

Meeting minutes

Kagaru to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton Community Consultative Committee

Date / Time	Location
22 February 2021 6.00-8.00pm	Algerter Sports Club

Chair	Secretariat
Hon Gary Hardgrave (Chair)	Laura Jarman (LJ)

Attendees

- ▶ Suzanne Corbett – Inland Rail Action Group (SC)
- ▶ Clayton D’Cruz – Individual (CD)
- ▶ Angela Harlen – Beaudesert Chamber of Commerce (AH)
- ▶ Stephen Harrison – Flinders Land Holdings Pty Ltd (SH)
- ▶ Max Hooper – Southern Brisbane Suburban Forum (MH)
- ▶ David Kenny – Logan Country Safe Group (DK)
- ▶ Steve McDonald – Regional Development Australia Logan & Redlands Inc (SM)
- ▶ Anne Page – Logan and Albert Conservation Association (AP)
- ▶ Sidney Smith – Algerter Chase Gated Community (SS)
- ▶ Robert Sutton – Individual (RS)
- ▶ Troy Thompson – Peet Flagstone (TT)
- ▶ Bob Wiley – Individual (BW)

Apologies

- ▶ Ken Madden – Individual

ARTC

- ▶ James Egan – Project Engineer – K2ARB (JE)
- ▶ Karen Hillery – Engagement Advisor – K2ARB (KH)
- ▶ Mark McNamara – Senior Environment Advisor – K2ARB (MM)
- ▶ Nicola Mitchell – Stakeholder Engagement Operations Manager (NM)
- ▶ Jane Roberts – Inland Rail Social Performance Principal (JR)
- ▶ Kerrin Roberts – Project Manager – K2ARB (KR)

Discussions

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<p>Safety Share</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair noted that ARTC starts each meeting with a safety share as part of its corporate social responsibility and provided a safety share on safe manual handling: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Keep the load close to the body and lift with the thigh muscles. ▶ Never attempt to lift or carry loads if you think they are too heavy. ▶ Pushing a load is less stressful on your body than pulling a load. ▶ Use mechanical aids or get help to lift or carry a heavy load whenever possible. ▶ Organise the work area to reduce the amount of bending, twisting and stretching required. ▶ Take frequent breaks. ▶ Warm up before and cool down after manual work with gentle stretches.

NO.	DISCUSSION
1	<p>Welcome and introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair opened the meeting. ▶ The Chair acknowledged the Traditional Owners. ▶ The Chair thanked members for attending and acknowledged the observers attending the meeting. ▶ The Chair advised that in case of emergency to follow the instructions of Algester Sports Club staff and pointed out the safety exits. ▶ The Chair acknowledged Councillor Tim Frazer from Logan City Council and Councillor Angela Owen from Brisbane City Council. ▶ The Chair notes an apology from Ken Madden. ▶ The Chair extended a welcome to the six new committee members, noting they had been appointed based on the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Knowledge of the local area, ▶ Participation in the local community ▶ Ability to gather and disseminate information regarding Inland Rail throughout the community and to bring representative views to the work of the Committee. ▶ The Chair noted the meeting is primarily for the business of the committee; but undertook to open up to a few questions from observers at the end if time permits. ▶ The Chair invited CCC members and ARTC staff seated at the table to give a short introduction on themselves and the group they represent. ▶ Members were requested to declare any 'real' or 'perceived' conflicts of interest which could be impacted or influenced by the Inland Rail project so they could be recorded in a register. These could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Business dealings; ▶ Community interests; ▶ Operational interests; ▶ Commercial interests; and/or ▶ Landholder interests. ▶ Chair Formerly represented Algester in Federal Parliament; current Chair of RDA Logan and Redlands; involved in community and Brisbane City Council committees, including the Better Suburbs and City Standards Committee ▶ CD Resident, associated with St Stephen's school ▶ JE K2ARB project engineer ▶ TT Representing Peet Ltd - developer of Flagstone (new city that abuts line), which is a designated priority development area with about 700 new homes at the moment and will grow to 30,000+ residents ▶ RS Looks after a property in Allenvue that straddles railway line ▶ AH Represents the Beaudesert Chamber of Commerce and is the conduit for the project back to town of Beaudesert ▶ MM K2ARB Environment Lead ▶ SM Representing RDA Logan and Redlands - looking to attract business to Logan area and strike a balance between economic investment and social cohesion and social investment ▶ AP President of Logan and Albert Conservation Association concerned with maintaining a healthy and connected environment for healthy communities for the future and Munruben resident ▶ NM Inland Rail Stakeholder Engagement Operations Manager

