

# Meeting minutes - unconfirmed

## Lockyer Valley Community Consultative Committee

### Date / Time

20 April 2021  
5:00pm – 8:30pm

### Location

Lockyer Valley Cultural Centre, Gatton

### Chair

Simon Warner

### Minute taker

Secretariat

### Attendees

- |                        |                      |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| ▶ Simon Warner (Chair) | ▶ Gary Stark         |
| ▶ Kathy Brady          | ▶ Neil Cook          |
| ▶ Maurice Hennessy     | ▶ Michael Keene      |
| ▶ Doug Lyons           | ▶ Gordon Van der Est |
| ▶ Daniel McNamara      | ▶ Darryl Green       |

### Apologies

- |                     |                  |
|---------------------|------------------|
| ▶ Margaret McCarthy | ▶ Jason Chavasse |
| ▶ John Schollick    | ▶ Gavin Simpson  |
| ▶ Kym Flehr         |                  |

### ARTC project team

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| ▶ Chris Matthews, Senior Project Manager, H2C | ▶ Corey Doran, Stakeholder Engagement Advisor, H2C  |
| ▶ Rizwan Afzal, Project Manager, H2C          | ▶ Stephen Brierley, Design Manager, H2C             |
| ▶ Shane Harris, Environmental Advisor, H2C    | ▶ Ashley Williams, Indigenous Participation Advisor |
| ▶ Damien Morrissey, Cultural Heritage Manager | ▶ Kylie Wendell, Stakeholder Engagement Lead, H2C   |
| ▶ Adam Marks, Offsets                         |   |

### Discussions

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p><b>Introduction, Acknowledgement of Country - 5.10pm – Chair</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome to committee, Chair delivered the Acknowledgement of Country.</li> <li>Chair welcomed:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Representative from the Office of Scott Buchholz MP</li> <li>Mayor, Lockyer Valley Regional Council and several councillors</li> <li>Kathryn Silk, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications</li> <li>Observers.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Five apologies from committee members: John Schollick, Margaret McCarthy, Gavin Simpson, Jason Chavasse and Kym Flehr.</li> </ul>
1	<p><b>Introduction, Project Description, Project Rationale, Reference Design, Timeline and Assessment Methodology – Chris Matthews</b></p>

	<p><b>Question from CCC member – Doug Lyons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The photo used in the presentation shows pan-rolled clips, I hope they're better than they were thirty years ago because a Mt Isa train had a wagon de-railed and broke clips for more than 100km. I noticed they are using different ones in Brisbane area now. Why are you using pan-rolled clips, have they been improved?</li> <li>• Chris Matthews – these are stock images we use, I would direct the question to one of the technical team, the clips we would be using will be to modern standards, we are designing the Inland Rail for a 30-ton axle load and they will be using whatever clips are required for that.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question from CCC member – Darryl Green</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have they got any information on the change to road networks throughout this project?</li> <li>• Chris Matthews – that information is contained within the EIS, specifically in the Traffic and Transport chapter and Summary of Findings document. It has also been presented many times to this committee and smaller groups.</li> <li>• Chair – it is also worth noting that one of the issues this committee has been fairly active about, particularly the passenger rail interface with ARTC has been specifically excluded. If you refer to the Draft EIS on page 8, there is a specific from the Office of the Coordinator-General to exclude discussion on passenger rail from the EIS. That's a separate question, it's not an ARTC question, it's a question that surprises me given that the Queensland Government made as part of the Terms of Reference for the EIS issues to do with linking to passenger rail and then to exclude it from the EIS is an interesting thing. That will be something we can take up with the Coordinator-General though, not with ARTC.</li> <li>• Chair – in relation to some of the other road project, it is important that we understand what is inside the scope of the EIS and what is outside the scope and that we ensure we take that up with the Department of Transport and Main Roads. Again, the Coordinator-General has made it clear they don't form part of the EIS.</li> <li>• Chris Matthews – while we have been obliged by the Federal Government to deliver a transport link for freight between Melbourne and Brisbane, in building it within Queensland we have been obliged not to preclude future passenger services. The rail design with Helidon to Calvert, and indeed between Gowrie to Calvert have been designed such that they don't preclude future passenger service, our tunnels have been designed to take passenger trains.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2</b></p>	<p><b>Stakeholder Engagement – Corey Doran</b></p> <p><b>Question from CCC member – Chair</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a list of community meetings, like we had today. Has that been published?</li> <li>• Corey Doran – the community information sessions have been detailed in a range of places. Details have been provided to directly impacted landholders, a 3,300 letter mail-out has occurred along the corridor and un-addressed mail out to 10,500 residents in proximity to the alignment advertising the sessions over the coming three weeks.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Land Use and Tenure – Rich Pidgeon</b></p> <p><b>No questions from CCC members</b></p>
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>Land Resources – Rich Pidgeon</b></p> <p><b>Question from CCC member – Darryl Green</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When do the landowners know what sort of action Inland Rail is going to take to regenerate land and that sort of stuff, where will that fit in the picture?</li> <li>• Rich Pidgeon – that is part of the Landscape and Rehabilitation Plan or Reinstatement Plan, these two plans are pretty similar. There's some direction in the Landscape and Visual Amenity chapter as well. The details at the moment are recommendations to be taken on, the next phase is when the detailed designers who will confirm what we're doing with the land will start to pick up on it. If you have specific comments or ideas or questions, please ask those through the submissions process. That way it ensures they will be answered and possibly incorporated into the updated EIS.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question from CCC member – Chair</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To that extent, one of the key salinity areas is near Laidley where there is an expression of salinity due to the de-vegetation of the hill slopes, there quite a bit of engineering works on that side of the road that runs into Laidley associated with Inland Rail. Have they made an assessment of the impact on salinity that will have?</li> <li>• Rich Pidgeon – they've definitely identified that and they've got the mitigation measures of what would be done, during the next phase of development there. And some of that would possibly be the blending of soils and covering of the material as well so it doesn't get exposed or run-off, the details are definitely in the EIS on those areas, but they were definitely of highest concern.</li> </ul>

