

Online community webinar summary

Snapshot

Date: 13 August 2025

Venue: Online, Microsoft Teams

Number of people registered: 18

Number of people attended: 12

These notes should be read in conjunction with the presentation provided.

If something can be immediately addressed, we have put in a [Please note] after the question.

Overall takeaway

The current regulatory proposals are welcome and follow community submissions, requests and concerns about the process of an Authority to Survey (ATS) and acquisition expressed over several years.

A high level of community interest in the Guideline processes was expressed, and how the Authority to Survey and Compulsory Acquisition processes may be affected by the draft Guidelines.

Regulations	What we heard
Gas Supply (Safety and Network Management) Amendment Regulation 2025	N/A
Pipelines Amendment (Miscellaneous) Regulation 2025	• Issues with understanding a pipeline proponent's intention regarding future possible pipeline abandonment, and the issues surrounding any intention to leave a pipeline in situ after its end of life. • The Department encouraged participants to inform them of examples of abandonment, and the issues this raises. • Request to define further 'notifiable excavation work' as per 23D <i>Pipelines Amendment (Miscellaneous) Regulation 2025</i>.

Draft Guideline	What we heard
Authority to Survey for Pipelines – Draft Guideline	• Clarification was sought regarding how often an ATS can be re-issued over a single piece of land, and if this is indefinite. If so, the attendee questioned if that is a reasonable course of action and fair for the landowner. • For example, a participant had an ATS renewed on their land and wasn't consulted for the second reissue and felt this was unreasonable. • Question regarding what are the landowner's obligations for 'moving out of the way' when the proponent comes to survey their land. • Question whether the landowner is meant to 'police' the ATS clauses during the survey activity. • Issue raised that currently proponents won't pay for a landowner's legal advice unless they sign up for an access agreement. • Issue that the legal fees agreed by a pipeline proponent for a survey agreement is a fixed fee and does not consider land size. • Issue that the draft Guideline does not address the issue of legal advice the landowner must seek to evaluate an ATS or the proposal for an ATS. • Issue regarding the potential for a pipeline proponent to be granted a longer extension on an ATS than the requested timeframe they applied for. • Questioning over whether the new Guideline will apply retrospectively to previous ATSs.

Draft Guideline	What we heard
Compulsory Acquisition for Pipelines - Draft Guideline	• The issue of the current use of Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs) by pipeline proponents is affecting the community; in some cases it potentially disallows the landowner to talk to the Department. It was requested that this issue be considered in the Guidelines. • Further clarification was sought on the issue of legal fees and other reasonable costs for: ○ the time delay in reimbursement to the landowner given some acquisition processes could take years ○ if the pipeline proposal is abandoned, how these costs are reimbursed. • Clarification was sought whether the six months of negotiation can only start once the proponent answers a question previously asked by the landowner. • Requested that a timeline (from the landowners' perspective) showing how the processes occur would be useful. • Criticism regarding landowners not being able to receive compensation until after their land is acquired by the licensee. • Criticism that it is not clear in the Guideline whether a survey must be undertaken before the compulsory acquisition process is initiated. • Questioning whether compulsory acquisition is for the land or only an easement.

Other issues

- Criticisms that a pipeline proponent is currently not communicating with landowners in a manner consistent with the draft Guidelines. For example, a proponent communicating with the landowner when they want something from them, such as negotiation for an ATS.
- Ambiguities around whether a property will have a proposed pipeline makes it difficult for people to know what to say when they are selling a property.
- Request for environmental impact studies from 15 years ago to be redone on a property – with new impacts found. [**Please note:** This issue would be considered by the NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure]
- Request for the Department to consider aligning a pipeline payment scheme with the electricity transmission strategic benefits payments scheme.

- Clarification was sought whether a landowner should write to the Department each time they are unhappy with the way a pipeline proponent behaves toward them – what is the complaints handling process?
- Question whether SEC Newgate has worked for energy companies like Santos and their credentials.
- Request that there be compensation for landowners for their time spent engaging with pipeline proponents and the NSW Government on proposal consultations.
- Questions on why the current NSW Government has not revised the 'Future of Gas Statement' released by the previous Government.
- Issue that landowners cannot insure their properties, equipment or people if they host gas infrastructure.

Next steps

The Department will provide presentation decks and meeting note summaries online and to participants who provided contact details.

Community members and landholders at these forums provided valuable feedback which is currently being considered by the Department. The Department wishes to thank all of the participants at the community forums for their time and insights.