

## Purpose and Outcome

The purpose of the meeting was to engage with stakeholders to introduce and discuss the transmission line engagement process and current transmission line projects in the Burnett region.

This meeting is part of the ongoing Powerlink stakeholder engagement program for new projects in the Burnett region.

### Attendees

*Gerard Reilly (Chair) (Powerlink) (GR), Nicole Maguire (Powerlink) (NM), Harminder Bhar (Powerlink) (HB), Kerry O'Brien (Powerlink) (KOB), Nicole Gagen (Powerlink) (NG), Narelle Titman (Powerlink) (NT), Kate Jackson (Powerlink) (KJ), Max Tolson (Powerlink) (MT), Dana Boxall (Powerlink) (DB), Rebecca Powlett (Queensland Hydro) (RP), Jon Carey (Stanwell) (JC), Graeme Lehmann (Mayor, Somerset Regional Council) (GL), Alan Broome (Burnett Inland Economic Development Organisation) (AB), Matthew Kenny (South Burnett CTC) (MK)*

### Apologies

*Insp. Scott Stahlhut (Kingaroy Police), Sarah Short (Swickers Bacon Factory), Helene Johnson (Yarraman Museum Association), Keith Campbell (Coopers Gap CCC), Les Schloss (Nanango Show Society), Kirstie Schumacher (South Burnett Regional Council), Rebecca Cross (South Burnett Grazing Network), Alan Logan (Rosalie North Landcare Group), Damien Martoo (Kingaroy Chamber of Commerce), Andrew Sinnamon (AgForce Qld), Jason Kinsella (Visit South Burnett)*

**Date & Time:** 23 March, 1:00 pm to 2:30 pm

**Location:** Nanango Cultural Centre

### Minutes

Agenda Item	Minutes and Actions
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Acknowledgement of country</b> <b>Welcome and housekeeping</b>
1.1	GR spoke to acknowledgement of country
1.2	Participant introductions
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Borumba Pumped Hydro Project – transmission line connection project engagement update</b>
2.1	Engagement timeline and statistics GR spoke to the project's engagement activities undertaken to date, noting engagement commenced in December 2021. Key statistics of the engagement process included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commenced engagement in December 2021</li> <li>• Released study area in July 2022</li> </ul>

Agenda Item	Minutes and Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Released draft corridors in November 2022</li> <li>• 37 community information drop-in sessions held</li> <li>• More than 2,100 residents have attended the community information sessions</li> <li>• More than 1,800 individual pieces of feedback received via email, feedback forms, phone calls, meetings and comments on interactive project map.</li> </ul>
2.2	<p>Community consultation key themes</p> <p>GR provided overview of key themes and matters raised by stakeholders during consultation.</p> <p>Feedback themes included:</p> <p>State-owned land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investigating the use of ‘state-owned land’ including State Forests and National Parks</li> <li>• Areas of cultural significance and connection to country</li> <li>• Potential for bushfire mitigation</li> </ul> <p>Property impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property impacts throughout planning, construction and operation</li> <li>• Compensation and land values</li> <li>• Loss of lifestyle and generational ownership</li> <li>• Amenity impacts and future use</li> </ul> <p>Lifestyle impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broader negative impact the project will have on lifestyle</li> <li>• Visual amenity impacts</li> <li>• Disruption of key recreational activities</li> <li>• Changes to lifestyle features that attracts residents and tourists</li> </ul> <p>Biosecurity and agricultural impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused on operation and maintenance</li> <li>• Management of giant rats tail grass, fireweed, and parthenium</li> <li>• Contractor compliance with biosecurity regulations</li> <li>• Devaluation of land and business operations</li> <li>• Broader threats to agricultural industry in the wider region</li> </ul> <p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presence of endangered species</li> <li>• Damage and destruction of wildlife habitats</li> <li>• Wildlife has a significant value to the community</li> <li>• Key reason for living in the region and lifestyle issues</li> </ul> <p>Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health impacts to residents living near transmission lines</li> <li>• Community concerns around electric and magnetic fields (EMF)</li> </ul> <p>Corridor alternatives and preferences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential of undergrounding sections of the transmission lines</li> </ul>

