INLAND ARTC

Meeting title III

e Illabo to Stockinbingal (I2S) Community Consultative Committee meeting 1

Attendees

Allenuees	
Garry West, Independent Chair	Grant Johnson (Junee Shire Council)
Rod Chalmers (Community Member)	Cr Pamela Halliburton (Junee Shire Council)
David Carr (Community Member)	Grace Foulds (Cootamundra-Gundagai Regional Council)
Tony Nichols (Community Member)	Mark Ellis (Cootamundra-Gundagai Regional Council)
James Coleborne (Community Member)	David Carter (NSW Farmers)
Geoffrey Larsen (Community Member)	
Annie Jacobs (Landcare)	
Cameron Simpkins, Project Manager (ARTC)	Justin Woodhouse (NSW Department of Planning & Environment)
Helena Orel, NSW Stakeholder Manager (ARTC)	Mick Fallon (NSW Department of Planning & Environment)
Daniel Lumby, Project Environmental Advisor (ARTC)	

Apologies Martin Honner (NSW Farmers)

Location	Cootamundra Library, Cootamundra	Date & time	28 February 2019 @ 1pm

Торіс	Discussion
1. Welcome	 The Chair welcomed all to the inaugural meeting. The Chair introduced Justin Woodhouse and Mick Fallon from NSW Department of Planning & Environment (DPE)
2. Conflicts of interest	 Garry West – pecuniary interest as the ARTC reimburse expenses and provide and pay a meeting fee. David Carr – non-pecuniary interest. Property located within study area. Geoff Larsen – non-pecuniary interest. Property located within study area.
3. Introductions	All members introduced themselves and provided a brief biography and their interest in the Inland Rail project
4. Presentation (Department of Planning & Environment)	 Justin Woodhouse provided a presentation (see the Inland Rail website, I2S page) in respect to the planning process for State Significant Infrastructure (SSI) and the role of the Community Consultative Committees (CCCs) The proposal will be assessed under Division 5.2 of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act and the regulations and the NSW Minister for Planning will be the determining authority. The Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) were issued in September 2018 which set out the technical framework for the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). It was recommended that the CCC members should become familiar with the SEARs. Once the EIS is lodged with the Department it will be on public exhibition for a minimum of 28 days. Formal submissions by the public in response to the EIS are sent to the department for consideration when assessing the project. Advised the names and contact details for the relevant Departmental personal if members need to contact them regarding the project.



	Matters raised by the CCC will be taken very seriously.
5. Community Consultative Committee (CCC) Functions	 Garry West provided a summary of the key aspects of the CCC Guideline and reinforced the role committee members have in community interaction with the proponent. The CCC is not a decision-making body but committee members have a vital role ir providing input. The meetings will be held quarterly and rotated to various communities. Mr West explained he will circulate draft minutes to members around 7 days after the meeting for members to clarify any matters they believe are not recorded accurately and a final copy will be sent to members a week after that for members to use as part of their community/stakeholder consultation process. These final minutes and a copy of presentations made at the meeting will also be uploaded to the I2S page on the ARTC website. Mr West noted that the Guideline provides for observers to attend meetings and suggested requests be directed to him so he could manage numbers. The committee was reminded that the meetings are not public meetings. Mr West noted that he already had requests for observers to attend the meeting.
6. Proponent's report	Cameron Simpkins, Daniel Lumby and Helena Orel from ARTC presented the Proponent's Report (see the Inland Rail website, I2S page)
	 Cameron Simpkins commenced with an overview of the inland Rail project which is developing a freight spine aiming for the first train to run in 2025 Project is currently in Feasibility Phase (Phase 2) which includes community consultation, site investigations, feasibility design and environmental impact assessment In March 2018, ARTC awarded the Phase 2 contract to IRDJV (WSP-Mott McDonald Joint Venture) Building the with a capacity of 20 trains per day. However, it will be the line's operators and not ARTC who will dictate utilisation. The Illabo to Stockinbingal section is a 37km greenfield project The study area is currently 2km wide and this will be reduced to 250m which is known as the Focused Area Investigation (FAI). It is hoped to present this at the next CCC meeting. The process is designed to refine the route and minimise the impact on many landowners. Design process is due to finish in July 2019. The FAI is refined using a Multi-Criteria Analysis, which considers a range of factors including: Technical Viability, Safety Assessment, Constructability & Schedule, Environmental Impacts, Community & Property Impacts, Operational Approach and Approvals & Stakeholder Engagement. Feasibility field investigations are undertaken to inform the MCA process and furthe refine the design. Tony Nichols asked when will the presentation be available for community discussions? Helena Orel indicated it normally goes on the website about the same time the minutes are available. Grace Foulds sought an indication of the impact on Stockinbingal? Cameron Simpkins advised he was not able to provide the definitive answer but it is being designed to provide for a safer environment.



