

Meeting minutes - unconfirmed

Lockyer Valley Community Consultative Committee

Date / Time

24 August 2021
5:00pm – 9:15pm

Location

Murphys Creek Community Hall, Murphys Creek

Chair

Simon Warner

Minute taker

Secretariat

Attendees

- ▶ Simon Warner (Chair)
- ▶ Kathy Brady
- ▶ Maurice Hennessy
- ▶ Daniel McNamara
- ▶ Margaret McCarthy
- ▶ Gary Stark
- ▶ Michael Keene
- ▶ Gordon Van der Est
- ▶ Darryl Green
- ▶ Jason Chavasse

Apologies

- ▶ Neil Cook
- ▶ John Schollick
- ▶ Kym Flehr
- ▶ Doug Lyons
- ▶ Gavin Simpson

ARTC project team

- ▶ Max Nichols, Senior Project Manager, G2H
- ▶ Nawar Spear, Project Manager, G2H (acting H2C)
- ▶ Michael Price, Environmental Advisor
- ▶ Shane Harris, Environmental Advisor, H2C
- ▶ Giano Terzic, Stakeholder Engagement Lead G2H
- ▶ Belinda Scott-Toms, Stakeholder Engagement Advisor, G2H
- ▶ Sarah Delahunty, Manager Stakeholder Engagement Qld
- ▶ Ashley Williams, Indigenous Participation Advisor
- ▶ Kylie Wendell, Stakeholder Engagement Lead, H2C
- ▶ Corey Doran, Stakeholder Engagement Advisor, H2C

Discussions

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>Introduction, Acknowledgement of Country – 5.20pm – Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome to committee, Chair delivered the Acknowledgement of Country. • Chair welcomed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Representative from the Office of Scott Buchholz MP ○ Lockyer Valley Regional Council councillors ○ Bec Kuhn, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications ○ Observers. • Five apologies from committee members: John Schollick, Neil Cook, Gavin Simpson, Doug Lyons and Kym Flehr.
	<p>Matters / questions raised by the committee – Chair response</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question – with regards to submissions for the Helidon to Calvert dEIS, will these be made available in the public domain for people to read? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chair – all the submissions will be collated by Office of the Coordinator General (OCG), passed onto ARTC Inland Rail who are required to respond, return to the OCG who will then provide response to the submitter. Timeframe of responses by OCG is unknown at this stage remembering the officers have other EISs to deal with simultaneously. ○ It is unlikely individual submissions (with name and address details) will be made publicly available for the broader community to read however, as part of a revised dEIS, a high-level summary of key topics and responses may be included as an appendix. • Question – post the current dEIS phase, what is the committee’s role? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chair – the committee’s role will be a continuing process – just because the dEIS is complete does not mean that the community won’t be consulted again. In a meeting in June 2021, the OCG made reference to the Cross River Rail project where consultation occurred on specific issues, a number of times post its EIS being approved. For Inland Rail projects, none of the PPP dEIS’s have been approved yet so if the OCG believes it appropriate it may need to go back on consultation more broadly, then that will occur. Basically, the process is not over and may not be for some time. • Statement – the committee received enquiries from some members of the community about lengthening the dEIS public consultation period as some believed communities weren’t aware of the impacts and did not have sufficient time to prepare submissions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chair – there are pockets of people within communities who have not welcomed information on Inland Rail projects and therefore believe they have not been appropriately consulted or feel informed enough to make a submission on the dEIS. Inland Rail is aware of these gaps and will continue to do forward-facing consultation within the communities to make sure people have access to the relevant information. Moving forward post approval of the EIS, the proponents will need to build a community and social licence for the next 30 years. It is not just about getting the EIS over the line and construction of the project, it is about the whole life of the project. • Question – the senate report is critical ARTC Inland Rail’s consultation and subsequent lack of social licence, how can ARTC build its social licence? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chair – the senate report is not a condemnation of the project. The Senate committee supports the project however it acknowledges that any infrastructure project of this size will have its issues and struggles. Part of the committee’s role is to try and help to address this issue. • Michael Keene – when community members attend drop-in sessions and other community engagement opportunities and raise issues of concern, are these issues actually taken on board and considered? It is incumbent on ARTC stakeholder engagement staff to be able to provide some traceability of issues raised by the community. Where does the information go? Is it considered? Is it rejected? The process is opaque. If there are examples of changes / improvements / modifications to the project directly as a result of community feedback, the ARTC community engagement needs to be better at publicising this. It is important that where community attends drop-in sessions and community engagement opportunities that they have faith that their concerns being raising aren’t a waste of their time. The community should have greater visibility of what happens to that information and I encourage ARTC to close the loop with those issues that have been raised with the team. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chair – ARTC has been working within a framework that has been set by both the Australian and State governments and for Queensland in particular, the corridor has been the corridor for a lot longer than ARTC has been working on Inland Rail. For communities who point blame at ARTC for being responsible of where the alignment is, is a bit harsh. Media has not allowed this to be public knowledge and ARTC may also be bound by saying this. ARTC and the engagement staff on the ground are doing their best to keep faith with the community however sometimes they need to be allowed to say that some matters, like the alignment positioning, is not something that can be influenced outside the corridor given by the Queensland Government. These matters need to be directed to your local member or State and Federal governments. It is also important that we remember that most of the need for engagement opportunities is providing information so the community is better informed. The level of trust between communities and ARTC is not as good as it should be. I implore the committee to think about ways to how we can help in this regard. • Statement – some members may not have received an email acknowledgement / receipt for their submissions to the OCG during the H2C dEIS public consultation. OCG has advised there was a minor technical glitch with email acknowledgements / receipts. If you are concerned about whether your submission for the H2C dEIS was received, please contact OCG via this email: inlandrailC2K@coordinatorgeneral.qld.gov.au (please disregard the reference to the C2K project – it isn’t an error, it is the email address created by OCG for enquiries).
<p>1</p>	<p>Introduction, Project Description, Project Rationale, Reference Design, Timeline and Assessment Methodology – Max Nichols and Michael Price</p> <p>No questions from CCC members</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>Land Use and Tenure – Rich Pidgeon</p>

