

Meeting minutes

Lockyer Valley Community Consultative Committee

Date / Time

12 April 2022
6:00pm – 8:00pm

Location

Grandchester Hall, 24 School Road, Grandchester

Facilitator

Simon Warner

Minute taker

Secretariat

Attendees (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Gordon van der Est
- ▶ Maree Rosier
- ▶ Darryl Green
- ▶ Michael Keene
- ▶ Daniel McNamara
- ▶ Maurice Hennessy

Apologies

- ▶ Jason Chavasse
- ▶ Doug Lyons
- ▶ Gavin Simpson
- ▶ Gary Stark
- ▶ John Schollick
- ▶ Margaret McCarthy
- ▶ Neil Cook

Guests (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Dianne Loughnan, DITRDC

ARTC project team

- ▶ Tony Lubofsky, Director PPP
- ▶ Chris Matthews, Senior Project Manager
- ▶ Nawar Spear, Project Manager G2H
- ▶ Rob Walker, Project Manager H2C
- ▶ Michael Price, Environment Lead G2H
- ▶ Jacqui Neill, Government Relations
- ▶ Corey Doran, Stakeholder Engagement G2H & H2C

Discussions

NO.	ACTIONS
1	<p>Introductions and Welcome to Country – 6:00pm – Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome to committee and observers • Chair welcomed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Representative from the Office of Scott Buchholz MP, Patrick Murphy ○ Lockyer Valley Regional Council councillor, Rick Vela ○ Ipswich City Council councillor, Shelia Ireland ○ Dianne Loughnan, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications ○ Observers ○ Apology from Tanya Milligan, Mayor Lockyer Valley Regional Council ○ Apology from Jim McDonald MP, Member for Lockyer

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Seven apologies from committee members: Jason Chavasse, Doug Lyons, John Schollick, Gary Stark, Neil Cook, Gavin Simpson, Margaret McCarthy ● Ashley Williams delivered the Welcome to Country ● Nil conflicts of interest.
<p>2</p>	<p>Actions from previous meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Committee members to consider and advise their desire to remain on the committee for another 12 months <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 11 committee members confirmed their interest in remaining on the committee and 3 committee members resigned. ○ We will look to recruit new members to fill vacancies ● CCC name change <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chair and committee unanimously decided on CCC name change to include Toowoomba and Ipswich regions – Gowrie to Calvert CCC. The name change will be communicated via an ENews, minutes, Chair Summary, newspaper, social media and the Inland Rail website. ●
<p>3</p>	<p>Announcement and introduction of PPP for the Gowrie to Kagaru projects – 5:10pm – Tony Lubofsky:</p> <p>Presentation key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Regenerate Rail has been appointed as the winning consortium for the Gowrie to Kagaru PPP project. ○ Regenerate Rail was one of three consortia that were shortlisted in 2019. ○ Regenerate Rail is a multinational consortium being a joint venture between three entities: GS Engineering and Construction (South Korea), Webuild (Italy) and Clough Projects Australia (Perth). ○ Regenerate will sub-contract to three local companies: BMD, Bielby and Martinus Rail each of whom are already engaged doing other works on Inland Rail. <p>Question from Daniel McNamara</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● With some of those sub-contractors already working on parts of Inland Rail, how will they work simultaneously to include the Queensland projects? ● Tony Lubofsky – the program for the G2K section is running behind other sections of Inland Rail so it remains to be seen to what extent there may be overlap between the projects. <p>Question from Maree Rosier:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● With regards to other companies working on other projects, is it likely to reduce the local job opportunities for our communities? ● Tony Lubofsky – I don't believe it will have an impact. This was evaluated as part of the tender evaluation process and there will be numerous opportunities for local companies. In the near future, we will hold sessions about local opportunities. <p>Comment from Daniel McNamara:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Toowoomba and Surat Basin Enterprise (TSBE) has launched a Supplier Portal which already has 300 businesses registered, these businesses have been provided to the consortia. <p>Comment from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● We will distribute the Supplier Portal link to the CCC. (ACTION). <p>Question from Maree Rosier:</p>

- Ultimately, will it be the consortium who decide who they will work with?
- Tony Lubofsky – correct.