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ MH Civil engineer; Coopers Plains resident; interested in how IR will integrate with road network and make sure those impacts can be managed ▶ SS Chair of Algester Chase Gated Community, adjacent to rail line ▶ SH Sits on the national board of Urban Development Institute of Australia; Chair of Gold Coast Light Rail; represents key representative of the Development Group for Greater Flagstone, representative for a large landowner adjacent to Inland Rail ▶ KR K2ARB Project Manager ▶ BW 20-year resident of Flagstone; member of Rotary, Logan Country Safe City Group, Neighbourhood Watch, Flagstone Community Association and Flagstone Men's Shed ▶ JR Inland Rail social performance - Inland Rail Skills Academy and Community Health and wellbeing ▶ SC Resident and represents Inland Rail Action Group ▶ DK Represents Logan Safe Committee ▶ LJ Stakeholder Engagement Lead for K2ARB.
	<p>Review of Charter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair noted that Charter states that it is to be reviewed every 12 months. ▶ The Chair asked if there were any Charter that members wished to discuss. ▶ The Chair drew a number of sections of the Charter to the attention of the members. <p>▶ PURPOSE</p> <p><i>ARTC is seeking from the Committee community input on aspects of the studies required as part of the project approvals process, as well as provision to ARTC Inland Rail of insights into community issues, concerns and opportunities, for the Project. The Committee will aim to facilitate:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ <i>Broader community involvement in the Project;</i> ▶ <i>Capture of local knowledge, issues, concerns and opportunities;</i> ▶ <i>Increased understanding and awareness of the Project; and</i> ▶ <i>Coordination of a more effective response from the Project Team to emerging issues, concerns and opportunities.</i> <p>▶ The Chair reminded members that the purpose of this committee was not to re-route this section of the Inland Rail. While that may be your personal preference, that is not within ARTC's remit. He noted that ARTC was delivering the route that has been determined initially by the Queensland Government who gave the advice to the Commonwealth that this is the route that was preferred. ARTC is trying to build that route and make it work within the scope of understanding the issues, concerns and opportunities. He further noted that if members wished to re-route the project, they needed to be having those discussions with your local elected representatives.</p> <p>▶ SCOPE</p> <p><i>The Committee will:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ <i>Receive briefings and updates on the Project;</i> ▶ <i>Discuss and provide comment or feedback on aspects of the Project;</i> ▶ <i>Represent community views regarding local issues, impacts and benefits; and</i> ▶ <i>Act as a conduit to provide information about the Project to the broader community.</i> <p><i>The Committee is for consultation purposes only and is not a decision-making body.</i></p> <p>▶ MEMBERSHIP RESIGNATIONS AND VACANCIES</p>

