

MEETING MINUTES

Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee Meeting # 7



MEETING MINUTES

Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee
Meeting # 7

DATE / TIME

19 September 2019
6:00pm – 9.00pm

LOCATION

Inglewood Civic Centre, Elizabeth Street, Inglewood

FACILITATOR

Mr Graham Clapham – Chair

MINUTE TAKER

Ms Laura Jarman – ARTC Inland Rail

DISTRIBUTION

All

ATTENDEES

- ▶ Mr Graham Clapham – SDD Chair (Chair)
- ▶ Mr Graeme Clarke – SDD member (GC)
- ▶ 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 Justin Saunders – SDD member (JS)
- ▶ Ms Rosalie Millar – SDD member (RM)
- ▶ Ms Laura Jarman – ARTC Inland Rail (LJ)
- ▶ Ms Mercedes Staff – ARTC Inland Rail (MSt)
- ▶ Ms Fiona Kennedy – ARTC Inland Rail (FK)
- ▶ Mr Robert Smith – ARTC Inland Rail (RS)
- ▶ Mr Scott Cobine – ARTC Inland Rail (SC)
- ▶ Ms Helen Williams – ARTC Inland Rail (HW)
- ▶ Mr Jon Roberts – ARTC Inland Rail (JR)
- ▶ Mr Merv Smith – ARTC Inland Rail (MSm)
- ▶ Mr Shane Harris – ARTC Inland Rail (SH)

APOLOGIES

- ▶ Mr Barry Bowden – SDD member (BB)
- ▶ Mr Brad Christensen – SDD member (BC)

Discussions

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>Safety share</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ The Chair invited LJ to share a safety moment with the committee.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ LJ provided a reminder regarding bushfire safety including:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Prepare a bushfire survival plan to help you assess whether to leave your home or stay and defend during a bushfire and how to prepare and protect your family and property.▶ Be aware of the fire-danger rating each day. It is recommended you don't stay to defend your home if there is a catastrophic or extreme-fire-danger rating.▶ Keep informed on major fire updates and be ready to act. If you receive a bushfire alert, take it seriously and act promptly.▶ Prepare an emergency survival kit.▶ Contain pets so they can be easily found in case of evacuation, and provide them with water, shade and a safe place.▶ Identify a neighbourhood safe place: a building or open space away from bushland that can provide some protection from the immediate threat of a bushfire.
1	<p>Welcome and introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ The Chair invited JS to deliver a welcome to country.▶ The Chair welcomed SH, MS and SC from ARTC to the meeting.▶ The Chair provided an overview of the meetings and functions he had attended since the last meeting:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Attendance at the Inland Rail conference, where he met with Richard Wankmuller and John Fullerton; who confirmed that they were aware of the issues being faced by the community.▶ Meeting with Toowoomba Regional Council Mayor and councillors to understand the CCC's perspective on community engagement.

