

Meeting title	Lockyer Valley Community Consultative Committee
----------------------	--

Attendees

Mark Hohenhaus – Committee Chair	Judy Seppanen – Committee Member
Kathy Brady – Committee Member	Simon Warner – Committee Member
Linton Brimblecombe – Committee Member	Gordon Van der Est – Committee Member
Neil Cook – Committee Member	Stephen Brierley – ARTC Inland Rail
Maurice Hennessy – Committee Member	Andrew Buckley – ARTC Inland Rail
Gary Stark – Committee Member	David Foster – ARTC Inland Rail
Kenneth Moore – Committee Member	Gary Graham - FFJV H2C Project Leader
Mark Newton – Committee Member	Helen Hutchings – ARTC Inland Rail
Ian Rickuss – Committee Member	Mercedes Staff – ARTC Inland Rail

Apologies

Peter Cahill – Committee Member	Max Nichols – ARTC Inland Rail
---------------------------------	--------------------------------

Guests and Observers

In accordance with the Charter, the Chair invited Thomas Kelly from the Grandchester/Calvert area and Jason Chavasse from the Gowrie Junction area to attend the meeting as guests.

Approximately 52 members of the public attended as observers.

Location	Forest Hill School or Arts		
-----------------	----------------------------	--	--

Date	25 June 2018	Time	6:00 – 8:30pm
-------------	--------------	-------------	---------------

Agenda No.	Discussion points
-------------------	--------------------------

1.	<p>Confirmation of previous minutes and actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes from the previous meeting were confirmed. • Actions from the previous meeting were addressed as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide more information in the next meeting about the status of lease arrangements, the local government component of leases and Inter-Governmental Agreements. <i>H. Hutchings advised the negotiations between the state and federal government regarding the Intergovernmental Agreement are still ongoing so at this point there is no new information available, however ARTC is committed to providing a status update at the next meeting.</i> 2. Amend engagement program to reflect suggestions for formal consultation on visual amenity early in the program, and greater focus on economic impact assessment in the social and economic impact assessment. <i>Action completed. The amended program was circulated to committee members.</i> 3. Provide committee members with plans of specific consultation activities. <i>Action completed.</i>
----	---

Agenda No.	Discussion points
	<p>4. Circulate slides from meeting to committee members.</p> <p><i>Action completed.</i></p>
2.	<p>Conflict of interest register</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No updates made to the conflict of interest register.
3.	<p>Update on progress of technical studies</p> <p>Garry Graham provided an update on key aspects of the EIS and feasibility design technical studies, including:</p> <p>Technical review of alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on engineering investigations and community feedback, preferred alignments have been identified for further detailed assessment. Alignment options have been considered in Gatton, Forest Hill, Laidley and Grandchester. Gatton: alignment remains in existing rail corridor to avoid direct impacts on private properties, minimise distance of alignment in floodplain, minimise impacts on grazing and cropping land north of Gatton and provide better cut/fill balance. Forest Hill: alignment remains in existing rail corridor. The option considered and presented for community feedback would create new direct impacts on private properties, increase the distance of the alignment in floodplain, impacts significantly more grazing and cropping land and isolates agricultural land between two rail corridors. It was noted the alignment could not go south of Forest Hill due to conflicts with topography and needing to cross the existing rail line. Laidley: alignment being considered includes a refinement to the Little Liverpool Range tunnel alignment, as well the alignment on the approach to the tunnel alignment. These refinements are better from an engineering perspective and avoid conflict with the existing rail line. Grandchester: options were presented south of the protected corridor. Based on community feedback a number of these have been discounted to various conflicts and impact on private property. FFJV are currently looking at a refinement which is slightly south of the protected corridor, which improves the connection into the Little Liverpool Range tunnel. The target date for finalising preferred alignment is currently August 2018. <p>Committee members asked the following questions and made the following comments in relation to the alignment options discussed. ARTC responses are noted in italics:</p> <p>L. Brimblecombe noted the recent consultation sessions were the first-time people had seen the alignment options and this was disturbing for many landowners impacted by the options. He asked what the community feedback was on the options, what is the process for determining the alignment and what is the timeline for signing off on the alignments.</p> <p><i>ARTC advised community feedback would be covered later in the meeting (agenda item 7). The process for determining the alignment is what is currently underway as part of the development of the EIS and feasibility design. The alignment is not signed off fully until the EIS is approved and this is an iterative process. The actual final position doesn't get locked in until the EIS is signed off. The EIS report will have a preferred alignment in it, and ARTC will need to document the various alignments that have been investigated and the consultation and feedback that has been received on these options.</i></p>