Agenda Item	Minutes and Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building a new substation closer to Lake Borumba</li> <li>• Opportunities around the co-location of corridors</li> <li>• Avoidance of communities and private properties</li> <li>• Minimising impacts to flood areas</li> <li>• Overall opposition to project and proposed corridors</li> </ul> <p>Vegetation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vegetation clearing and acquisition of offsets</li> <li>• Impacts to remnant vegetation and management</li> </ul> <p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental impacts including biosecurity and conservation management</li> <li>• Compliance with environmental legislation</li> </ul>
2.3	<p>Question and answer from participants</p> <hr/> <p>No questions from participants</p>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Borumba Pumped Hydro Project – transmission line connection multi-criteria analysis</b>
3.1	<p>NT spoke to the multi-criteria analysis (factors applied to compare corridor options). NT noted that the preference would be to avoid impacts; however, where impacts are required Powerlink will manage, minimise or mitigate these impacts. Criteria are applied across social (considering the use of land and the community livelihood within and adjacent to corridor options), environment (considering a balanced approach to corridor selection with the least practicable impact on environment and heritage values) and economic (considering construction and operational factors such as cost be considered at a preliminary level, given the scale of project).</p> <p>Social criteria applied are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agricultural land</li> <li>• Residential homes</li> <li>• Use of State-owned land</li> <li>• Number of properties</li> <li>• Intensive use</li> </ul> <p>Social analysis rationales are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback received through community consultation</li> <li>• Analysis derived from spatial data sets</li> <li>• Understanding land which provide livelihoods for local communities including agriculture, grazing, cropping, intensive land uses, biosecurity matters, tourism, recreational and property usage etc.</li> <li>• Consideration for size of land required, lifestyle and visual impacts, farming or other business operations, potential utilisation of state-owned land within investigation area and corridors</li> <li>• Proximity to homes</li> </ul> <p>Environmental criteria applied are:</p>

Agenda Item	Minutes and Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Endangered species</li> <li>• Areas of concern</li> <li>• Areas of least concern</li> <li>• Essential habitat</li> <li>• National parks, conservation areas and nature refuges</li> </ul> <p>Environmental analysis rationales include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental criteria under the <i>Vegetation Management Act 1994</i></li> <li>• Essential habitat values and preference to minimise impacts to protected areas managed under the <i>Nature Conservation Act 1992</i></li> <li>• Cultural heritage and Native Title under the <i>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003</i> and <i>Native Title Act 1993</i></li> <li>• State and local heritage sites</li> <li>• Uphold general biosecurity obligation under the <i>Biosecurity Act 2014</i></li> <li>• Multiple uses of National parks including recreation</li> </ul> <p>Economic criteria applied are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corridor option length</li> <li>• Minimise land with a 30% slope or greater. CL noted that range crossings for trucks are 10% - 15%. 30% gradient would have an impact on access tracks.</li> <li>• Co-location with existing lines.</li> </ul> <p>Economic analysis rationales include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constructability including length of corridors considering terrain and technical construction method and overall costs implications to project</li> <li>• Further considerations including topography and contours, soil types and landslide potential, areas of flood inundation of land, crossing of water courses, rail lines, roads and crossing existing infrastructure</li> <li>• Co-location opportunities (putting services together)</li> </ul> <p>NT noted that the following further technical considerations criteria are also being investigated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor ground conditions</li> <li>• Unexploded ordnances (UXO)</li> <li>• Power supply resilience</li> </ul> <p>Technical considerations analysis rationales include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor ground conditions can have significant impacts to project cost and constructability</li> <li>• High-level mapping and geotechnical investigations will confirm ground conditions, potential impacts and mitigation measures</li> <li>• Consider proximity to land used land by Australian Defence Force, potential risk of UXO</li> <li>• Specialist advice to be sought including risk assessment and management plan</li> <li>• Consider the exposure of the corridor to natural or other disasters, with the aim of ensuring resilience of power supply</li> </ul>