**5 Landscape and Visual Amenity – Rich Pidgeon**

**Question from CCC member – Kathy Brady**

- Just having a look through Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual Amenity, can you define; consider 'urban design inputs' and 'sensitive design inputs' and how the community can have input and when they can do that and if we should say about it in the EIS?
- Rich Pidgeon –the terminology used is a Landscape Assessment terminology; the difference between urban and sensitive urban is more of a condition on the receptor. If there's a residence it is considered a sensitive urban, if it is just commercial use then it's likely to be urban design. The reason they've said consider that is because in detailed design element it's when they will do the detail in relation to the pavement and the landscape or rehabilitation strategies and they will have a series of plans, like they do with engineering drawings that will depict what needs to go in what areas. With regard to the consultation and inputs, I would suggest not to hold back, if you have specific areas where you'd like to see types of landscaping or where you'd like input into the types of landscapes that can then trigger ARTC to come back and involve people in the process in detailed design. But until we know who the detailed designers are and who the constructors are its pretty hard to know what they're process are.
- Corey Doran – at this point in time it's about your submission, what you or the community would like to see and how they'd like to see it done. It is important to capture these matters in your submission for the Coordinator-General to condition the project in how that engagement may occur. When it comes to what we will see if there is no comment or no conditioning, that will rely on the proponent and who the constructing body is. As you saw with the Visual Amenity workshop, the intent is there, and the position of the project is that detailed design is when we'll address those issues.
- Chris Matthews – Kathy, if you have comments regarding the aesthetics of bridges, we implore you to put them in your submission. As discussed previously the two bridges in Laidley, we've put them into the project requirements that have gone to the proponents/bidders to consider those in keeping with the architectural and historic value of the community.
- And for the other towns, like Forest Hill and Gatton, the same would apply?
- Chris Matthews – confirmed.

**Question from CCC member – Gordon Van der Est**

- On the Forest Hill slide where you presented the noise barriers concept, in view that it's a level crossing and if you put barriers up with cars going across you will have completely cut out their sight to left and right, so there is a safety risk there. And in view that you have stated that you will be keeping the existing fence, and in view that there is a new operator on the track with new, quieter locomotives, very quiet compared to Aurizon. Would you consider a two-stage process? Really the town doesn't want the barriers, there's really got to be a noise pollution issue to justify them, can we elect no barriers? To assess and see how it goes, in other words the project makes provision to retrofit in the future if the community wants it, otherwise we consider leaving them out?
- Rich Pidgeon – it is a difficult one at this stage, in that we have just done the impact assessments so it's looking at is there a noise issue or isn't there, there will be more detailed information in the Noise and Vibration section to help clarify that. Also, the detailed design phase has yet to come and similar to the question before, if you have specific areas where you'd like to see types of treatment or where you'd like input into the types of mitigations that can be used then trigger ARTC to come back and involve people in the process in detailed design in your submission.

