

Meeting title	Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee		
Attendees			
Mr Graham Clapham – Committee Chair (Chair)	Ms Rosalie Millar – Committee Member (RM)		
Mr Barry Bowden – Committee Member (BB)	Ms Maria Oliver – Committee Member (MO)		
Mr Brad Christensen – Committee Member (BC)	Mr Justin Saunders – Committee Member (JS)		
Mr Graeme Clarke – Committee Member (GC)	Ms Marcia Smith – Committee Member (MSm)		
Mr Jeff Chandler – Committee Member (JC)	Ms Kim Stevens – Committee Member (KS)		
Mr Norm Chapman – Committee Member (NC)	Mr Gareth Rees – ARTC Inland Rail (GR)		
Mr Gary Hayes – Committee Member (GH)	Mr Luke Smith – FFJV (LS)		
Mr Brett Kelly – Committee Member (BK)	Mr Robert Smith – ARTC Inland Rail (RS)		
Ms Georgina Krieg – Committee Member (GK)	Ms Mercedes Staff – ARTC Inland Rail (MSt)		
Apologies			
Mr Robert Barrett – Committee Member (RB)	Mr Ross Fraser – Committee Member (RF)		
Location	Millmerran Cultural Centre	Secretariat	Laura Jarman
Date	7 March 2018	Time	6:00 – 8:00pm

Topic	Discussion
1. Introductions and welcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair opened the meeting, welcomed committee members and observers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Welcome to BC, BK and JS who were apologies for the first meeting. ○ Reminded observers that they were there to observe and any matters they wished to raise at meetings must be submitted via a member or the Chair. ○ Advised he had attended the Inner Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee meeting the previous evening. The issues raised by that committee were similar to those previously raised by this committee. ○ Advised that he had personally visited a number of committee members properties to familiarise himself with their issues. ○ Reiterated that the role of the committee is not to debate the route, but to deal with issues and get the best possible outcomes with the community. • Apologies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Robert Barrett ○ Ross Fraser. ○ Dolly Bennett (observer).
2. Conflicts of interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair, MO, BC, BB, GK, JC, BK, KS - own property within study area. • JS is representing the Bigambul Native Title Corporation, which is the registered native title claimant for this area.
3. Charter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All agreed there were no issues with the Charter provided in the materials.
4. Update on progress of project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARTC Project Manager RS provided an update on the project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ARTC has recently engaged consultants Future Freight Joint Venture (FFJV) to carry out the priority works on finding design solutions to crossing the Condamine floodplain. ○ LS is here representing FFJV at tonight's meeting. ○ FFJV is in the process of preparing management plans and developing its

detailed methodology ahead of engaging directly with landowners on the Condamine floodplain to gather anecdotal evidence to supplement their technical studies and input to the detailed model.

- ARTC has submitted an application to the Queensland Office of the Coordinator-General, including an Initial Advice Statement (IAS), requesting that the B2G project be declared a 'coordinated project'.
- If the project is declared, the Coordinator-General (CG) will issue draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for public comment.
- ARTC has also electronically lodged the Referral for the project for consideration under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) with the Commonwealth Department of Environment and Energy (DEE).
- ARTC will be focussing on the Condamine floodplain study over the coming months but will also be progressing design works for the entire corridor, including other flood areas such as the MacIntyre Brook.

- *Questions and discussion*

- Chair – I have reviewed the Helidon to Calvert (H2C) ToR. From your IAS, do you expect that the ToR for B2G will be similar?
 - RS – We expect that the ToR for B2G will be similar to the H2C ToR as the projects have similar issues. We recognise that there will be unique items on B2G that need to be considered.
 - GS – The ToR for all four Inland Rail projects in Queensland will be similar. The CG will consider geographical differences between areas.
 - Chair – commented that the ToR are heavy reading.
- JC – How will the ToR be changed? Were there many changes to the ToR for the other projects?
 - GR – The CG will consider properly made submissions and incorporate changes into the final ToR. The minimum timeframe for public submissions is four weeks, but ARTC has requested six weeks to ensure people have enough time to make a submission.
 - Chair – The term “properly made submission” is very important. Submissions need to meet the requirements of the CG in order to be considered.
 - GR – We will provide a link to the CG’s webpage on how to make a properly made submission and will provide education to the community to support that.
 - MSt – ARTC is in the process of putting together a program, which outlines technical and consultation activities, and is aiming to provide to the committee prior to Easter.
- RM – Can the submission period be extended?
 - GR – Community members would have to write to the CG requesting an extension.
- GC – When do you expect the draft ToR will be released?
 - GR – The timing of a declaration and release of the draft ToR is determined by the Coordinator-General, but ARTC anticipates that, if declared, indicative timing may include a project declaration in late March and the draft ToR mid-year.