Agenda Item	Minutes and Actions
3.2	Question and answer from participants
	<p>JC – Have you seen there is a difference between what people perceive as State land and what the Act states is State owned land?</p> <p>NT – Yes there has been a difference between what people perceive as State land and what the <i>Land Act 1994</i> identifies as State land.</p> <p>AB – Does Powerlink have an outline map already of the direction that the transmission lines may go?</p> <p>GR – at the moment we have the corridor options map.</p> <p>MK – I am a mountain biker and there has been a lot of effort to work with forestry to develop mountain bike trails and a lot of people aren't aware of this.</p> <p>NG – the corridor options are currently 4 km wide and the draft Corridor Selection Report will bring this down to one corridor approximately 1 km wide to Tarong/Halys and to Woolooga substations.</p> <p>Recreational uses, like mountain biking, has been identified as a use to consider during corridor selection. The analysis/rationale uses a lot of layers that include things like mountain bike tracks.</p> <p>MK – is there anything in the analysis from a jobs/maintenance perspective?</p> <p>GR – Powerlink considers that at an operational level. However, this is an important part of the process and we are very keen for feedback on the criteria. Powerlink is looking for stakeholder input and thoughts on what might be missing.</p> <p>JC – is aesthetics an issue raised or is there perceived health concerns that people have raised in relation to property land values?</p> <p>GR – have definitely picked up stakeholder concerns in relation to health as part of social. Stakeholder have raised concerns in relation to EMF.</p> <p>KOB – several layers of comment include 'I live here because of...' it is important to understand the experience that people have and that siting of infrastructure can potentially lower amenity.</p> <p>AB –the valuation concern depends on what property that the transmission line is going through. For example, if going through a grazing vs irrigation paddock. In the multi criteria analysis there is fairly wide coverage in the criteria, but where does compensation fit in? Compensation is far more relevant now than what is was.</p> <p>NT – compensation does not necessarily come into the corridor selection. Come into consideration once the corridor is selected.</p> <p>Powerlink is reviewing our compensation and Powerlink can share this information with stakeholders once the review is complete.</p> <p>DB – as part of the review Powerlink is looking to what other states are doing and reviewing this in the Queensland context. Powerlink is looking at equity and taking learnings from other states and their schemes.</p>

Agenda Item	Minutes and Actions
	<p>GR – Powerlink is aware that community expectations in relation to compensation have changed over the years.</p> <p>JC – will the revised compensation arrangements be retrospective? Or just apply to new projects?</p> <p>DB – the policy will not be retrospective but will apply to this project.</p> <p>JC – wind farms have been divisive in some communities – resulted in those that have and those that have not situation.</p> <p>NT – Powerlink is aware of these situations. The approach to easement acquisition has changed over the years and Powerlink’s preferred approach is for acquisition through negotiation.</p> <p>AB noted that there is talk in the community to not talk to Powerlink unless you have a lawyer with you.</p> <p>GL – important that people have had the opportunity to be involved. There are people in our area that are interested in where the narrowed down corridor is. It is something that is going to have to happen and it’s about trying to come up with the best outcome for everyone. We keep looking at things like pumped hydro and there are a lot of things you have to go through and there will be environmental issues.</p> <p>NT – the potential future use of land, both private and State land, is considered as part of the analysis.</p> <p>There is another process that will need to be gone through for the environmental approvals. Powerlink is yet to start that process.</p> <p>AB – from the landholders perspective, can’t see why you would put it through freehold land when there is area across national park. Landholders will not have much sympathy. Why would they consider reducing the value of their land and have restrictions on their land. Some of the comment is to government as a whole, not just Powerlink.</p> <p>GL – have had many people say it would be better if it went through State forest. The transmission line might be one way that weeds get managed in State forest.</p> <p>NT – Powerlink has had conversations with government and landholders to understand why the transmission can or cannot go through areas of land.</p>
3.3	<p>Future milestones</p> <p>NM outlined the following next steps:</p> <p>27 April 2023:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Release of draft Corridor Selection Report identifying the recommended corridors (one north to Woolooga Substation and one west to Halys/Tarong Substation) – each recommended corridor around 1 km wide.</li> <li>• Comprehensive engagement process to gather input on the recommended corridors and wider report. Powerlink will endeavour to contact all landholders in the recommended corridors before the document’s public release (phone call then letter).</li> </ul>