**6 Flora, Fauna and offsets – Dr Chris Schell and Adam Marks**

**Question from CCC member – Chair**

- Just because you didn't see them, doesn't mean they're not there. There have been sightings of the Powerful Owl and Red Goss Hawk in recent times, doesn't mean they're not there.
- Dr Chris Schell – absolutely, that's one of the outcomes of this, is that the species you've actually mentioned have come up as being subject to significant residual impacts, so that's why in recognition, that any survey that's undertaken, even if it is undertaken in full compliance with the State or Commonwealth guidelines, good scientific rigour will not allow you to say, just because you didn't see it, doesn't mean its not there.

**Adam Marks presented regarding particularly project offsets.**

**Question from CCC member – Chair**

- Am I right in interpreting that all of the offset requirements for the Queensland section, from the Border to Kagaru, are going to be bundled together so that offsets that relate to impacts in the Lockyer Valley could actually end up delivered somewhere else?
- Adam Marks – the answer will be partly correct and partly not, for Border to Gowrie, we'll be co-locating all our offsets within the Border to Gowrie section because it's in the brigalow belt bio-region. For Gowrie to Kagaru, we'll find offsets within that entire area that will reflect the impacts across each of the projects. The way that we've actually identified our offsets, as it currently stands, it turns out we have offset locations and properties through-out the alignment so there will be offset outcomes within the key corridors within the G2K alignment. We certainly won't be putting a Lockyer based outcome down in Whetstone, the assurance you have in that strategy is there is a policy environment that requires us to find offsets as close to the impacted area as possible. There's a very distinct driver

