

MEETING MINUTES

Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee
Meeting # 8

DATE / TIME

11 December 2019
6:00pm –
9:00pm

LOCATION

Millmerran Cultural Centre, Walpole Street, Millmerran

FACILITATOR

Mr Graham Clapham – Chair

MINUTE TAKER

Ms Laura Jarman – ARTC Inland Rail

DISTRIBUTION

All

ATTENDEES

- ▶ Mr Graham Clapham – SDD Chair (Chair)
- ▶ Mr Jeff Chandler – SDD member (JC)
- ▶ Mr Norm Chapman – SDD member (NC)
- ▶ Mr Gary Hayes – SDD member (GH)
- ▶ Ms Kim Stevens – SDD member (KS)
- ▶ Mr Brett Kelly – SDD member (BK)
- ▶ Mrs Georgina Krieg – SDD member (GK)
- ▶ Mr Robert Barrett – SDD member (RB)
- ▶ Mrs Maria Oliver – SDD member (MO)
- ▶ Mr Barry Bowden – SDD member (BB)
- ▶ Ms Rosalie Millar – SDD member (RM)
- ▶ Ms Laura Jarman – ARTC Inland Rail (LJ)
- ▶ Ms Nicola Mitchell – ARTC Inland Rail (NM)
- ▶ Mr Jon Roberts – ARTC Inland Rail (JR)
- ▶ Ms Helen Williams – ARTC Inland Rail (HW)
- ▶ Mr Scott Cobine – ARTC Inland Rail (SC)
- ▶ Ms Amanda Reed – ARTC Inland Rail (AR)
- ▶ Ms Naomi Tonscheck – ARTC Inland Rail (NT)
- ▶ Ms Jo Tait – ARTC Inland Rail (JT)

APOLOGIES

- ▶ Mr Graeme Clarke – SDD member (GC)
- ▶ Mr Brad Christensen – SDD member (BC)
- ▶ Mr Justin Saunders – SDD member (JS)

Discussions

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>Safety share</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ NT provided an observation regarding the increase of animals and livestock on the roads: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Consider the country you are driving through and any factors that may increase the presence of livestock and animals on the roads, such as bush fires and drought ▶ Take care when driving, especially early morning and dusk, and remain alert ▶ Manage fatigue by stopping every two hours and taking a break.
1	<p>Welcome and introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ LJ delivered an acknowledgement of country. ▶ The Chair tabled a letter received from the Millmerran Chamber of Commerce; GC no longer represents the Chamber on the SDDCCC ▶ NC and MO will remain independent, but will relay information to the Millmerran Chamber of Commerce as necessary ▶ The Chair presented the questions and topics received from Committee members to be addressed at the meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BK – Condamine floodplain crossing hydrology ▶ BK – Macintyre floodplain crossing hydrology ▶ BK – a query regarding the Social Impact Assessment ▶ RM – how much water is required for construction, and where will water would be sourced from ▶ JC – requested information about how the project will affect the value of land and properties ▶ MO – requested more information about costs associated with doing business with Inland Rail ▶ RB – a discussion about where meetings are being held. ▶ The Chair confirmed all questions raised will be addressed in agenda items, or general business.