- JC – The Inland Rail website is difficult to navigate
 - MSt – Thank you for your feedback. Your comments have been noted.
- FFJV project leader LS provided an introduction and overview of the Condamine floodplain study.
 - FFJV is a joint venture between Aurecon and Aecom. The two companies have a long history of working together on various rail projects, including on previous phases of the B2G project and will take that knowledge and expand on it.
 - ARTC has given a strong directive that the first priority for FFJV is the Condamine floodplain.
 - The FFJV team is developing a methodology for our approach to the Condamine floodplain. It will involve more than just hydrology.
 - We need to calibrate and refine our flood model. We have already gathered anecdotal evidence from some people in the area. There are some gaps, we will we need to talk to more people to gather more details.
 - If committee members, meeting observers or other community members wish to discuss specific flood behaviour at their property, please contact the Inland Rail Community Engagement Team.
 - Flood model will be updated to the 2016 standard and will include extra gauge stations.
 - FFJV will consider what type of structure will be used to get across the floodplain. This will be informed by geotechnical investigations, flow paths, erosion control, cultural heritage and ecology studies. To date there have been a lot of desktop studies, but we need to get on the ground to validate and expand on these investigations.
 - We also need information on access and how farms along the alignment operate.
 - An initial solution for the Condamine floodplain is expected to be released for community consultation mid-year, with a preferred solution expected in late 2018.
- *Questions and discussion*
 - GK – What is the flood model being updated from?
 - LS – The model was originally from Toowoomba Regional Council and looked at the 1 in 100 year event. As part of these studies, we would take that further and look at the 1% and 2% probability as well as the 1 in 2000 year and 1 in 10,000 year events.
 - Chair – A big issue is the division of farming businesses. Will you consider that?
 - LS – Yes – that will be considered as part of the social impact assessment in the EIS.
 - RM – Will you just be looking in the two-kilometre study area?
 - LS – From a floodplain perspective, we will be looking upstream and downstream. From previous studies, we know that we have a lot more investigation in certain parts outside of the study area.
 - JC – When will the IAS be released?
 - GR – The IAS will be made available on the CG's website when the project has been declared. The EPBC Referral is currently available on the Commonwealth Department of Environment and Energy website. We will provide the link.
 - BK – As a committee, do we have the ability to seek out our own hydrological and design engineer to review your work? We need independent advice.

- Chair – You have hit on an important issue. I don't think it's fair that the proponent provides all of the technical advice on the project. It is too complex for laypeople to respond in a way to influence the CG. I think it is reasonable for the proponent to fund independent advice. As an action from the last meeting, I was to discuss this issue with ARTC. I have written to the ARTC CEO on this matter.
- GC – I endorse this letter.
- GR – You are also able to submit this letter to the CG as he has the powers to condition ARTC to do this.
- LS – FFJV has engaged an independent peer review of our studies – Dr Mark Jempson. He is based in the southern states, but has good Queensland experience.
- o GK – Questioned the wording of the request for a technical expert who is “seen to be independent” – how is “independent” defined?
 - Chair – We want to have ability to procure independent person to scrutinise ARTC's findings on a few key issues if required.
 - JS – Raised concerns as even the “independent” consultant would be funded by ARTC.
- o RM – Do you account for stubble in the flood studies?
 - LS – Yes
- o Chair – Can you tell us more about Aurecon and Aecom?
 - LS – Aurecon and Aecom are both multinational companies and have worked together on numerous rail projects together including Trackstar, Moreton Bay Rail Line, Robina to Varsity Lakes, Corinda to Darra and the Springfield Line Extension. These projects have been constructed and we have good understanding of constructability. We will also be engaging external consultants for some studies including geotechnical, surveying and environment. These may be open tenders and local companies may apply.
- o GC – Have you worked on a project crossing 15 kilometres of floodplain?
 - LS – Aurecon and Aecom worked on the Gold Coast Line, which had significant floodplain areas.
- o GC – What is the weight on the line?
 - LS – We are planning for 30T loads.
- o NC – What happened with flooding at Rothwell? After the first big rain, half of Rothwell was flooded.
 - LS – You will have to refer to the Department of Transport and Main Roads about that.
- o Chair – the Inner Darling Downs committee will be holding a meeting to discuss the methodology for the Condamine floodplain study at 6pm to 8pm on 10 April 2018. Venue is to be determined. How would this committee feel about a joint meeting?
 - *There were no objections to holding a joint meeting.*