	<p>that puts us in a very tight space with offsets to ensure we find our offsets as close to the impact area as possible. The other things that govern that will be by geographic regions and geographic distinctions and sub-regions, so you will find the close placement of our offsets to those impacted areas. Some of these matters are very geographically restrictive.</p>
<p><b>7</b></p>	<p><b>Air quality – Rich Pidgeon</b></p> <p><b>Question from CCC member – Darryl Green</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You've mentioned the pollution from the tunnels and stationary plant. What about where you have three locomotives heading east with a west wind from Forest Hill through to here, that's all air pollution coming this way, how is that being managed?</li> <li>Rich Pidgeon – it is being managed as part of the operational aspects of the locomotives themselves and how it's being assessed, they have factored in the speed of the train and the notch and operating level that engine is at, all of which has been incorporated into the modelling of the air quality impacts. There's a lot of detail in the EIS and the contours of each type of elements are in there, it definitely has been assessed under the full power, where they take a reasonable worst case scenario for each of the assessments, and that is used for each of the disciplines, capturing the highest levels.</li> <li>Rich Pidgeon - and another point as well, the EIS and the monitoring for matters like noise and air are based on current locomotives on the ARTC alignment, as time goes on the locos will only improve and as the old clunkers get retired.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question from CCC member – Gordon Van der Est</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are the diesel locos fitted with Diesel Particulate Filters?</li> <li>Rich Pidgeon – I don't know, they could be fitted with them but that's out of our scope.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question from CCC member – Gary Stark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are they allowing for driverless trains?</li> <li>Rich Pidgeon – again, out of our scope.</li> </ul>
<p><b>8</b></p>	<p><b>Surface water (Rich Pidgeon) and hydrology (Trinity Graham)</b></p> <p><b>Question from CCC member – Gary Stark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the size of the treatment plant (at the tunnel)?</li> <li>Rich Pidgeon – that will be determined in detailed design, the way the tunnel will be constructed will be to avoid to water running into the tunnel, at the western end there will be drainage to divert it before it goes through so the water will only be what falls of the train in the tunnel and limited seepage from the sides of the tunnel if there's any ground water coming through, but that's minimal as well.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question from CCC member – Gary Stark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With regards to the modelling and the 25% / 50% blockage, if you've actually been there during a flood, if you see what comes down in the flood and I reckon you have a 99% blockage in 90% of culverts and that's why it blows out the railway line. Unless you bridge that from the cricket ground to Sandy Creek, you are going to have the same problem. The other thing you are going to have to fix is the existing line. If that stays where it is with the same culverts, you are going to have the same result. We will be flooded out more and more and it won't just be 10% or 10ml.</li> <li>Trinity Graham – we will be upgrading the culverts under the QR line.</li> <li>Gary Stark - we don't want culverts, we want bridges because of the size of the flood and the amount of rubbish that comes down</li> <li>Trinity Graham – as part of your EIS submission, it's very important that you put that in there so it can be looked at in detailed design. We are proposing banks of culverts and they aren't small banks of culverts, they are large banks of culverts have been added in and the additional area under the QR line as well as under our alignment. In terms of blockage, we are following the national guidelines at this point in time and again if there is additional information you would like to put in to your submission that challenges that, please do that so it can be looked at further in detailed design. You can also give us some examples of what types of material / debris that comes down because that helps us with our calculations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question from CCC member – Gordon Van der Est</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I give you recognition for the fact that you have added 400 lineal metres through Forest Hill and including Laidley you are probably getting up around 2.5kms. It is my understanding that the study area that ARTC undertook was 1km either side of the current alignment.</li> <li>Trinity Graham – no, not for flooding. That 1km more relates to the environmental side. In terms of flooding, you can see how far we've modelled. We have modelled the whole flood plain and in terms of impacts we look –</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gordan Van der Est - with regards to the event we had a month ago, 1 in 10 / 1 in 20, all this extra water is now going to be coming through, it is all going to arrive at the Warrego Highway (near the second hand shop) which wouldn't have 150ft of lineal opening. In the little event we just had I was coming home at 9.30pm and it was actually backing up and flooding roads etc. Where has the Warrego Highway drainage requirements been captured in the EIS?</li> <li>• Trinity Graham – the flood modelling does extend all the way down beyond the Warrego Highway and I'm hoping the mapping shows it, but our impacts don't extend that far downstream. Our impacts are very much located along the actual alignment and definitely don't extend down that far.</li> <li>• Gordan Van der Est – did you identify the inadequate drainage at the Warrego Highway?</li> <li>• Trinity Graham – we have the existing structures under there, but I don't think we have looked at the blockages under there. When we do the analysis we would have to look at it with and without our alignment so where I have put it in the base case for the Warrego Highway, goes in to the developed case so that I only identify the impact of our alignment. So if we think there is another scenario that should to be looked at in terms of inadequate drainage at Warrego Highway scenario, then put that in your EIS submission and then we may need to have a further look at it. It's whether that blockage would actually make anything change up near you or on the alignment because ultimately what it might mean is that that the Warrego Highway goes under sooner.</li> <li>• Chair – unfortunately that is outside the scope of the EIS.</li> <li>• Gordan Van der Est – I'm sorry, Simon, that is not good enough, you cannot just ignore the issues as out of scope.</li> <li>• Chair – I understand. This maybe something that the Committee can bring up separately to the EIS.</li> <li>• Gordan Van der Est – TMR refuses to even engage of this issue with ARTC.</li> <li>• Chair – we will put that on the agenda to have a discussion perhaps at a later stage. Similar to a lot of other things, DTMR have said it is not in there and the community will have to deal with that separately.</li> </ul>
<p><b>9</b></p>	<p><b>Groundwater – Rich Pidgeon</b> <b>Question from CCC member – Darryl Green</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where do you actually monitor, at the face of the cutting or out in the flats?</li> <li>• Rich Pidgeon – a couple of areas, it'll be visual observations at the cuttings, is there any water seeping through but also the registered bores within proximity to it, in consultation with the landowners we'll be getting onto those properties to monitor the in-situ areas. To make sure we have to calculation. If any of those people have historical records of their bores, then that's even better again, we can use those to our advantage too.</li> </ul>
<p><b>10</b></p>	<p><b>Noise and vibration – Steven Walker</b> <b>No questions from CCC members</b></p>
<p><b>11</b></p>	<p><b>Socio-economics – Rich Pidgeon</b> <b>Question from CCC member – Gary Stark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When the gas pipeline came through that company had their own ambulances, we have a problem here in the valley where we've had two cases were there was a 45 minute and 3 hour wait for an ambulance to come from Laidley to Forest Hill. Is there anything in your construction that you have your own ambulances?</li> <li>• Rich Pidgeon – at this stage, probably not, but it's something that we can consider. Through stakeholder engagement there's been interactions with Queensland Ambulance and other emergency services to make sure they know what we are doing and any potential roads closures or temporary closures so they can work with local community in terms of access and routes for that traffic. It is something we can carry through to the next phase for construction, it is not unheard-of for them to have their own medics on-site but a transient workforce and not anticipated to be all in one place as they work throughout an alignment, not impacting one medical centre or ambulance. Definitely a valid concern and worthy of a submission.</li> </ul>
<p><b>12</b></p>	<p><b>Cultural Heritage – Rich Pidgeon</b> <b>Question from CCC member – Gordon Van der Est</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Forest Hill War Memorial, where you have it down as 'very large impact' and after mitigation you have it down as 'slight', so you've obviously looked at it. What are you doing to achieve that miracle?</li> <li>• Rich Pidgeon – I cannot comment, to not know exactly what that is, I don't want to mislead you. We can get back to you on that one, it'll definitely say what is it in the EIS, there is more detail in the tables. I believe it'll be by saying it's in the area but we're avoiding it, it's not going straight through it and there'll be some mitigation, may be by landscape and visual amenity processes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>13</b></p>	<p><b>Traffic and Transport – Ronnie Pauls</b></p>