Comment from Chair:

- The local community need to be aware of this and work with organisations like TSBE and councils, so these local opportunities aren't overlooked. The councils will be very involved in this space and making sure we get as much local activity as we can. This is a good role for members, please share this information amongst local businesses.

Comment from Tony Lubofsky:

- At the "Meet the Proponent" event in March 2021, each of the three proponents expressed the importance of pursuing local opportunities and their commitment to maximising these opportunities. ARTC Inland Rail will hold Regionerate Rail accountable for the commitments made.

Question from Chair:

- Was Regionerate Rail's proposal the closest of what has been put forward to the EIS designs?
- Tony Lubofsky – yes, Regionerate Rail decided not to deviate materially from the reference design. I don't believe there are any changes of significance and most changes relate to the vertical alignment rather than the horizontal alignment. The only significant alignment change that we are investigating, by request of the Lockyer Valley Regional Council, is the viability of a Gatton bypass.

Question from Gordon van der Est:

- How is that analysis going (Gatton bypass)?
- Tony Lubofsky – investigations are ongoing. The more we look into it, we're finding there is significant devil in the detail. A bypass was put to us by one of the three consortia who felt it could avoid a lot of issues, be easier to build and save money as opposed to going through Gatton however when we looked at this option, it is not quite as attractive as that. I am not suggesting there aren't potential benefits, however there are other issues associated with that solution. For example, achieving the gradient we need, crossing over a flood plain requiring large structures, impacts on prime agricultural land etc - there isn't a simple solution. We advised council that we would look into it and do a Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) to weigh up the pros and cons.

Comment from Maree Rosier:

- Regarding the MCA process, the social aspect is very underrepresented.
- Tony Lubofsky – we will look at the bypass from every angle and advise accordingly.

Question from Gordon van der Est:

- Were there any 100% Australian companies or consortium bidding as the head contractor?
- Tony Lubofsky – no, and this is because of the size of the project, it is too big for any single Australian company to absorb.

Question from Michael Keene:

- In the winning proponent proposal, did you see much innovation in the proposal?
- Tony Lubofsky – we saw a certain amount, for example the design of the Toowoomba tunnel and the solutions relating to the ventilation within the tunnel.

Question from Chair:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the proponents have any ideas about the social amenity and detail design of the bridges and viaducts? Tony Lubofsky – this is something that will be developed during the detailed design phase. We acknowledge this is a concern to communities and councils and we will work with Regionerate Rail to ensure we get a good outcome. This applies to landscaping around the alignment also. <p>Question from Gordon van der Est:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The dEISs are very large volumes, did the proponents go through the major issues that were raised by the community and offer some response or methodology they are going to use to address them? Tony Lubofsky – they have covered the major issues to some extent, where they have been able to. Whatever information we had available, we made available to the proponent. Their immediate priority right now is to work with us in addressing all the feedback that has come back through the public exhibition process. <p>Comment from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The OCG seem to be well behind the program, we may write to the OCG to ask why the delay and whether they intend to release something soon. Tony Lubofsky – we are still waiting on the Request for Information (RFI) from the OCG on G2H and H2C dEISs and agree, this process is taking longer than we would like. <p>Question from Maree Rosier:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there any space in this proposal to allow for future passenger rail? I was told it was out of scope. Tony Lubofsky – it has always been a part of our agreement with the Queensland Government that we will design and build Inland Rail to allow passenger trains to use Inland Rail. It is up to the Queensland Government as to whether this happens or not. Inland Rail is being built for freight but if there is capacity for passenger trains (via available train paths) and the Queensland Government choses to provide the passenger rail service, then yes, they can use Inland Rail. <p>Question from observer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will this rail line be electrified? Tony Lubofsky – no. The passenger trains that would use Inland Rail will not be electrified. It will be a decision for the Queensland Government.
4	<p>Cultural Heritage – 6:30pm – Corey Doran (in the absence of the Cultural Heritage team)</p> <p>Presentation key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The team met with Yuggera Ugarapul people to discuss Social Performance matters. The pedestrian Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Surveys are ongoing. Stone artefact scatters and isolated artefacts were the most common Aboriginal heritage sites that were identified during the surveys, followed by scarred trees. These sites will be managed under the measures set out in the approved Cultural Heritage Management Plan that Yuggera Ugarapul and Western Wakka Wakka have with Inland Rail. ARTC Inland Rail hosted an Indigenous Community BBQ in Newtown Park in Toowoomba on 2 April 2022 and more recently in Ipswich on 9 April 2022.
5	<p>Social Performance – 6:35pm – Ashley Williams</p> <p>Presentation key points:</p>