5. EIS process

- GR provided an overview of the EIS process.
 - o Referred to EIS process diagram (attached) – ARTC has submitted an Initial Advice Statement (IAS) to the CG (box 2 on diagram). The purpose of the IAS is to inform the CG why B2G should be declared a ‘coordinated project’.
 - o We are anticipating that the CG will declare B2G a ‘coordinated project’ (box 3 on diagram). This will be the commencement of the formal EIS process. When the

	<p>project has been declared, the IAS will be available on the CG’s website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The CG will then release draft ToR for the project and this will be the community’s first opportunity to formally have their say on the project (box 4 on diagram). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Questions and discussion</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chair – Why is it important that B2G be declared a ‘coordinated project’? GR – B2G has a large capital value and will have some impacts on the environment. By being declared a ‘coordinated project’ this allows the Queensland Government to coordinate its response to the EIS. The CG’s role is to liaise with the relevant Queensland Government departments and agencies. We have made application for a bilateral agreement so that the Commonwealth environmental matters are assessed by the CG in the EIS to create one consolidated assessment. It typically takes 12 to 18 months to produce an EIS. If the assessment takes longer than 18 months, ARTC can apply to the CG for an extension.
<p>6. Communication</p>	<p>a) Social media guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MSt advised that ARTC had developed some draft social media guidelines for committee members following enquiries received from members of the other committees on what may be appropriate to post and share, and how this might be approached. We hope these are useful tips. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>No objections to the guidelines were raised.</i> ○ Chair – If anyone has any questions or issues with the social media guidelines, please contact ARTC. <p>b) CCC documentation timeframes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MSt advised that ARTC had developed a process to provide some clarity around the documentation process and timeframes for the community consultative committee meetings. No questions were raised. ● <i>Questions and discussion</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MO – the committee meetings should be advertised well in advance of the meetings and in the Pittsworth Sentinel as well as the Toowoomba Chronicle. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MSt – Noted. ARTC will advertise future meetings in the Pittsworth Sentinel.
<p>7. General business</p>	<p>a) Discussion regarding existing rail corridor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Chair advised that he wished to discuss the issue of the alignment of Inland Rail through Brookstead. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I was contacted by a Brookstead resident regarding the alignment of the rail corridor in relation to the existing GrainCorp facility. ○ This resident was concerned that the Inland Rail wouldn’t fit in the existing rail corridor through the GrainCorp facility. Their view was that it was preferable for the GrainCorp facility to be impacted than to establish a new rail corridor and impact other private property as the infrastructure there is old and outdated. ○ It is a complex issue involving many parties with competing interests – GrainCorp, the community in Brookstead, people who use the facility, and people who would be impacted by a new line.

- I would like to see a community discussion about what the community would prefer to see happen here.

- *Questions and discussion*

- MSm – Will this be assessed in the EIS?
 - GR – The EIS will assess property impacts.
- Chair – There are also other facilities at Yandilla and Pampas. This may also be an issue
 - BK – The Pampas facility has not been used for 10 years.
 - MSm – I believe the Yandilla facility is up for sale.
- KS – Have any of the farmers spoken to GrainCorp?
 - GK – I haven't spoken to anyone. It's an issue of knowing the right person to speak to. The people on the ground who we have access to are none the wiser than us. Is it something ARTC should manage?
- GK – The feedback I've received is that ARTC should consider the existing rail line through Brookstead. How big is the new line and will it fit through town? What is the exclusion zone on a straight section of track?
 - RS – This varies subject to variables including the speed of the train and curve of the track. We have general parameters, but the first step is carrying out investigations on the ground. The parameters are on the website – we will provide the link.
 - LS – The nominal rail corridor width is 60 metres, but will vary depending on earthworks.
 - GR – Where we can, we will use the existing corridors to minimise impacts. ARTC will carry out a full survey of the existing corridor and compare those with what we are looking at.
- Chair – The current GrainCorp facility is serviced by rail. I expect that one question that users will have is does the option exist for Graincorp to send grain by rail on the Inland Rail.
 - GR – This will be assessed in the EIS.

b) Next meeting

- MO raised that the next meeting should be held in Yelarbon
 - No objections were raised.
- All agreed the timing of the next meeting would be determined by the release of the draft ToR.

