

Meeting minutes

Gowrie to Calvert Community Consultative Committee

Date / Time

16 August 2022
6:00pm – 8:00pm

Location

Grantham Butter Factor
6 Victor Street, Grantham

Facilitator

Simon Warner

Minute taker

Secretariate

CCC Attendees

- Gordon van der Est (GVDE)
- Darryl Green (DG)
- Maurice Hennessy (MH)
- John Schollick (JS)
- Michael Keene (MK)

CCC Apologies

- Gary Stark
- Margaret McCarthy
- Daniel McNamara
- Maree Rosier
- Jason Chavasse
- Neil Cook

Guests (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- Dianne Loughnan, DITRDC

ARTC Attendees

- Robert Walker, Project Manager H2C (RW)
- Amanda Quayle, Engagement Manager (AQ)
- Janeen Bulsey, Indigenous Participation (JB)
- Michael Price, Environment Lead (MP)
- Jacqui Neill, Government Relations (JN)
- Jeff Sargeant, Government Relations (JS)
- Kylie Wendell, Engagement Lead H2C (KW)
- Nawar Spear, Project Manager G2H (NS)
- Myf Jagger, Social Performance Principal (MJ)
- Selina Nalatu, Cultural Heritage Advisor (SN)
- Fleur McPherson, EIS Delivery Specialist (FM)
- Brendan Nerdal, Government Relations (BN)
- Kim Wheatley, Engagement Lead G2H (KWh)
- Corey Doran, Engagement Advisor H2C (CD)

Discussions

NO.	ACTIONS
1	<p>Introductions and Acknowledgement of 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 ○ Dianne Loughnan, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications ○ Representatives from the Lockyer Valley Regional Council ○ Representatives from the Ipswich City Council ○ Observers ○ Apology from Tanya Milligan, Mayor Lockyer Valley Regional Council ○ Apology from Jim McDonald MP, Member for Lockyer ○ Six apologies from committee members: Gary Stark, Maree Rosier, Margaret McCarthy, Jason Chavasse, Daniel McNamara and Neil Cook • Chair delivered the Acknowledgement of Country • Nil conflicts of interest.

NO.	ACTIONS
2	<p>Actions from previous meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruitment of new CCC members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Nil nominations received during the nomination period, will remain with the existing committee – closed</i> • Toowoomba Surat Basin Enterprise (TSBE) Supplier Portal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Daniel McNamara will present information at the next CCC meeting – open</i> • ARTC's formal response to CCC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>ARTC has distributed the formal response to the committee – closed.</i>
N/A	<p>Impromptu briefing from Stephen Hart, Lockyer Valley Regional Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SH – acknowledging Ian Church Chief Executive Officer, Lockyer Valley Regional Council (LVRC) is in attendance tonight and welcomes any questions or comments. • At the last Gowrie to Calvert CCC meeting in April 2022, there were statements made where LVRC was unable to validate them at the time and Council would like to provide clarity on those statements. • LVRC is unable to hold a position on the CCC. (<i>please note: the ARTC Inland Rail CCC Charter states: No person who is a sitting Member of Parliament (MP) or Councillor, or a direct family member (spouse, children, parents) of a sitting MP or Councillor may nominate as a member, nor may any person who is employed by a commercial contractor to ARTC. Therefore, Council staff would be permitted if none of these conflicts apply).</i>) • LVRC's position paper from 2018 outlines its policy positions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ References to where the committee can find Council's EIS submission / material on the website. In this submission, Council have communicated a potential bypass of Gatton and Forest Hill townships ○ LVRC's is advocating for passenger transport. ○ Council is excluded from representation on the committee and can only attend as observers (refer to note above). ○ Council is not an approving authority, the Coordinator-General is the only authority who can consider and condition the projects. ○ Council do not play a role in the approval. Council has certainly had input into the design in terms of returned assets, flood modelling etc and has been involved in advocacy for the community and how impacts may affect communities. ○ Council regularly meets with local governments to discuss the Inland Rail project, these include Ipswich City Council, Scenic Rim Regional Council and Toowoomba Regional Council. Additionally, Queensland Government representatives in the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR), Office of the Coordinator-General and the Australian Government in Canberra. ○ LVRC is very invested in Inland Rail and regularly meet with these agencies to discuss a range of matters. <p>LVRC's position paper from 2018</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council put out a position paper in 2018 which outlines Council's policy position which contains five principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Loss of connectivity ○ Flood impacts ○ Mitigate of amenity impacts – noise, dust, vibration etc ○ Minimal use of good quality agricultural land within the corridor ○ Integrated transport planning – advocating for passenger rail and active transport cycling • We recognise these principals don't always gel nicely together. We acknowledge while the rail corridor may have limited impact on noise, it may increase flood impacts. Council's attempt to balance these views as best as possible when considering the design process. It is important that we consistently note and target these principals.