	<p>No questions from CCC members</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>Land Resources – Rich Pidgeon</p> <p>Question from CCC Chair – Simon Warner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the dEIS set out guidelines for what must be included in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP)? Rich Pidgeon – the dEIS will nominate the plans and high-level content / commitments and (with respect to land resources / contaminated land) will be managed under a Contaminated Land Management Plan to be developed under the contaminated land guidelines from the Department of Environment and Science (Queensland). The dEIS makes the commitment but it doesn't have all the steps or how they will be managed etc. To prevent sedimentation of waterways or neighbouring properties during construction, one of the guidelines is that erosion and sediment control plans will be developed by and subsequently inspections undertaken by a certified practitioner in erosion and sediment control in accordance with the International Erosion Control Association guidelines. Those plans will be updated as the works progress, there will be an initial plans and then subsequent ones as the topography changes etc. <p>Question from CCC member – Jason Chavasse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When does the landowner get the opportunity to review these management plans to make comment? Rich Pidgeon – the management plan within the dEIS details all the requirements that must be met. It provides the basis of what future plans must detail but currently, doesn't have specific details. Whatever is stated in the dEIS must be carried forward. The preamble is that the plans will be built upon as the project progresses. Furthermore, as government approvals are received, any conditions imposed on the project will be put into those future plans. Additionally, if landowners have suggestions or input put into the EMP as a part of the review of the dEIS, this should be a part of your dEIS submission. It will be analysed by technical leads as well as ARTC and put into the dEIS, if required.
<p>4</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Amenity – Rich Pidgeon</p> <p>Question from CCC member – Jason Chavasse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who is responsible for fencing once ARTC walk away from it? Rich Pidgeon – ARTC will be responsible for the maintenance of the fencing. It may be subcontracted out once operational. It will be in ARTC's best interest to keep those fences maintained as we won't want livestock or people entering the corridor. <p>Question from CCC member – Jason Chavasse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> So with regards to all the management plans that we don't get to see, we've got to try to pre-empt what may go into them? Rich Pidgeon – you will be able to make comment on the mitigation measures within the chapters and technical reports and the current EMP that is within the dEIS. If you think this information is too light on and it needs more detail, you need to put this into your submission. Is ARTC committed to show a genuine commitment to this process? If the general public don't read through or comment on the 10,000 pages of the dEIS, when you finally produce these draft management documents, will they be provided to the committee or put out for public consultation again? It is very hard to envisage what will be in the all the plans when it is lacking detail. Rich Pidgeon – please refer to the EMP section of the dEIS and you will start to get an understanding of the amount of information and mitigation measures that are in there. It is similar to other large-scale infrastructure projects and will have commitments to guidelines and specific legislation. While it may be high level and not have specific detail about every single property or area, you should have confidence that it will be audited and reviewed by various departments and independent professionals. Chair – as part of your dEIS submission, you can also suggest to the OCG that 'all management plans go to some form of public consultation before they are signed off' because they are not at a detailed enough level currently to make comment.