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
2	<p>Actions arising from previous meetings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ARTC to seek to explain the split between the NS2B and B2G projects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ JR explained for the purposes of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) the B2G project was from the NSW/QLD border to Gowrie Junction; but for the purposes of design the project was from the existing QR South-Western line at Kurrumbul Road. This was to ensure consistent design across the Macintyre Floodplain by the NS2B project team. 2. ARTC to present business opportunities with Inland Rail at next meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Included as an agenda item. 3. ARTC to provide details of construction camp locations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ JR confirmed three accommodation camp locations have been identified at Yelarbon, Inglewood and Millmerran. Camps are proposed to be located outside of the townships. ▶ MO queried why the camps are proposed to be located outside townships. ▶ LJ acknowledged the preference from the community; however, discussions with local government and other stakeholders that has meant that camps were preferred outside of townships. ▶ RB commented that he was aware of concerns raised by Goondiwindi Regional Council regarding supply of water and power and the availability of land for the location of an accommodation camp in Yelarbon. ▶ MO confirmed that the final decision regarding the location of accommodation camps was at the discretion of the company appointed to undertake construction of the alignment. ▶ JR confirmed the camps would accommodate an average of 200 people, with 400 during peak construction times. 4. ARTC to consider analogies for noise levels. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Ongoing. 5. ARTC Property team to present at next meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Included as an agenda item at this meeting. 6. ARTC to provide the committee with a copy of the property acquisition factsheet once completed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Distributed to CCC members September 2019. 7. ARTC to provide the committee with a copy of the Social Performance factsheet once finalised <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ HW confirmed the factsheet was in the final stages for approval. 8. ARTC to respond to BK's presentation on Condamine floodplain <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Included as an agenda item at this meeting
3	<p>Community consultative committee format moving forward</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ NM presented the intention to renew the membership of the four original Community Consultative Committees (CCC) as the original two-year term expires on 31 December 2019. This includes the Southern Darling Downs (SDD) CCC. Current members of the SDD CCC are encouraged to re-nominate for a position on the future CCC. ▶ NM thanked the CCC members for their contribution, time and commitment to the work of the CCC over the past two years. ▶ NM advised the CCC members that a donation had been made to rural aid groups in the CCC's name in lieu of Christmas gifts. ▶ The Chair advised the CCC members that he had been offered the opportunity to Chair the new CCC should he wish to do so <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair confirmed his intention to accept the offer ▶ The Chair acknowledged the support of the CCC members over the past two years.
4	<p>North Star to Border (NS2B) Project update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ JR delivered an update on the progress of the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Two alignments have been designed to cross the Macintyre floodplain; A and D1 ▶ The Goondiwindi Regional Council (GRC) and local landowners have requested validation of the proposed alignments across the Macintyre floodplain ▶ This involves doing a new Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) survey of the floodplain and comparing it to the LiDAR completed in 2015. ▶ Once the data has been processed and flood events have been tested, this information will be presented back to the community for consultation ▶ Both alignments A and D1 will be tested against the new LiDAR to determine the best crossing of the floodplain.

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>Questions and discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BK provided feedback that locals on both sides of the Macintyre River were concerned the preferred alignment would stop water flows down Whalan Creek. Locals estimate 40% of water in the 2010/11 flood event bypassed through Whalan Creek. BK recommended the project team get more involved with the local community to understand water flows. ▶ NT responded that there has been a lot of focus on water flow around Whalan Creek; and we are currently looking at the existing infrastructure that has been put in place in the area. The current LiDAR is indicating that infrastructure has been put in place to direct water flow into the Macintyre River to protect cultivation land. What we are wanting to see is where the water would go in a flood event now, with or without an Inland Rail alignment. ▶ RM asked if the alignment decision for the Macintyre floodplain crossing would be completed before the B2G EIS was being submitted. ▶ NT confirmed the B2G EIS would be submitted with the understanding that an additional EIS may need to be completed based on the alignment selection in NS2B. ▶ JR confirmed the B2G project had been given until December 2019 for submission of the EIS by the Coordinator-General. ▶ RM asked if it wouldn't be better to have an alignment that is correct than a probability. ▶ JR reminded the committee that the process that was being undertaken was to validate the model and not to re-visit the design. ▶ BB questioned that given the existing bush fires, would the rail corridor be cleared of trees. ▶ JR confirmed that the rail corridor would be cleared to the edge of the corridor.
5	<p>NSW/QLD Border to Gowrie Project Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The project update was presented in three parts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Design update ▶ Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) ▶ Engagement update <p>Design Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ JR presented a graphic fly-through of the proposed alignment from Kurrumbul to Millmerran ▶ JR noted the fly-through was still under development and did not include the Condamine floodplain crossing ▶ During the presentation, the following observations were made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ some changes made to road alignments to ensure safe stacking distances at crossings and intersections ▶ no decisions have been made regarding noise mitigation measures ▶ hydrology and water flows ▶ cut/fill ratios in the Southern Darling Downs ▶ proposed crossing loop locations. <p>Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ JR presented and updated on the progress of the EIS ▶ Fieldwork is complete ▶ Draft reference design and constructability are key inputs into the EIS ▶ All draft technical assessments currently being completed ▶ Stakeholder consultation for the EIS is ongoing ▶ Consultation has taken place with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Landowners; peak bodies; interest groups; community groups; environment groups; local businesses; all levels of government; and design, engineering and environmental specialists ▶ EIS covers 18 topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Project description (design and constructability) ▶ Land use and tenure ▶ Ecology ▶ Surface water and hydrology ▶ Groundwater ▶ Land resources (soils) ▶ Traffic, transport and access ▶ Social impact