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council engaged consultants and had Council officers heavily involved in the EIS submission and as a result, submitted substantial EIS submissions on both the H2C and G2H projects. These submissions can be found on our website: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Council’s submission relating to the G2H dEIS ○ Council’s submission relating to the H2C dEIS <p>Potential bypass of Gatton and Forest Hill townships</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2018, ARTC looked at a few alternative alignments around Gatton and Forest Hill and when we recognised the enormity of the impacts outlined in the dEIS, Council’s submission focused on advancing one of those alternative alignments outside Gatton and Forest Hill in an effort to reduce the impacts. Council is trying to achieve the minimal amount of impact for these communities. To date, ARTC has not changed the alignment and is remaining with the Reference Design through Gatton and Forest Hill. • Council will continue to advocate for an alternative alignment to minimise the number of people affected in these towns as we believe the impacts simply cannot be mitigated. <p>LVRC’s role and involvement regarding passenger transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council is very pro-passenger rail and Mayor Tanya Milligan has been very active in pushing for this. We acknowledge it is not within ARTC’s scope however Council wants to continue to advocate to ensure the design and alignment can accommodate passenger trains. We have concerns that the alignment cannot accommodate passenger trains.
3	<p>Cultural Heritage – 6:15pm – Selina Nalatu</p> <p>Presentation key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pedestrian Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Surveys are ongoing. The surveys have been occurring since mid-2016. A large portion of the pedestrian survey has been complete. • Stone artefact scatters and isolated artefacts were most common Aboriginal heritage sites identified during the surveys, followed by scarred trees. • These sites, items and places 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. • As the design is finalised, teams will be back out in the field undertaking further field work. This will include management activities such as avoidance, salvaging of surface artefact scatters and archaeological test-pitting to determine site extents and deposit depth. <p>Question from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were any issues raised in the EIS that the Coordinator-General suggested ARTC need to address further? • Selina Nalatu – not specifically. The RFIs received on Cultural Heritage will be addressed through the EIS process. A lot of what we deal with is confidential between ARTC and the Aboriginal parties and we are bound by that confidentiality. <p>Question from Darryl Green:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the property owner allowed to be involved in the survey? • Selina Nalatu – the landowner is more than welcome to be present while we undertake the survey. <p>Question from Darryl Green:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why are the survey results confidential and not shared with property owners who own the land?

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selina Nalatu – it is confidential between the Aboriginal party and ARTC to manage and mitigate those areas. It doesn't inhibit the landowner to continuing to practice regular farming activities on the property. <p>Statement from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If something of interest is found during the survey, it is up to the Aboriginal party to opt to engage with the farmer, not ARTC. It is not ARTC's Cultural Heritage. Unless there is a management plan in place, the find is not protected. <p>Statement from Selina Nalatu:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to protect that confidentiality. For example, the Aboriginal Party may choose to not disclose or register the site so it can't be impacted.
4	<p>Gowrie to Helidon project update – 6:20pm – Nawar Spear</p> <p>Presentation key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introductions of new members in the G2H team: Kim Wheatley, Stakeholder Engagement Lead; Fleur McPherson, EIS Technical Lead. Preparation of letters to landowners as part of a program-wide groundwater bore survey campaign. Future Freight Joint Venture is undertaking hydrology modelling. 60 submissions received by the Office of the Coordinator-General following the EIS public exhibition in 2021, Project team is reviewing the submissions. Waiting for the Request for Additional Information (RFI) from the Coordinator General. Undertaking supplementary technical studies.
5	<p>Helidon to Calvert project update – 6:25pm – Robert Walker</p> <p>Presentation key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project team is reviewing the EIS submissions and updating chapters of the revised dEIS. Project team has commenced addressing the H2C RFI requirements for the project. <p>Question from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is Regionerate Rail (RR) progressing with contract requirements? Robert Walker - RR is progressing well, and we are working with them on the contract. <p>Question from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is difficult to finalise the EIS and respond to the submissions without completing Detailed Design. The Committee and general community are concerned that the Detailed Design will not be complete by the next round of the public notification for the revised dEIS, thus making it difficult to comment on a complete dEIS without all the relevant project information. Robert Walker – the Detailed Design will be shared with the communities as it unfolds with RR. How it relates to the EIS is complicated. The project doesn't need a full Detailed Design to obtain EIS approval, however we do need enough design to understand the impacts. We believe we can do that in consultation with RR and we have a further 12 months until we need to submit the revised dEIS. Some of the RR design will inform the dEIS but it won't be a full Detailed Design. This phase will continue after the EIS is approved.