- *Questions and discussion*

- JC – There was an article in the Toowoomba Chronicle about the Queensland Government not undertaking resumptions until there had been proper consultation.
 - Chair – That article was saying that the Queensland Government would not compulsorily acquire any property without adequate community consultation. I was nominated to this role by the Queensland Farmers Federation and

their position is that they would consider this project a success if ARTC could progress the project without compulsory acquisition.

- GR – There will be community consultation throughout the EIS process. We cannot progress any acquisition until the project is approved, which is 18 months to two years away. The acquiring body for the project has not yet been determined.
- o GC – Can you confirm that ARTC has not yet acquired any land and it will be 18 months to two years before you are at that stage? This is important for people in the community as they are concerned about what may happen to those who are affected.
 - GR – That’s right – ARTC has not acquired any land in Queensland for any of the projects. If anyone has concerns about the property acquisition process, ARTC has a property team who can answer questions and provide detailed and appropriate information and facts about how property acquisition may happen in 18 months to two years.
- o GC – When the red line is on the map, it will bring things closer to identifying which properties may be affected. That will take away some of the pressure on communities.
 - GR – Understood.
 - MSt – B2G property requirements are yet unknown. When they are known, it would be ARTC’s preference to acquire property by way of private treaty, rather than by compulsory acquisition.
- o Chair – QFF received a letter from a southern legal firm offering to represent them on land acquisition. The QFF CEO is meeting with a person from that legal firm on 15 March – the Chair has been asked to attend. QFF does not support scaremongering or acquisition of land before the process is conducted.
- o GH – Concerned that there will be a gap between what the landowners want in terms of crossings or other project aspects and what can be designed for a certain budget. How are we going to close that gap? How long until we get some guidance on what to expect? We need to know the scope of engagement for FFJV.
 - Chair – The project wouldn’t get approval if the adverse impacts were too damaging on communities.
 - RS – We will look at how we can provide information on FFJV’s scope of services brief to the committee.
- o BK – The Senate estimates committee has requested a cost estimate for Inland Rail. What is the timeframe for providing this? How can you provide accurate costing when the project has not yet been designed?
 - RS – We have a concept design and a concept budget. As we develop the design, we can refine the cost estimate for the project. If it looks like we’re going to go over budget at any point we need to have a conversation with our client.

Chair – ARTC is to provide some detail on this at the next committee meeting.
- o Chair – The community is concerned that the design for the project will be restricted by the budget and not by what needs to be done to prevent adverse

	<p>impacts on the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RS – Potential impacts will be assessed in the EIS and the CG will set conditions of approval to ensure that impacts are appropriately managed. It is a balancing act between what is acceptable to the community and the cost. The costs for construction are determined by the tender, which will take into account approval conditions. ARTC may need to go back to the Australian Government and ask for additional funds. o BK – Tonight we’ve talked about the floodplain. Should we have a systematic approach to looking at issues by area and trying to resolve them? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chair – I agree that the issues are many and varied, but the role of this committee is not to solve the issues but to make sure they are raised. It is ARTC’s responsibility to deal with the issues and the committee will make sure that ARTC’s response is adequate and meets community expectations - MSm – Suggested that everyone in the committee print a dot point list of concerns in their community.
<p>8. Conclusion and confirmation of actions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o ARTC to provide a link to the CG’s webpage on how to make a properly made submission. o ARTC to provide an indicative project program prior to Easter. o ARTC to provide the link to the EPBC Referral on the Commonwealth Department of Environment and Energy website. o ARTC to provide a link to the design parameters. o ARTC to provide overview of FFJV’s scope of services to the committee. o ARTC is to provide some detail of how cost estimates are calculated at the next ordinary meeting. o Committee members to prepare a dot point list of concerns in their community. • Meeting closed at 7.50pm.