	<b>No questions from CCC members</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>Hazard and Risk – Rich Pidgeon</b> <b>No questions from CCC members</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>Waste and Resource Management – Rich Pidgeon</b> <b>Question from CCC member – Gordon Van der Est</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What about fire ants?</li> <li>• Rich Pidgeon – fire ants are contained in Bio-Security and the EIS, confirming the strict following of protocols and procedures, movement of any materials has to be done in a certain way where it's shaken out, tested and tested again and only moved in area of the same zone it needs to be. Otherwise, it has to be fully treated and monitored to assess any fire-ant activity before being re-used elsewhere. Definitely a process in place as a bio-security one from the State Government.</li> </ul>
<b>16</b>	<b>Cumulative Impacts – Rich Pidgeon</b> <b>Question from CCC member – Kathy Brady</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I can see it's five years construction, for one specific place, potentially could that take 5 years in the one place?</li> <li>• Rich Pidgeon – there will be development across it for 5 years but the last bit will more to deal with testing and commissioning, not actual construction but rather finalisation works. The earliest stages will be the enabling works, at the start, smaller elements of work. The middle phases, it progresses along, but in different elements. With rail, we build it from bottom up, so you'll have the embankment built up to allow the rail to be run along, to do it in an order, not built in sections. There are elements, like the tunnel, where it will be built from one end, the western end, and the noise and etc could be expected to start there and shift as the tunnel progresses to the east.</li> <li>• Further, as covered in noise section, the noise and construction interaction for the public are day time hours, night time hours are works that will be approved by the construction authority and commensurate to the style of works but there are elements of the design which may be used for the duration of the project like laydowns and site offices.</li> </ul>
<b>17</b>	<b>Draft Outline Environmental Management Plan – Rich Pidgeon</b> <b>No questions from CCC members</b>
<b>18</b>	<b>General Business – all</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of Rizwan Afzal as Project Manager for H2C, taking over from Chris Matthews who has taken on a senior position.</li> </ul> <b>Question from CCC member – Gordon Van der Est</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post Easter 2021, there was a meeting in the township of Forest Hill where they revisited, after a Forest Hill Community Development Association meeting that they had with the Lockyer Valley Regional Council and they want to revisit the options in terms of; at the moment they're sitting there with a level crossing, that is exactly what the community initially asked for. They were asked to sort-of take a twenty-year view and look into the future a little bit, and I think it's a little bit sort-of divided but the township wants to investigate the flyer-over option, so specifically I want to raise 5 points, the township wants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ARTC to present additional options for consideration to the forest hill community for evaluation, in addition to the three options that were tabled in 2019.</li> <li>○ ARTC to reengage with the forest hill community and re-evaluate all options under consideration, revisit and restart the process.</li> <li>○ ARTC to organise a meeting with TMR/QR to confirm the legality of a three track level crossing, I believe a three track level crossing is illegal but there are others that don't, I just want to put the issue to bed, its destructive.</li> <li>○ ARTC to provide the traffic counts and wait times as surveyed, can we also have the project counts and wait times, with traffic flow with the addition of the third track and additional rail traffic?</li> <li>○ ARTC to conduct and independent, one-on-one survey of all Forest Hill residents to identify the preferred option the community wants?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Chair – the issue is one that is part of the whole process, the EIS process is designed to get people to respond to a proposal that is being made by ARTC. The fact that the community may have 'changed its mind' in relation to what its desired outcome might be is almost irrelevant. The issue is that anybody, including that community, or people within that community, should be able to make a submission to the Coordinator-General saying they are unsatisfied with the solution that is currently being proposed. Now, asking ARTC in the middle of an EIS process to conduct another meeting so they can go back to the Coordinator-General and say, stop the process is just not going to happen. So, the issue simply is that that community or the Lockyer Valley Regional Council if they were involved in</li> </ul>