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<p><i>A member's position becomes vacant if they provide their resignation in writing. A position may be declared vacant if the member:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ <i>Fails to attend more than two consecutive meetings in the calendar year without prior notice; or</i> ▶ <i>Breaches the Committee meeting operating principles</i> <p>▶ OPERATING PRINCIPLES COMMITTEE MEMBERS <i>To ensure the Committee achieves its aims, members agree to the following principles:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ <i>Respect the rights and views of other members;</i> ▶ <i>Provide constructive input;</i> ▶ <i>Agree to disseminate information to, and gather feedback from, the community or group they represent, without taking responsibility from ARTC.</i> <p>▶ The Chair noted that in this iteration of the committee, he would like to see more reporting back from members about what people in the community are asking and saying about the project.</p> <p>▶ MEDIA LIAISON <i>Committee Members can speak to the media outside the Committee meetings as individuals about the Project, but not as a spokesperson on behalf of the Committee or the Project. Only the Chair is authorised to speak on behalf of the Committee, after consulting with the Committee Members, recognising that time demands may require this to be done within a limited timeframe. The Committee as a collective may distribute press releases about the Committee. Such releases would be subject to ARTC's prior approval.</i></p> <p>▶ OPERATIONAL PROTOCOLS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ <i>Members will be invited to nominate topics or issues for discussion, as will the Project Team, through the Chair. Raised issues will need to be provided to the Secretariat for inclusion on the meeting agenda, and will be allocated a time limit to allow appropriate discussion within the meeting timeframe.</i> ▶ <i>The Committee will meet at an appropriate place and time, as notified to Committee Members by the Chair. It is expected that the Committee will meet quarterly (every 12 weeks) on dates and places set out in advance, but may set meetings on a more frequent basis.</i> ▶ <i>Extraordinary meetings may be called by the Chair if deemed necessary, based on significant issues to be tabled and discussed, and will be done so with at least five (5) days written notice to all members.</i> ▶ <i>Meeting minutes will be taken by the ARTC Secretariat. The minutes will include attendance, apologies, declarations of interest, and a record of topics discussed and assigned actions.</i> ▶ <i>All members must confirm accuracy of the minutes. Meeting minutes that require significant changes should be responded to in writing and forwarded to the Chair, to be tabled for discussion at the next Committee meeting. Amendments of the minutes should be agreed to by members.</i> <p>▶ The Chair stated that it was critical for members to forward agenda items by the date that's required; so that they can be placed on the agenda; so they can be discussed at the meeting , finding answers to the questions or maybe necessitate a briefing on a particular issue.</p> <p>▶ The Chair noted that going forward, he hoped the committee would be more driven by the members and requested they put forward agenda items. He further noted that if this were not the case, the committee may not have much to discuss.</p> <p>▶ The Chair also noted that a number of questions were submitted in the last 24 hours. ARTC needs to be given adequate time to consider questions and prepare a detailed response.</p>