MEETING MINUTES

Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee Meeting # 7

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Attendance at an ARTC presentation to the Mayor and councillors. It was clear that there is a difference of opinion between the council's Director of Infrastructure and ARTC on a number of the proposed road-rail interfaces along the B2G proposed rail alignment.▶ Chair – Advised the committee of the resignation of Ms Marcia Smith, noting that as the two-year term of the CCC expires in December 2019 a decision had been made not to fill the position, pending the outcome of ARTC's decision on the future of the CCC.▶ Chair – Acknowledged submissions received by the CCC from BK and RB; and the observers present at the meeting.▶ Chair – Welcomed public interest and reminded observers that the meeting was for the business of the committee and asked that any questions from observers be withheld until the end of the meeting.
2	<p>Actions arising from previous meetings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Chair to forward committee email update from Dr John Macintosh.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Completed 13 June.▶ Chair – Advised that Dr John Macintosh had advised him that he had been caught up in the aftermath of bushfires and he has been unable to finalise his report. Dr Macintosh is yet to reply to a few landowners' queries, and hopes to complete this, and his report before the next meeting.2. ARTC to distribute the link for the Parkes to Narromine social performance information.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Completed 26 June.3. ARTC to develop and distribute frequently asked questions/a fact sheet about social performance and doing business with Inland Rail.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ The preparation of the fact sheet is in progress and it will be circulated when completed.4. Helen Williams and Jo Tait to present at the next meeting regarding opportunities for business.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ The presentation on business opportunities is carried forward to the next meeting, due to the availability of Jo Tait.▶ Noted that Helen Williams will present a brief update on doing business with Inland Rail later in the meeting.5. ARTC to distribute the revised land acquisition factsheet when it is finalised.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ The preparation of the fact sheet is in progress and it will be circulated when completed. <p>▶ Chair – Noted that the agenda was quite full, and asked ARTC and committee members to be respectful of time.</p>
3	<p>North Star to NSW/ QLD Border (NS2B) project update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ RS presented an update on the NS2B project on behalf of John Carr, NS2B Project Manager.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Background<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ ARTC has been working closely with the NS2B communities to develop a model of the Macintyre River floodplain crossing.▶ The Macintyre River floodplain crossing is just downstream of the Dumaresq and Macintyre rivers. The floodplain includes the main river channel and Whalan Creek. The floodplain is approximately seven to nine kilometres wide at the Inland Rail crossing location.▶ The project is being designed to achieve 1% AEP (1 in 100 year) flood immunity requiring the rail height to be raised.▶ Key community concerns have centred around flooding risks to nearby sensitive receptors, Toomelah, Boggabilla and Goondiwindi; and the selected crossing location.▶ The NS2B community have lived through a number of decades of development in the flood plain, which has resulted in significant changes to how water moves through the flood plain. This is backed by their experience of major flood events in 1976 and 2011 which have highlighted how the floodplain has changed.▶ They are concerned the selected alignment may further change flows in the floodplain with a negative outcome.▶ Through community consultation and technical workshops, the Macintyre River floodplain model has been successfully calibrated against historical flood event data and private flood markers.

MEETING MINUTES

Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee Meeting # 7

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ We are currently working with the community to adequately demonstrate the predicted impacts to our key flood immunity criteria being: Afflux (changes to flood heights), velocity control (preventing scour), time of inundation (duration of floods) and flows paths (making sure they remain unchanged). ▶ Key features of the Macintyre floodplain crossing solution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Macintyre floodplain is approximately 7 to 8 kilometres wide at the Inland Rail crossing location. ▶ Due to infrastructure developments on the Macintyre floodplain catchment, a large proportion of the Macintyre floodwater is concentrated in the Macintyre River and Whalen Creek systems. ▶ The proposed crossing solution consists of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 7 bridges ▶ 3km total bridge length including 1.7km viaduct spanning across the Whalan Creek, Tucka Tucka Road and Macintyre River ▶ Approximately 90 banks of culverts. ▶ Next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Further refinements require to capture the current floodplain landform (infrastructure developments). ▶ Further consultation with the Goondiwindi community, local flood specialists and directly affected landowners to further develop the model and reference design. ▶ Independent review of the Macintyre floodplain model and developed case – assessed by BMT. ▶ ARTC expect to submit the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) early 2020. Subject to approval, construction will begin late 2020 / early 2021. <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RB – Can the B2G section commence construction before the NS2B section has been completed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS – The design component of the NS2B project that is in Queensland needs to be included in the B2G EIS. So NS2B needs to be in a position to include their design in the B2G EIS later this year. ▶ RS – In relation to construction, the procurement strategy has not been decided as yet, but there is a chance that it will be two different construction packages, and NS2B would wait for full approval on both projects before construction commenced. We can provide more explanation around this split on this at the next CCC meeting. ▶ JC – How is the recently announced Parliamentary Inquiry likely to affect the whole project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS – This is recent news and at this stage it is business as usual. We will engage with and be a part of the inquiry but as this state we are not anticipating any impacts to our ongoing design development and EIS submission. ▶ GC – Are you still going to put in your EIS as per the original timetable, or with the inquiry are you going to wait? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS – Unless we are directed by the Federal Government to go on hold, we will continue to move forward with a view to submitting the EIS before the end of the year. ▶ Chair – It is my understanding that when new information becomes available the Coordinator-General could require a supplementary EIS? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ FK – Yes that is part of the process. We submit the EIS, it goes out for public exhibition and then the Coordinator-General and government agencies assess the technical information and the public submissions and then, at that time, can require an additional EIS to be prepared. ▶ GC – So to paraphrase: you are going to submit your EIS, unless you get told to stop and see what’s going to happen? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS – Correct.
4	<p>Project update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS delivered an update on the progress of the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ ARTC acknowledge that the level of detail being presented at the meeting can be distressing and/ or confronting for directly affected landowners. We hope that presenting this information will help remove some uncertainty. ▶ What the community will see: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Proposed project footprint (the area required for construction and operation) ▶ Proposed rail alignment (including road/ rail interfaces; crossing loops and the Condamine Floodplain crossing) ▶ Proposed road centrelines.