	<p>it or any of the proponents of that process should make submissions to the Coordinator-General outlining exactly what you've asked to be done, saying that they are unsatisfied with that and that they think there is a better response, and that there should be a better response and they need this information to assist in them making that decision. That's the correct way to go, then that becomes a submission that has to be responded to by the Coordinator-General and ARTC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is quite possible that the Coordinator-General may ask ARTC to do exactly what you've asked them to do, they may find a different way of solving the problem, but you've got to let them do that. My advice to you is to make a submission, ARTC really almost have their hands tied at this moment as they can't go back and make another proposal, while this one is being considered.</li> <li>Gary Stark – the only thing I'd like to add, I just want to know about the pedestrian crossing, if it's going to be level crossing, pedestrians should be able to go across an overhead bridge. Because there's so many young kids, apparently, running across the line in front of trains going over to the skate park.</li> <li>Chris Matthews – at the moment, in Forest Hill it is currently proposed as a level crossing, based on interactions with the town, we will keep the crossing in place. Not to relocate it as per the vehicle level crossing to maintain the connectivity to the community. It will be an actuated (active), when a train is approaching booms and alarms will be active.</li> <li>Chair – we can argue what it should be and by all means make a submission and make it clear what you think it should be.</li> <li>Chris Matthews – wish to draw your attention to some of the information in the EIS, the clearance we require for the double stacked containers, 7.1m clearance, you are looking at something that would be quite a significant structure within a town like Forest Hill. I suggest and echo Simon, the reference design is complete and done to inform the EIS, the best place to make any concerns known is through a submission to the Coordinator-General, every submission that gets sent we are obliged to respond to.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question from CCC member – Maurice Hennessy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where can I get information on what effect it will have for me for noise?</li> <li>Chris Matthews – if your house has been identified as a sensitive receptor, I encourage you to attend a DEIS Community Information Sessions where you will be able to speak with a Noise and Vibration expert or alternatively contact the Inland Rail office and discuss the property with the Stakeholder Engagement Advisor.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question from CCC member – Kathy Brady</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In relation to the noise barriers, what are the other options?</li> <li>Chris Matthews – as Steven said earlier, at this stage of the design the first point is we've identified noise. So the easy solution is to stop the noise at the source, which may be a barrier, that not to say that what it is going to look like at the end, we may get a lot of opposition and comments regarding barriers in the EIS. As we go through to detailed design you might find we're doing something else to suppress some of the noise and they may need put noise barriers at potentially your garden wall or alternative architectural treatments. Expected to be confirmed in detailed design when discussions are had with all those people where we exceed the threshold at the moment. It's also worth noting, the Terms of Reference were set for us, had a noise level and certain criteria, there's and interim criteria that been developed by the Department of Transport and Main Roads which is a little bit more stringent and what we've done to be more equitable across the Inland Rail we have taken the noise criteria from NSW which is even stricter again.</li> <li>If there are places where the only way practical way is to have the actual noise barrier and people are going to be badly impacted without it, are there any ways to make the actual barriers look better?</li> <li>Chris Matthews – absolutely, what you saw was a worst-case scenario, there are examples all over the highways and cities that are aesthetically improved. They may have stencilling on them or the way they have been cast, there are a lot of opportunities. What we recognise is that barriers and their other impacts, including for flood can be counter intuitive, there's a fair bit of work to be done in that space.</li> </ul>
<b>19</b>	<b>Conclusion and meeting close: 8:45pm</b>

**Actions**

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	Confirm mitigation measures proposed for the Forest Hill War Memorial	ARTC	Next Meeting

**Next meeting**

The next CCC meeting will be mid-2021. Date, time, location to be advised.