with. If Transgrid were to begin undergrounding today, they could be finished by 2027.
- Les noted that from the outset, everyone knew undergrounding would be more expensive, at what cost would Transgrid have agreed to actually underground?
- Nathan noted that while cost is an important factor, AEMO has stated HumeLink must be complete by July 2026.
- Les questioned if Transgrid would be able to install a double circuit 500kv line above ground line in that time and stated Amplitude believe it is possible to install undergrounding cables in that time.

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

- Rebecca noted that it is frustrating to see the report in the public domain. It was noted the community do not endorse the report, and there is great frustration that it seems Transgrid has made a decision based on a flawed report.

- Rebecca noted that there was no assessment of the best route apart from the route along the Hume Highway. All the other routes considered for undergrounding were those outlined in the route refinement study using the InDeGo method, which has also been accused of being flawed. It was further noted that the report has taken an unbalanced approach and does not take into account non-market benefits.
- The numbers used for undergrounding were costed using 2022 numbers. Throughout the study Rebecca noted the community members on the Steering Committee were told that all prices across the industry had significantly increased in 2022. It is the Steering Committee's view that the overhead costs should also be calculated using costs relevant to environments in 2022 to calculate a meaningful understanding of the difference in cost.
- Rebecca noted that undergrounding has significant benefits for local landowners and the environment, which should be taken into account holistically when considering the overall price of undergrounding.
- Rebecca noted that the community has heard Snowy Hydro 2.0 is already behind schedule, so what is the point in having HumeLink ready for 2026 when there will be no energy to move.
- A community CCG member asked if Les discussed the pricing of overhead lines with the experts in Paris.
- Les noted they did not discuss that pricing as it has gone through a more passive process and not the top down approach that GHD has taken. What has been outlined in the Steering Committee's letter is that the cost of undergrounding is being compared to 2020 number for overhead which is not an accurate comparison. Les commented that supply chain numbers and the cost of labour has significantly increased and overhead lines have significant labour needs.
- A community CCG member asked if biodiversity offsets have been included.

- Dan responded that they have been done as a pro rata estimate based on the 70-metre easement.
- A community CCG member asked if the potential damage of bushfires to overhead lines had been taken into account.
- Nathan responded that those risks are managed from the engineering standpoint
- Nathan asked Les to reiterate the timings of HVDC undergrounding.
- Les responded that in the GHD report, they have provided a schedule that will take approximately 6.5 years, including preliminary works. In Paris, Les reported that the technical experts he spoke to advised a 48 month delivery timeframe in today's market would be feasible. Les noted his estimate would be that the actual delivery of the installation would take 4 years, with an additional one year for procurement.
- Dan noted that part of the problem is that the timings have not taken in account the time needed for additional EIS work and a revised route selection.
- A community CCG member asked if Transgrid is on track to deliver the overhead lines by mid 2026. It was noted that if the lines were to be undergrounded, there would be no community opposition which would speed up the undergrounding process in comparison to overhead.
- Nathan responded that AEMO have determined HumeLink must be completed by July 2026 which is outlined in the ISP and the roadmap for all major energy infrastructure projects.
- A community CCG member said there isn't any urgency for HumeLink from the perspective of Snowy 2.0
- Dan acknowledged this was correct, however there are many additional benefits that come from HumeLink being completed for the rest of the grid.
- Nathan noted the team are procuring flexibly so if any changes or opportunities come to bear, they can be accommodated. Looking at Australia's market, world experts often question how

expensive it really is to deliver infrastructure in Australia. The undergrounding study was a desktop study and will remain at plus or minus 100% from the concept stage until the actual detailed design. This is a very early phase report.

- A community CCG member asked what the cost estimate is for HumeLink.
- Nathan responded that the cost estimate is \$3.3 billion but it has contingency built into the total cost. For undergrounding, there was no contingency, this is because undergrounding is in a much earlier desktop phase of research compared to what is understood about overhead for the project.
- Dan noted that he is aware that there is about \$150 million not accounted for in the final undergrounding cost. He acknowledged the report is not perfect, however the level of accuracy has been factored into the final decision and the input of costs.
- A community CCG member commented that the study is a desktop study, which was the same response the community got when concerns were raised about the route refinement study. The community understand that everything has to start somewhere, however, decision making was based off a flawed report by GHD which the community could see gaps in the research and something similar has happened with the undergrounding report.
- Nathan responded that it was an independent report done by GHD. Transgrid does not agree with everything outlined in the undergrounding report, and they make their own views. Transgrid cannot tell a consultant how to write the report. Transgrid has taken Amplitude's numbers into account which do not meet the cost or time parameters. Discussions have been had with the energy commissioner about the policy pieces, and there is greater understanding building at a higher level.
- Rebecca commented that statement is misleading because Transgrid is going to community saying a decision on undergrounding has been made on the

flawed report, whilst at the same time saying they are tied and cannot make the decision because it is up to the government regulators.

