

Meeting title	Inner Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee: Meeting 4		
Attendees:			
Ken Murphy (KM)	Acting Chair		
Lance McManus (LM)	Toowoomba and Surat Basin Enterprise		
Larry Pappin (LP)	Inner Downs Inland Rail Action Group		
Paul Hanlon (PH)	Individual		
Jennifer Schmidt (JS)	Individual		
John Cameron (JCa)	Darling Downs Cotton Growers and Cotton Australia		
Rob Loch (RL)	Pittsworth District Landcare Association		
Jason Chavasse (JCh)	Gowrie Junction Progress Association		
Kylie Schultz (KS)	Individual		
David Taylor (DT)	Individual		
Chris Joseph (CJ)	Individual		
Mercedes Staff (MS)	ARTC Manager Stakeholder Engagement – Queensland		
Rob Smith (RS)	ARTC Project Manager – Border to Gowrie		
Fiona Kennedy (FK)	ARTC Environment Advisor – Border to Gowrie		
Jon Roberts (JR)	ARTC Design Manager - Border to Gowrie		
Willow Hart (WH)	ARTC Engagement Lead - Border to Gowrie (Inner)		
Naomi Tonscheck (NT)	ARTC Engagement Advisor – Border to Gowrie (Inner)		
Peter Brown (PB)	ARTC Queensland Property Manager		
Amanda Reed (AR)	ARTC Queensland Property Manager		
Helen Williams (HW)	ARTC Social Performance Advisor		
Apologies:			
Adrian Beattie	Western Wakka Wakka		
Joy Mingay (JM)	Toowoomba Chamber of Commerce		
Ian Jones (IJ)	Darling Downs Shire Steering Committee		
Geoff Penton (GP)	Queensland Murray-Darling Committee		
Location	Kingsthorpe and District War Memorial Hall, Kingsthorpe	Secretariat	Willow Hart
Date	8 November 2018	Time	6:00 – 8.30pm

1. Welcome (Ken Murphy)	<p>KM: Welcomed members and observers</p> <p>RL: requested to extend meeting by half an hour</p> <p>Committee and ARTC: agreed</p> <p>KM: reminded everyone on the Committee that the Committee is a consultative Committee and if members have something to say, to keep it respectful.</p> <p>KM: asked if the minutes were correct</p> <p>Committee: agreed</p>
--------------------------------	---

<p>2. Update conflicts of interest register</p>	<p>No additions or changes to the register.</p>
<p>3. Actions arising from last meeting</p>	<p>Actions from previous meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ARTC to provide a written response to CCC within 2 days about the identification on vehicles – completed <p>RL and LP: both reported seeing unbranded vehicles in the last month</p> <p>WH: Informed that all contractors and ARTC staff have been told to brand vehicles. Where contractors do not have their own branding, ARTC supplies branded magnets. The direction to ensure all vehicles are branded has been included in inductions.</p> <p>WH: requested members and their communities contact ARTC with locations and times to be able to follow up on any unbranded vehicles.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. ARTC to circulate information about weed management policy and more information about washdown facilities <p>FK: ARTC is currently developing a weed fact sheet and will distribute it to the CCC before the end of the year.</p> <p>RL: Do contractors have a different weed management policy to ARTC? If so, does ARTC review all contractor policies and documents to assess whether or not they are consistent with ARTC’s policies?</p> <p>FK: Yes; contractors have their own environmental management plans and as part of those plans, ARTC reviews and documents these plans.</p> <p>LP: Requested in more information about Clean Weed records.</p> <p>FK: Contractors are required to keep Clean Weed records in their vehicles. Landowners are able to request to see these at any time.</p> <p>ACTION: ARTC to find out if it is possible to provide the committee with the documented review of contractor weed policies.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. ARTC to send MCA factsheet link to the CCC – completed. 4. ARTC to include information about site restoration in notifications <p>WH: ARTC commenced including, and will continue to include, information about site restoration in the bi-monthly notification of field studies and site investigations in October 2018.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. ARTC to provide more information about sponsorship and social investment activities at the next meeting – WH and HW provided an update. See Consultation and Communication section below. 6. ARTC to understand where Graham Clapham’s comments about goodwill for stock control during construction came from and provide an update to the CCC. ARTC to provide update about managing livestock during construction – PB provided an update. See General business section below. 7. JCh to provide more information about what they would like included in the field trip – ongoing 8. RL to email copy of suggested CCC Chair guidelines to the committee – completed