<p>5</p>	<p>Flora, Fauna and offsets – Dr Chris Schell</p> <p>No questions from CCC members on flora and fauna</p> <p>Michael Price presented regarding particularly project offsets.</p> <p>Question from CCC member – Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it be a condition that the offsets sites be secured prior to construction?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael Price – potentially yes. • Does the dEIS prescribe that offsets be procured prior to construction? Is it an option that something else will occur other than offsets to meet the requirements of the State? • Michael Price – the State has alternative offsets, sometimes it can come down to monetary but in the first instance from the State’s point of view, it will be land-based.
<p>6</p>	<p>Air quality – Rich Pidgeon</p> <p>Question from CCC member – Jason Chavasse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will there be ‘real time’ monitoring at sensitive sites where higher emissions have been identified so people can have faith that it is within the requirements? • Rich Pidgeon – unsure how ‘live’ the information will be accessed by the public, however there will be monitoring reporting requirements in line with the State and Federal air quality guidelines. Dust deposition gauges will certainly be located in some areas and potentially ‘real time’ monitors. Obviously, they can’t be placed everywhere but they will be placed in hot spots and might be deployed if there is an area where there have been significant complaints, issues previously or high-risk areas etc. Other projects I have worked on there has been monthly reporting requirements and if there were any measures that were above the threshold requirement they must be reported as soon as detected to the relevant government authority for review and assessment. <p>Question from CCC member – Kathy Brady</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regards to the entrances and exits to the tunnel, approximately how many metres to the entrance of the tunnel would the dangerous area be? • Rich Pidgeon – in those higher concentration areas, approximately 50 metres. That said, the engineering of the ventilation stacks ensures it is dispersed fairly quickly, upwards in the air. • Michael Price – additionally, the modelling includes not just the tunnel portals but the crossing loops also. From an operations point of view, we refer to the south-west coal management plan that the existing West Moreton System has adopted which provides us with a better understanding of how to establish our modelling. <p>Question from CCC member – Darryl Green</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will there be tunnel doors at each end of the tunnel portals? • Rich Pidgeon – yes.
<p>7</p>	<p>Surface water (Rich Pidgeon) and hydrology (Trinity Graham)</p> <p>No questions from CCC members on surface water</p> <p>Trinity Graham presented on hydrology</p> <p>Question from CCC member – Gordon Van der Est</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Lockyer Creek modelling, how many flood gauges were used? • Trinity Graham – there were several flood gauges used for calibration to historical events and the details are contained within the dEIS. • When you apply the modelling to known flood marks, what was the range? • Trinity Graham – in the dEIS there is a table that shows this information. Typically when you have flood debris levels, you try to be within plus or minus 300mm. When you match the stream gauge you try and be within plus or minus 150mm. The debris marks are generally surveyed after the flood recedes and the debris could have fallen down or been pushed around etc. Sometimes the recorded levels aren’t always precise, for example where debris has been pushed or moved by a boat going past or vehicles going through the water resulting in the debris not represented accurately, which is why we have to look at all the information to get the best matches we can across the dataset. Additionally, this is why we took the modelling results out to the community and asked if this is what landowners recalled of the flooding events. We also had aerial flood photography and flood photos from landowners etc. We try and use as much information as we can and not just rely on one dataset. • Gordon Van der Est – appreciate this is about G2H but downstream, one of the findings was that there was only one gauge in the modelling, so how many now are in the modelling? • Trinity Graham – that relates to the Expert Flood Panel comments for H2C (Lockyer Creek) which we are currently responding to. We have actually used more than one gauge and we simply need to explain this further in our response to the panel. • Gordon Van der Est – so you have used about 6 or 13 gauges, not just one? • Trinity Graham – I do not know the exact numbers of how many were used but I can take that question on notice.

