

<b>Meeting title</b>	<b>Inner Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee</b>
----------------------	---

**Attendees:**

Professor Steven Raine	Chair
Kylie Schultz	Individual
Rob Loch	Pittsworth District Landcare Association
Larry Pappin	Inner Downs Inland Rail Action Group
Paul Hanlon	Individual
Jennifer Schmidt	Individual
John Cameron	Darling Downs Cotton Growers and Cotton Australia
Ian Jones	Individual
Ken Murphy	Individual
Jason Chavasse	Gowrie Junction Progress Association
Belinda Saal	Individual
Chris Joseph	Individual
David Taylor	Individual
Adrian Beattie	Western Wakka Wakka
Mercedes Staff	Manager Stakeholder Engagement – Queensland
Rob Smith	Project Manager – Border to Gowrie
Laura Jarman	Engagement Lead – Border to Gowrie
Jo Tait	Engagement Lead – Gowrie to Helidon

**Apologies:**

Joy Mingay	Toowoomba Chamber of Commerce
Lance McManus	Toowoomba and Surat Basin Enterprise
Geoff Penton	Queensland Murray-Darling Committee

<b>Location</b>	Pittsworth Function Centre, Pittsworth	<b>Secretariat</b>	Jo Tait
<b>Date</b>	14 December 2017	<b>Time</b>	6:00 – 8:30pm

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion points</b>
<b>1. Introduction and welcome from the Chair</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted recording of proceedings for the purpose of compiling minutes only. These will not be released.</li> <li>Welcome members, observers and media. Chair encouraged all to stay for meeting or have conversation after the meeting.</li> <li>It is critical that we have two-way communication about the issues that affect your community.</li> </ul>

Topic	Discussion points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to understand how impacts can be minimised and how we can maximise opportunities.</li> <li>• The role of the committee is to provide advice – high-level advice from community that you can't get from individuals only.</li> <li>• Particularly interested in impacts beyond the study area – reach out into the community to capture views beyond the 2km zone.</li> <li>• Recognise for many of you this journey has already been going for some time.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Update on progress of project (Rob Smith)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The B2G project is currently at the concept stage, moving into feasibility stage.</li> <li>• The aim is to submit the B2G Initial Advice Statement (IAS) to the Coordinator-General (CG) in early 2018 to kick off the EIS process.</li> <li>• ARTC are pushing forward with awarding the design consultancy contract. Within this there is a priority package to investigate the Condamine floodplain solution. ARTC expect to have preliminary consultant findings in four months and final solutions in nine months.</li> <li>• While ARTC does not control the statutory process, ARTC expect the draft B2G Terms of Reference (ToR) to be released around end of Q1 2018. ARTC will tell everyone when that is available.</li> <li>• The Gowrie to Helidon EIS process is more advanced. The final ToR for the EIS has been released.</li> <li>• For B2G, ARTC have a concept level design – from that ARTC will determine a concept level estimate. The earlier investigations provide some level of certainty that there were no fatal flaws in the concept design development.</li> <li>• The CCC and the broader community will be kept up-to-date through the EIS process.</li> <li>• ARTC has been directed to do the design work and the EIS on this study area to identify the preferred alignment for a corridor.</li> <li>• Once ARTC get the designers on board, they will bring provide ARTC with a timeline and strategy on how they will approach the design based on engagement and consultation with communities. ARTC can bring that detail to this forum.</li> <li>• Work will be done on this study area. If ARTC did find a fatal flaw that was not anticipated, ARTC may have to go and advise the client that there is an issue and suggest that ARTC may have to look outside of the corridor study area.</li> <li>• ARTC have sent out 34 letters advising there may be a requirement to access property across the B2G corridor (~50% of Property Access Forms have already been signed), so that ARTC can progress initial studies. Consent is required for ARTC to access properties within the corridor where ARTC may be looking to progress environmental studies to inform the EIS.</li> <li>• ARTC don't go into anybody's property without landholder consent which is a voluntary agreement.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Detailed review of Interim Charter</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is intended that there will be one charter consistent across the four consultative committees. There have been some recommendations or suggestions which have from the other community consultative committee meetings.</li> <li>• Four amendments were tabled for consideration and agreed by the committee: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Under Scope - dot point 2 - the word 'negotiable' was removed, to amend to "The Committee will discuss and provide comment or feedback on aspects of the Project" – to enable the Committee to discuss all aspects of the project, rather than limiting discussion to only aspects that are considered negotiable.</li> <li>2. Under Operating Principles of Committee members - dot point 3 - the words "without</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