MEETING MINUTES

Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee Meeting # 7

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Consultation process:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ A staged approach has been used for the release of the proposed rail alignment▶ Directly affected landowners were contacted first with their individual maps▶ Presentations made to the Inner Downs and Southern Downs CCCs▶ The alignment will be made available to the wider community through newsletter distribution and an online interactive map▶ Community information sessions will be held in key towns along the alignment in October 2019.▶ Next project phase<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Detailed design is the next phase of the project, this will include alignment optimisation, public road design, private crossings, utilities and hydrology. <p>Proposed rail alignment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ JR provided a fly-through presentation of the proposed rail alignment, from Kurumbul to Southbrook.▶ RS explained why the proposed alignment had gone outside of the study area near the Commodore Mine:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ This was a challenging area as we were left with as little as 400 metres to fit the alignment between the edge of the study area an operating mine.▶ In consultation with the Commodore Mine and Interger, we identified assets that were relative to their ongoing operations; and they highlighted to us that they own all of the land on the other side of the road in this area.▶ This enabled ARTC to develop an alignment that, albeit going outside the study area, is contained wholly on their property; and doesn't impact any other landowners.▶ This proposal still needs to be approved through the EIS process. <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ GC – Why aren't crossing loops shown on the individual landowner maps?<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ RS – Crossing loops are shown on the interactive map and on the alignment maps that will be available at the community information sessions.▶ RS – Note that road rail interfaces and crossings are not endorsed by local councils – consultation with them is ongoing.▶ JC – Is there a timeline for the release of information about private crossings?<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ RS – As the vertical alignment is likely to change in detailed design, it is not possible to confirm with landowners exactly where the private crossings will be located. It will not be until we are in detailed design (late 2020, early 2021) that will be we will be able to start conversations with landowners. We have gathered information from landowners about crossings and will feed this into the detailed design process.▶ BK – Noted that the level crossing on Gilgai Lane was missing from the newsletter map.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ RS – Confirmed there was a proposed level crossing on Gilgai Lane, and that it is shown on the interactive map.▶ KS – How close is rail line to Sapphire feedlot?<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ JR – About 100m - on existing rail reserve.▶ GK – Noted there is a lot of wide machinery that would cross the rail line from Pampas-Bostock Road.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ JR – Advised GK to attend CIS to discuss with team.▶ GC – Why is the proposed alignment going along the eastern side of Millmerran-Inglewood Road and not staying in the forest?<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ RS – Technical reasons as crossing Millmerran-Inglewood Road further north would have required a realignment of the highway due to Department of Transport and Main Roads sighting distance requirements. Goondiwindi Regional Council has provided feedback, and we acknowledge landowner concerns; it is possible that there may be some changes in this area and we continue to consult with the local community. This is the design that will be submitted with the EIS though.▶ KS – How was the study area put completely over the Commodore Mine in the first place?<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ RS – I think the overarching principle was to follow the Millmerran-Inglewood Road.▶ RM – Do other property owners have the opportunity to shift the alignment outside of the study area to reduce operational impacts to their property, so long as the alignment remains on their property?<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ RS – Advised ARTC needed to assess each situation on a case-by-case basis, to understand how/if we can go outside the study area. We acknowledge that some landowners have made similar requests to

