

Meeting minutes

Gowrie to Calvert Community Consultative Committee meeting

Date / Time

6 December 2023
6:00-7:35pm

Location

Laidley Sports Complex, 8 Ambrose Street, Laidley

Chair

Simon Warner

Secretariat

Laura Jarman

Distribution

All members

Attendees

- Gordon Van der Est (GV)
- Darryl Green (DG)
- Maurice Hennessy (MH)
- Michael Keene (MK)
- Neil Cook (NC)
- Gavin Elphinstone, Queensland Approvals Lead (GE)
- Harry Lister, Stakeholder Engagement Advisor (HL)
- Jacqui Neill, Corporate Affairs Manager (JN)
- Max Nichols, Acting Area Director (MN)
- Bill Quince, Program Property Director (BQ)
- Shakira Sellen, Stakeholder Engagement Advisor (SS)

Apologies

- Jason Chavasse
- Margaret McCarthy (Yuggera/Ugarapul People)
- Maree Rosier
- Fleur McPherson, EIS Delivery Specialist

Guests

- Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts (DITRDCA) representative
- Michael Hawkins, Office of the Coordinator-General (OCG) (MH)

Discussions

NO.	DISCUSSION
1	<p>Welcome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Chair delivered an Acknowledgement of Country. – The Chair welcomed members, observers and guests from DITRDCA and OCG, and acknowledged Lockyer Valley Regional Council councillors. – The Chair noted apologies from members Aunty Margaret and Jason Chavasse, and Fleur McPherson from Inland Rail. – The Chair invited members and Inland Rail team members to introduce themselves and the group they represent. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MK – Grandchester resident – DG – landowner – NC – Laidley resident – GV – resident of Forest Hill and Laidley – MG – Gatton resident – BQ – Inland Rail Program Property Director

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GE – Inland Rail EIS team - HL – Inland Rail stakeholder engagement - LJ – Inland Rail stakeholder engagement lead - The Chair – Murphy’s Creek resident.
2	<p>Actions from Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Item 1 – Committee to be presented with the flood modelling results before the 2nd round of EIS consultation (rather than during the public notification period). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GE noted this is not something that is available at this point in time and will be taken as a future action. - Item 2 – Committee to be presented with updated visualisations and viewpoints before the 2nd round of EIS consultation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GE noted this is not something that is available at this point in time and will be taken as a future action. - Item 3 – Overall delivery strategy and the Tier 1 contractors. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Chair noted this would be addressed later in the meeting.
3	<p>DITRDCA update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA advised that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As part of an election commitment, Dr Kerry Schott AO was appointed by the Australian Government in October 2022 to undertake an Independent Review of Inland Rail. - The Australian Government released the Review findings on 6 April 2023 and agreed to its 19 recommendations in full or in principle. - Inland Rail are working closely with the Australian Government to deliver on its response to those recommendations. - The Government is committed: Inland Rail is nationally important infrastructure needed to meet Australia’s growing freight task, help improve road safety and decarbonise our economy. - The Government has announced that it remains committed to getting the delivery of the Inland Rail project back on track and re-focus the delivery. - The route of the Inland Rail project will connect the new intermodal terminal at Beveridge in Victoria with Kagaru in Queensland (the existing Sydney/Brisbane line). - The Inland Rail Service Offering (1.8-kilometre trains, double-stacked, 24 hours between terminals) will operate between the intermodal terminal at Beveridge in Victoria and the proposed terminal at Ebenezer in Queensland. - The link from Ebenezer to Kagaru will be single-stacked. Completing the connection to Kagaru is important for overall network resilience. It will enable trains to move up the east-coast line and transit into NSW or come through the Inland Rail route and transit down to Newcastle, and Sydney as needed. - The Government is putting in place the arrangements needed for the delivery of the project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Government has supported the set up of Inland Rail Pty Ltd as a subsidiary of ARTC to deliver the project. - A staged approach to the delivery of the Inland Rail: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complete the southern section of the project between Beveridge and Parkes to Narromine, NSW in 2027 - Complete Narrabri to North Star Phase 1, NSW in 2023 - Complete environmental planning approvals