6 H2C Request for Additional Information presentation – 6:30pm – Fleur McPherson
Presentation detailing key themes of the H2C Request for Additional Information (high level).

Key themes and questions from Committee:

- **Project rationale and description**
 - Nil questions from Committee
- **Approvals**
 - Nil questions from Committee
- **Land use and tenure**
 - Nil questions from Committee
- **Land resources**
 - Nil questions from Committee
- **Landscape and visual amenity**
 - Nil questions from Committee
- **Flora and fauna**
 - Nil questions from Committee
- **Air quality**
 - Nil questions from Committee
- **Surface water and hydrology**
 - Nil questions from Committee
- **Surface water and hydrology (flooding)**
 - Nil questions from Committee
- **Groundwater**
 - Nil questions from Committee
- **Noise and vibration**
 - Nil questions from Committee
- **Social**
 - Nil questions from Committee
- **Economics**
 - Nil questions from Committee
- **Cultural Heritage**
 - Nil questions from Committee
- **Traffic, transport and access**
 - Nil questions from Committee
- **Other items to address in the revised dEIS**
 - Nil questions from Committee

Question from Darryl Green:

- With regards to salinity and contaminated lands, when will consultation commence between ARTC and the landowner as far as management and restoration (IE trees)?
- Fleur McPherson – the consultation will be undertaken if we need to access the land and undertake management measures. It will be a land-based agreement.

Question from Darryl Green:

- Once the natural habitat is disturbed and removed, restoration can take years, are there any predetermined measures known at this stage?
- Fleur McPherson – there may be salinity issues exacerbated by the project. The process is to undertake an analysis of the existing situation, what potential impact the project may have and how we can reduce that impact. Where we can't reduce the impact, we would set up agreements with the landowners. The EIS defines the process of how we would manage this, it won't detail property-specific details for each of the landowners.

- Michael Price – soil sampling (salinity) was undertaken by Aurecon in 2021 and it has been confirmed we will need to readdress for the revised dEIS. It is a key topic we are aware of in the Lockyer Valley based on feedback from landowners, Council, EIS regulators.

Statement from Chair:

- A part of the approving the dEIS, the Coordinator-General may condition the project to deal with the salinity in areas where salinity is an issue.

Question from Maurice Hennessy:

- What are the design plans for the intersection of Old College Road and Eastern Drive in Gatton?
- Robert Walker: ARTC is aware of the traffic concerns and the future constraints (by closing Gaul Street level crossing) in this area and discussions are occurring with the road owner, TMR. Traffic modelling has been done previously and we will do additionally modelling to assist with our discussions with TMR.

Statement from John Schollick:

- With regards to the sawmill on Eastern Drive, Gatton, TMR advised they were looking at multiple options such as traffic lights or a roundabout. I firmly believe they should consider a slip lane, not traffic lights or a roundabout.
- Robert Walker – TMR is still assessing this area and will aim for an option that requires the least amount of land-take from landowners.

Question from Michael Keene:

- Will the noise and vibration study be redone?
- Fleur McPherson: Yes, we will undertake new modelling. The Coordinator-General has asked ARTC to undertake modelling in accordance with the TMR interim guidelines.

Question from observer:

- There was no mention of biosecurity within the RFI presentation, there was information about hazard and risk, however not biosecurity. What is being done?
- Fleur McPherson – one of the RFI's relate to biosecurity matters and the Coordinator-General has requested ARTC provide more information about how we plan to manage biosecurity matters. The revised dEIS will include an outline plan in relation to fire ants and other biosecurity matters.

Question from observer:

- For those landowners who were impacted by recent rain events in February and May 2022, is ARTC consulting directly with them or are landowners required to approach ARTC and offer this information?
- Amanda Quayle – consultation can happen either way. ARTC has undertaken consultation with landowners where we think there will be a change in flooding conditions (reduction or increase), landowners will have received letters, phone calls and we offer to meet with them to discuss impacts. In some instances, we hold Information Sessions and ask people to attend those sessions and talk to us.
- Additionally, we have been working with local councils to obtain flood photographs, our hydrologists have been visiting landowners, having discussions and taking photos and markers to understand changes in flood levels. We encourage all communities and landowners to provide information to us as any information will assist us in informing the project.