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Economics ▶ Noise ▶ Air quality ▶ Landscape and visual amenity ▶ Waste management ▶ Cultural heritage ▶ Hazard and risk assessment ▶ Cumulative impact ▶ Sustainability ▶ Legislation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The EIS is structured into 25 chapters, an environmental management plan, 25 technical appendices, executive summary and alignment drawings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Chapters explain the topic, the existing environment and an assessment of potential impacts. ▶ Environmental management plan shows out the management and mitigation measures. ▶ Technical appendices provide modelling, research and supporting data. ▶ EIS will be lodged with the Office of the Coordinator General in December 2019. ▶ EIS will undergo adequacy review by the Coordinator General and other government agencies. ▶ If accepted as adequate, the public display and submission period will be determined by the Coordinator General. ▶ Coordinator General and government agencies will undertake a formal review of the technical content and submissions. <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ JC asked if the EIS was going to be made available as hard copy or download and print copies ▶ LJ advised that the EIS would be made available in hard copy and online. She also advised that a summary document would be developed in plain English and point people to the appropriate section of the EIS. ▶ MO asked if there would be assistance for people who were having difficulty locating information in the EIS ▶ LJ advised to call the team on the 1800 number and we will assist ▶ The Chair remarked that he had had contact with the Coordinator General's office, who had told him that they were keen that concerned parties make submissions in their own terminology, it did not need to have technical data to support the submission. ▶ The Chair also encouraged people not to be daunted by the EIS, and if they did not think that something was adequately covered in the EIS, then use this opportunity to bring it to the attention of the Coordinator General. ▶ JC asked if it was known when the EIS would come back from the Coordinator General for public comment. ▶ JR responded that the timing of the release was at the determination of the Coordinator General. ▶ The Chair commented that the Inner Darling Downs Chair had committed to writing to the Office of the Coordinator General requesting an extension of two weeks to their standard period of public exhibition; he asked if the Southern Darling Downs CCC would like him to do the same. ▶ All Committee members agreed that they supported this action. <p>Engagement update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ LJ provided an overview of the engagement activities undertaken during the reference design. This included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Newsletter distributed to 5000 residences ▶ 3 e-newsletters each distributed to approximately 1750 recipients ▶ 10 meetings with government agencies and community groups ▶ 9 community information sessions attended by 193 community members ▶ 214 calls, 173 emails, 301 letters and 50 meetings with directly affected landowners ▶ 47 comments on B2G interactive map ▶ 2631 B2G project webpage visits. ▶ LJ provided an overview of the EIS public exhibition process. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Office of the Coordinator General will lead the statutory consultation process, and ARTC will support this by facilitating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ direct advice to landowners in study area

