

## MEETING MINUTES

### Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee Meeting # 5

#### DATE / TIME

21 March 2019  
6:00pm – 8:23pm

#### LOCATION

Inglewood Civic Centre, Elizabeth Street, Inglewood

#### FACILITATOR

Mr Graham Clapham – Chair

#### MINUTE TAKER

Ms Laura Jarman – ARTC Inland Rail

#### DISTRIBUTION

All

#### ATTENDEES

- ▶ Mr Graham Clapham – SDD Chair (Chair)
- ▶ Mr Graeme Clarke – SDD member (GC)
- ▶ Mr Jeff Chandler – SDD member (JC)
- ▶ Mr Norm Chapman – SDD member (NC)
- ▶ Mr Brad Christensen – SDD member (BC)
- ▶ Mr Gary Hayes – SDD member (GH)
- ▶ Ms Kim Stevens – SDD member (KS)
- ▶ Mr Brett Kelly – SDD member (BK)
- ▶ Mrs Georgina Krieg – SDD member (GK)
- ▶ Mr Robert Barrett – SDD member (RB)
- ▶ Ms Laura Jarman – ARTC Inland Rail (LJ)
- ▶ Ms Mercedes Staff – ARTC Inland Rail (MS\*)
- ▶ Ms Fiona Kennedy – ARTC Inland Rail (FK)
- ▶ Mr Robert Smith – ARTC Inland Rail (RS)
- ▶ Ms Tara Venturini – ARTC Inland Rail (TV)
- ▶ Ms Helen Williams – ARTC Inland Rail (HW)
- ▶ Ms Amanda Reed – ARTC Inland Rail (AR)
- ▶ Mr Jon Roberts – ARTC Inland Rail (JR)

#### APOLOGIES

- ▶ Mr Barry Bowden – SDD member (BB)
- ▶ Ms Rosalie Millar – SDD member (RM)
- ▶ Ms Marcia Smith – SDD member (MS)
- ▶ Mr Justin Saunders – SDD member (JS)
- ▶ Mrs Maria Oliver – SDD member (MO)