- Explanation and artist information for the Indigenous paintings that have been hung in Gatton.
- Overview of the Skills and Training Programs:
 - Program host is Energy Skills Queensland, delivered by Centre Excellence Rail Training
 - 12 participants (7 Indigenous) completed an 8-week course for a Certificate 2 Rail Infrastructure
 - ¾ of the cohort are currently working in rail (for rail labour companies).
- Community engagement over last 4 months:
 - Laidley NAIDOC, late 2021
 - Newtown Park (Toowoomba) Yuggera Ugarapul Community BBQ / project update, April 2022
 - Queens Park (Ipswich) Yuggera Ugarapul Community BBQ / project update, April 2022.
- ARTC has been supporting the Men's and young Men's Group through funding Certificate 4 Mental Health Training, yarning sessions, weekend camps on country, Families and Fathers fun days and artefact making.

Question from Maurice Hennessy:

- With regards to the training, do you give any consideration to Men's Sheds?
- Ashley Williams – this program is a Men's Group, not a Men's Shed with no physical location or community facility to meet at. It is where they go out bush and have a yarn with the young men and talk about their issues and encourage them to make good choices.
- Corey Doran – consideration (funding) for Men's Sheds can be achieved by submitting an application through the Inland Rail Sponsorships and Donations program, the current round closes 30 April 2022 and then next round closes 31 July 2022.

6 Helidon to Calvert project – 6:40pm – Robert Walker

Presentation key points:

- Regionerate Rail is now on board and the focus for the H2C project team over the next 6 months is to work with them, firm up the contract to look and move into the next stage which is detailed design and early works. There will be an opportunity to do some early works outside the EIS, particularly in the utility space. We cannot commence project works until the EIS is approved.
- There will be a range of work around firming up the EIS and information exchange between Regionerate Rail and EIS.
- We will continue to work with the local councils on key issues such as road /rail interfaces. For LVRC, we will focus on the possible closure of Gaul Street level crossing and what the traffic modelling looks like. For Ipswich City Council (ICC), we will focus on the level crossing assessments in Calvert and Grandchester.
- We're also working with Queensland Rail (QR) to understand the separation between the existing line rail line and our new line. Later this year, we can also commence the relocation of QR's signals, location cases, signage (referred to as enabling works). These enabling works are not approved under the EIS, it is approved under a Railways Operations licence and we need to have this done ahead of the main contract.

Comment from Cr Sheila Ireland:

- During the recent rain events, it flooded in Calvert, the velocity of the water through Grandchester lifted the bitumen off Ipswich Street and moved it close to houses, how is that going to work with trains coming at speed through that area? (Calvert Station Road)
- Robert Walker – the modelling predicts what the velocities are and what we have to do to manage those velocities. There will be a range of conditions regarding the velocity and the OCG will determine this. These are the conditions we need to meet otherwise we won't be in

accordance with the legislation. While the storms were pretty unusual, they were very significant events and the project will need to meet the hydrology conditions. We have done a lot of modelling in the past to understand the velocity levels and we have a lot more modelling to do. The trains will need to go over the water without influencing the water's behaviour and that's the balance we have to achieve.

- The flood modelling is one of the key elements of getting the project right and is one of the elements that receives the most scrutiny from the OCG. Inland Rail has a range of specialists in this space and have partnered with the State Government's International Flood Panel who will also provide targets and conditions.