	<p>RL: requested the committee vote on the Chair roles and responsibilities</p> <p>KM: reminded the Committee that in accordance with when the original calls that went out for the nominations for the Committee, it was also talked about "the role of the Chair; and the Chair is appointed and managed by ARTC". That was part of the original application process, that any Committee member, before they applied for the role, that was all part of it. So, we need to be very careful about trying to change what is already in place in accordance to what we have originally signed up for in the first place.</p> <p>MS: recommended placing on the agenda when the new chair was appointed</p> <p>ACTION: add Chair's roles and responsibilities to next meetings agenda</p> <p>9. ARTC to commence process to appoint a new chair</p> <p>WH: Nominations are with independent reviewer</p> <p>Ongoing actions</p> <p>Members to provide advice to ARTC about how best to communicate with your community</p> <p>ARTC to notify about field works two weeks prior to commencement</p> <p>ARTC to provide project update prior to meeting</p> <p>CCC members encouraged to inform their communities to call ARTC if they have concerns about contractors</p> <p><i>New discussion and actions</i></p> <p>LP: Requested the IDDCCC engage with an engineering firm to review the engineering in the IDD.</p> <p>KM: asked did LP mean hydraulic? Structural?</p> <p>LP: would like an engineering firm to cover a number of aspects – geotechnical, alignment design and so on</p> <p>RS: If the Committee would like to get together a scope of works and provide a proposal/estimate to ARTC, ARTC will review and consider the request for potentially financing the review. So each application is reviewed on its merits and has to be approved by the CEO.</p> <p>ACTION: Add to next meeting's agenda - Independent review for the IDD</p> <p>JS: Asked what ARTC had done in response to the article she shared at the previous meeting and why it wasn't in the minutes as an attachment.</p> <p>WH: Distributed copies of the article and ARTC's response to the committee members. ARTC reached out to the author of the letter to find out more about the authors clients and their individual circumstance. The author did not provide any information.</p>
<p>10. Project update (B2G project team: Rob Smith)</p>	<p>NSW/QLD Border to Gowrie (B2G) project – RS</p> <p><i>Note: also refer to project update</i></p>

Focused area of investigation.

The focused area of investigation is within the two-kilometre wide study area. It does vary in width along the entire alignment, depending on the level of certainty we have in that particular section.

Wellcamp area

- Needs to tie-in with SQ InterLink’s facility
- No crossing across Gowrie Creek
- On the edge of the 2km study area and away from the Gowrie Mountain community
- Investigating using structures near Gowrie Creek to try to minimise impacts to landowners and so they can maintain access to water
- Crosses the Warrego Highway at adjacent angle with rail over road
- Crosses Toowoomba Cecil Plains Road and Brimblecombe Road rail over road. Approximately 7.1m between road level and underside of bridge structure
- North side of the study area near Wellcamp airport to provide safe clearance distances from the airport
- Geotechnical and hydrological constraints in the area including Gowrie Creek
- Least amount of level crossings
- Avoids Powerlink Pylons

Southbrook

- Follows existing transportation corridor
- Avoids the town of Southbrook
- Avoids complex construction issues being directly off the Gore Highway
- Reduction in earthworks volumes; better cut fill balance
- Alignment to the rear of property boundaries

Southbrook to Pittsworth

- Follows existing transportation corridor
- Avoids the township of Pittsworth to the east side of the Gore Highway
- Lessens the number of overland flow crossings
- Less properties within 200m
- Reduces construction complexity being adjacent to the Gore Highway
- No grade separate interchange required on the Gore Highway back to the west side

Pittsworth to Yarrenlea

- Existing QR track alignment not compliant and suitable for Inland Rail
- No grade separate intersection required on the Gore Highway to cross to the East
- Suitable cut material to balance deficit in the Gowrie area
- Suitable horizontal and vertical rail alignment
- Limited impact on existing Development Applications