Agenda Item	Minutes and Actions
	<p>In mid-2023:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final Corridor Selection Report will be released which will identify a ‘study corridor’. Then Powerlink will work with landholders, and seek input from the community and other stakeholders, to identify a 70 m easement within each study corridor (north to Woolooga Substation and west to Tarong/Halys substations).</li> </ul> <p>In mid-2024:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following comprehensive environmental and technical assessments, and ongoing engagement with landholders, the community and other stakeholders, Powerlink will release the environmental assessment report (EAR) for public review and comment. The EAR will identify a preferred alignment for the transmission line.</li> <li>• Powerlink will also progress other project approvals as required, including Federal environmental approvals under the EPBC Act. GR noted that this process can be quite long.</li> </ul> <p>In 2025:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After around two years of finalising project approvals, transmission line construction is expected to commence.</li> </ul> <p>In 2029:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transmission lines are expected to be operational, enabling the pumped hydro site to connect into the electricity grid, providing energy up to Central Queensland, out to Western Queensland and down to Southeast Queensland.</li> </ul>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Current projects underway and proposed in the local area</b>
4.1	<p>GR outlined the following as current and future projects in the local area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wambo Wind Farm Connection – first stage is 42 turbines for 252 MW, second stage is a further 300 MW. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Powerlink connection project involves 47 km of 275 kV transmission line to a new substation at the wind farm to the Halys substation.</li> <li>○ Intention is to use the existing 132 kV Tarong to Chinchilla transmission line corridor for the majority of the alignment.</li> <li>○ A Ministerial Infrastructure Designation Proposal is with the Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning</li> <li>○ Powerlink concurrently running a public consultation process on the proposal. Submissions are due to the Minister on 29 March 2023.</li> <li>○ JC noted that construction contractors are currently scaling up for stage 1. Joint venture partners are also progressing stage 2 and community consultation is underway.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Meandu Mine Transmission Line Relocation Project – involves relocating a short section of the existing Tarong to Middle Ridge transmission line. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Environmental Assessment Report is due to be released in the next month or two.</li> <li>○ Powerlink can let the SRG know when the report is out.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Agenda Item	Minutes and Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queensland Hydro overview of activities include:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Progressing approvals for exploratory works at the State and Commonwealth levels.</li> <li>○ Submission of the Detailed Analytical Report to the State government on 31 March 2023.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
4.2	<p>Question and answer from participants</p> <p>AB – in relation to Wambo Wind Farm Connection, when you upgrade a line like that, do you have to revisit the easement width?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">NT – Yes, the easement will need to extend by 10 m – from 50 m to 60 m</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The upgrade will involve taking down the existing, putting in new infrastructure.</p> <p>AB – at the first SRG meeting there was talk that if the Borumba Pumped Hydro Project’s transmission was 500 kV it would go to Halys and Tarong if 275 kV. Has a decision been made on that?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">GR – Not yet.</p> <p>JC – in relation to the Meandu Mine Transmission Line Relocation Project, is it wholly with the State forest?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Through collaboration with Stanwell and government agencies the relocation of the transmission line is partly on Stanwell lands (1.2 km) and through State forest (3.4 km)</p>
<p><b>Meeting closed.</b></p> <p><b>Next meeting potentially 24 or 26 April.</b></p>	