Question from Cr Sheila Ireland:

- If you leave the line at level, will you put up flood lights also? When the creek floods the flood lights make drivers aware there is water over the level crossing and road?
- Robert Walker – that is a good idea, we can certainly talk to the designers about this and what type of warning devices can be explored.

Question from Gordon van der Est:

- In view that discussions have commenced with QR, are they agreeable to what is being proposed for certain works and level crossings? For example, do they agree with the relocation of Forest Hill level crossing and configuration to maintain a vehicle crossing over a triple railway track?
- Robert Walker – the discussions occurring with QR currently is more about the relocation of their assets that would be underneath our track. Scope wise, no we don't have an agreement with them about what each level crossing looks like. That consultation and agreements still needs to occur.

Question from Daniel McNamara:

- When it comes to early works, how is ARTC being transparent with the local businesses so they can have tender for these pieces of work?
- Robert Walker – as mentioned before, there is going to be so much work locally that the demand for skilled labour is going to be very high and will provide opportunities for a lot of businesses.

Question from Maree Rosier:

- Has anyone considered erosion soils in the east and west of Laidley and what erosion will be put in place for that type of soil?
- Robert Walker – those finer details are yet to be confirmed, we are aware of the types of erosion soils and where they are. The key to erosion knowing the velocity and that is a target that the OCG will condition us to. Further hydrology modelling and during detailed design, this will be addressed. For example, what the soil type is, what is the velocity applicable to it and how we implement that velocity either by more culverts, rock mattress. There are a range of factors that will be confirmed at a later stage.
- Maree Rosier – what happens if it is not right?
- Robert Walker – it will be very obvious if it is not right. If there is a defect in the project, we will have to rectify that defect.
- Maree Rosier – curious to know that why in the "H2C update", the possibility of the bypass wasn't mentioned?
- Robert Walker – the bypass wasn't a factor from Regionerate Rail and it is work outside of what we are doing with Regionerate Rail, that is why it wasn't mentioned. As Tony mentioned early, investigations and discussions are ongoing with regards the bypass.
- Maree Rosier – when will we likely know what the bypass is going to look like and what is going to be done?

- Robert Walker – we are getting close to ending our investigations, potentially another month or so.
- Maree Rosier – will there be an opportunity for input from the community?
- Robert Walker – unlikely.
- Chair – the discussions are between LVRC and ARTC and are not including the broader community. It is not part of the draft EIS nor the response to the draft EIS or Regionerate Rail's proposal, it is something that only ARTC is talking with LVRC about at this stage.
- Maree Rosier – will it be included in Regionerate Rail's works?
- Robert Walker – a decision needs to be made first and depending on the outcome, it can be included in the Regionerate Rail's works. It did not get presented as part of the dEIS so it is not an official part of the project in the eyes of the OCG or public. It was an idea that came out of the procurement process from one of the three proponents, hence why we need to do that evaluation, so it was in parallel to the EIS. There was a lot of work done earlier around alignment which chose the current corridor and that is what the EIS is established on.

Question from Gordon van der Est:

- Given the early work done 5 years ago with regards to alignments, are all these being revisited?
- Robert Walker – no, the proposal being revisited is what has come from one of the proponents as part of an innovation or value engineering idea.
- Chair – the committee and the public need to understand that there wasn't any requirement for ARTC to do other than what it has done so the process is of going back and looking at other options is something ARTC and Council are doing as an extra. At this stage, we are assuming there won't be a change in the alignment, until there is.

Comment from Maree Rosier:

- Gatton is the only regional town that Inland Rail goes directly through in all of Queensland. I can't conceive how anybody thought that was a good idea to start.
- Chair – the decision around the alignment was made by the State Government 15 years ago.

Question from Maurice Hennessy:

- What decisions have been made around the entry of Old College Road and Eastern Drive?
- Robert Walker – the traffic modelling on those intersections will be presented to Council. The scope of works has not yet been decided however, upgrades are likely.