Yarrenlea to Brookstead

- Existing QR Corridor
- Possible link to sidings at Yarranlea

	<p>Condamine (as per presentation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARTC had an early deliverable to identify potential solutions for the crossing of the Condamine floodplain and report back to key stakeholders. • The Condamine floodplain is approximately 12.5 kilometres wide at the Inland Rail crossing location and the alignment lies within the existing Queensland Rail Millmerran Branch rail corridor. The alignment is being designed to 1% AEP (1 in 100 year) flood immunity requiring the rail height to be raised in places. • Significant work has been undertaken to develop the flood model and preliminary crossing design in consultation with landowners and other key stakeholders. • This preliminary design identifies that in a 1% AEP (1 in 100 year) event, there would be 33 private landowners who would experience changed flood behaviour. This includes 10 landowners that would experience increased flooding at houses or sheds that already experience a degree of flooding at ground level. ARTC has had individual meetings with 32 landowners to discuss the flood modelling results and preliminary crossing solution • ARTC will now be seeking further consultation with landowners to identify, understand and mitigate impacts that have been identified and to continue validation of the model. Mitigations may include raising houses, building levee structures and further design development of the crossing solution. This is to ensure that there is no unacceptable worsening/adverse impact to external properties. • The design is preliminary and will continue to be refined through the process of further stakeholder consultation, mitigation of impacts and ongoing design work. • ARTC has developed a baseline flood model of the Condamine floodplain catchment area in TUFLOW and URBS software using data from many different sources. • Updated hydrology to Australian Rainfall and Runoff (ARR) Guidelines 2016. • The new model now includes additional inflows and a larger boundary compared to Phase 1 works. • ARTC surveyed 29 historic private and public flood level markers and spoke to landowners about their experiences to validate the flood model. • The model has been calibrated against the 1991 and 2010 flood events. The model will be calibrated against other events to provide further confidence. • Numerous design options were analysed including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1 concept design – three bridges (1.8 kilometres of openings) crossing the three main channels supplemented by embankment with culverts • full viaduct with limited embankment and culverts.

- Potential options investigated considered:
 - changes in flood extent
 - positive and negative changes in water level (or afflux)
 - changes flow velocities, flow direction, flood durations or frequency of inundation
 - blockage caused by debris mobilisation
 - risk of scour and erosion.
 - Current preliminary design controls include oversized bridges across main debris transportation paths, majority of culverts are 2.1m, minimum culvert size of 900mm, 25% blockage allowed for in current preliminary design.
 - Further design considerations include grouping of culverts, and scour and erosion control.
- Next steps:
 - Further validation of the flood model
 - Gather key stakeholder and community feedback on the preliminary design. ARTC will consider this feedback in developing the preferred crossing solution
 - Design road and private crossings (in consultation with landowners and key stakeholders), assess resulting flood impacts and design mitigation measures as required
 - Design scour protection, erosion control and fencing
 - Work with impacted landowners to design mitigation measures at affected buildings
 - Present the preferred solution to key stakeholders and the community.

Questions and discussion

DT: asked about flooding at Gowrie Creek if built to the north side and asked for CJ's opinion

RS: if built on the north side the pylons will disrupt the flow of the flood waters and create flood issues

CJ: said he would need to see more exact information however it could possibly cause flooding

LP: how will noise be mitigated when the rail is high up. Eg. Brimblecombe Road.

RS: We are currently modelling existing noise. Then we will simulate the train running past to understand the amount of noise that may be generated. From there, we look at noise mitigation options if they are required.

RL and LP: asked about waterflow paths at Athol and what structures were proposed

	<p>ACTION: MB to attend next CCC meeting to provide an update about waterflow paths at Dry Creek and Westbrook Creek and what structures are proposed</p> <p>LP: asked about types of fencing to be used for the rail corridor and how it will be maintained</p> <p>RS: we will consult with landowners about the types of fence and ARTC will be obliged to maintain any fences that we put along the track corridor.</p> <p>JR: ARTC are currently preparing a fencing strategy and each parcel of land and the usage of land will be looked at individually</p> <p>KM: recommend action CCC supply a list of questions to ARTC</p> <p>JS: asked about queuing on to the Gore Highway affected by potential level crossings on local roads</p> <p>JR: we are looking at how the road and rail may interact and what types of crossing will be required. As part of this we include a stacking distance to accommodate queuing. There will be changes to local roads and we will be coming out to the community about this over the coming months.</p> <p>ACTION: provide CCC with information about road/rail interfaces and what TMR and TRC have been involved with and ask if council can attend the next meeting to provide their point of view</p> <p>RL: asked about possible use of explosives during construction?</p> <p>RS: the use of explosives has not yet been determined</p> <p>JCh: Recommend talking to Nexus about their learnings with explosives</p> <p>ACTION: ARTC to look at moving the line in Southbrook to the other side of the study area</p> <p>KS: asked about water flow, changing the way farmers capture water, compensation, what happens if severed land can't be accessed or watered?</p> <p>RS: the focused area of investigation has it does give us a much better ability to have those very specific conversations with the individual landowners. Up until now, when we were doing all the options analysis and we had the two kilometre-wide study area, it made it difficult to have those meaningful conversations because we couldn't come in and show a line and say, "What does this mean; and how do we manage that with you as an individual?"</p> <p>PB: If an area of land is not required for the corridor and can't be accessed or it's of no use to you or we can't design a solution for access for that land, or it can't be watered in any shape or form, then there is provision in the acquisition legislation that says that additional land outside of that required for the corridor, subject to being agreed between the acquiring authority and the owner, that that land can be acquired and compensation paid for that.</p> <p>JS: Requested noise monitoring to reflect seasonal noise.</p> <p>ACTION: ARTC to provide a map showing locations of noise monitors and consider additional noise monitoring</p>
--	---