ARTC

are building the line for the capability of intermodals being constructed.

- David Carter sought advice on the design with regard to property impacts? Cameron Simpkins advised he is not in a position to provide the definitive answer yet but reinforced they are trying to minimise property impacts where possible.
- Rod Chalmers. When do you expect to move to Phase 3? Cameron Simpkins. Need EIS approvals from DPE and purchase the land and hoping to move to Phase 3, which is the construction phase, somewhere between January 2021 and January 2022.
- David Carr. When you finally acquire the properties is it your intention to peg out the route so people can actually see it? Cameron Simpkins. We first get to the FAI and then the final rail corridor will be further defined to be 40 to 60 metres. Can walk the route and hope to show it on the map planned to be presented at the next meeting.
- Justin Woodhouse (DPE). Is the EIS that will be submitted for approval be the 40 to 60 m route? Cameron Simpkins. Yes, but in addition it will include the construction corridor so it may be up to 250 m in some parts.
- Annie Jacobs. Sought clarification on the width of the corridor. Cameron Simpkins, confirmed in some areas there will be an access road in addition, which will also be accessible by RFS for movement of emergency vehicles.
- In some places where acquisitions are made there will be small parcels of land left as islands. The project team has discussed has discussed the possibility of utilising these areas for biodiversity offsets. Pam Halliburton queried whether any of these islands could attract a building permit? Cameron Simpkins does not expect that to be the case.
- Annie Jacobs queried the width of the buffer zone. Cameron Simpkins. 10 metres of rail track and 10 metres of access road beside. Annie Jacobs. Can this area beside the tracks be vegetated? Cameron Simpkins. Yes, but need to consider impacts of landscaping with the operational aspects of the rail corridor. This includes the height and placement of vegetation within the corridor. Hopefully, any plantings in the rail corridor will be indigenous species. There will be no restriction for landholders to plant trees on their side of the corridor David Carter observed it is important that this corridor also be kept clean from noxious weeds and pests.
- Annie Jacobs. Is there an opportunity for carbon offsetting within the local district? Daniel Lumby. Biodiversity offsetting will form part of the planning approval and ARTC are currently investigating potential offset sites. ARTC is particularly interested in holding discussions with local landholders located in the proposed alignment and investigating other opportunities in the surrounding district.
- Mick Fallon clarified there is a difference between carbon offsets and biodiversity offsets. Carbon offsets are not a matter within the jurisdiction of the NSW department.
- Geoff Larsen sought clarification of the train numbers. Is it 20 trains per day or 20 trains each way per day. Cameron Simpkins advised their planning number is 20 trains per day but it will be up to the operators as to whether that number is realised. Geoff Larsen also sought clarification on provision of a layby in this section of the track? Cameron Simpkins confirmed there will only be one crossing loop in this section.
- David Carr. When will we be in the land acquisition phase? Cameron Simpkins. We have commenced already. Conversations have commenced with some property owners. David Carr. What is the process? Cameron Simpkins Explained there will be agreement in some cases but in others the acquisition will be conducted in



accordance with the Land Acquisition (Just Terms) Act 1991. David Carr. How many property owners are going to be affected? Cameron Simpkins. There are 15 in this section. David Carr. Is there the equivalent of an arbiter or an ombudsman for this process? Cameron Simpkins. The legislation is the process, which allows for both parties to have valuations at the ARTC expense, that is used for negotiation. The rail corridor will ultimately be owned by the TfNSW but negotiations will be undertaken by ARTC.