	<p><i>(Question on notice response: this comment relates to the validation of the design event modelling against the flood frequency analysis (FFA) and this was done against the Glenore Grove stream gauge FFA. More detailed information is being prepared for the Flood Panel and will be available publicly. The calibration of the modelling to historical gauge records has been carried out at several gauges as detailed in the dEIS.)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gordon Van der Est – what are the velocity ranges? • Trinity Graham – I will take that question on notice also. <p><i>(Question on notice response: the Final EIS will include additional mapping showing velocities and % change in velocities. If there are specific locations that Gordon is interested in, we can arrange to show him this detail for the Final EIS.)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jason Chavasse – in the Gowrie Creek area in the sensitivity analysis, have you factored in the increasing of infrastructure development Toowoomba and northwest area? • Trinity Graham – no because any planned development has to mitigate back to the existing conditions. It is standard practice that any development is required to do a no-worsening. • Jason Chavasse – that is the theory but what happens when several 400 square metre lots are put in, they put it down to storm water which then comes down and hits your structure. • Trinity Graham – Council will ask developers to demonstrate a no-worsening from their development. Council has already done flood studies of those catchments and council will identify regional retention facilities that need to go in place to mitigate that increase run-off.
<p>8</p>	<p>Groundwater – Krystal Nicholls No questions from CCC members</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>Noise and vibration – Michael Price</p> <p>Question from CCC member – Jason Chavasse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When you say internal, is that the internal decibel policy? • Michael Price – the noise readings refer to internal or external to the house, not an internal policy or procedure. <p>Question from CCC member – Kathy Brady</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the digital noise interactive map be made available on the Helidon to Calvert project? • Michael Price – eventually yes, however no timeframe at this stage. <p>Question from CCC member – Michael Keene</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARTC continually fails to acknowledge, particularly people who live rural, do not live 100% of their time inside their house. Please advise how architectural treatment to a house is of any comfort to people who are outside their house. • Michael Price – the guidelines and criteria we are following are based on residents inside during the night-time. We acknowledge that people in rural setting spend a lot of time outside. We also acknowledge that we cannot mitigate all noise, we cannot remove the noise, noise will be heard. • The statistics of criteria are not of any comfort to people who have to live with the noise. • Michael Price – as landowners and members of the community, this needs to be raised with the OCG in your dEIS submission. • If this rail line is going to be introducing noise that is currently not there, there should be an obligation on the proponent to mitigate the noise as much as practicable, not to just some limit or criteria. Architectural treatment is not acceptable for people who spend a lot of time outside. • Max Nichols – the benchmark (for noise criteria) has to be set somewhere and this benchmark has been established by government agencies. We are complying to the numbers within those guidelines that have been established and we are bound by government guidelines in that space. • Chair – where committee members believe the benchmark and guidelines may not be suitable, this needs to be documented in your dEIS submission. <p>Question from CCC member – Kathy Brady</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there any work being done on the track to mitigate noise impacts? • Michael Price – yes, track design is a part of the process. For example, continuously welded rail. This will eliminate wheel squeal and clickety-clack from the wheels. Driver behaviour is also considered, horns, revving of engines etc. <p>Question from CCC member – Jason Chavasse</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be nice to understand ARTC's level of commitment to the community when it comes to social impacts verses dollars. Will you go above and beyond the guidelines if the community suggests earth mounds to shield the noise etc? Michael Price – one of the challenges in the G2H project is existing rail line and roads. Continuous consultation with council and Department of Transport and Main Roads is occurring so we can negotiate alternative noise mitigations (such as noise barriers, earth mounds, area of available land to do this etc).
10	<p>Cultural Heritage – Rich Pidgeon</p> <p>Question from CCC member – Margaret McCarthy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There isn't much aboriginal information within in the slide handout. There is a lot of information missing and I am not satisfied with this. I request Damien Morrissey speak with the Applicants and Elders – there is a lack of Aboriginal Indigenous Heritage information. Rich Pidgeon – I understand more work is occurring and will be ongoing. We may need to look at what can be taken out of the Cultural Heritage Management Plans and the additional studies that have been done and inputted in to the final EIS. Ashley Williams – I think there is a lack of communication between the Traditional Owners groups and Inland Rail is insufficient. Action for Damien Morrissey to speak directly with Margaret McCarthy (<i>action completed and closed on 26 August 2021</i>)
11	<p>Social Impact Assessment – Rich Pidgeon</p> <p>Question from CCC member – Gordon Van der Est</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inland Rail acknowledges economics strengths including agricultural, forestry, small business and tourism, how will the impacts as a result of this project going to deal with this? Michael Price – in relation to the existing environment and the social value of that area, this information is provided to us by local government. This is the basis of how the existing environment is explained. When Inland Rail look at it from a social impact point of view, we look at which values are significant in those areas for example, if tourism is in the area, what impacts does noise and vibration have in that environment. Use tourism for an example, where there is an impact with noise, visual, pollution etc and businesses are damaged, what happens then? Michael Price – we will aim to mitigate and minimise the impacts in the first instance but with the business itself, we will look through a number of management plans (social impact management plan – contained in the dEIS and has significant detail within it).
18	<p>General Business – all</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Katharine Brady – announced resignation from the Lockyer Valley CCC. Lockyer Valley Tourism has put forward a replacement representative for consideration, Maree Rosier. Chair – will endeavour to organise a meeting with the Office of the Coordinator General with regards to the Gowrie to Helidon dEIS for members to attend and ask questions – similar to what was held for the Helidon to Calvert project in June this year. Chair – there will be another formal CCC meeting before the end of the year.
19	<p>Conclusion and meeting close: 9:15pm</p>

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	Damien Morrissey to speak directly with Margaret McCarthy	ARTC	ASAP (<i>action completed and closed on 26 August 2021</i>)

Next meeting

The next CCC meeting will be held on 7 December 2021, Forest Hill School of Arts Hall, 5.00pm – 8.00pm.