NO.	ACTIONS
7	<p>Social Performance – 7.20pm – Myf Jagger</p> <p>Presentation key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Social Performance team is responsible for overseeing Inland Rail’s commitments as they relate to workforce, accommodation and housing and community wellbeing. This includes overseeing the Project’s implementation of the revised Social Impact Management Plan. • Presentation summarised recent events supported and/or hosted including Clontarf Foundation Employment forums, Workforce Development events and jobs and careers expos. • The Workforce Development Events are targeted to local businesses providing upcoming opportunities with Inland Rail and also to put businesses in contact with the support services, government agencies and programs and labour hire companies that are available to help them grow their workforce to get Inland Rail ready. • Maintain a range of partnerships supporting upskilling and participation with Inland Rail. Our Grand Opportunities program offers a series of co-designed online work experience programs for students and schools – free to access, offering students industry mentoring and micro-credentials they can add to their Curriculum Vitae. • Working with Councils and soon, the wider community, about the scope of the Project Community Wellbeing Plans which form part of our Revised EIS commitments. • Inland Rail Sponsorships and Donations program for eligible community groups for one-off events, projects and activities. Eligible organisations can apply for amounts between \$1000 and \$4000. More than \$820,000 has been provided to over 230 recipients from communities across Australia. <p>Question from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding the Social Impact Management Plan and the Community Wellbeing Plan, are there set KPIs ARTC is aiming for? • Myf Jagger – there are three core objectives to the Community Wellbeing Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ implementing strategies that mitigate impacts on community facilities and access to services ○ identify ways to either mitigate and/or positively contribute to the health and wellbeing of community members impacted by the Inland Rail project ○ investigate initiatives and opportunities to offset or enhance amenity where we have identified there are going to be impacts experienced in terms of amenity and enjoyment of place. We will aim to consult with communities regarding projects that they believe are suitable. For example, enhancing streetscapes, improving connectivity, contributing to social character and community cohesion. <p>Question from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledging the Queensland projects haven’t exclusively commenced yet, I am interested to know what measures and targets ARTC is aiming to achieve with regards to employment numbers, likely number of students / schools engaged and educated on opportunities etc. Can you provide measures and targets? • Myf Jagger – at the next meeting, I can present information outcomes achieved based on our southern projects, for example local and indigenous employment, workforce diversity and local spend. I can also provide an overview of the proposed monitoring program for the Social Impact Management Plan which sets out how we intend to monitor outcomes across workforce management, business participation, accommodation management, community wellbeing and the engagement that underpins that. (ACTION)

NO.	ACTIONS
8	<p>Stakeholder Engagement – 7:30pm – Corey Doran</p> <p>Presentation key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nine engagement events have been undertaken along the Helidon to Calvert alignment from April to July 2022, with 341 direct conversations taking place with stakeholders. Ongoing consultation with landowners regarding land access. • Undertaking meetings with schools, churches and community groups. • Meetings with new landowners who have recently moved to the Toowoomba and Lockyer Valley areas. • Field visits for European Cultural Heritage and surface and groundwater testing.
9	<p>General business – 7:40pm – all</p> <p>Question from Gordon van der Est:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the intention that the Inland Rail line will be dual gauge (both standard gauge and narrow gauge) so that passenger trains may use the line? • Dianne Loughnan – the business case is ongoing. <p>Statement from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Terms of Reference for the Inland Rail, there was a clear requirement that the Inland Rail design is to provide a viable passenger service in coordination to the project. I don't believe there was any reference to this in the dEIS. • Stephen Hart – this was mentioned in Council submission. <p>Question from Gordon van der Est:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARTC recently purchased the block of land on Eastern Drive, the community rumour is there is a route change and there will be more impacts to existing landowners in that area, is this correct? • Corey Doran – the rumour is not correct. There has been no change to the H2C Reference Design alignment, it will run parallel to the existing line through Gatton. <p>Statement from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I will write a letter to the State Government regarding the passenger rail study and provide an update the committee when a response is received. (ACTION).

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	Social Performance KPIs (measures and targets) and employment outcomes based on Inland Rail's southern projects	Myf Jagger	Next meeting
2	Correspondence from the Chair to the State Government about the progression of the passenger rail study		When a response is received from the State Government

Next meeting

Tuesday, 13 December 2022, 5:00pm – 7:00pm

Murphys Creek Community Hall

Jessie Lane (off Dodts Road), Murphys Creek