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ static displays ▶ community information sessions ▶ website and interactive map ▶ submissions to the EIS ▶ objections to the adequacy of the EIS assessment of impacts and commitments can be made to the CG by written submission ▶ submissions must be 'properly made', that is: be written; be signed by the writer(s); state the name and address of each writer; be made to the CG sent by electronic or as hard copy; and be received on or before the last day of the submission period. Submissions cannot be made to Inland Rail. <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BK noted that while the numbers presented on the levels of community engagement were impressive it did not help the landowners that felt they were not being listened to. ▶ LJ acknowledged BK's comment and said that the consultation and concerns of the community inform the EIS and concerns regarding the design are recognised. ▶ The Chair asked if there were any plans to release the EIS in an electronic format, other than on a website. ▶ LJ confirmed that plans were currently being made to distribute the EIS on a USB.
6	<p>Condamine floodplain crossing Independent hydrology review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair noted he had circulated to the Committee the report completed by Dr John McIntosh and Water Solutions. ▶ The Chair acknowledged some people saw the work undertaken as inadequate and incomplete however, confirmed that he believed the work had been completed and was in line with the scope of the review. ▶ The Chair advised he had had further communication with Dr McIntosh regarding the inaccuracies noted in the hydrology model in the 2000 flood event. He committed to sharing the response with the Committee members. ▶ The Chair remarked he was pleased that an international, independent panel was to be convened to review flood modelling as part of the intergovernmental agreement signed between the Queensland and federal governments. <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BK commented his expectation of an independent review was that another flood model would have been undertaken, rather than Dr McIntosh validating the model to determine if it was fit for purpose. ▶ JC agreed with BK's comment and added that the model calibration was still unsatisfactory. ▶ GH commented he shared BK's feelings regarding Dr McIntosh's report and that it covered off on legalities of traceability. He also shared his frustration that the process of the alignment across the floodplain had been ongoing for a number of years, with no resolution. ▶ NC commented that he had been working in the construction industry for a number of years and it has been his experience that the more technical expertise you engage, the greater the number of differing solutions you will be presented with. ▶ The Chair noted that Dr McIntosh was not engaged to produce a new model; and that his brief included a review of the model and the process used rather than the data that the model produced. ▶ The Chair also noted no modelling has ever been applied to any other infrastructure that has been built on the floodplain; and what this model is trying to do is the best attempt to quantify the impact of the new rail alignment. ▶ GH queried the adequacy of the model in determining the allowances that have been provided for blockage and whether they should be increased rather than the adequacy of the data the model returned. ▶ RB queried if the independent panel would only be considering the Condamine floodplain crossing. ▶ The Chair confirmed his understanding that the panel would be looking at all water interference from this infrastructure. <p>Response to the Central Downs Irrigators' presentation on the Condamine floodplain crossing</p>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ JR presented a response to the presentation that BK had made at the previous CCC. ▶ Given there was no hydrology expert present at the meeting, it was suggested BK be given a copy of the presentation and questions be taken on notice for a response. ▶ Key issues raised in BK's presentation were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ width of the Condamine floodplain; ▶ flood modelling; ▶ validation of the flood model; and ▶ request for further flood model review. <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ JR confirmed when ARTC refers to a 12.5-kilometre-wide floodplain; reference is being made to the length existing south-western line across the floodplain. ARTC acknowledge that the actual floodplain is wider than 12.5 kilometres. ▶ BK queried the statement "flood model achieved good calibration" given the inaccuracies in the model to a known flood event. ▶ BK asked for the margin of error for the flood model. ▶ JR confirmed this action was currently being worked on by FFJV. ▶ BK queried the accuracy of flood inundation maps presented by ARTC. ▶ JR confirmed this was included in the EIS and could be raised as a matter for public submission. ▶ JR went through the photographs presented by BK in his presentation and provided information from FFJV as to the match between the photographs and the model; and some reasoning as to errors occurring for example in accurate LIDAR data. ▶ The Chair commented the presentation and discussion indicated there was a deficiency in the modelling, however the model was never designed to replicate reality; if a model did replicate reality it would be obvious that the data had been manipulated to achieve that. The model needs to be able to tell us what the change to water behaviour is going to be with the alignment to confirm there is enough openings along the alignment to allow for blockages or not. ▶ GH shared the Chair's opinion and reiterated the level of inaccuracy in the model should drive the number or percentage of openings along the alignment. ▶ GH asked if there was a case-study showing where the model had been used along another 19-kilometre-wide floodplain. ▶ The Chair noted it would be a good question for the international panel. ▶ JR outlined the remainder of the presentation, including independent review and the work of Dr Marker; the history of the floodplain design process and EIS review process. ▶ BK queried the level of cooperation between FFJV and Dr Marker. Dr Marker had requested information that FFJV were reluctant to provide. ▶ JR provided an overview of what was included in the EIS in relation to water volumes that would be required for construction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Hierarchy of water use from sourcing water: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ public surface water and water storage (eg dams and weirs); ▶ permanent water flows and courses; ▶ privately held water storage (dams and tanks by private agreement); and ▶ mains water supply. ▶ Predicted B2G project will require 2,620 megalitres. ▶ BK queried if this included the water required for concrete production. ▶ JR confirmed that it did. ▶ JR commented this estimate was based on the reference design which may change during the detailed design phase.
7	<p>Property overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ AR presented an overview of the land acquisition process, timing and compensation principles ▶ Land acquisition process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Land required for the Inland Rail project will be mostly acquired through compulsory acquisition ▶ An Acquiring Authority with acquire the land using the process set out in the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i> (ALA) ▶ The current design shows passage through property, however this may change as a result of community consultation, EIS approval and detailed design

