

Meeting title	Scenic Rim Community Consultative Committee		
Attendees			
Ms Katherine Bensted – Committee Chair (Chair)	Ms Alison Duke-Gibb – Committee Member		
Ms Aretha Acton – Committee Member	Ms Robyn Keenan – Committee Member		
Mr Phillip Bell – Committee Member	Ms Jennifer Sanders – Committee Member		
Mr Simon Birrell – Committee Member	Miss Rosemaree Thomasson – Committee Member		
Mr John Brent – Committee Member	Mr Robert Walker – ARTC Project Manager		
Mr Danny Bukowski – Committee Member	Mr Gareth Rees – ARTC Environment Manager		
Mr Robert Collett – Committee Member	Ms Deb Daly – ARTC Community Engagement		
Ms Angela Collyer – Committee Member	Mr Reggie Dutt – ARTC Communications		
	Ms Mercedes Staff – ARTC Engagement Manager		
Apologies			
Ms Janice McGregor – Committee Member	Ms Narella Simpson – Committee Member		
Observers			
A total of 11 observers attended the meeting including the Federal Member for Wright and representatives of Scenic Rim Regional Council, Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development and Cities and the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet.			
Location	The Centre, Beaudesert	Minute takers	Deb Daly
Date	22 February 2018	Time	6:00 – 8:00pm

Agenda No.	Issue / Topic	Name
1.	<p>Introductions and welcome from Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgement of Traditional Owners • Project staff introduced themselves, noting recent changes in staffing • Committee members introduced themselves (introductions included in December meeting minutes), noting members that did not attend December meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Aretha Acton – lives in Peak Crossing and operates Flinders Peak Winery (accommodation and winery) ○ Danny Bukowski – real estate agent in the area, regularly asked about the project and wishes to share Inland Rail information ○ John Brent – former Mayor for the region, vegetable grower, long term resident of the area • Observers welcomed and advised their interest in the project. • Noted that minutes from December meeting were agreed to by the committee members. • Noted discussion topics that members raised at the previous meeting (noted in December meeting minutes) and a desire for these to be used for future agendas. This would allow interested community members to attend when an agenda topic interested them. 	<p>Chair</p> <p>ALL</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair noted her request for agenda items at this meeting, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) representative to discuss the Southern Freight Rail Corridor selection – ARTC made request to TMR however a resource was unavailable for the meeting. ARTC provided copies of the <i>Final Assessment Report – Southern Freight Rail Corridor Study (2010)</i> to all members in attendance. ARTC noted that the <i>Initial Advice Statement: Inland Rail – Calvert to Kagaru (2017)</i>, supplied to the Office of the Coordinator-General (CG) was developed based upon TMR's report. ○ Passenger rail inclusion in Inland Rail – ARTC advised that this may be discussed in a future meeting. 	
2.	<p>Conflicts of interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair noted that a register of conflicts is not required but welcomed members to have any perceived conflicts noted in minutes. • Committee member, Phillip Bell, noted that he and his wife are Directors of a pastoral company that has interests in a property that is within the investigation area. 	Chair
3.	<p>Agreed Charter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MS noted that all members in attendance had a copy of the agreed Charter, incorporating the requested changes from the December committee meeting. • Chair noted that requested changes had been made. 	Chair MS
4.	<p>Update on progress of project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation provided by ARTC Project Manager. • Presentation addressed the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concept studies commenced in 2016 ahead of the Initial Advice Statement (IAS) being lodged with the CG in 2017. Later in 2017, the CG declared the Calvert to Kagaru (C2K) project a coordinated project. ○ TMR will be an advisory agency that will review the C2K Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). ○ C2K is currently in the Feasibility Phase (overall there are six phases as part of the ARTC governance process). The Feasibility Phase is anticipated to be completed in mid to late 2019, with operations anticipated to be around 2024. Timeframes were noted as being available on the Inland Rail website. ○ The Feasibility Phase will include analysis of potential impacts and mitigation requirements, design for approval, identifying associated costs and development of the EIS. ○ RW noted that railways in Queensland are owned by the Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy and leased to TMR. ARTC as a rail operator lease rail lines from TMR, as a sub-lease. 	Chair RW

- Technical and Approvals Consultancy Services (TACS) contract awarded to Future Freight Joint Venture (FFJV), comprising Aecom and Aurecon.
- Possible alternative route for the tunnel alignment through the Teviot Range is being considered. The alternative alignment was noted on the map used in the Initial Advice Statement and shown at the meeting.
- Land Access Agreements are being sought with private property owners on a voluntary basis. RW noted that agreements are only being sought where investigations are required.
- ARTC will be seeking community input to areas of concern, particularly around flooding, within the C2K project area.
- Investigations to be undertaken by TACS include:
 - rail design
 - bore holes and test pits
 - hydrological modelling
 - road/rail interface and access requirements
 - land acquisition requirements
 - flora and fauna
 - operational noise and vibration.
- Timeframes of investigations discussed, noting that the Feasibility Phase will take between 12 – 18 months, ahead of the lodgement of the EIS in mid-2019.
- Committee member advised that engagement by TMR for the Southern Freight Rail Corridor (SFRC) was focussed toward the community west of the range rather than to the east, with no community meetings or other activities in the Kagaru area. Committee member queried if ARTC could investigate an alternative alignment from the tunnel, directly to Bromelton, rather than via Kagaru that had been gazetted as a rural residential estate. RW advised that ARTC would need a very good reason to divert from the SFRC and that feedback should be provided to the CG, responsible for the Terms of Reference (ToR). Chair queried if the committee member could be provided with a contact in TMR to provide clarity around the SFRC alignment. MS agreed to refer the committee member's request to TMR.
- Federal Member for Wright, Scott Buchholz MP, asked if the EIS considered social impacts. RW confirmed this was the case.
- Committee members requested community consultation timeframes to ensure that the broader community can provide input, not just the directly impacted property owners. ARTC to provide timeframes for consultation activities.
- Committee member requested that EIS modelling activities consider the worst-case scenario for impacts such as noise and vibration, with specific mention made to the possible future inclusion of 3.6km length trains on the track. Chair noted that she had been privy to an ARTC presentation regarding the existing, operational Hunter Valley rail line that included specific information about