<p>11. Consultation and communication – WH and HW</p>	<p>Ongoing discussions with landowners for the focused area of investigation.</p> <p>Information sessions are scheduled between 10 November and 21 November 2018.</p> <p>ARTC have recently sponsored the Brookstead and Kingsthorpe State Schools. You are welcome to submit suggestions for sponsorship for your community. Sponsorship requests are then assessed by ARTC.</p> <p>The community survey will be open from 12 November to 21 December 2018. The community survey is an opportunity for the community to share their views on the project.</p> <p>HW: we are looking to optimise benefits and managing social impacts for local communities. This will be done at a whole of programme level, for example an education program focused on how to behave around trains.</p> <p>Project level actions will also be developed and are based on the findings of a social impact assessment (SIA). We are currently carrying out a social impact assessment for the B2G project. There will be a number of sources used for the SIA including the community survey, interviews, workshops and information sessions. Workshops are conducted with key service providers like Health, Emergency Services, child-care services, aged care and so on.</p> <p>The purpose the social impact assessment is for us to understand the current community, what you (the community) value, where your concerns are. We then identify potential positive and negative impacts and then develop mitigations and management actions to address them.</p> <p>All information collected as part of the community surveys abides by privacy laws.</p> <p>The social impact assessment is a key component on the EIS, and the community will also that the opportunity to comment on the draft EIS.</p> <p>ACTION: update the community survey to provide more information about the project and how to answer it.</p>
<p>12. General business</p>	<p>Compensation/agistment</p> <p>PB: before we start construction, following the process of acquisition, we have to have an interface agreement in place with landowners, that details all fencing and stock on the impacted property. The agreements will be developed on a case by case basis to reflect individual circumstances. Included in the interface agreement will be any requirement for temporary fencing etc.</p> <p>KS: asked about how will compensation work for dams and water within the dam.</p> <p>PB: compensation is intended to put landowners in the same position, in a monetary sense, after acquisition as they were prior to the acquisition. Claims for compensation can include claims for changes to dams and loss of profit during construction.</p> <p>Each property will need to be assessed individually to work out impacts, what is required and compensation.</p> <p>Next meeting</p> <p>Next meeting to be held for three hours (6pm-9pm) in early 2019.</p>

<p>13. Close and confirmation of actions</p>	<p>Meeting closed at 8.30pm</p> <p>Actions arising from this meeting:</p> <p>ACTION: ARTC to circulate weed factsheet when it is developed and to find out if it is possible to provide the committee with the documented review of contractor weed policies.</p> <p>ACTION: JCh to provide more information about what they would like included in the field trip – ongoing</p> <p>ACTION: Role of chair to be included as an agenda item at the next meeting.</p> <p>ACTION: ARTC to continue process to appoint a new chair</p> <p>ACTION: Add to next meeting’s agenda - Independent engineering review for the IDD</p> <p>ACTION: provide CCC with information about road/rail interfaces and what TMR and TRC have been involved with and ask if council can attend the next meeting to provide their point of view</p> <p>ACTION: ARTC to look at moving the line in Southbrook to the other side of the study area</p> <p>ACTION: ARTC to provide a map showing locations of noise monitors and consider additional noise monitoring</p> <p>ACTION: update the community survey to provide more information about the project and how to answer it.</p>

Attachment 1: Conflict of interest declaration

Adrian Beattie	Potential for MOU with Indigenous community employment.
Jason Chavasse	Works for Queensland Government, Department may assess the Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Would exclude himself from this process if the CCC role would directly conflict with work responsibilities.
Rob Loch	Owns property within the study corridor. May potentially provide a resource to planning groups working/bidding on project but no current plans in place. Would exclude himself from the consulting work if this arose.
Paul Hanlon	Owns property within the study corridor. Interested in potentially sourcing Brisbane treated water for irrigation through a pipeline that could possibly use the rail corridor.
David Taylor	Owns property within the study corridor.
Larry Pappin	Owns property within the study corridor.
Jenny Schmidt	Owns property within the study corridor.
Kylie Schultz	Owns property within the study corridor.