Agenda No.	Discussion points
	<p>I. Rickuss stated there is no ‘preferred option’ for the community in the Lockyer Valley, so please stop referring to them as preferred options.</p> <p>T. Kelly asked if the protected corridor was still the preferred option for Inland Rail.</p> <p><i>ARTC advised that the Gowrie to Grandchester protected corridor was still the preferred option, however there are refinements being considered within the EIS study area.</i></p> <p>Flooding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hydraulic engineers are currently working on a comprehensive model for the Lockyer Valley flood catchment. This includes updating data from previous flood models because of change in the Australian Standard and incorporating data supplied by local Councils and data points gathered from the consultation sessions to assist with calibrating the model to make it as accurate as possible. When this is done the model is used to assess any new impacts the project may cause and allow a design and engineering solution that will address those impacts. It is anticipated that the flood modelling will be completed by the end of September and that will feed into the engineering work. <p>Level crossings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently, obtaining traffic counts from council on various roads, including constructability impacts. Level crossings assessed using Australian Level Crossing Assessment Model (ALCAM), which considers factors such as road traffic numbers, vehicle types, train numbers, speeds and sighting distances to provide guidance on the appropriate safety treatment at each level crossing. Proposed treatment of level crossings is expected to be presented for community feedback in August/September 2018. <p>Site investigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Topographic scans have commenced, and laser survey of the existing rail corridor has been completed. Geotech investigations have been slowed due to requirements for environmental clearances. Significant increase in Geotech scope required for PPP data collection. FFJV and PPP Geotech activities will be coordinated to limit the impact and inconvenience on landholders. Currently expected to start Geotech site activities from August 2018. <p>Social and economic impact assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social Impact Assessment survey is currently underway with surveys rolled out at consultation sessions and available online: https://www.research.net/r/InlandRailSIA. <p>Flora and fauna:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Already done flora and fauna mapping based on government databases mapping. Anticipating engagement with environmental groups to access additional data sets.
4.	<p>H2C Crossing loops</p> <p>Garry Graham provided an overview of the purpose, length and proposed location of crossing loops on the H2C alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A crossing loop is a place on a single line railway where trains in opposing directions can pass each other.

Agenda No.	Discussion points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A crossing loop is double-ended and connected to the main track at both ends. • Crossing loops will be nominally located at intervals of 10 – 12 kilometres along the alignment and would be approximately 2km in length to accommodate the 1.8km maximum design length of trains using Inland Rail. • In the Helidon to Calvert section crossing loops are currently proposed to be located north of Helidon, east of Gatton, west of Laidley Plainlands Road and east of Grandchester. • To determine the appropriate placement of the passing loops, FFJV undertake an engineering assessment for each location and ARTC undertake operational modelling to determine the timing of the passage of trains along the alignment. <p>S. Warner stated that crossing loops have been historically located inside villages. He asked if we can ensure the crossing loops are not located inside or close to residential areas because trains stopping and starting will always make more noise than trains passing through.</p>
5.	<p>Community feedback and concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K. Brady noted the position of crossing loops is of major concern to Laidley residents. The main reason is these loops will generate a lot more noise because of trains idling waiting for other trains to pass and will be much more disruptive in many different ways. At a previous Lockyer Valley meeting, H2C Project Manager Max Nichols had advised there were two possible locations for the passing loop near Laidley – which was either on the eastern side of Laidley Plainland Road (near Valley Vista Estate) or on the western side of Laidley Plainland Road. Numerous Laidley residents have expressed concern the crossing loop could be located on the eastern side of Laidley Plainlands Road, which would locate it closer to the populated areas of Laidley and would prefer it's located on the other side, as far as way from the residents as possible and keep it out of the town as much as possible to minimise disruption and noise. • G. Graham advised we are aware of the community feedback about the passing loop. ARTC need to do further operational modelling of the two options and will feed this back to FFJV for their design. The location is expected to be determined in August/September 2018. • K. Brady advised that concerns were raised by Gordon Claridge and Hanneke Nooren; an email was sent to the committee regarding a variety of different things. These emails and documents were tabled by K. Brady. • The Chair agreed to Mr Claridge explaining his concerns to the meeting. Mr Claridge stated he has a number of concerns about the consultation process, particularly the latest one in May, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He attended a consultation session and believes the people he spoke to did not have expertise in the areas of interest to him, which are flora and fauna and noise. ○ The summary of comments he received did not reflect those he made at the session. ○ The process for recording comments on the CollabMap software and how it would be used was not explained properly. ○ ARTC has not put the CollabMap software online and therefore a good system for community consultation is being wasted. ○ The Social Impact Assessment community survey has not been advertised or promoted, including at the consultation sessions, and this survey closes on 1 July. ○ In previous one-on-one discussions with project team members there were some commitments made and some of these people had now moved on and information had been lost. This is not a good way to establish trust and credibility with the community. • A. Buckley advised that it is ARTC's intention to put CollabMap online during the current phase of consultation. ARTC recognise that it is a valuable consultation tool.