#### GUESTS

- ▶ Dr John Macintosh – Water Solutions (JM)
- ▶ 10 observers

## Discussions

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p><b>Safety share</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair invited MS to share a safety moment with the committee. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ MS – ARTC Inland Rail is mindful that the Inland Rail project is impacting on communities and landowners across the alignment from Melbourne to Brisbane. We are aware they may also be experiencing other challenges, such as unemployment or change in climate conditions, and may be feeling anxious or stressed. ARTC has put mechanisms in place to support those members of the community who wish to access mental health support, either face-to-face or over the telephone.</li> <li>▶ ARTC has appointed a local, independent service provider – NewAccess – developed by BeyondBlue.</li> <li>▶ Brochures and cards with full contact details for NewAccess are available, which I would be happy to share with the committee and the observers after the meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Chair – Mental health is an issue that none of us like to think about and none of us like to talk about, but we should all be mindful of it.</li> </ul>
1	<p><b>Welcome and introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair welcomed SDD members and observers and asked that observers refrain from participating in the meeting. The Chair noted everyone was welcome to engage with each other after the meeting concludes, but that the meeting is for the business of the CCC.</li> <li>▶ The Chair acknowledged JM from Water Solutions, who will be making a presentation about his work regarding the floodplain crossing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ At the CCC inaugural meeting here in Inglewood in 2017, this committee decided that we needed some independent oversight of what FFJV were saying about the floodplain crossing; and the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>engagement of JM from Water Solutions stemmed from that meeting. Tonight we will see some of the work that JM has been engaging in.</p> <p><b>Apologies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair acknowledged apologies from SDD members MS, RM, MO, JS, BB and Member for Southern Downs, James Lister.</li> </ul> <p><b>Conflicts of interest</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Chair – I have an access agreement with FFJV for flood verification heights only.</li> <li>▶ BK – I would declare that I have an interest. I am a landholder adjacent to the project. How should the committee deal with declaring this interest? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Chair – It's about nobody in the future being able to accuse you of being deliberately obscure with why you are saying and acting in a certain way on the committee. If you have declared that you do have an interest, and you are a landholder that is adjacent or affected, everybody on the committee understands why and your reason for saying those things.</li> <li>▶ GK, JC and KS declared they are landowners within the study area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Actions arising from previous meetings</b></p> <p>Action item 1 – Provide information on the procurement model proposed to inform the local community of potential opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW – ARTC is still developing exactly what it looks like but this is an overview of what we are doing and how we are factoring and trying to maximise local and Indigenous participation. It's largely through three tiers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Local Market Readiness – market analysis and engagement, business capacity building, and linking with major contractors and suppliers. We are looking at how we build capacity through running programs, in partnership with some of our government stakeholders, and looking at how we provide benefit aspects.</li> <li>▶ Procurement Process – social criteria in tender processes, local content in contracts and contractor management. Contractors will need to tell us how they plan to utilise local businesses; and that will be then translated into local content expectations within contracts. Some public reporting is already happening from the Parkes to Narromine project around local content and local employment outcomes.</li> <li>▶ ARTC Inland Rail Governance – Social Performance objectives, Indigenous Participation Plan and public reporting. We are working closely with government to make sure that we can maximise benefits for local regions wherever possible.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Chair – Will this appear on the ARTC website? MO is not here and she possibly instigated this. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW – We will be talking to Millmerran Progress Association next month. We are updating our information because we are receiving a lot of queries about it. We will work to get more information out to the public.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Action item 2 – Confirm the number of landowners in the Condamine floodplain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair noted there was some confusion in the previous meeting about the number of lots versus individual landholders impacted.</li> <li>▶ RS – This information is from FFJV. There are 1,526 lots within the 1-in-100-year flood extent area. With the preliminary design crossing in place, the model shows flood impacts to 246 lots in a 1-in-100-year event. Of those 246 lots, they are owned by a total of 37 landowners. 33 of those landowners are private and four are government.</li> </ul> <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ BK – I have an issue with what you call 1-in-100-year flood. I know the flood modelling that you have done, and we have averaged one 1-in-100-year flood every four and a half years for the last 90 years. How do you call them 1-in-100-year, when we are getting them every four and a half years, on average, in the last 90 years? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS – The 1-in-100-year is just a statistical number. It doesn't mean to say that they cannot occur more frequently than that; but it is a way to measure and define an event according to statistics and annual exceedance probability. I believe JM is going to discuss this.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS – This is just a way of defining an event, according to the <i>Australian Rainfall and Run-off Guidelines</i>, 2016. It's a technical term that is a common industry term and practice that is used in all current design development. It is typical standard industry practice to define an event in that manner. That is about the best description I can give without having to defer to a hydrologist and explain mathematically and statically why that is defined in that manner. I understand your concerns.</li> <li>▶ BK – Four and half years isn't "1-in-100-year". It is not even "1-in-100 months", let alone "100 years".</li> <li>▶ RS – It is not how statistics work in that manner. It is not to say that it's going to happen "only once in 100 years". It's the roll of the dice, but statistically, in the way that's measured, it's "1-in-100".</li> <li>▶ JM – I can talk about this later on. A 1-in-100-year flood might not define the event, rather than the timing of the event.</li> <li>▶ RS – That is correct. It is a way to define any event using statistics.</li> </ul> <p>Action item 3 and 4 – Provide more information on the results of the geotechnical testing and on the proposed location of crossing loops.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair noted JR will present on these items later in the meeting.</li> </ul>