7 Gowrie to Helidon project – 6.50pm – Nawar Spear

- Since the proponent announcement, we have been going through a phase of scope finalisation which includes the items of OCG feedback.
- We are incorporating the Department of Transport and Main Roads technical requirements as well as Queensland Rail interface, these works are ongoing.
- Road / rail interfaces are a key matter of the local government authorities impacted by the Gowrie to Kagaru PPP.
- ARTC is working collaboratively with local government authorities to progress and resolve outstanding matters.
- ARTC continues to work with Toowoomba Regional Council and Lockyer Valley Regional Council to resolve their respective road / rail interfaces and other matters.

Question from Chair to local government Councillors in attendance:

- Are you getting reports in Council about the conversations that are being had with local government authorities, are they being received at a Councillor level? Are you satisfied with the information / consultation you are getting from ARTC?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cr Rick Vela – yes, we are getting regular updates however what the Project Managers are talking about here is the engineering solutions. They have monthly engineering meetings where they are identifying issues from a council perspective and how ARTC can overcome them. We also receive quarterly updates from ARTC. • Chair – ok good. With regards to passenger rail, I am aware that Council is restricted to talking to anyone about what has been discussed to date. A lot of money is spent on a passenger rail study and apparently scenarios have been decided upon but none of this is known by the community. I was disappointed to hear that passenger rail wasn't included in the City Deal (south-east Queensland wide detailing infrastructure projects). They assume community consultation has been had, but Council hasn't been out to anybody so I don't know how they can call that community consultation. • Cr Rick Vela – there are a lot of complex movements involved, for example Inland Rail, TMR, Council and now the proponents. We have council representative who sits on the passenger rail working group, which has confidentiality clauses. We don't make these decisions. The Federal Government set aside funding to look at the feasibility of passenger rail, that funding is funnelled through the State and essentially the State lay out the rules of how the working group functions. It is a very complex arrangement. <p>Question from Maree Rosier:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the conversation with Council regarding the Gatton bypass? • Cr Rick Vela – a few weeks ago Council requested Inland Rail revisit alternative alignments outside of Gatton. • Stephen Hart, Advisor/Representative for LVRC – we have made a very detailed submission to the EIS process, we obviously didn't have the information about the impacts of the railway of any meaningful way until we received the EIS. Since reviewing the EIS, Council collated the facts to back up our discussion about alignments around Gatton and made a very detailed submission to the OCG seeking the change on the alignment, based on the information contained in the EIS. • Stephen Hart – Council is seeking to minimise the impact as many residents and as much of the impact to town in general as we can – this was the basis of requesting a change to the alignment. Obviously with pushing it out there, we acknowledge there will be a different set of stakeholders. The principal behind the resolution made was to try and minimise as far as possible the impacts of the most amount of people.
8	<p>G2H and H2C stakeholder engagement – 7:10pm – Corey Doran</p> <p>Presentation key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater bore survey being distributed to landowners in Calvert to Kagaru project section first, closely followed by H2C and G2H. • Early works related to utilities have been identified in the Boundary Street / western tunnel portal area, engagement will commence once works receive necessary approvals. • Withcott Family Fun Day, 24 April 2022 – sponsorship applicant. • Laidley RSL markets, 30 April 2022 – Inland Rail presence.
9	<p>EIS progress – 7:20pm – Michael Price</p> <p>Presentation key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARTC recently received the moderated submissions from the OCG. There were approximately 60 submissions for G2H which have been summarised by issue. We will respond to these as part of the revised EIS.