Agenda No.	Discussion points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A. Buckley said it is ARTC's intention to advertise the Social Impact Assessment community survey widely. He noted that we will be seeking to extend the closing date to ensure we can gather as many responses as possible. • The committee passed a motion to recommend that ARTC extends the survey closing date for six weeks and to advertise it as widely as possible. K. Moore requested that the Consultation Program be updated to include the community survey. • K. Brady noted that when she attended the Laidley consultation session she didn't receive a reference number for the comments she made. • K. Brady urged any committee members to bring any concerns received from community members to committee meetings, so they can be tabled. • J. Chavasse requested that when issues are being identified and considered, such as alignment issues and crossing loop locations, that this is done across the whole G2H and H2C project areas, rather than just focusing on H2C. This will allow people representing those areas get to understand the whole picture. • I. Rickuss noted that houses are still being built in the Valley Vista estate in Laidley – he asked what information ARTC has received about the developer. H. Hutchings advised the developer is aware of the protected corridor and the residents will be consulted in the same way as any other residents. I. Rickuss noted he has received complaints from owners who didn't know about Inland Rail. • M. Hennessy asked about the viability of the freight line and what work has been done in relation to assessing this. D. Foster advised an extensive business case was conducted, which concluded there was a demand for the project, which is why the Federal Government invested money into building this infrastructure. The primary reason for needing Inland Rail is the projected future freight growth and the current road and rail network will not have capacity to meet the future growth requirements. The Business Case is available on the website.
6.	<p>Presentation by Gordon Van der Est and Ken Moore</p> <p>G. Van der Est presented on the history of flood events in Forest Hill and nearby areas and the relevant design standards and legislation that he considered should be taken into account as part of flood studies for Inland Rail.</p> <p>This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Points of agreement include that construction of Inland Rail is undertaken through a bilateral agreement between the federal government and the states, and that ARTC can only explore alignments in easements or land controlled and dictated by the state of Queensland inside the determined study area • A list of documented flood events in Forest Hill and Laidley • Pictures of various flood events • Maps and diagrams showing water volumes and flow directions • Details about previous works to alter the existing railway line height and bridges • Information about relevant Queensland state government legislation <p>K. Moore presented about a proposed change to the Inland Rail alignment to avoid impact on agricultural land in the Lockyer Valley and considerations around the existing rail line and the potential impact on flooding.</p> <p>This included:</p>

Agenda No.	Discussion points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maps showing a proposal to co-locate Inland Rail in the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing corridor and the Warrego Highway corridor. • Rationale for this proposal including its perceived reduction of impact on Lockyer Valley agricultural lands and possible flooding impacts. • Information about the existing West Moreton rail line. • Information about the ‘flood footprint’ in the Lockyer Valley, previous flood reports and engineering standards. • Potential for ‘human disasters’ from freight rail operations. <p>G. Van der Est tabled a document detailing 100 years of flooding data. He advised he would send through additional maps and diagrams (as shown in the presentation) electronically following the meeting.</p> <p>The committee approved a motion requesting ARTC engineers to meet with engineers engaged by Forest Hill committee members for the purposes of handing over flood data and research.</p> <p>The committee approved a motion requesting a meeting between Inland Rail CEO and engineers and Minister for Transport and Main Roads Mark Bailey, Federal Member for Wright Scott Buchholz, State Member for Lockyer Jim McDonald and Lockyer Valley Regional Council Mayor Tanya Milligan to discuss expansion of the study area to enable consideration of alignment alternatives outside of the current study area.</p>
7.	<p>Report on consultation sessions and feedback received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A. Buckley provided a report on the feedback received during the first round of consultation in May. • There were 10 consultation sessions held for both G2H and H2C projects, with 222 attendees and 282 comments provided on CollabMap across both projects. • A summary of comments per category was provided and it was noted the most frequent comments were on the categories of alignment and water (flooding). • Maps detailing the location and categories of comments in CollabMap were shown. <p>In relation to specific locations, the following feedback and issues were provided:</p> <p>Gatton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In relation to the two alignment options to bypass the centre of Gatton township – numerous landowners impacted by the options attended the sessions and they all expressed their opposition to the options based on the significant impacts they would have on the viability of their farms. • Flooding impacts from the project and historical recollections of flooding. • Road and rail interface and the need to maintain operability of existing local road network to ensure there is no community severance. • Operational noise and vibration impacts. <p>Forest Hill:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The alignment option to the north of the centre of Forest Hill township – there was consensus that the alignment in the existing corridor has significantly less impact than the alternative option shown. • Flooding impacts from the project and historical recollections of flooding. • Proposed treatments to the existing level crossing - the need to maintain operability of the