3	<p><b>Review of CCC Charter</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair asked whether any members had any comments or issues regarding the Community Consultative Committee Charter and noted a few items for consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Agenda: It is open to committee members or the community that they represent, to put forward items for discussion or to be brought to the attention of ARTC.</li> <li>▶ Length of meeting: Existing meetings are two hours long, though we have gone ten minutes over time on one occasion and 10 minutes under time on another occasion. I wouldn't like to purpose the Committee set a longer time for the meeting. I would be keen to hear from anyone else. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ GC – I think it would be a good thing to extend the meeting a further 10 minutes and invite questions from observers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Chair – We have done that previously, so I have no issue with that. However, this is just a forum to raise issues, not deal with them. Use the time to raise the issues and make sure ARTC and FFJV understand what it is that you are saying. This isn't the forum for debating the issue and making progress about the issue.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Representing community organisations: There's an expectation that those members representing community organisations would be reporting the issues as they are raised in this forum to those organisations. If there was a period of time where you were absent from the committee or couldn't attend a meeting, should a proxy or another representative from the organisation that you are representing be able to attend. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RB – I propose that.</li> <li>▶ Chair – We would include in the charter that if you were representing a community organisation and you couldn't attend, that you would send somebody else. It seems to me it's something the committee wishes to include in the charter.</li> <li>▶ GK – I have been appointed to this committee as an individual; however, I am also a member of Brookstead State School P &amp; C. Is that what you are talking about as also representing your community? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Chair – Yes. If there was an issue pertinent to your community organisation, I would expect that they would want to be informed or have their view heard. I don't see it being a problem if you wanted to send somebody in your stead.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair confirmed no other issues with regards to the CCC Charter.</li> </ul>
4	<p><b>Project update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS delivered an update on the progress of the project since the previous meeting in November 2018: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Consultation with the landowners that were identified within the focused area of investigation about potential impacts to their properties and understanding how their properties currently function, in order to move forward with alignment design development.</li> <li>▶ There has been a recent focus on road/rail interfaces and capturing all the information to feed into our design development for level crossings or grade separations. This has resulted in a slip in the design delivery schedule of approximately six weeks.</li> <li>▶ The current plan is to submit the EIS in September of this year.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ We have been progressing development of the Condamine crossing solution. We will be carrying out finished floor surveys in order to understand the impacts of the preliminary crossing design solution in the coming weeks. This will allow us to then determine potential mitigation solutions with those landowners in question.</li> </ul> <p><b>Design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JR provided a design update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Geotechnical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Condamine Floodplain Geotechnical Factual Report received December 2018</li> <li>▶ Site investigations undertaken between May and September 2018</li> <li>▶ Survey across a 20-kilometre section of the existing Millmerran QR Line</li> <li>▶ 7 boreholes, 6 augers and 7 dynamic cone penetrations</li> <li>▶ Groundwater monitoring at 4 borehole locations</li> <li>▶ Laboratory testing complete</li> <li>▶ The findings of the geotechnical investigations will determine the design of the Condamine floodplain crossing structures.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Hydrology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Hydrology and Flooding Report received February 2019 (excluding the Condamine and Macintyre River)</li> <li>▶ 9 creeks and catchments modelled: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Back Creek</li> <li>▶ Nicol Creek</li> <li>▶ Bringalily Creek</li> <li>▶ Native Dog Creek</li> <li>▶ Cattle Creek</li> <li>▶ Pariagara Creek</li> <li>▶ Macintyre Brook at Inglewood</li> <li>▶ Macintyre Brook at Bybera Road</li> <li>▶ Macintyre Brook at Cremascos Road.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Data collection – previous studies, survey information, existing drainage structures, stream gauge data, rainfall data, local observed flood data, site inspections</li> <li>▶ Hydrologic model development – setup, design event parameters, validation</li> <li>▶ Hydraulic model development – setup, structures design</li> <li>▶ Calibration – historical events, calibration</li> <li>▶ Impact assessment – afflux level, increase in velocity</li> <li>▶ Sensitivity analysis – various scenarios modelled.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ We have almost finished our 70 percent designs due in early April of this year. We will be able to report on all the catchments from the NSW/QLD border up to Gowrie.