- Les noted the two reasons given for not moving forward with undergrounding were cost and timing. In terms of cost, it was always known that undergrounding would have a larger cost than overhead. The question was how much and would the price difference justify the benefits that come from it? To simply that this is the AER process and therefore Transgrid cannot do anything, implies that there was not much reason as to why the study was done from the outset. In terms of timing, anyone who understands HVDC will know that that installation will take between 4 – 5 years to build. If they are truly the two reasons why undergrounding has been deemed unfeasible, there was no point to this study from the outset.
- Carl noted that they are the right questions, however they are questions the energy commissioner should explore. From there, it could be mandated that all transmission lines go underground. Because it is not Transgrid's decision, the most cost efficient program must be followed. Transgrid is not the decision maker, but if they can get the cost down enough and display the community benefits, possibly the government could meet them halfway.
- The Chair noted that there are conversations happening at the highest levels of government. If the policy landscape does change, the procurement process has been flexible enough to 100% pivot to undergrounding.
- Dan commented that he does not think it has been a wasted 9 months. He noted the report could be better, however there is good information and very positive discussions have stemmed from it.
- The Chair thanked the community CCG members on the Steering Committee and their ongoing contribution.
- Rebecca noted that it feels empty now they have come to the end of the process and cannot even endorse the report.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Chair noted the process moving forward will be that Transgrid will respond to each issue in the letters to the Chair and Transgrid. - A community CCG member commented that it seems as though Transgrid is transferring the responsibility from Transgrid to the regulator. No one will explain how the process works at all. The legislation was created in the 60s to justify the least cost to the consumer stand point. While the environmental costs are not taken into account this argument will remain. How can all parties work together? - A community CCG member commented that what they do not like about this process is that everyone knows undergrounding was going to be too expensive but the messaging about it is as though it could be possible. Transgrid is not telling the community how it really is. Undergrounding was never going to happen, if that could have been made clear from the outset, the community could be focusing on things that are actually in play. - Nathan responded that 12 months ago, Transgrid held the same opinion. The commitment to the undergrounding study was made because the community wanted it. Transgrid has made flexible arrangements so things could change but due to the precarious nature of the NEM, it is a difficult space. 	
Red Hat Review	<p>Brendan Nelson provided an overview of the Red Hat Review.</p> <p>See slides 13 – 29 of the presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Brendan has provided a draft report to Transgrid and he is currently working through comments. - Brendan thanked the landowners for informing the report and making recommendations. The recommendations speak to more than just HumeLink, given the full program and portfolio Transgrid is working through, there are some lessons learnt that will need to be taken into account for future projects so communities do not have the same challenges. 	-

- The review focussed on feedback and input from the HumeLink Action Group, Bannaby Residents Action Group and impacted landowners.
- The review was conducted between June 2022 and August 2022.

Brendan outlined the key findings of the report.

- Transgrid has done a lot of work internally, however the community has not seen it. When you look deeper there has been a lot of work done that is not public facing. Transgrid should publish a report on all of the options and why some were discounted or considered. Transgrid has started this report and it should be made available before the EIS goes live. There were many other route refinement reports completed other than the GHD report, however that information is not collated in a single point.
- The GHD options report was a desktop study and not suitable for making a decision on which route option to choose. It would be good to make a strategic options assessment but it misses the community understanding. The scope lacked clarity. GHD were not asked to produce a report that would satisfy the EIS requirements. There is helpful information in the report, but it does not provide a holistic understanding of the impacts on the community.
- Transgrid does not have a policy on route selection or refinement. As a member of the community, you are well within your rights to question how Transgrid has reached certain decisions, and there is need for a policy. Transgrid is currently commissioning a policy which will be put in place by the end of the year. There have been a lot of lessons learnt that will feed into future projects. The policy will be outlined on Transgrid's website and will be clearly articulated, so everyone has clarity on assessment processes. WSP has been engaged to do that by the end of the year.
- At the start of the HumeLink project, community engagement was horrendous, however there have been many positives lately. Community trust was burnt in the first year of this project. There is a lot of work being done now with plenty of

resourcing and funding going towards it. There has been an internal system issue within Transgrid which has meant many loops have not been closed out when raised by the community.