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Undertake surveys and testing required to further inform the design of Inland Rail, environmental planning approvals and land acquisitions – Secure land required for the Inland Rail corridor. – The Government will make further decisions on the delivery of Inland Rail as it has more certainty that the project can be built to an agreed budget and timeframe. <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – GV requested summary of the key recommendations of the report as some people may not have read it. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DITRDCA noted the government’s response provided a response against each of the review’s recommendations. As requested, DITRDCA provided a summary of the Government’s response to each of the recommendations and their implementation status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Recommendation 1: To ensure that the ARTC Board had the right mix of skills to undertake its role in operating the national network. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: This has been implemented by the Government. They have appointed a new Chair of the ARTC Board and members since the Review. – Recommendation 2: The position of the chief executive of Inland Rail should be filled permanently. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: That process is on-foot. – Recommendation 3: Separate the delivery of Inland Rail from ARTC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: Underway, with the establishment of the Inland Rail Pty Ltd subsidiary appointment of the Board for that company; and the governance arrangements for that company to be able to report to the Minister for Finance and the Minister for the Department of Infrastructure and Transport. – Recommendation 4: The position of managing director/chief executive of ARTC should be in charge of overseeing the operation of ARTC and not be involved in the delivery of Inland Rail, going forward. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: That process is underway. – Recommendation 5: A Statement of Expectations (SoE) should be issued for ARTC and the subsidiary company. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: The Shareholding Ministers have issued an interim Government’s expectations for the operations of the national network and delivery of Inland Rail and it is available online. – Recommendation 6: Inland Rail project team should do a full review of its risk management processes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: Underway inside Inland Rail. – Recommendation 7: The service offering as identified in the 2015 business case should be retained; and is important to industry. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: The Government has agreed the Inland Rail Service Offering should be retained. – Recommendation 8: That the end points for Inland Rail should be the proposed terminal at Ebenezer and the new terminal at Beveridge; and they will be the end points for the actual double-stacked service offering. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: The Government has agreed to this recommendation. – Recommendation 9: The intermodal terminal Ebenezer should be developed, subject to the outcome of the business case. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: The Ebenezer business case is being finalised. – Recommendation 10: The Commonwealth and New South Wales Governments should investigate opportunities to increase intermodal terminals or have open-access, independent intermodal terminal at Parkes.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: Underway and is being led by the National Intermodal Corporation. – Recommendation 11: ARTC should ensure that the signalling system that will be part of Inland Rail and part of the national network is interoperable with existing or future State network signal systems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: Underway, led by ARTC as part of it network interoperability project. – Recommendation 12: Where Inland Rail bisects regional towns, that as additional train traffic arises, this should be addressed; through modifications to limit noise and enable cross-town traffic. Where those modifications/mitigations cease to be effective, then options for a bypass should be considered. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: The Government has agreed to this recommendation and need for Inland Rail to ensure the design and operation of the project reflects forecast train numbers and mitigates impact accordingly. – Recommendation 13: The Government should engage specialist to review the design solutions developed by ARTC, to make sure they are fit and appropriate and efficient; and that the work that's required to test/prove up those designs, in terms of surveys/geotechnical work is undertaken, to remove uncertainty. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: Specialists to be engaged in early 2024. – Recommendation 14: ARTC to review its approval processes and seek to learn some lessons as to what has caused prolongation in some areas; and focus on being more efficient in these approval processes; and addressing issues that have been raised in the past. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: Underway inside Inland Rail. – Recommendation 15: ARTC and Inland Rail should consider how possession regimes can be modified to allow further flexibility so that if one is lost due to weather or some other incident, that you don't have to wait a full six months for that annual regime to come around again. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: Possessions regimes to be agreed between ARTC and Inland Rail as required. – Recommendation 16: Review staging of Inland Rail with a focus of delivery to Parkes; focus on gaining approvals; focus on securing the corridor to provide greater certainty as to cost and when the project can be delivered. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: Implemented. – Recommendation 17: ARTC should negotiate with Regionerate Rail, the PPP proponent, as to the best way forward given the review and the processes that were afoot at the time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: Implemented. – Recommendation 18: Undertake value engineering, which is the costing exercise around those design and scope, that are tested through the earlier recommendation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status Linked to recommendation 13 with specialists to be engaged in 2024. – Recommendation 19: As the project proceeds, the Commonwealth and State governments should continue to consider where regional benefits can be best realised. To facilitate this, the Commonwealth government should raise the issues with the State counterparts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status: The Regional Development and Delivery division within the Department of Infrastructure is tasked to engage and discuss what opportunities may be arising from Inland Rail. – DG asked if the project corridor was “set in concrete” and when the public would know the actual design. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Chair noted this would be addressed in the upcoming presentation from Inland Rail. – DITRDCA added the route was set and work was continuing on the project design for the agreed route.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – GV asked why a connection from Ebenezer to Kagaru was still planned when removing it from scope would save a lot of money. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DITRDCA responded that it was strategic as the connection from Ebenezer to Kagaru would provide resilience for the whole rail network. If there were an outage south of Sydney, Melbourne-Newcastle traffic could use Inland Rail and connect via to the Brisbane-Sydney line; or if there were an outage on the Sydney-Parkes line, trains could come up the Brisbane-Sydney line and take Inland Rail into central NSW and across to Perth. It’s a longer route, but no different to when trucks drive thousands of kilometres due to road outages as we have seen with recent floods. – The Chair requested an update on the Brisbane to Toowoomba passenger rail study, which has been going for several years. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DITRDCA confirmed that the first stage of the passenger rail study had been completed; however, a decision on the next steps rested with the Queensland and Australian governments, rather than the departments. Noted that Inland Rail has been tasked with the designing the project to accommodate passenger rail. – The Chair asked DITRDCA provide feedback to the government that the public would like an update. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DITRDCA confirmed it would raise with the areas working on that project. – The Chair noted that the EIS doesn’t seem to have taken into about advances in train technology in assessing impacts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DITRDCA advised that the EIS has to mitigate the known impacts that exist now; however, a move to a whole electric train fleet would significantly reduce locomotive noise, though wagon noise and wheel on rail noise would still continue. – MN added that the EIS uses a conservative assumption with the current modern crop of freight trains generally seen to be a worst-case scenario. All of the mitigations that we would have to put in place would be for the worst type of trains and gets a better result for the environment and community. – The Chair noted that the DITRDCA slide used the term “costing” rather than “budget” in its slides and sought clarification of why. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DITRDCA advise that the term costing had been used is that the project can’t have a budget until it is clear how much it is going to cost. The risk and uncertainty components of the estimated project cost may be higher than it needed to be, so we need to go through a process to provide more cost certainty. – DITRDCA added that the reality is: moving large volumes of freight over long distance, rail is far more efficient than road. It might cost a lot to build in the first instance, but it's cheaper in the long-term than road repairs and upgrades. – MK asked if there was a connection between the recent cuts in State-based infrastructure projects compared to the Federal infrastructure budget. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DITRDCA advised that the Government committed to review the \$120 billion ten year, rolling pipeline of infrastructure projects. Many of those projects have been in the pipeline for several years and had not even started planning. The purpose was to go through the very large list of projects and undertake a review as to whether they were still supported by the State and funded and whether they were likely to be delivered or not. A number of the cuts included “zombie” projects that were no longer supported by states and had not started planning. Inland Rail was exempt from the review as it had its own review process. There is \$14.5 billion equity