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Road rail interface <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ TMR has requested no level crossings on State roads.</li> <li>▶ Proposed treatments for crossing State roads: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Rail bridge over public road at Millmerran-Inglewood Road (Millmerran area), Millmerran-Inglewood Road (Clontarf area), Millmerran-Inglewood Road (Inglewood area).</li> <li>▶ Public road bridge over rail line at Cunningham Highway (Yelarbon).</li> <li>▶ Other roads are still under development and the roads identified above for grade separation are still under assessment and may be subject to change, based on further investigation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ When we can't achieve road/rail separations and connectivity through grade-separated junctions, the next thing we look at is whether we can consolidate or partially close roads. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Consolidation – of public roads to a more appropriate location to cross the rail line. This may require a public road detour if no alternative access is available.</li> <li>▶ Partial closure – if road has an alternative access to a crossing location that is more viable from a safety/time/cost perspective.</li> <li>▶ In the Southern Darling Downs areas, there's not a lot of roads in close proximity. The roads we are particularly interested are in Pampas. When 70 percent preliminary design is reached, we will release those for further consultation.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Once elimination has been investigated, level crossings will be proposed in the form of:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Passive level crossing – will be implemented if it complies with relevant design standards, including local and state government.</li> <li>▶ Active level crossing – will be implemented if a compliant passive crossing cannot be achieved.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ All public level crossings will be risk assessed using the Australian Level Crossing Assessment Model (ALCAM) to verify the treatment of a passive or active crossing. Typical inputs for ALCAM:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ train volumes and speeds</li> <li>▶ road vehicles, surface, speed etc.</li> <li>▶ sighting distance for all vehicle types</li> <li>▶ road and rail grades</li> <li>▶ visibility</li> <li>▶ crossing geometry.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Based on the outcome of this process, a recommended treatment will be taken forward in design.</li> <li>▶ The project team has been carrying out engagement with government agencies and special user groups to provide detailed comments on the road /rail interfaces:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Department of Education</li> <li>▶ Emergency services – Police, Fire, Ambulance</li> <li>▶ TransLink – school buses</li> <li>▶ Bus Queensland</li> <li>▶ TMR</li> <li>▶ Toowoomba &amp; Goondiwindi regional councils</li> <li>▶ Department of Science and Environment.</li> <li>▶ Local community information sessions</li> <li>▶ Further risk assessment on a developed design can now occur with input from all affected parties (ie risk workshop).</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ There has been a lot of work done but there is still more to do and we can't yet give certainty about level crossings, apart from the grade separations mentioned. Public level crossings are going through the same procedure. Where we can make geography and terrain work, we will; and then we will be looking at alternatives or level crossings and the types of level crossings.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Passing loops                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Potential for five passing loops in the Border to Gowrie section</li> <li>▶ Loops are two kilometres long to allow for 1.8-kilometre trains</li> <li>▶ Future proofing for four kilometres</li> <li>▶ Loop location factors                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Rail alignment is flat and straight</li> <li>▶ No level crossings</li> <li>▶ Minimal social and environmental impacts</li> <li>▶ Utilisation of existing QR loops</li> <li>▶ Loop locations in development assessing the 1,700 kilometre route from Melbourne to Brisbane</li> <li>▶ Locations to be released as part of the 70 percent alignment (May 2019).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Schedule                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ In early April, we will finalise the 70 percent feasibility design. That will bring together the road, rail, drainage, earthworks, bridges, the hydrology and all the other design elements. We then have a month to review it and it will also be presented to Council and TMR for review and comment. At this stage the alignment release will be in May of this year. All of the comments we capture will be fed back to our designers, FFJV; and then they will be formally released with the 100 percent feasibility design, which again we will have a month to comment on. All of this information will feed into the EIS.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ GC – What part of April do you expect the 70 percent design to be received?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JR – Early April..</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ GK – Where you talked about consolidating roads, you said here in the Southern Downs that it probably wasn't a great concern. In areas where you have had to consolidate, how close are those roads?</li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JR – That will vary. It could be in the region of between one to five kilometres. In the Southern Downs, the distance between roads is considerable, so consolidation is difficult. We would expect up to five kilometres depending how easy it is, traffic usage, journey times, etc.</li> <li>▶ GK – So if there are two roads within five kilometres of each other, they could be consolidated? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JR – They could be. It is something we would look at in the design process.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ GK – I would have thought there would be a lot of roads, especially as you get closer to Millmerran and Brookstead. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JR – Yes there are.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Chair – what are the dimensions for rail over road crossings? Will these accommodate loads of excess dimensions, non-divisible loads or heavy agricultural machinery? How are you going to ensure it caters for the future? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JR – It depends what road it is. If it is a State road, we will be governed by TMR standards and their clearances for road usage in that area. If it is a council road, we will be governed by their standards and their clearances.