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair encouraged members to review the meeting minutes to ensure accuracy, but noted they are not a transcript.
	<p>Future meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair noted that under the terms of the Charter, the committee is to meet quarterly. He proposed to set meeting dates in advance, noting there may need to be some flexibility in dates as there was not much value in holding meetings where there is no new content to discuss. ▶ The Chair proposed quarterly meetings on the last Monday of the month. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 31 May ▶ 30 August ▶ 29 November. ▶ The Chair asked if members had any objections to the dates. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ <i>No objections were raised.</i> ▶ The Chair noted that ARTC would source suitable locations for each of the meetings rotating along the rail line. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ <i>-No objections were raised.</i>
2	<p>Update on actions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ARTC to report back to the members regarding progress on the development of a business case regarding a dedicated freight line to the Port of Brisbane. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ NM advised that the State and Federal governments were continuing to work on the business case and she would bring an update when there was something more tangible to report. ▶ NM undertook to re-send the summary of the Port of Brisbane study background. 2. ARTC to share the presentation with members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair noted this had been completed. ▶ LJ added that while new members didn't receive a copy of the last presentation, a lot of the content was covered in the new member briefing that they received. 3. ARTC to provide ongoing updates on the progress of environmental and technical studies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair noted this would be covered in the agenda item on project overview. 4. ARTC to provide further information on the impact on the business case for the Gowrie to Kagaru public private partnership project with and without coal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR advised that this was one of the questions that was taken on notice from the Senate inquiry and that ARTC would issue the formal response to that question to the Committee.
3	<p>Project update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR provided a K2ARB project overview and update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ At the November 2020 meeting, ARTC presented some of the impacts/mitigations that had been determined out of the last 18 months of studies. ▶ The project now has a reference design for the proposed enhancement work sites and draft primary approvals documentation, based on those studies and the potential impacts and proposed mitigations.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ ARTC is not in a position to do anything with that documentation as it is awaiting a decision from the Coordinator-General regarding the application to be declared a coordinated project. ▶ The project team is now focussing its efforts on forward planning; largely around procurement strategy activities so it is in a position to move into detailed design when an approvals pathway has been confirmed. ▶ Moving forward in the next few months ARTC will continue to engage with the Office of the Coordinator-General and key stakeholders, such as TMR and elected representatives, Committee and the community. <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ TT requested a copy of the reports and designs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR responded that ARTC had shared a summary of the outputs but noted they can't issue the reports themselves until the project approvals pathway is understood. ▶ MM added that ARTC had already met with some property developers and would continue to engage with landowners and developers. ▶ TT noted that the information provided to that point had been useful. ▶ SH asked if ARTC had any update on the timing of the Coordinator-General's response. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR advised that ARTC did not have any more clarity on the timing. The Coordinator-General is continuing to deliberate the outcome of the application.
5	<p>Communication and engagement update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ LJ provided an overview of recent communication and engagement activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Seven community information sessions in December attended by 148 people ▶ The information session were promoted via: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Advertising in the Jimboomba and Beaudesert Times, Albert & Logan News (digital) and MyCity Logan. ▶ A printed newsletter distributed to houses 1km either side of the alignment, which is nearly 12,000 houses. ▶ Two emails to the database - about 1800 recipients – in November. ▶ A geographically targeted social media campaign from 22 November to 16 December. ▶ An electronic newsletter was distributed in February – any feedback or suggestions for articles would be welcomed ▶ ARTC has commenced meetings with identified property owners to clarify arrangements if ARTC wishes to access their property in the future to undertake further investigations including to potentially inform the development of mitigation measures. Meetings are ongoing. ▶ LJ advised of upcoming engagement activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ ARTC is finalising the details of the most recent round of sponsorships and can't give too much away, but an application from this area has been successful. Advised people to stay tuned for more details. ▶ In late March, ARTC is running noise workshops for those property owners whose properties are expected to experience changed noise conditions during the operation of Inland Rail or whose properties adjoin the location of a proposed noise wall. These are closed workshops for invitees only, however, as previously mentioned, ARTC can also run one of these workshops for CCC members. Asked members if they would be interested in such a session. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ <i>-Members indicated they would be interested.</i> ▶ LJ undertook to arrange noise workshop for CCC. <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p>

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ AP flagged that she was concerned about noise workshops being run during Easter school holidays. ▶ LJ advised that school holidays had been factored into the planning and the noise workshops will have concluded before they start.
	<p>Mental health support and training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ JR provided an overview of how Inland Rail is supporting the mental health in communities along which Inland Rail is planned. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ ARTC is working to establish a systemic and consistent approach across the 1700 kilometre alignment spanning three states. ▶ ARTC is establishing relationships with the seven federally funded Primary Health Networks (PHNs) that cover the entire Inland Rail alignment. The PHNs are regional experts in the health of their communities and are set up to know what is needed in each community and to commission appropriate services to support their communities. ▶ The main driver is to understand what support mechanisms exist in which community; so that ARTC is promoting existing independence, sustainable and local services; which already exist and which continue beyond the construction of Inland Rail. ▶ JR provided an overview of the service available in the K2ARB project area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Brisbane South PHN supports the Wesley Mission Queensland, a local organisation, to offer a free mental health service called "The Well-being Mental Health Service". ▶ You don't need a GP referral. It is really for people who not necessarily have a mental illness but are having a bit of anxiety or there's a blip. ARTC always supports people to talk to their GPs if they need greater support. ▶ The PHN has a very thorough website, if people are requiring more kinds of intense services. ▶ JR advised of mental health support training opportunities available to CCC members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The training is to help people understand what the mental health service network looks like in their community; and to help them feel confident if people reach out to them and says, "I'm feeling stressed; I need some assistance." ▶ A range of training options exist, either face-to-face or online ▶ It's not about becoming a counsellor or making referrals; it's not about replacing a GP or trained professionals; it's about knowing what to do or say if someone reaches out to you and then an appropriate level of self-care. ▶ The Chair asked if the committee would be interested in exploring training opportunities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ <i>About half the members indicated they would be interested.</i> ▶ JR undertook to investigate training options.
6	<p>General business and questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair opened the session to general business from the CCC members. ▶ SM requested information about what the opportunities Inland Rail presents for people to get long-term skills that are returnable to the communities in which they live. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ JR advised of the different elements of the Inland Rail Social Investment Program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Inland Rail Skills Academy – a virtual academy offering opportunities to raise awareness about the skills required in the delivery of Inland Rail and more broadly. ▶ STEM skills training – big priority. Inland Rail supports a number of STEM programs, one of which focuses on virtual work experience for high school students to enable them to gain