	<p>noise and the associated mitigation practices and asked that a presentation of that nature be shared with the committee at a future meeting.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>EIS process overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation provided by ARTC Environment Manager. • Presentation addressed the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Early activities included an application to the CG in May 2016 for the project to be deemed a coordinated project, requiring the development of an EIS. The project was also referred to the Commonwealth Department of Environment and Energy. On 16 June 2017, the project was declared a coordinated project with a draft ToR developed and released for public consultation for 4-6 weeks prior to the final ToR being released on 8 December 2017. ○ GR noted that the EIS must address the natural, built, social and economic impacts of a project, in accordance with the ToR. ○ Noted that ARTC is eager to seek local input and knowledge from community members and interest groups via the numerous community consultation opportunities to be coordinated by ARTC as part of the EIS development. Engagement with the community will be aligned with project milestones and is led by ARTC, with input and involvements from TACS. ○ EIS is anticipated to be lodged with the CG in mid-2019. Should the CG indicate, further work may be required by ARTC. Upon approval, the CG will issue conditions and recommendations and release an Evaluation Report ahead of the Commonwealth Minister handing down their findings. • Chair requested that a similar project/s be provided to the committee for members to gain insight to the process. • Committee member queried if ARTC would be undertaking a similar study to that of the C2K EIS, north of Kagaru, for that section of the alignment. GR noted that the adjacent project, Kagaru to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton (K2ARB) will be assessed via an Environmental Assessment Report (EAR), to be reviewed by TMR in accordance with ARTC's existing sub-lease for that section of operational rail corridor. GR noted that the work proposed on K2ARB is significantly different to what is proposed for the C2K section but that community input would be sought through the EAR process. • Committee member queried if the C2K project was the only section of major new, greenfield rail track proposed. ARTC advised that there are 13 different projects across the alignment, noting that three other CCCs have been established for Queensland projects. • Committee member queried if ARTC would rely on the existing regional ecosystem mapping or if ARTC would undertake their own investigations. GR confirmed that ARTC would undertake their own investigations and seek to correct any mapping errors. Committee member also queried if a significant ecosystem was found on the route, how would this be addressed. GR noted 	<p>Chair</p> <p>GR</p> <p>RW</p>

	<p>that the first preference is to avoid them, alternatively ARTC would mitigate the impact and/or provide the necessary offsets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee member noted they had seen early survey maps (1800s) in the Department of Surveyor General and suggested they should be considered. GR noted that the EIS would address matters of cultural heritage. • Committee member queried if property owners had already been notified about ARTC's desire to undertake investigations on their land. RW noted that the process is based on requests to property owners, led by the TACS identification of key areas for investigations. Committee member queried if the key areas are publicly available. RW advised that this was an internal, engineering process and suggested that if property owners wanted particular investigations undertaken at their property they can lodge a request with ARTC for consideration. • Committee member noted that the corridor is gazetted but ARTC doesn't own the properties. GR confirmed this was correct, noting that TMR had gazetted the corridor and were undertaking their own acquisition process. ARTC was unable to confirm how many properties had been acquired by TMR. Committee member queried who was responsible for the management of TMR's acquired land (noting weeds and feral animals). GR indicated this would be TMR as the property owner. 	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Communication update</p> <p>a) CCC documentation timeframes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation timeframes reviewed and discussed. • Process for members seeking reimbursement of travel costs noted. <p>b) Social media guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft social media guidelines reviewed and discussed. • Meeting schedule for 2018 noted, committee members agreed to hold next meeting in Peak Crossing, preferably at the new school hall. Committee member noted that the next meeting needs to be widely promoted to ensure potential observers can attend. 	<p>Chair</p> <p>MS</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>General business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member for Wright, Scott Buchholz MP addressed the meeting. • Model release forms tabled, noting the permitted purpose of 'ARTC promotional materials'. 	<p>Chair</p> <p>ALL</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee member requested that the C2K alignment could be incorporated into Queensland Globe. GR advised that Queensland Government owns Queensland Globe and is outside of ARTC's control. Chair suggested that committee members encourage property owners to contact ARTC directly. 	
8.	<p>Conclusion and confirmation of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link to the <i>Final Assessment Report – Southern Freight Rail Corridor Study</i> and the <i>Initial Advice Statement: Inland Rail – Calvert to Kagaru</i> be provided to the committee. • ARTC to request that Scenic Rim Regional Council allow a static display, including maps shown at the meeting, to be installed at the Scenic Rim Regional Council Beaudesert Library. • ARTC to advise best contact point within TMR for committee member to seek advice about the SFRC. • ARTC to provide community consultation timeframes to the committee, aligned with the project's technical activities and approvals milestones. • GR to provide a list of similar projects to Inland Rail that have undertaken the EIS process. • ARTC to provide email for members to distribute/promote each future meeting. • ARTC to provide table for members update as part of travel expense reimbursement process. 	