- RFIs from the OCG have been received for the B2G and C2K projects and we are working with the OCG on how certain items will be addressed. Some are conditions set upon ARTC and some are requests for ARTC to do further work.
- While ARTC has not yet received the RFIs for G2H and H2C, we are assuming there will be similar issues raised to what was received for B2G and C2K. There is logic to the assumptions as the approach and methodology we have adopted is consistent across all projects, for example noise and vibration mitigation.
- Ecology fieldworks are being undertaken along the alignment and a koala specialist is developing a koala management plan.
- ARTC has developed fauna sensitive design guidelines for Inland Rail and we have engaged a consultant to develop a Fencing and Fauna Passage Strategy. Community input will be a part of this process.
- ARTC has been collecting flood data from the February and March rain events, including meeting with landholders to map out flood markers.
- Monitoring of groundwater and surface water will be ongoing on a monthly basis and the groundwater model has been updated in consultation with the Department of Regional Development, Manufacturing and Water.
- Interactive noise maps for the three PPP projects are now available for stakeholders:
 - Gowrie to Helidon: [G2H noise map](#)
 - Helidon to Calvert: [H2C noise map](#)

Question from Michael Keene:

- What does it mean that ARTC assumes the majority of the RFIs will be the same as the B2G and C2K projects? Will the answers be the same?
- Michael Price – the RFIs are a high-level summary document from the OCG. The RFIs are worded in a way that allows ARTC to understand what issues it will likely be required to address for the other projects. For example, an RFI we have already received on one of the projects states “work towards the Queensland guidelines in the approach to noise and vibration”. We can assume that the other projects will also receive this RFI.
- ARTC is trying to be proactive in this space and move through the EIS process with the information we have. Its methodology for assessing noise and vibration is the same across all projects.

Question from Michael Keene:

- Is ARTC expecting the RFIs will be similar and on that basis are preparing responses?
- Michael Price – correct. For example, we have done a lot of soil assessments along the alignment which wasn’t included in our dEIS. Ecology work has also been done, based on where we knew the gaps were based on the RFIs received for the other projects.

Question from Gordon van der Est:

- Can you see all the submissions that went in to the OCG?
- Michael Price – yes, I can.

Question from Gordon van der Est:

- So that would help ARTC immensely in pre-empting the responses you are going to receive from OCG?
- Michael Price – correct. We received the moderated responses from the OCG earlier this year, and since then we have received the actual hard copy of the submissions from submitters.

Comment from Michael Keene:

- This is the first time I have ever heard that ARTC has had full visibility of all the submissions. We, as a committee, have been repeatedly asking for detailed information regarding those submissions.
- Michael Price – we did speak briefly about this at the previous CCC meeting in December 2021, where the H2C Environmental Advisor and I declared G2H had received 60 submissions.

Comment from Michael Keene:

- I assumed that because you haven't received the RFIs, you aren't across the issues raised. But in fact, you are because you have had visibility of all the submissions the whole time.
- Michael Price – correct, but we don't know what the OCG is going to request ARTC to do and put in the revised EIS. Submissions are one thing - the RFIs and what is not adequate in the dEIS is another.

Comment from Chair:

- At the December 2021 meeting, you mentioned the submissions, we went to the OCG and responded with they **will not** make the submissions available to the public, they were not going to publish the submissions. That was a categorical decision that they made and told us. At no point have we been made aware that ARTC has had full access to the full submissions made by the public in full details. We were aware ARTC had consolidated data but we were not aware ARTC have had access to the submissions for that period of time.
- Michael Price – for every EIS I have been involved with in previous roles, we get the copy of the submissions as they are. The OCG also provides us with the moderated version (with the names and personal details removed) and this moderated version is what is published in the revised EIS. The EIS will not state personal names, addresses and issues that were raised by a submitter.

Question from Michael Keene:

- When you say you've had access to all of those submissions, is that verbatim or have you had moderated or deidentified? Because you have said you have received both.
- Michael Price – we have the letters from submitters. What we get from the OCG is a moderated version (with details removed) that can be released to the public in the revised EIS, they will be the ones we respond to.

Comment from Gordon van der Est:

- In the meeting the CCC had with the OCG in Gatton, the OCG said the submissions won't be public, but they said they will take each issue for each area and put it in a detailed list and the issues will be public but we will never know who made the comment.
- Michael Price – correct.

Question from Gordon van der Est:

- So Michael, you are saying that you have seen the full blown submission? If I made a submission, you can see I made a submission?
- Michael Price – correct.