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<p>committed to Inland Rail and that commitment remains in the Government's budget. Other projects that were exempt were infrastructure projects that were election commitments of current Australian Government.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NC requested an update on the Inland Rail connection to Gladstone. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA advised that Commonwealth had committed funding to the Queensland Government to undertake a business case on the feasibility of Gladstone to Toowoomba or Goondiwindi connection and it was still underway. - DITRDCA reiterated that Inland Rail is Beveridge to Ebenezer and Kagaru and was never a project that would run to Gladstone – that would be an addition to the existing project. Inland Rail is about moving freight between Melbourne and Brisbane, improving connectivity for regional freight, and more efficiently over the network.
4	<p>Inland Rail update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MN provided an update on the actions Inland Rail was taking following the review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Formed in July 2023, Inland Rail Pty Ltd, a subsidiary of ARTC, is delivering Inland Rail <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - comprises a Chief Executive reporting to a standalone Board - subsidiary directors with specific capabilities appointed to oversee a project of this complexity. - The sections of Inland Rail between Beveridge in Victoria and Parkes in New South Wales have been prioritised by the Australian Government for completion by 2027. - Inland Rail will then connect existing rail networks between Melbourne, Sydney, Perth, Adelaide and the Illawarra via Parkes and Narromine. - In a staged approach, Inland Rail will focus on achieving environment approvals and securing land for the rail corridor to provide more certainty as to the delivery and full cost of the Inland Rail program. - The Australian Government will determine the future delivery schedule for Inland Rail once approvals for all remaining sections are obtained and there is greater certainty on costs to deliver the Program. - Inland Rail is working with State and Australian Governments to expedite environmental approvals processes where possible to help reduce construction delays. - As a subsidiary of ARTC, Inland Rail Pty Ltd operates with its own governance and delivery arrangements in line with the Inland Rail Review - Inland Rail's board comprises: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Executive Chair Robert Rust - Deputy Chair Louise Thurgood - Directors Erin Flaherty, James Cain, Vivienne King and Peter Duncan - The board members have been chosen for their skills, qualifications, knowledge and experience, including in the delivery of nationally significant freight infrastructure projects. - Revised EISs for Gowrie to Kagaru and NSW/Qld Border to Gowrie sections are in progress - Australian Government support for intermodal terminal at Ebenezer - subject to Brisbane Inland Rail Intermodal Terminal Business Case - 39km of single-stacked, dual gauge rail proposed to connect Ebenezer and Kagaru to the Brisbane to Sydney East Coast line. - Recommendation 17 in the Independent Review of Inland Rail recommended that Inland Rail review the contracting model of the Public Private Partnership (PPP) for the G2K sections. - The Australian Government agreed with that Recommendation and since the Review was released in April 2023, Inland Rail has been working with the preferred PPP contractor, Regionerate Rail in response to this recommendation.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – In November 2023, following negotiations, Inland Rail has agreed to not proceed with the PPP contracting arrangements. – Regionerate Rail has been conducting valuable work in G2K since being selected as preferred contractor in March 2022, undertaking a range of preliminary early works including site surveys, utility services investigation and geotechnical investigations that will help inform ongoing environmental approval processes and future construction works. – Inland Rail will now focus on gaining approvals for the G2K sections and continuing with land acquisitions to secure the corridor for Inland Rail. – Once these important tasks have been completed and the Australian Government has greater certainty around the program’s construction schedule and cost, there will be discussions on the delivery model for the G2K sections of Inland Rail. – Inland Rail will continue to keep the community updated. – The status of the Gowrie to Helidon, Helidon to Calvert and Calvert to Kagaru projects remains “subject to environmental approvals”. – Awaiting the Ebenezer terminal business case so we can ensure alignment. There will be a change of project scope with the Ebenezer to Kagaru section being single stacked. Inland Rail is adapting the design to make it cost efficient. – The Office of the Coordinator-General (OCG) has granted an extension to the declaration dates for the three projects to lapse on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Gowrie to Helidon (G2H): 1 February 2025 – Helidon to Calvert (H2C): 1 August 2025 – Calvert to Kagaru (C2K): 1 February 2026 – Inland Rail is currently preparing additional information to support the