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ ARTC will engage with impacted landowners throughout the design process to understand potential impacts on property and ways to mitigate ▶ Following project approval, ARTC and the Acquiring Authority will contact landowners to explain the resumption process ▶ Land acquisition timing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Land will not be resumed until after: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ project approval by the Coordinator-General for the Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning; and ▶ agreed arrangements between ARTC and the Acquiring Authority ▶ Consultation with property owners will have occurred prior to the resumption process commencing ▶ Resumption timeframes are typically 6 to 12 months. Resumption agreements with landowners can also be negotiated. ▶ Compensation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Eligibility for compensation is governed by the ALA ▶ The ALA sets out how compensation is assessed and can include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ value of land taken ▶ loss or damage caused by severance ▶ loss attributable to disturbance (eg: legal, valuation, relocation and financial costs incurred in connection to the acquisition) ▶ Landowners can claim an “advance of compensation” if a claim is unable to be settled ▶ Claim for compensation can be made up to three years following resumption under current legislation ▶ Useful resources. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ ARTC Inland Rail Property Acquisition Fact Sheet (QLD) www.inlandrail.com.au ▶ Queensland Government https://www.qld.gov.au/law/your-rights/legal-and-property-rights/government-land-acquisition-and-resumption <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ JC asked what the process was to calculate the cost of land and business values for directly affected properties and would it be up to the landowner to engage someone to do that? ▶ AR confirmed loss of profits resulting from interruption to business, or as a direct consequence of land being taken was something that could be claimed, and the onus was on the landowner to make that claim. ▶ AR went on to explain that forensic accountants are usually engaged to demonstrate loss of profits and it is usually submitted with other documents, such as land valuations; and these are submitted to the Acquiring Authority, and they would normally engage their own valuers to review the claims. ▶ The Chair asked if the engagement of the professional services was also claimable. ▶ AR confirmed engagement of the professional services were claimable if they were directly in connection to the claim, and it was completed after gazettal of the taking of the land. ▶ CCC member asked if compensation extended to loss of value for properties close to the line which would be affected by noise and vibration. ▶ AR stated compensation only extends to where there is a direct land-take. ▶ GH shared his personal experience with land acquisition, relating to the reasonableness of costs; and that often farms have multiple titles, but often compensation is only given on one title. ▶ BK clarified properties not directly impacted by land take would not receive monetary compensation. ▶ AR confirmed this was the case; and the effects of noise and vibration exceedances are mitigated as required. ▶ The Chair stated he believed some people would be interested in establishing new lots through the severance of land. ▶ AR confirmed once resumption has been completed, there is a rationalisation process where surplus land may be offered to adjacent landowners for potential amalgamation of land. From past experience, this process is often done via an expression of interest to adjacent landowners.
8	<p>Doing business with Inland Rail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ HW presented an overview of doing business with Inland Rail <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Socio-economic outcomes of the project are included in the Inland Rail social performance program ▶ Businesses have the opportunity to benefit from Inland Rail through a number of channels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ direct supply to Inland Rail ▶ direct supply to Principal Contractors