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ NC – A lot of over-sized equipment goes down the Gore Highway. It's got to come through Toowoomba, some way or another. Are you going to be able to cater for that? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JR – Yes, we are working with TMR and it is governed by the structures either side of that structure for width and height requirements.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ GK – When you talk about council roads, farming is changing year to year and we are going from 8 metre gear to 12 metre gear and heights are always changing. Have to checked to ensure council have updated their regulations to reflect this? For us shifting things around on the road, height doesn't really matter; but if you are trying to go through a tunnel, which is not something that we currently deal with, it becomes a problem. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JR - When we speak to council, we will take that into account and ask what current standards they are working to.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ GK – As a visual, would it something like going under the new Toowoomba Bypass out on the highway? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JR – Yes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ BK – Some machinery is 5.5 metres high. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JR – Yes and there are road verges and road envelopes which ARTC has to adhere to, where there are verges that are wide verges, not just the carriageway width. TMR and TRC have said there are roads out there which move heavy machinery for mining, etc. They have asked for the clearance on specific roads to be higher than others, to give them that route, such as Oakey to Pittsworth.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ GH – In your consideration of roads, there are a number five kilometres apart. I think you may not be taking into consideration the unformed road reserves. There would be a lot of those that would exist, that the railway would have to sever. They are often used by farmers to get from one place to the other, so they are important and should be taken into consideration. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JR – Where there are unformed roads, we treat those as normal roads if we are proposing to do any works, crossings or severances.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ KS – When the train is coming up to these little side roads to cross it, how far out does it start blowing its horn? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JR – We will try and get some feedback on that.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>EIS and environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ FK presented an update on the EIS and environmental studies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ We received the final Terms of Reference (ToR) in mid-November 2018.</li> <li>▶ Since then we have been undertaking consultation with government agencies, community groups, interest groups, lobby groups. This has been an extensive programme of consultation.</li> <li>▶ We have also completed the significant amount of fieldwork for the EIS.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ This work will feed into the technical assessments to meet the reporting deadline and submission to the Office of the Coordinator-General in September of this year.</li> </ul> <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Chair – When will the general public be able to see the EIS? Is ARTC obligated to release it when it goes to the Coordinator-General, or only after the Coordinator-General has considered it?                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ FK – The EIS will go to the Coordinator-General for an adequacy check for approximately one month; then it will be advertised for public display. I expect it will be open for submission for a period of six weeks because it's such a large document, but this is at the discretion of the Coordinator-General.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Chair – In what form will it be made available?                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ FK – The EIS will be made available in multiple formats, including at local libraries, electronically through the Coordinator-General and ARTC websites, and through some information sessions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ NC – How many pages is the EIS?                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ FK – Hundreds of pages. There's a lot of information in these documents. ARTC is keen to use a variety of methods to tell people what the information is about.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Chair – Is there a statutory period that the Coordinator-General has to deal with?                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ FK – It will likely take a few months for them to consider the EIS document, and they may request additional information. The whole process is likely to be complete mid-2020.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair confirmed with FK that the general public can make submissions to the Coordinator-General. He acknowledged it is a vital period for the public to understand the EIS and make submissions to the Coordinator-General.                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ I have had several discussions with the Coordinator-General about this period; and my fear has always been how the Coordinator-General deals with public submissions versus the very professionally produced material that ARTC would be putting in their document. The assurance I've got each time is: "so long as the person making the submission can articulate their concern in a form that the CoG can understand, they will source the technical information they need to make a determination about the submitter's concern".</li> <li>▶ You need to tell your communities that this is a significant opportunity to have input into whatever issue they are concerned about; and the Coordinator-General does deal seriously with their concerns and is an independent arbiter in this. If the concerns are not adequately addressed in the EIS, the Coordinator-General will require ARTC to produce a supplementary statement to deal with the concerns.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ FK – ARTC is obliged to address submissions against the ToR.</li> <li>▶ The Chair confirmed no further questions for FK and thanked her for her presentation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Community engagement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ LJ provided update on community engagement:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Introduced new team member TV to the committee.