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>ARTC, however any movement outside of the study area needs to be contained entirely within that landowner's land – this is not possible with some of the smaller landholdings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ GC – You were approached by a landowner around DA Hall & Co's poultry facility in Millmerran with a proposal to straighten the alignment and move it onto the high county, with the full concurrence of the neighbouring landowners. I know ARTC engineers went and looked at it and believe they were fairly excited about it, but because it was 300-400 metres outside the study area you were unable to do it. Halls is the biggest employer in the area – some 350 people – and has major expansion plans. Suggested ARTC should re-examine that proposal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS – Advised ARTC was continuing to engage with the Halls in relation to the proposed rail alignment on their property. ▶ BK – Raised concerns about the embankment pushing water from Back Creek into Grass Tree Creek will be flow into the Halls facility, which houses 1.8 million birds and critical infrastructure. This would have a huge detrimental impact on the Halls of around \$200 million, which would then negatively impact on Millmerran as they employ 300 locals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS – Stated that concerns would be addressed in the Condamine Floodplain crossing presentation. ▶ RB – Is there any provision for a pedestrian access across the rail alignment in Yelarbon? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS – Discussions have taken place with Queensland Rail, and the request for a pedestrian crossing will be considered as part of the EIS. <p>Condamine floodplain crossing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS presented an update on the proposed Condamine floodplain crossing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Flood model update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Following community engagement and independent hydrology review, the model has been updated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ expanded the flood model has been expanded to incorporate additional local flow paths, in particular within the Back Creek catchment ▶ validated the flood model against the 2013 flood event ▶ undertaken further sensitivity testing on the model to determine how inflows from local creeks may impact water levels and velocities in a 1-in-100 (1% AEP) flood event in order to gain more robust results based on local knowledge ▶ included additional data from the Warwick and Cecil Weir stream gauges, as well as anecdotal data of historic flood events prior to 1921, to improve our flood frequency analysis. ▶ Crossing design development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ In response to community feedback and flood model updates, ARTC Inland Rail updated the floodplain crossing design from that which was presented in late 2018. ▶ Key changes included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Extending the bridge over the North Branch by around 250 metres north ▶ Moving the Yandilla rail bridge further south and combining with Grasstree Creek bridge ▶ Increasing the number of culverts near Yandilla grain silos to ensure the drainage channel to the south of the silos has sufficient culverts to convey water in lower event. ▶ The design now includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 6 bridges (4 locations) ▶ 6.1km total bridge length ▶ ~500 culverts (900mm – 2.1m in diameter). ▶ Predicted impacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The number of private landowners whose properties are predicted to experience changed water behaviour decreased to 23. ▶ The number of houses predicted to experience positive afflux is now 6 and the number of other buildings predicted to experience positive afflux is 13. ▶ Next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ ARTC will present the proposed crossing solution to key stakeholders and the community. ▶ ARTC expects to submit the proposed crossing solution with the EIS in late 2019. ▶ ARTC will continue to work with independent hydrologists and landowners to respond to questions and concerns. ▶ ARTC will further improve the modelling accuracy, including additional LiDAR survey, and further expert review of the methodology, model and results. ▶ Subject to project approval, through the detailed design phase, ARTC and the contractor will work with impacted landowners to identify mitigation measures (e.g. levee banks or raising houses) to mitigate the impacts in accordance with the Conditions of Approval.