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ indirect business arising from the project ▶ using Inland Rail when operational. ▶ Inland Rail is committed to providing full, fair and reasonable opportunity for local and Indigenous businesses to participate through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ supplier capability development ▶ communication ▶ procurement strategies ▶ governance and reporting ▶ Inland Rail operations. ▶ Inland Rail will work closely with key stakeholders to deliver business benefits. ▶ Key stakeholders have been identified as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ contractors and suppliers ▶ Federal and State government departments ▶ chambers of commerce and business representative groups ▶ local councils, including Regional Skills Investment Strategy Project Officers ▶ various other local stakeholders. ▶ Currently Inland Rail are gaining an understanding of the local environment through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Social Impact Assessment ▶ engagement with key stakeholders ▶ presentations to businesses ▶ Inland Rail Skills Academy, and ▶ planning business capability sessions in the near future ▶ Inland Rail Sills Academy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ launched 22 August 2019 ▶ focus on creating opportunities for education, training and skills development and employment ▶ the academy will help build regional prosperity ▶ partnering with Australasian Railway Association: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ skills training in rail construction, operations and rail maintenance ▶ business participation and capacity building. <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ MO had submitted a question regarding the costs of doing business with Inland Rail, in particular the registration costs for the Industry Capability Network (ICN), being \$600 or \$1,400 for premium membership. ▶ HW confirmed registration itself was free, but there were options for obtaining greater visibility on the platform. ▶ MO felt that this created an un-even playing field, especially for small business. ▶ HW acknowledged MO's concerns but reiterated that the pricing structure was ICN's business model. ARTC Inland Rail will be providing additional ways for local businesses to increase their visibility for key contractors, for example, "meet and greet" sessions. ▶ MO said it was important to continue to work the community. ▶ HW supported this and welcomed ideas of how to maintain the balance between what was required by the project and how to advocate for local inclusion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ JT presented on ARTC's vision for the future of Inland Rail <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ How ARTC works <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 100% shareholder is the Federal Government ▶ Tasked with delivering Inland Rail ▶ ARTC manages and maintains 8,500 kilometres of rail network across 5 states ▶ ARTC does not run trains ▶ Rolling stock operators buy train paths off ARTC. ▶ Increasing rail's share of freight movements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 2015 – 2.0 mega-tonnes of freight transported by rail ▶ 2030 – Inland Rail business case predicates 5.7 mega-tonnes of freight transported by rail ▶ 2050 – 11.1 mega-tonnes of freight transported by rail ▶ Types of freight moved (2050) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 25% coal and minerals

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 9% agriculture ▶ 66% inter capital (food, beverage, whitegoods) ▶ Developing sidings and terminals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Driven by the market ▶ Private enterprise will determine where it is viable to locate and operate a siding or terminal ▶ No pre-determined location of number of sidings ▶ Inland rail will provide connection to regional lines and areas <p><i>Questions and discussions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair asked for clarification that existing sidings needed to be included in the design. ▶ JT confirmed there was a requirement to connect Inland Rail to existing sidings. ▶ BK asked about connection to existing lines that are currently unused or incomplete. ▶ JT confirmed that connectivity needed to be provided, but that it would a question for Queensland Rail as to whether they were going to invest in bringing those lines up to operational standard.
9	<p>General business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Meeting locations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RB proposed a change to the current voting system to determine where meetings should be held, and change it to a roster of where meetings are held so that meetings are spread across all the communities that the B2G project operates in. ▶ The Chair acknowledged this was a source of contention. ▶ The Chair went to ascertain that as this was the last meeting of the current CCC, it was not appropriate for that group to be making policy decisions for the incoming CCC. ▶ The Chair publicly declared that he would be accepting ARTC's offer to chair the incoming CCC; and offered his assurance that this issue would be dealt with. ▶ Social Impact Assessment (SIA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ HW requested further clarification from BK on his question ▶ BK expressed his concern that the SIA was being completed by a contractor who has a financial interest in the project. ▶ BK advised he did not believe FFJV would present an accurate Social Impact Assessment. ▶ HW clarified that while FFJV were undertaking the SIA, as a specialised piece of work it had been outsourced the Elliott Whiting who are well regarded in this discipline. ▶ HW also stated she believes draft SIA reflects the concerns and potential impacts of the project. ▶ Closing remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Before opening the floor for observers' questions, the Chair made some closing remarks. ▶ The Chair provided advice to people considering applying or reapplying for a position on the CCC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ This project isn't going to go away just because you don't want it; the same as a lot of other projects haven't gone away because we didn't want them. ▶ That doesn't mean that you shouldn't continue to voice your concerns and raise issues in a legitimate and articulate way. ▶ When you are applying, read the terms of reference or the charter that the CCC operates under – the charter is what the CCC exists to deal with. One thing that is not on the charter is to put the rail line somewhere else – if that comes out of the issues dealt with by the CCC we have done a good job. ▶ The Chair concluded by thanking all members of the CCC for their orderly and constructive contribution to the last two years of operation. ▶ GH thanked the Chair for his contribution ▶ JC also thanked the Chair for his leadership and independence.
10	<p>Questions from observers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair opened the meeting to questions from observers. ▶ An observer asked if the public would be made aware that the EIS had been submitted to the Coordinator General for review. ▶ LJ confirmed that the public would be advised once the EIS had been submitted to the Coordinator General for adequacy review.

MEETING MINUTES

Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee Meeting # 8



NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<i>Meeting closed 9.00pm</i>