- Transgrid has been held responsible for decisions they have not made. Transgrid is the builder on this project, and they must build to the budget given to them. Transgrid has been taking responsibility for decisions that are being made by others and this has not been communicated to the community.
- Transgrid is progressing with the EIS investigations to meet the AEMO 2022 ISP delivery timeframe. There are large parts of the corridor that would be deemed as non-contestable, there are also large parts of the corridor where issues exist. The project is at a critical point, if Transgrid is to achieve energisation by mid-2026, the EIS needs to be submitted, however this is made difficult as there are still parts of the route that have not been fully deciphered. It is very important that the impacts of the ISP on the community are understood. Energisation of HumeLink has been brought forward by a year as an insurance policy. If the time stayed where it was, and any of the coal fired plants shut down, there would be much greater consequences than bringing HumeLink forward.
- Bushfire risk is important and has been heavily considered. There is spatial data available about bushfire risks for the last 100 years. The bushfire risk from a network point of view has been considered properly. Transgrid believes that if there is an impact to the network, they will still be able to operate. Transgrid needs to properly define the level of acceptable risk to the community, the RFS and the nation. The discussion around bushfires will influence where the final decision is made.
- There is no silver bullet solution. While undergrounding does have benefits, it is not realistic for the entire 360km route.
- A community CCG member asked if Brendan thought a hybrid model of

overhead and underground could be feasible based on risk.

- Brendan responded that it could be. If the network planning team believes the risk tolerance will not withstand the potential risk then it could be possible. He noted the community will have a different view than the network planning team.

Brendan gave an overview of bushfire resilience

- All the options being considered in the Tumut area have a high degree of bushfire risk and recent bushfire risk history.
- Transgrid's existing transmission network in the Tumut area was impacted by 2019/2020 bushfires. Transgrid's report to the AER identified 65 outages of 330kV in the Tumut region.
- 4 lines were out of service including line 2 which had damaged insulators and couldn't be re-energised for several weeks.
- HumeLink is a nationally significant project and resilience against future bushfires is critical both from an operational perspective and from an RFS/community safety perspective.
- Clarity on the level of risk tolerance would improve the route selection and refinement process.
- A community CCG member commented that it is not just Transgrid's assets at risk, the assets are also landowners'. Landowners have natural capital, productive farming land that this infrastructure significantly puts at risk. The RFS has told landowners that they will not go under the power lines, so you will have farmers out under the lines risking their lives to save their properties.

Brendan gave an overview of the bushfire hazard summary.

See slides 17 and 18 of the presentation.

- None of the options completely absolve bushfire risk from an operational, RFS or community perspective.
- Engineering options should be fully investigated when firefighting requirements are investigated.

Brendan gave an overview of undergrounding compared to overhead.

- There is a basis to consider partial elements to be undergrounded but it has to be in the context of Transgrid's constraints. The budget is \$3.3 billion, so Transgrid should investigate if it is possible to explore ways to reallocate funding.

Brendan gave an overview of the route refinement.

See slides 20-29 of the presentation.

- The 5 primary options considered in the Red Hat Review were:
 - o Maragle to Yass via Blowering
 - o Maragle to Yass via Blowering northeast deviation
 - o Maragle to Yass via Tumut North
 - o Maragle to Yass via Green Hills
 - o Wondalga to Maragle to Yass via NP

Greenhills – the majority of the route is on public land. An area of concern is the introduction of new impacted properties where the route exits the public land.

Tumut North – the hardest option on the community but probably the best in terms of bushfire constraints.

Blowering – a good option that would have been worth further investigation, however too much time has elapsed. If this review had been done 12 months ago, work on the route could have continued and it may have been ok.