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<p>awareness of the skills used in rail construction and operations and maintenance, and connection into industry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ STEM on Track – an events-based approach to stimulating interest in STEM subjects and potential careers. ▶ Scholarship program – 20 scholarships along the alignment to support first-year Bachelor degree entrance into STEM areas. Last year, a young man from Logan got into paramedicine. <p>▶ SC requested ARTC not site crossing loop in Forestdale area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR provided update on the crossing loop review, noting it was not yet finalised. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ ARTC has undertaken a desktop study to look at the viability of moving the loop further south within the Greenbank Military Training Reserve. ▶ The new location results in an increased number of sensitive receptors overall. ▶ The other issue with that location is ARTC wouldn't be able to meet all of its standards/requirements for how a loop should be designed and constructed. This will create issues with vertical grades and potentially generate other impacts, such as more strain on the locomotive and coupling, more wear and tear on rails and, therefore, more maintenance. ▶ ARTC needs to understand what that means for the business; particularly in terms of whole life cost, including whether it may generate more disturbance to the community in that area because of the potential for more maintenance. ▶ KR advised that ARTC has carried out at a higher level assessment on the Kagaru Loop near Flagstone. <p>▶ SM asked if it would be feasible to run the Kagaru (Flagstone) crossing loop out at Bromelton.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR replied that the way the section works is that a certain capacity utilisation is required between Kagaru and Acacia Ridge, but Bromelton is a different section of track. ▶ KR offered a technical presentation on how it works, how the loop locations are determined and modelled at a future meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair confirmed the committee was interested in receiving a briefing on operational modelling and an operational model is prepared and the kind of factors that need to be taken into consideration. <p>▶ AP noted that Greenbank military training area is on the national heritage estate, has significant natural heritage values and also cultural heritage values so any proposal to move the loop there would have huge environmental impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR responded that environmental impacts were a significant consideration in the process; ▶ MM added that in the current proposed loop location or if it is moved to the Greenbank area, all permanent railway infrastructure works would be within the existing rail corridor. ▶ AP advised that whole area from Greenbank Military to Flinders Peak is a State corridor that is identified for environmental values. The current rail is a barrier for fauna movement. ▶ The Chair suggested it may be appropriate for other governments to consider bridges/land bridges to provide some further spots for animals to pass over the railway line. <p>▶ SH advised that he would like to gain confidence that the two crossing loops in the best location; in the most appropriate location. Suggested they could be peer reviewed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SC noted that the current location of the crossing loop is the most densely populated part of the whole section of rail with more than 50,000 people in the section. ▶ KR advised that ARTC had taken on board the concern and are looking at it; however, if and when ARTC gets to a decision point, if the committee wanted another independent look at it, that would be for the committee to consider.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ TT requested that the rail loop presentation also look at mitigation measures as the Flagstone loop, where trains could idle for an extended period, does not have any barriers proposed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR responded that when the proposed noise barriers were presented in the November CCC meeting, ARTC was awaiting information on the proposed developments in the area to inform the modelling. In the coming months the team will be in a position to talk about what that means. ▶ CD stated that the loops are currently 1.8km long but were being future proofed for 3.6km. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR clarified that the Inland Rail business case is to construct a loop to accommodate a 1800-metre train; which would require a loop of 2,150-metre minimum length. ARTC does not have approval under the business case to build a loop to accommodate a 3600-metre train; however, as part of the reference design phase, ARTC has considered how a train of this size could fit. Any mitigations required as a result of extending that loop are not currently budgeted and will not be delivered under the project as currently scoped. ▶ CD asked where the forecast 45 trains per day would come from and whether it included traffic from northern NSW that could go to the Port of Brisbane instead of the Port of Newcastle. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR advised it was the forecast peak operations on the section between Kagaru and Acacia Ridge (2040) and would include the XPT passenger services that come on the existing interstate north. ▶ MH tabled a list of questions and advised would be happy for them to be taken on notice and a written reply provided. He noted that one question about crossing loop design to fit the longer trains had already been answered by KR in the course of the meeting. ▶ MH stated that it seemed that ARTC had adopted a low-cost pathway of lowering the tracks under the existing bridges. Given that the original intended purpose for the corridor was a passenger rail line, the cost in taking this corridor for the purpose of freight rail is going to pass on additional cost and risk in the government being able to activate it for that purpose in the future. Does the planning takes into account future land requirements and future works to bridges, in terms of widening and rectification works to bridges? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR responded that it does not. ARTC has adopted the approach of track lowering as replacing the bridges would incur significant costs not associated with achieving the Inland Rail business case. ARTC consults with TMR on their plans for that corridor; noting that the projects are at distinctly different phases. ▶ SH commented that his organisation had approval from ARTC and the State Government to build a bridge across Wyatt Road but are trying to get a road to connect to it. ▶ MH commented that widening the bridges in the future will cause significant additional impacts and questioned whether that could be done up front. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair commented that it is a Queensland Government route and they are going to be the ones to come up with answers to that. ▶ The Chair noted that TT has also submitted questions for discussion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ TT advised that his questions he had been answered during the course of the meeting. ▶ The Chair opened up the meeting to questions from observers. He noted that these need to be questions not statement of opinion. He further noted that this is not a forum for discussing your own personal situation. ARTC is happy to meet with residents in person, on the phone or via Zoom to discuss those matters.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<p><i>Observer questions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ An observer noted that construction noise was more of an issue for him than operational noise and asked if there would be noise workshops for construction noise. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ MM responded that as the project proceeds through its approval process, ARTC will be engaging with the people along the corridor where these impacts will be. The construction program is based on a possession strategy; where ARTC will take over track possession for 36 to 60-hour periods for continual works. There will also be pre-and post-possession works undertaken. ARTC will be engaging with the people along the corridor who may be impacted by construction-related noise. ▶ An observer asked if ARTC could confirm that the existing standard gauge rail that links Acacia Ridge to the Port of Brisbane is still considered adequate by ARTC for their purposes until 2040. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR asked if the question related to the current condition of the track or capacity. ▶ The observer clarified that his question related to the anticipated export from Melbourne to Brisbane port. ▶ KR advised that Inland Rail was not a port project, is was terminal to terminal, and advised she would take the question on notice. ▶ An observer noted that Minister for Transport and Main Roads Mark Bailey had recently released a statement advising there would be no coal on this section of Inland Rail until passenger rail is considered, which would be after the Cross River Rail project is finished. It also mentioned the plan for four tracks – two passenger and two freight. The observer noted that with four tracks he didn't see why crossing loops were required. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR advised she couldn't talk to what TMR or Minister Bailey were proposing; but that the Salisbury to Beaudesert passenger transport project had different timing to Inland Rail at the moment. As Inland Rail is proposed to commence construction before that project is designed, ARTC would need to install crossing loops first. ▶ An observer asked if project would have a positive or negative impact on jobs and how traffic would be managed between Acacia Ridge and the Port of Brisbane. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR advised there was an existing railway from Acacia Ridge to the Port – the narrow gauge component of which is operational. She noted that growth in truck movements would continue; however, Inland Rail will stem some of that growth by providing a operators with a choice and creating a modal shift. ▶ An observer asked if an organisation like RACQ had been engaged to do an independent assessment of traffic. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR replied that she had interpreted that the observer was asking about what ARTC calls “cumulative downstream traffic impacts”. These are outside the scope of the K2ARB project – it is a matter to be addressed under the terminals business case that's currently agreed between the State and Federal governments. KR advised that there were standards to comply with in assessing traffic impacts. ▶ The Chair noted that some of the projections for traffic out of Acacia Ridge had been quite frightening, including tripling the amount of trucks, so the traffic model for Acacia Ridge to the Port does need to be looked at. ▶ An observer asked if extraordinary meetings would be open to observers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair confirmed that was the intention, however, there may be matters that need to be discussed directly within the committee.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ An observer asked what the noise barriers would be constructed out of. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ MM advised ARTC was looking at concrete barriers at this point in time, noting this would be looked at further in detailed design. ▶ An observer asked if the environmental reports were publicly available. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR advised they were not being released until the approvals pathway has been agreed. ARTC is concerned that if the reports were released publicly before the Coordinator-General has made a decision, it could be seen as influencing that decision. ▶ An observer noted that he lived near the Acacia Ridge terminal and his legal property access had been removed in 1980 and he had been unable to get another one. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair suggested he could talk to his State or Federal member. ▶ An observer noted that the valuation of properties backing onto the railway line will drop but they weren't entitled to compensation through the Federal State or Local government and asked where landowners stand in regard to devaluation of properties. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR confirmed that ARTC is not acquiring property in this section and, it was not required to pay for devaluation under legislation. ▶ The observer noted that they were ok with the existing train numbers on the interstate line but not 45 trains/day – this would make them prisoners in their own home. The observer sought confirmation that the feedback provided by the community was provided to the Federal Government. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ LJ confirmed that ARTC did report back to the Federal Government. ▶ CD requested details of estimated traffic volumes when Inland Rail is commissioned. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ NM advised it was in the order of 20-25 trains per day, ramping up to 45 trains per day in 2040. ▶ An observer noted that she had read a news report about the Senate Inquiry which said that this rail line was not a success and should not be going ahead but tunnels should be investigated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair responded that he had presented to the Inquiry in Brisbane and the Senate was compiling a report on the matter. ▶ The Chair noted that the scope of the CCC was to consult on the project as it's been announced to deal with the issues and concerns, but issues around redesign or potential alternative routes were a matter for residents to take up with their elected members. ▶ MH asked what percentage of freight was going from Acacia Ridge to the Port of Brisbane. He noted this would help people to understand if a dedicated rail tunnel were constructed from Acacia Ridge to the Port what percentage of trucks would reduce and what percentage would be left to deal with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR advised that around 70 per cent would be off loaded and the remainder – around 25 per cent – of minerals and agricultural project would potentially continue to the Port. ▶ The Chair noted that there has been talk about a variety of intermodal facilities – not just Acacia Ridge, but also Bromelton, Ebenezer, Gatton, Wellcamp – that could impact that market response and train numbers.
7	<p>Conclusion and confirmation of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ LJ confirmed the actions for the meeting as per the action list below.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="240 309 1059 338">▶ SC tabled a list of questions she had collated from her community. <li data-bbox="240 383 1430 443">▶ The Chair thanked the presenters and everyone for attending the meeting and noted that the next meeting is planned for 31 May 2021 – venue to be confirmed. <li data-bbox="240 488 632 517">▶ The Chair closed the meeting.

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY
1	ARTC to re-circulate the summary of the Port of Brisbane study background.	ARTC
2	ARTC to circulate the answer to a Question on Notice regarding the impact of coal transport on the project's Business Case.	ARTC
3	ARTC to send potential dates for a workshop for CCC members regarding noise mitigation.	ARTC
4	ARTC to further investigate mental health training for CCC members.	ARTC
5	ARTC to provide a technical presentation on operational modelling for crossing loops at an upcoming meeting.	ARTC
6	ARTC to confirm the existing rail line to the Port of Brisbane has sufficient capacity until 2040.	ARTC