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ GC – What are the mitigation plans for the properties that are impacted by changed water behaviour? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS – We are still seeking access to properties to survey floorboard levels at affected properties. ▶ GC – While this is a step forward – there needs to be a zero sum gain in affected properties. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS – Acknowledge that ARTC needs to mitigate these impacts. ▶ BK – Around my house the water is higher than the model predicts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS – We are looking to improve the resolution of the survey in the area, which will improve discrepancies in the modelled area. We are also looking at taking at face value the anecdotal markers that have been presented to us and adding the afflux and assessing the implications. ▶ Chair – Highlighted RS’s point about ARTC accepting anecdotal evidence as important. <p>EIS and environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ FK presented an update on the EIS and environmental studies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Fieldwork is now complete ▶ Draft reference design and constructability assessments are key inputs into the EIS – now completed ▶ All draft technical assessments have been submitted to ARTC for review ▶ Stakeholder consultation for the EIS is ongoing. <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Chair – When will the general public be able to see the EIS? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ FK – We anticipate that the exhibition period for the EIS will be in 2020. <p>Noise and vibration assessment methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SH presented to the committee on the assessment methodology used for noise and vibration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Noise <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Noise is often termed as an unwanted sound ▶ ARTC is working to lower noise levels than required by the Terms of Reference ▶ Department of Transport and Main Roads interim guidelines (March 2019) have the following noise limits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ For new rail: average of 60 decibels and a maximum of 82 decibels ▶ For upgrades to existing rail: average of 65 decibels and a maximum of 87 decibels. ▶ ARTC have set the following noise limits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ For new rail: daytime (7am – 10pm) average of 60dba and a maximum of 80dba; night time (10pm – 7am) average of 55 dba and a maximum of 80dba ▶ For upgrades to existing rail: daytime average of 65dba and a maximum of 85dba, night time average of 60dba and a maximum of 85dba. ▶ Operational noise and vibration assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Assessment approach considers noise and vibration that is airborne, ground-borne and structure-radiated ▶ Considers movements on the proposed alignment, within the rail corridor and crossing loops ▶ Assesses the noise and vibration on brownfield and greenfield sites ▶ Assesses noise and vibration from fixed emissions – for example trains idling on a crossing loop or at a siding, horns and active level crossing alarms ▶ Approximately 1,600 noise receivers in the B2G project ▶ Modelling identified 93 sensitive receptors – that is those receptors of noise that exceed ARTC’s maximum noise limits. ▶ Noise mitigation strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Noise mitigation strategies must be practical and reasonable ▶ Includes strategies for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Reducing the source of noise e.g. sleepers, continuous weld rail, curve squeal, lubrication and crossings ▶ Reducing the transmission of noise e.g. barriers of varying heights, landscaping ▶ Property specific strategies e.g. property fencing, glazing, building façade treatments ▶ ARTC’s approach to noise mitigation is based on selecting feasible and practical solutions ▶ Noise barriers are usually considered for groups of receptors