Topic	Discussion points
	<p>taking responsibility from ARTC” were added, to indicate it remains ARTC’s responsibility to disseminate project information to the community, rather than this being the responsibility of the Committee.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Addition of a clause to enable ARTC and the Chair to identify and invite individuals who have significant understanding of the local area or specialist knowledge to attend committee meetings from time to time, as relevant, and actively contribute to those meetings.</li> <li>4. Addition of a clause to enable the Committee to review the Charter every 12 months.</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chair ran through Interim Charter section by section and there being no other issues raised, the Committee agreed to ratify the Charter with the changes as noted above.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Preliminary discussion of issues, concerns and opportunities for the Project (All)</b></p>	<p>Committee members were asked to identify specific issues, concerns and opportunities for each section along the corridor study area.</p> <p><i>Brookstead to Pittsworth</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that research is being rushed. Preference to do it thoroughly. ARTC comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Expediting procurement process</li> <li>○ The reason ARTC have a priority on the design consultancy for the floodplains is to ensure that information is obtained as soon as possible on the feasibility and options for this section</li> <li>○ ARTC will not bypass any process or design development steps nor let something slip through the cracks.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Is it possible to do a flood study over a four month period? ARTC comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Hydrological data and flood models based on historical data for the area are already available and will be used for the design studies.</li> <li>○ The key constraint regarding timing will be how long it takes to go and do the geo-technical investigations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• How soon will people know if you’re not going to use their parcel of land? ARTC comment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ARTC are asking the consultant to look at the alignment with the expectation that within the next three months they will be able to provide ARTC with advice on areas within the study corridor where the alignment definitely won’t be able to be located.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Key areas of interest are flood plain and flooding, major flooding, water back-up.</li> <li>• Black soil rail construction viability. Black soil is 100m deep in some areas.</li> <li>• Floodplain, building, cost maintenance.</li> <li>• Noise to township of Brookstead and businesses (GrainCorp and school).</li> </ul> <p><i>Pittsworth to Southbrook</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The route chosen crosses maximum number of properties, enormous potential to dislocate and disrupt a lot of people’s access to their farms and homes, social dislocation, stopping movement of people and wildlife</li> <li>• Cut and fill impacts on groundwater.</li> <li>• High density of people, visual and audible aspects.</li> <li>• Impacts on water, access of essential services (ambulances), effect on community in general, impact on school bus run.</li> </ul>

Topic	Discussion points
	<p><i>Athol</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Operational viability of the train, 24 hour service, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, operational viability to reach target, process for doing costing to taxpayer. Will it be like the NBN, what happens after Acacia Ridge?</li> <li>Community impact, EIS submission support at ToR and EIS stage.</li> <li>Number of road crossings, impact on major highways and small country roads, impact on road safety for road users.</li> </ul> <p><i>Gowrie</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large number of sensitive receptors, dual line, all activity with construction, air, noise, tunnel entry, TBM, operation of venting 6km long tunnel, level crossings, would prefer a grade separation at Gowrie Junction Road, not a boom gate crossing.</li> </ul> <p><i>General</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interested in the source of materials and impacts of quarrying.</li> <li>Access to rural produce, it should drought-proof rural Australia.</li> <li>What impact does construction including cut/fill and tunnelling have on shallow bores and springs? What effects on this water and flow paths?</li> <li>The cumulative impact of the existing railway, new railway, Toowoomba Second Range Crossing and the Interlink freight hub.</li> <li>Professional support for interpreting the more technical components</li> </ul> <p>ARTC comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Through this process ARTC will consider facilitating appropriate support</li> <li>ARTC acknowledge that they need to bring all landholders along on the journey</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensuring land tenure searches are done correctly, making sure proper native title processes are followed through the EIS.</li> <li>Concern regarding impact on property sales and prices.</li> <li>Risk that people let their property get run down because of the expectation going through, up for a huge cost because they've let it get run down.</li> <li>Would like to see some clarity around preferred alignments as soon as we can.</li> <li>Impacts on property values.</li> <li>Look at opportunities to benefit landholders and the environment with improvements or offsets.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5. General business</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ARTC noted that it is aware that third party correspondence has been sent to landowners advising that their property is required for the project. This is not correct as the specific alignment for the project is not yet known. However, these letters are causing people undue stress and concern. If committee members become aware of any of these letters, please bring it to the attention of ARTC. ARTC is looking to provide general communications to clarify this matter.</li> <li>As noted earlier, ARTC are hoping to provide guidance as soon as possible in relation to specific properties if they are deemed not required for the project alignment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6. Topics for future meetings</b></p>	<p>Suggested topics for future meetings included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report on IAS lodgement.</li> <li>Introduce hydrology consultant.</li> <li>Discuss expectations around draft ToR.</li> <li>Provide surety around timeframes and engagement processes.</li> </ul>

Topic	Discussion points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timeframes and methodology for Condamine floodplain.</li> </ul> <p>The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for mid-March 2018.</p> <p>Meeting closed at 8.30pm.</p>
<p><b>7. Confirmation of actions</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rob Smith to respond regarding what are the extents of the Condamine Floodplain.</li> <li>• Rob Smith to respond to query regarding cost structure of the capital expenditure.</li> <li>• Rob Smith to respond regarding native title processes and land tenure searches.</li> <li>• Jo Tait to send an email out asking who is interested in sharing contact details within the committee and also on the ARTC website.</li> </ul>

**Attachment 1: Conflict of interest declaration**

Steve Raine	Extended family members own property within the study area.
Adrian Beattie	Potential for MOU with Indigenous community employment.
Jason Chavasse	Works for Queensland Government, Department may assess the Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Would exclude himself from this process if the CCC role would directly conflict with work responsibilities.
Rob Loch	May potentially provide a resource to planning groups working/bidding on project but no current plans in place. Would exclude himself from the consulting work if this arose.
Paul Hanlon	Interested in potentially sourcing Brisbane treated water for irrigation through a pipeline that could possibly use the rail corridor.
Belinda Saal	Interested in potentially sourcing Brisbane treated water for irrigation through a pipeline that could possibly use the rail corridor.