submission of the revised draft EISs for the G2H, H2C and C2K projects. – The C2K project, which connects to Ebenezer, will progress with a revised scope that we are in the process of determining with the Australian Government. – LJ provided an overview of recent engagement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Drop-in information sessions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Laidley RSL Markets – 29 July 2023 – Peak Crossing Hall – 14 June 2023 – Purga Hall – 10 May 2023 – Laidley RSL Markets – 29 April 2023 – Peak Crossing Hall – 27 April 2023 – Yamanto Shopping Centre – 20 April 2023 – Regional Shows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Gatton Show – 21 – 22 July 2023 – Rosewood Show – 30 June – 1 July 2023 – Boonah Show – 2 – 3 June 2023 – Meetings with key stakeholders. – BQ provided an overview of the property acquisition program and status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Schott Review provided clear direction to continue work securing the corridor, including the acquisition of required land. – A program of early acquisition work is currently underway and will continue on a considered basis. To be suitable for early acquisition, land will be of demonstrable strategic benefit and / or associated with a genuine case of hardship for the landholder. – Compulsory land acquisition processes for the rail corridor will be undertaken by the Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR). Inland Rail does not have the power to compulsorily acquire land directly.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The process of acquisition, landowner rights and the assessment of compensation is guided by the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. Noted affected landowners are entitled to be reimbursed for things like legal fees, valuation fees, costs associated with actually going through the negotiation and eventually concluding it. – Compulsory acquisition of land by DTMR will not commence until the final EIS is accepted and the Evaluation Report has been released. <p><u>Questions and discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Chair noted that a question from a previous meeting was regarding project legacies and one of those associated was that at the end of the project there was an opportunity for excess land not required for the project to be returned to environmental purposes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – BQ advised that Inland Rail had been purchasing land for biodiversity offset requirements. In NSW a lot of that is to do with koala habitat. – BQ noted that Inland Rail was not in the business of trying to build a property portfolio and agrees there needs to be an ongoing discussion about how land is returned to the market. In some cases there will be obvious market opportunities and adjoining landowners, but there may be opportunities to do something outside the box. – MN responded to DG’s earlier question regarding the project design and assessment of impacts – the alignment is not going to change. The revised draft EIS will assess the project against the terms of reference and provide the additional information being sought by the Coordinator-General. – MK asked if compensation was payable to Regionerate Rail as a result of the decision not to proceed with the PPP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MN responded that there was a commercial in confidence conclusion to the PPP arrangement. They were paid for some preliminary early works, which included design. – DITRDCA clarified that Regionerate Rail was only paid for what they were entitled to access under the agreement and exit arrangements. – GV asked if the EIS will include an assessment of the downstream impacts with regard to water flow to the Warrego Highway, including five kilometers downstream. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MN advised that the EIS has to address the flood impacts of the design, the construction and operation of the project in consideration to the requirements of the International Flood Panel. It would be subject to a flood model and flood impact objectives. – GV asked if the findings of the international flood panel would be made public. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DITRDCA advised that the International Flood Panel’s four interim reports and final report were all available online. <p><u>Observer questions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Observer requested clarification of Recommendation 12 regarding realignment in relation to the comments about the alignment being set and not changing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MN responded that recommendation refers to mitigation first of the current alignment and if these are proved to be inadequate. – DITRDCA clarified that the route for Inland Rail was set – Beveridge to Ebenezer connecting to Kagaru. Within that route, Inland Rail is undertaking a design exercise. The Review is clear that the design needs to accommodate the forecast rail traffic and mitigate for that. – A review is underway of the future rail traffic numbers. It will help inform the EIS and Ebenezer business case. The critical component about that is: where designed mitigations are not fully effective, then the design and associated mitigations have to be reviewed and revised, noting