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ For isolated receptors, mitigants expected to include at property treatments to control rail noise inside the property. <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ GC – At what distance from the alignment are the noise levels measured and do you have mapping? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SH – ARTC made a decision to model noise within two kilometres of the proposed rail alignment. The noise levels will be different at the same distance from the alignment due to topography, embankments, bridges and cuttings and the general landscape of the area. Details for specific sensitive receptors will be available at community information sessions. ▶ JC – Can you please explain what a receiver is? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SH – A receiver or receptor is the building or structure that “hears” the noise or “feels” the vibration from the trains travelling along the alignment. ▶ JC – Noted that predicted noise levels are probably not going to mean much to residents if they can’t compare the noise of a train going past to their existing noise levels. So, if you are on a main road and have trucks going past, if you are able to say “The train is going to be such and such a noise level and your existing noise level is such and such, on average” that is going to mean something to the resident. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SH – For major infrastructure projects, the way noise is assessed is different to how noise is typically assessed. For major infrastructure projects we are set an average and a maximum noise level, regardless of the existing noise level. To what ARTC have done to minimise the impact is to set lower than required average and maximum noise levels. ▶ NC – Suggested that analogies might be a good way for you to explain noise impacts – for example I know what a semi-trailer on the highway sounds like, and can tell you if it’s a single, double or triple, but I can’t tell you what the decibels are. It might be useful if we could understand if it’s going to be louder than a semi-trailer or is it going to be a car. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SH – I had thought of it in those terms, I will reflect on that, as we have had this type of question before and I know other projects are working on this as well. ▶ BK – People are going to want to know what the expected noise during construction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SH – That information is included as part of the deliverables for the EIS – but it has not been touched on in the presentation here. ▶ Chair – Requested FK confirm that there will be conditions in the EIS surrounding noise and there will be limits set, and ARTC will be able to be held to account on statements they commit to about noise. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ FK – Advised that was correct. <p>Social performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Chair – in the interests of time, the social performance and business update is held over until the next meeting. ▶ HW – With the release of the proposed rail alignment we are conscious that people may be more concerned or experiencing more anxiety than usual. We have the 1300 number people can contact to access support services. ▶ HW – In addition we would like to offer CCC members the opportunity to undertake a training program developed by Lifeline called “Community Connections Program”. The program trains people in how to identify and support others in their community to access relevant services. ▶ Chair – Requested HW email him the details to distribute to committee members. <p>Community engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ LJ provided update on community engagement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Upcoming engagement activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ CCC meetings for both Inner and Southern Darling Downs ▶ Landowner meetings ▶ Newsletter distribution to approximately 6000 households ▶ Website update ▶ Community information sessions. ▶ Phone calls and meetings have been held with directly affected landowners and have been provided with maps showing the proposed rail alignment in relation to their property. ▶ A newsletter showing the proposed rail alignment for the B2G project has been distributed.

MEETING MINUTES

Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee Meeting # 7

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Community information sessions will take place in late October with ARTC and technical representatives available to answer any queries.▶ If you are unable to attend a community information session please contact us on 1800 732 761 to speak with us, arrange a meeting or you can make a comment on the interactive map.
5	<p>General business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ BK agreed to hold over this discussion around his request to have independent soils assessment until the next meeting.▶ All agreed that the next CCC meeting would be held in Millmerran in December.▶ MO – Asked about the location of construction camps, as that presented an opportunity for doing business with Inland Rail.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ FK – advised that consultation was required with landowners and councils, and ARTC hopes to be in a position to share these at the community information sessions.▶ JC – Request that it be publicised that members of the public can submit questions to committee members before the meeting; and those questions will be brought up at the meetings and recorded.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Chair – advised that people are welcome to submit questions either to CCC members or ARTC at any time.▶ BK – Questioned format of CCC meeting as he feels it has achieved little over the past two years as there is not enough opportunity to discuss issues.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ LJ – noted that prior to each meeting she sends a request for agenda items to CCC members and she urges members to respond.▶ Chair – Advised that the CCCs are nearing the end of the two-year term they were originally appointed for and he suspected there will be some discussions between the chairs of the committees and ARTC about what the CCCs might look like going forward. Confirmed that BK’s issues around format will be discussed.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ MSt – Confirmed that ARTC is looking at the most appropriate format for the CCCs going into 2020 in the context of context of our Queensland projects and the upcoming phases of those projects. Expect to be able to come back to the CCC in the coming months; but definitely before this term expires.▶ GH – Requested copy of KMZ file of design to enable members to review design more thoroughly.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ RS – Advised that ARTC does not transmit KMZ files but noted that the detail shown on the map would be shared on the interactive map on the website.▶ MO – Requested the property team provide an update at the next meeting.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ RS/MSm – Agreed this could be added to the agenda.
6	<p>Questions from observers</p> <p>The Chair welcomed questions from observers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Observer – Request ARTC host a community meeting rather than a drop-in session so that questions and answers can be heard by everyone.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Chair – Noted. ARTC to address concerns directly with observer.▶ GK – Suggested that a community information session run after a CCC meeting might be a good way to engage.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ LJ – Noted.▶ Observer – There are lots of things that remain unanswered.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Chair – Duly noted.▶ Observer – Can you explain what is meant by a 1-in-100 year flood.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Chair – ARTC will explain to you privately following the meeting.
7	<p>Brett Kelly (BK) presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ BK presented to the meeting on the Condamine floodplain crossing:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Width of floodplain<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Acknowledged ARTC’s recognition of the floodplain being 19 kilometres wide.▶ Errors in flood modelling