- A community CCG member commented that it is very frustrating for them to hear they have been guinea pigs due to negligence at the start of this project. There is an opportunity to consider the land use in a different way. The Tumut North route impacts the most people, but other routes have a higher bushfire risk. There is an opportunity to use that land differently that will mitigate bushfire risk and as a result impact less community members.
- A community CCG member noted that Matt Kean publicly promised where public land could be used it would be.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Brendan noted that in his report, he has strongly recommended where the route can be undergrounded it should be. <p>Brendan gave an overview of biodiversity offsets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - About one third of the budget is going towards biodiversity offsets. There are discretionary powers around biodiversity offsets that are not often used, but the regulations around biodiversity offsets were not created to manage projects of this scale. The bigger strategic narrative of HumeLink is more important than localised biodiversity impacts. - Nathan noted that HumeLink is contributing to reaching the overall emissions targets, so relief could be given to fund certain aspects such as partial undergrounding. It's a decision that will be made soon after the election and will fundamentally change the discourse around the project. - A community CCG member commented that this is a benchmark project, if you don't get this right, future projects are doomed. - Brendan commented that he does think there is a chance of getting a good outcome but it is a complex array of moving parts. - A community CCG member asked if there is an opportunity for the route be undergrounded in the Tumut community, would it take a more direct route? - Brendan responded that he doesn't know, but generally undergrounding takes a more direct route. 	
<p>Bushfires</p>	<p>Nathan gave an overview of bushfire management.</p> <p>See slide 26 of the presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 27 July a pilot Bushfire Management Workshop took place. Due to COVID and several plane cancellations, there were limitations to the workshop. - Transgrid has taken learnings from the workshop and will be including them in the EIS. - Transgrid will be making more of an effort to work with the RFS at all levels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nathan has a meeting scheduled with the RFS Commissioner. 	
<p>Compensation</p>	<p>Carl Charlier introduced himself as the Commercial Manager for HumeLink and gave an update on compensation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On 25 August 2022, Transgrid met with representatives from the HumeLink Action Group (HAG), the Australian Energy Infrastructure Commissioner (AEIC) and some impacted landowners. The meeting identified that an update of the Option Deed and Property Management Plan was required. Over the last two weeks, Transgrid has been updating the Option Deed document and Property Management Plan as per the feedback received. The new document is a lot more straightforward. Any landowner who has received a copy of the Option Deed previously used will be issued with the new Option Deed and given the option to consider any changes made in the new Option Deed. - A community CCG member commented that there are still gaps in the documents. Access to easements needs additional consideration and compensation needs to be factored in. This should be a legacy agreement and time should be spent getting it right. - A community CCG member commented that it should be document the energy commissioner would sign himself. The member asked if the commissioner would get a copy of the updated documents. - Carl responded that the energy commissioner has seen the documents. Transgrid has incorporated as much of the feedback received as possible and share the objective of making it as easy as possible to understand. - Carl noted that Transgrid is still going through the final feedback. The intent is to make the final updates and send out the updated option deed. - Nathan noted that operations on farms can be very different. Transgrid appreciates that in some cases it will be an intricate process for a valuer to value certain complexities on various farms. 	

EIS update	<p>Naomi gave an update on the EIS.</p> <p>See slide 6 of the presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Field investigations are continuing, as part of that Transgrid are working to prepare the community for the public exhibition period. - Community information sessions on the technical reports are being run between now and when the EIS will go on exhibition. - The EIS is anticipated to go on public exhibition in April 2023, following the election. 	
Geotech and tower locations	<p>Dan gave an overview of the geotech investigations.</p> <p>See slide 7 of the presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Geotech investigations (ground surveys) are expected to occur between late September 2022 through to mid March 2023. - Naomi noted that all efforts are being made to minimise impact by limiting crew size, work hours and footprint as well as ensuring stringent biosecurity measures are abided by. - Dan noted that testing will include either a borehole test or a penetration test – which has less impact. - The borehole testing is done using a truck mounted machine and a smaller track mounted machine is used where the area is less accessible. - Dan noted that Transgrid has given some landowners structural locations, however all locations are subject to change in the final design. If landowners ask for the concept location Transgrid will provide it. 	
Observer questions	<p>The Chair gave the observers in attendance the opportunity to ask questions of the Transgrid team.</p>	
Agenda setting for subsequent meetings	<p>Next meetings</p> <p>October</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tuesday 11 or Wednesday 12 <p>The Chair noted the October meeting will mark one year since the establishment of the Humelink CCGs. The next meeting will be an</p>	

	<p>opportunity to reassess membership, processes, functionality, protocols etc.</p> <p>November</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wednesday 23 or Thursday 24 <p>December</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tuesday 6 or Wednesday 7 	
Meeting close	The meeting closed at 7:35pm.	

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