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<p>that the Beveridge to Kagaru route is set, but there may be a localised adjustment to the alignment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Observer sought to clarify if route and alignment were not necessarily the same thing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA advised that the first step is to review the design and mitigations and it might be that the design needs to change, but if impacts cannot be designed out the other options may need to be considered such as adjustments to the position of the track but the route of each project section from terminal to terminal would overall remain the same. - Observer asked if the committee and local governments would be considered in the review of design and cost review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA advised that the nature of the information used for the review would need to be kept commercial in confidence. - Observer asked if it would consider if there were two alternative alignments within a route. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA responded that there was one alignment that the design and mitigations would be developed for the purpose of assessment. Inland Rail is undertaking an options assessment report to consider the preferred aligned against an alternative alignment; however, the reference design is the one that must be tested to ensure it mitigates impacts. - Observer noted that the process of developing a design, developing an EIS and then property acquisitions may push out project timeframes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA noted that it would be evaluating the design that is subject to the EIS to get a cost there will probably be a number of iterations of cost review as timing of EIS approvals is confirmed, conditions of approval are known and constructions schedules are developed. - GV asked if the term “mitigation” referred to flood, noise, traffic, liveability, and vibration. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA confirmed it did. - GV requested the results of the alternate route not through Gatton. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MN noted the options assessment report was still under development.
<p>5</p>	<p>Office of the Coordinator-General update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MH provided an overview of the role of the Office of the Coordinator-General (OCG) and the project evaluation process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OCG evaluate coordinated projects – complex projects going through an approvals process, and which don’t have another home in government. - Following the release of the draft EIS, the OCG received comments from individuals, State government agencies, Councils and the Commonwealth on a range of topics – some more material than others. These have been synthesised down and a request for information issued to ARTC, which is working on a response to those questions. - The next step is to review the revised draft EIS and then the OCG will make a decision as to whether ARTC has appropriately responded to the information request, then it will go on public exhibition again., noting not every project goes through exhibition twice, but it is fairly normal on larger projects. - ARTC will then respond to the feedback and the OCG may seek further information from ARTC. Eventually, the OCG will make a decision that they have sufficient information to finalise the documentation and formally evaluate the project, then potentially conditionally provide an approval for the project to progress. - The evaluation would be published online by the Coordinator-General. It will detail imposed conditions that the Government will imposes on the proponent and some recommendation.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<p>There will be some recommendations to the Commonwealth Government, and they have to provide subsequent additional approvals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The timelines are in ARTC's court. - The Border to Gowrie project is more progressed and hopefully we will be able to release it for public comment as early as April 2024. Noted that the OCG seeks specialist consultant advice on four areas: flooding and hydrology, noise, traffic and transport, and flora and fauna issues. - The revised Draft EIS, will include a response to submissions within that documentation. <p><u>Questions/discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MK asked if there was a point at which an approved EIS expires and needs to be re-done. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MH advised a currency period for an evaluation is included in the evaluation report and is typically three-four years, noting the OCG can extend that. - DG asked if the OCG undertook on-site visits and investigations or if it was just a desktop exercise. Noted he was concerned that relevant specifics may not be considered. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MH responded that the team had been to site multiples times to see aspects of the project and were happy to talk to people about their concerns. - MH further noted that it is the proponent's role to engage with stakeholders to work through any concerns they may have. - MN added that the formal consultation period enables stakeholders and members of the public to provide information to the Coordinator-General. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MH noted it was a balancing act between impacts and benefits - not development at any cost. - The Chair recalled a point that was made in a previous presentation that on complex projects, while the whole EIS may not be reviewed, perhaps part of it may need to be re-examined if circumstances change. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MH agreed that there will be changes during detailed design and construction that will change impacts and there is a change process to allow that to happen. Substantial changes may require additional assessment, public consultation and additional conditioning.
<p>6</p>	<p>General business and questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Chair noted that there had been lots of discussion and questions already and asked if there were any further questions. - MK noted several presenters had referred to a meeting the previous night and asked what meeting that was. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LJ advised there had been a combined meeting of the Inner Darling Downs and Southern Darling Downs community consultative committees the previous evening and that several of the presenters were the same.
<p>7</p>	<p>Conclusion and confirmation of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Chair thanked guest speakers, members and observers for their attendance. - The Chair advised of the intention to review the committee in early 2024. - The Chair closed the meeting at 7.35pm.

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	Committee to be presented with the flood modelling results before the second round of EIS consultation (rather than during the public notification period).	Inland Rail	TBC
2	Committee to be presented with updated visualisations and viewpoints before the second round of EIS consultation.	Inland Rail	TBC