MEETING MINUTES

Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee Meeting # 7

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BK showed images of the flood event on the Condamine floodplain crossing, showing water depths around properties, roads and the existing rail alignment, which differed from the modelling undertaken by ARTC. ▶ <i>Image: Looking towards Millmerran 27/12/10</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BK referred to email from RS to Sharmil Markar regarding the modelled height of the water on the Gore Highway near Paul Curtis' property. Your modelling suggests it is 200mm over road, but this photo shows it was 700-800mm. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS undertook to review flood modelling to determine if the location was on the highway or at the fence posts. ▶ <i>Image: Looking towards Brookstead 27/12/10</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BK advised that photo shows water going straight ahead to Grasstree Creek on the eastern side of the existing rail line. If there is an embankment that comes across there with the new line and joining onto the existing line, there's no way for that water to go where it used to go. The water will instead cut straight across into Hall's mill; and then Hall's admin block. ▶ <i>Image: Property on Harris Road</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BK advised the flood model indicated the height is 49 centimetres lower than the measured height. ▶ <i>Image: Yandilla church</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BK advised that the modelled height is 60 centimetres below the measured flood height. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS advised this was not correct as the model calibrated well at this location. ▶ <i>Image: Aerial image of DA Hall & Co administration block</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BK pointed out the levee bank and the poultry sheds to the left, noting it was about 100 millimetres from breaking over the top, which was scary to think there were chickens in that shed. ▶ BK stated that although there are concerns with the current flood modelling, it is useful to demonstrate some aspects, such as increased water levels. Upstream of the line, it poses dangers to lives and livelihood, flooding of houses, sheds and major damage to farming infrastructure; and immense costs associated with repair. Second major concern is that of erosion, due to the increased water velocity downstream. Once the topsoil is washed off your land, it's not much good. We expected no change in flood, in height or velocity. ▶ Erosion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BK showed images of local erosion and scouring post a flood event. ▶ ARTC past performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BK showed images of ARTC infrastructure following flood events in other areas in Australia. ▶ Requests to ARTC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ ARTC and FFJV acknowledge that the Condamine floodplain is 19km wide, not 12.5km (or any lesser distance), and design the rail for this increased water volume, as this has been ignored in the current design. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BK acknowledged this had been done. ▶ Seek approval from Richard Wankmuller for an independent expert with international credibility to model water flow on the Condamine floodplain using independent data. ▶ [Seek approval] for an independent expert with international credibility to model water flow for the Macintyre floodplain at Goondiwindi. ▶ RS committed to responding to BK's presentation.
8	<p>Confirmation of actions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ARTC to seek to explain the split between the NS2B and B2G projects. 2. ARTC to present business opportunities with Inland Rail at next meeting. 3. ARTC to provide details of construction camp locations. 4. ARTC to consider analogies for noise levels. 5. ARTC Property team to present at the next meeting. 6. ARTC to provide the committee with a copy of the acquisition fact sheet once finalised. 7. ARTC to provide the committee with a copy of the Social Performance fact sheet once finalised. 8. ARTC to respond to BK's presentation on Condamine floodplain. <p><i>Meeting concluded at 9.00pm.</i></p>