Question from Gordon van der Est:

- This is the first time we have been told this; our confidentiality was promised by the OCG. So, you saw my submission on the Bremer?
- Michael Price – no, I am not in H2C or C2K project.

Question from Chair:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would like ARTC to advise exactly what they have been given by the OCG and what you haven't been given. The OCG has made certain promises to us and it does not sound like they have kept those promises. Or vice versa. ARTC has seen information that you have not informed the CCC about. If you have had access to the detailed submission, whether or not it includes information that is relevant to the EIS or not, if you have had access to those, you have not told us that and this is the first we have heard of it. We do realise that you have had access to the moderated / deidentified list of issues, we understood that from the December meeting. Michael Price – I can't comment on what the OCG may have informed you in those private meetings. Chair – the committee wants a very clear clarification of what ARTC has and has not had access to. <p>Comment from Michael Keene:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ARTC led this committee to believe that they were only going to receive moderated versions of the submissions. <p>Comment from Nawar Spear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ARTC will take this as an action to come back to the committee (ACTION) <p>Question from Darryl Green:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the validity of the noise decibel readings on the noise map? I'm sure three locos on an incline up a hill will be louder than 50-55 decibels without any terrain in between? Michael Price – it is a predicated noise reading based on the alignment horizontal and vertical plus the traffic plan. I can take that question on notice and provide more detail.
10	<p>Flood modelling – 7:50pm – Michael Price</p> <p>Questions from committee members consolidated prior to the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the rain events in February 2022, did Inland Rail collect any flood data from key flood areas in the Lockyer Valley? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, and we are continuing to collect data. We recently met with landowners in the C2K and H2C areas to talk about the recent events and share photos and videos they may have. We have also collected data from public sources. Additionally, there will also be a groundwater survey distributed to landowners and council asking them to provide any information they may have. If data was collected, what happens to it, will it be used in any way? IE, will we update / redo our flood modelling? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ARTC is investigating whether the collected data will be able to validate or calibrate the flood model. That is being worked out with the OCG at the moment. If data was collected, were there any positive findings? IE, where flood modelling has indicated flooding in a particular area, did the recent events show a different result? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scale of the recent event is yet to quantified making it difficult to correlate the event with the modelled events in the draft EIS. The flood report is still being finalised and isn't available yet, will the flood panel take the recent events in to consideration and how do they assess the additional information / data? Will it delay finalising the report? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The flood panel is working on their final reports however the recommendation will be to consider this event. This will be a decision for the flood panel

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For future rain events, will any data be taken into consideration in the planning of building Inland Rail? Or once the flood panel has finalised its report, its complete and never to be revisited? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The flood model will be used during detailed design to determine whether any changes to the design meets flood impact objectives. It is likely that the flood impact objectives will be a condition of approval, along with being a Project commitment. ○ There will be ongoing consultation with landowners and stakeholders to collect data. As we progress into detailed design, the flood models will be updated again. We aim to hold workshops in the future so our hydrologists can provide information and speak with landowners about flooding and hydrology. • Will the proponent do their own flood modelling? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, Regionerate Rail will undertake flooding modelling as part of detailed design. Flood modelling will be carried out at different stages of the project design development to ensure it meets all necessary environmental and Independent Flood Panel requirements.
11	<p>Toowoomba to Brisbane passenger rail – 7:55pm – Chair</p> <p><i>This information has been provided by the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications (DITRDC) who has a representative on the TMR-led technical working group that is exploring this business case.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Queensland Government's Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) and the Australian Government's Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications (DITRDC) have partnered to undertake a strategic business case to progress initial phases of investigations that has examined the benefits, options and timing to deliver improved passenger rail service connections in the Toowoomba to Brisbane corridor. • The findings from the strategic business case are currently being considered by both governments, and will inform the next steps for the project, including whether the project proceeds to a detailed business case. • The strategic business case has considered the opportunity for integrating passenger rail services with future freight operations on the new Inland Rail infrastructure between Gowrie and Calvert based on the Inland Rail reference design. If the project proceeds to a detailed business case, any developments to the Inland Rail design since the strategic business case was completed will be considered. • Ongoing engagement with all local governments within the study area (Toowoomba, Lockyer Valley, Ipswich, Brisbane and Somerset) has been critical to capturing local insights. Local government and ARTC have provided input to the project through a technical working group, including assessment of options to deliver improved passenger rail services. TMR and DITRDC have also provided project updates to these Councils. • Broader stakeholder engagement on the project would occur as part of the detailed business case.
12	<p>General business – 8:00pm – all</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sponsorships and Donations program, Round 13 closes 30 April 2022. The next round will open immediately and will close 31 July 2022. • Next meeting to be determined in due course.
13	<p>Observer questions / general discussion – 8:05pm – all</p>