- Geoff Larsen. At least one landowner has refused access to his land will that impact on the overall plan. Cameron Simpkins. No, we have been able to make assumptions of the impacts.
- David Carr. Is the project fully funded for all stages? Cameron Simpkins. Yes, and both sides of the Parliament have indicated support for the project proceeding. David Carter. NSW Farmers are supportive in principle but has some concerns and would prefer a fuller inquiry. Cameron Simpkins noted that input from discussions with NSW Farmers had resulted in bridge heights being raised in the design so as to allow farm machinery to be moved under them.

Daniel Lumby provided an update on the EIS

- Daniel provided a progress update on the EIS including detail around the proposal being undertaken in accordance with the SEARs. The proposal has been declared a controlled action under the Commonwealth Environmental Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act)
- The SEARs are developed by DPE with input from a range of government agencies
- The EIS submission to DPE for adequacy review will likely be in Quarter 1 2020 and public exhibition will follow.
- Assessment methodologies were explained including ARTC commitment to undertake direct consultation with DPE and other regulators for higher risk issues (i.e. flooding)
- Annie Jacobs. Do you assess the impact of the built line on water flow? Daniel Lumby. Yes. Baseline flood and hydrology assessment is underway and this will provide the basis of design to mitigate impacts of water flows.
- Continuing field based surveys to inform the EIS assessments include winter bird surveys, threatened flora, groundwater monitoring and noise & vibration. A second round of cultural heritage surveys are also scheduled with further consultation of Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs) being undertaken,
- Social assessment requires input from various other investigations as well as feedback received from community consultation events. Cameron Simpkins explained that the ARTC has a social licence under which to operate and that includes buying local where possible.
- ARTC engaged an agronomist very early in the EIS investigation to conduct first hand conservations with landholders to gain an understanding of the current agricultural operations and assess agricultural land use impacts. The information gathered will feed in the design (i.e. sizing of underpasses, location of level crossings) and address SEARs requirements.
- Annie Jacobs asked will there be a fund, similar to wind farms, set up by ARTC to support community based projects like Landcare for instance? Cameron Simpkins. That is outside the scope of the project. Helena Orel advised she will take that question back to her team for investigation.
- Annie Jacobs. Is there an opportunity to help support landholders to adapt to a new way of operating their farm? Cameron Simpkins. We are trying to leave farms as

	 ongoing concerns and operational. ARTC is proposing to take landholders on an excursion to see how farms operate with the rail line in place. <i>Helena Orel provided a stakeholder engagement and consultation update</i> Provided a timeline of the consultation process Detailed communication is continuing through Council briefings, rail and road network operators, community 'drop in' sessions, elected representatives, special interest groups, local aboriginal groups as well as the CCC. Detailed the ARTC social performance outcomes which includes workforce management, local and indigenous industry participation, housing & accommodation, health & community wellbeing, community and stakeholder engagement. Cameron Simpkins explained that they expect worker numbers to be 1,000 over the 2-year construction period with an expected peak of 300 for 6 to 9 months.
	 James Coleborne. Do you work in a linear fashion or work everywhere at once? Helena Orel. In other sections of the Inland Rail Project they are working on multiple sites at once and we expect something similar in the Illabo to Stockinbingal section.
7. Actions required	 Next meeting ARTC to present on the land acquisition process Chair to provide members with link to the DPE SEARs Helena Orel to investigate how or if a community fund could or is likely to operate
8. Other agenda items	 James Coleborne sought information on speed of trains and breaking systems. Cameron Simpkins advised electronic brakes are the current technology. Current freight trains run at 95kph and the speed for the Inland Rail has been gazetted as 115kph and went on to advise the curve at Stockinbingal will be eliminated and the resulting curve will be known as a 350 curve which will eliminate wheel squeal. David Carr sought advice on how communications will work with stakeholders. Chair indicated the minutes are the primary source and any questions that may flow should be directed back to him and he will refer them to the ARTC for response and action. Cameron Simpkins indicated there will be further communications directly with impacted communities. Rod Chalmers observed that he felt the meeting demonstrated that the CCC is not just a 'box ticking' exercise. Geoff Larsen indicated that it is a pity the CCC was not is place earlier as many of the early visits from consultants were regarded as a waste of time. Geoff then stated that the consultation over the last 12 months from Heath Martin has been excellent.
9. 10. Meeting minutes approved	Next meeting: Thursday 30 May 2019 at Stockinbingal. Meeting closed 3.50pm. The Chair thanked all for their attendance. Garry West Independent Chair 15 March 2019 West