Agenda No.	Discussion points
	<p>crossing for motorists and pedestrians to ensure there is no community severance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational noise and vibration impacts. Impact on heritage buildings in town, e.g. war memorial and old rail building. <p>Laidley:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flooding impacts from the project and proposed design to mitigate impacts. Operational noise, vibration and air quality impacts. The minor alignment refinement to the east of Laidley into the Little Liverpool Rage tunnel received positive feedback. Property impacts, including land use, severance and access. Impact on local road network, proposed realignments and road crossings. Environmental concerns including underground water quality, pollutants. Value and purpose of the consultation process with respect to previous processes, e.g. OCG terms of reference comment period. <p>Grandchester:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Numerous suggestions from landowners who are currently directly impacted by the preferred alignment to move the alignment further south of Grandchester. Many landowners who would be directly impacted by the alignment options provided feedback about their opposition to these proposals, the extent of potential impacts on their properties and the reasons why the original alignment was preferred. Flooding impacts from the project and historical recollections of flooding. Property impacts, including land use, severance and access. Land acquisition process and timing. Operational noise impacts. <p>A. Buckley noted the sessions generated highly valuable data and feedback that will be used as part of the ongoing technical review of the alignment and feed into the EIS studies, as well as providing an indication of the type of activities and objectives of the consultation for the next phase of consultation.</p>
8.	<p>General business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Buckley advised ARTC intends to base community engagement staff locally in the regions and as part of this ARTC is working to establish an office in Gatton. A. Buckley introduced new engagement team members Gail Harris, who has been appointed as the G2K engagement lead and Corey Doran, appointed as H2C engagement advisor. Both team members attended the meeting as observers. I. Rickuss asked if there is an opportunity for the committee to receive the information that is forwarded to the Minister or the Board from these meetings. He has heard from departmental people that the Lockyer Valley is quite supportive of the project - this is what the Board has been telling the Department. H. Hutchings advised the only information that goes to the Board is what is publicly available, such as meeting minutes and Chair's summary. L. Brimblecombe advised he was approached by some landowners north of Forest Hill and they were distressed in regard to the alignment options presented at the sessions. L. Brimblecombe asked whether the comments made on CollabMap are public and if they include people's names. A. Buckley advised that the comments made during the consultation sessions are not online and the version that goes online won't include any comments made at the sessions. M. Hennessy asked if ARTC can advise people by email when the online consultation and community survey are available. A. Buckley confirmed this would be done. S. Warner suggested the next meeting should be attended by the Federal member for Wright

Agenda No.	Discussion points
	<p>Scott Buchholz and the State member for Lockyer Jim McDonald. He is aware that Mr Buchholz is available on the 3rd and 4th of September and suggested the next meeting be held on one of those dates, so he has an opportunity to attend and hear what the community is saying.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S. Warner requested the Consultation Program be updated to reflect the changed dates to flora and fauna studies. • J. Chavasse said it would be useful to let people know if the comments made into CollabMap will be available online. If people can only see their comments it can become divisive and it's more useful if people can see other people's comments and if they are similar to their own. He suggested that the comments could have identifying details removed which would remove any privacy concerns. • G. Stark asked if any surveys had been done to find out what percentage of the community support the project. H. Hutchings said that a survey of this nature does not provide any benefit to the development of the EIS. • K. Brady stated that 169 people attended the consultation sessions and she believes that is not adequate and ARTC needs to do more to get people to attend the sessions. • M. Newton asked about the alignment to Gladstone. D. Foster advised the alignment to Gladstone is not within the scope of the Inland Rail project. The pathway to this alignment is through the political process and ARTC don't have any ability to influence that.
	<p>Confirmation of actions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a status update at the next meeting about the Inter-Governmental Agreements and how Councils are going to be paid for the loss of their rates base. 2. Extend the closing date of the Social Impact Assessment community survey for an additional six weeks, from the current closing date of 1 July 2018 and advertise and promote it as widely as possible. 3. Update the Consultation Program to reflect the changed dates to flora and fauna studies. 4. Update the Consultation Program to include the Social Impact Assessment community survey. 5. Action request for ARTC engineers to meet with engineers engaged by Forest Hill committee members for the purposes of handing over flood data and research. 6. Action request for meeting between Inland Rail CEO and engineers and Minister for Transport and Main Roads Mark Bailey, Federal Member for Wright Scott Buchholz, State Member for Lockyer Jim McDonald and Lockyer Valley Regional Council Mayor Tanya Milligan to discuss expansion of the study area to enable consideration of alignment alternatives outside of the current study area.