Comment from Gordon van der Est:

- With regards to the flood modelling impacts in the Lockyer Valley, I had ARTC's hydrologists visit me last week and in terms of the engineering and where all the culverts are going, to provide some data on the Laidley flood plain there's been three brand new banks of culverts and three extensions added and in Forest Hill there's been three brand new banks of culverts and four extensions added, all of which are new locations where culverts didn't formerly exist.
- ARTC hydrologist David Franklin and I both agreed that the water flows are going to double, and all the water arrives at one area, the Warrego Highway, which is out of scope for Inland Rail. I want to state for the record that while I recognise this is not ARTC's fault, I believe this matter is verging on negligence. We have just had another flood event and we talk about the probability of our floods being 1-in-50 or 1-in-100 but the frequency is actually 1-in-10. Every flood is different and this recent one on the northern side of the highway in the Central Lockyer, I would describe it as catastrophic. A lot of farmers counted millions of dollars in individual losses, the fact that we are going to double the flows and we are starting preliminary construction last quarter this year and this issue is not resolved, someone has to do something. You cannot be allowed to just keep rolling with key issues like this being unaddressed.
- On the southern side of the Warrego Highway, we banked up again near the second-hand shop again, and it banked up all the way to the truck stop, took out the Big Orange, took out Lindsay Brothers Transport and we're going to double the flows. So potentially we are going to double the magnitude of a problem and I understand it is TMR, but this needs to get in the public domain and force them to the table.
- Michael made a comment in his closing statement that he has had discussions with TMR, I would really appreciate to hear from you as to what those discussions are. Is this matter being recognised? Is it being swept under the carpet? TMR is liable and have been liable for past floods because it goes unaddressed.
- Chair – we will aim to seek comment from TMR, ARTC and the OCG because I know there was at least 3 submissions brought up the issue of the impact to the Warrego Highway. And you will remember the OCG encouraged us to put those submissions in during our meeting in 2021. So really, we should be asking them what they intend to do about it. It is outside the scope of ARTC but it has to be dealt with.

Question from Gordon van der Est:

- How do we get this out in the public domain? Through media exposure?
- Chair – start with the process of asking ARTC when the issue is going to be addressed and are they going to address it directly with TMR or otherwise?

Question from Michael Keene:

- The OCG has announced a new project declaration lapse date of 1 August 2023, that is a long way off, what impact that is going to have to the overall project timeline? Does that lapse date represent a significant shift in what ARTC was expecting.
- Tony Lubofsky – it is longer than what ARTC was expecting. The lapse date doesn't mean we can't get our approvals before that date. We are in discussions with the OCG and trying to expedite this process, but it is taking a long time. OCG seems to have a limited capacity to assess the four Inland Rail EISs concurrently and have manpower issues, OCG are telling us the process is going to take longer than we initially expected. It is totally out of our hands.

14 Meeting close: 8:10pm

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	Distribute TSBE's Supplier Portal link to the CCC	Secretariate	Completed 29 April 2022
2	ARTC to confirm what the Office of the Coordinator General have provided, and when, in terms of submissions (moderated vs entire)	ARTC	Upon distribution of approved minutes

Next meeting

Tuesday, 16 August 2022, 6:00pm – 8:00pm, Grantham Butter Factory