</li> <li>▶ Recent engagement activity:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Talking to people who are within the focused area of investigation to discuss operation of their property, particularly in relation to public and private road crossings. It's important to understand how people operate their property to feed into design.</li> <li>▶ Talking to people about the road/rail interfaces. We held a workshop with some landowners in Brookstead a few months ago and also held a series of eight pop-up consultation stands at various locations throughout the study area. We are using feedback to inform design of the road crossings.</li> <li>▶ Attended Millmerran and Inglewood Shows and spoke with a lot of people whose properties are within the focused area of investigation. Also spoke to people within the general project area, who we may not have met before.</li> <li>▶ Last night met with Goondiwindi Chamber of Commerce and business owners. This was a great opportunity to meet people who are from the community but not necessarily within the directly impacted zone.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Upcoming engagement:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ We will be holding a workshop with Pampas landowners to talk about some of the local roads.</li> <li>▶ Attending Toowoomba Show from 28th to 30th March.</li> <li>▶ Attending meeting with Millmerran Progress and Commerce in a few weeks.</li> <li>▶ Expect to release the <b>alignment in May/June 2019</b>. We will be running a similar process to the release of the focused area of investigations; in that we will be contacting those people who will be impacted by the alignment directly via telephone and letters before we release the alignment to the general public</li> <li>▶ When EIS is released, there will be community information sessions, newsletters and website updates to support the statutory consultation process.</li> <li>▶ Everyone is encouraged to visit the interactive map on the B2G webpage to provide feedback. You can view the focused area of investigation on an aerial image.</li> </ul> <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ GK – Can you confirm if there was police presence at the Brookstead pop-up consultation stand?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ LJ – I wasn't a at the Brookstead meeting, so I will have to take that question on notice. If you weren't able to make the meetings and you did have some information to share, I would encourage you to do that via the interactive map, or over the phone, or after the meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ JC – Are you having a meeting with the landowners and farmers in the areas south of Millmerran regarding roads? There are quite a few farmers south of Millmerran that are going to be impacted by rail access.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ LJ – The intention wasn't that we would have a group meeting because we have been working more individually with the landowners about what's happening in that area. Let's catch up after this meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair made reference to the question from GK regarding a police presence in Brookstead.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ I have made my views clear as to the presence of security personnel, be they police or private security people, at these types of forums; because I understand how rural communities view such presence. My advice to MS was it would be my preference that if there was any hint that that sort of presence was needed, it should be kept low-key, least visibility as possible; because as a rural community person, I find that quite threatening and intimidating.</li> <li>▶ I also believe that it's not in ARTC's interest to be coming to a community where they are guests, to sell a concept to a community that's so good, that they need security to help sell it. I publicly thank MS and RS for hearing my concerns and for dealing with it in a sensible manner that we can all live with.</li> <li>▶ If somebody has a view about security presence at ARTC public events in our communities, we would like to hear about it.</li> <li>▶ These issues are sometimes deeply emotional and of great distress to some people. I am sure we would all feel terrible if something untoward should happen. We need to be mindful of each other's feelings and concerns and emotions in all of these matters.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
7	<p><b>Independent review of Condamine floodplain modelling</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair introduced JM to the committee.</li> <li>▶ JM gave an overview of his role on the project and commitment as the committee's hydrology specialist.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ I am satisfied that the technical information FFJV and ARTC has provided is fit-for-purpose.</li> <li>▶ The community needs to be empowered to look at the technical information and understand it in a way that they can make their own decision as to what the impacts might be for them. My challenge is to enable that.</li> <li>▶ My role is to explain this technical information so that the community can go back to ARTC or go through the EIS and articulate that there is a problem with the information provided.</li> <li>▶ With regards to the comment made earlier by BK, the 1-in-100-year is a benchmark number and point of reference. What it means to you is what I am trying to explain.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ JM presented the Interim Report on Flood Impacts             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ This is a strategy document for communicating the flooding work to the community. It is a strategy for getting people on board with the process, understanding the modelling and getting the acceptance of the work.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ There are some graphics used to convey flooding information produced by the FFJV engineers. I would like to get the committee on board with this approach.</li> <li>▶ JM advised his approach to communicating technical information:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ I look at FFJV's work and question whether it is fit-for-purpose, if it has integrity and whether it is the right sort of work to be done. And I believe it is.</li> <li>▶ The next thing is whether it gives me the information I need to communicate in a way the community can understand. That is what I am working on with the full assistance and support from ARTC.</li> <li>▶ FFJV and ARTC have been open and supportive to give me the information I need to do my work. At no time have they offered any interpretation or opinion of that information which is fantastic. They have stepped right back from it and said, "Here's the information. We will talk with you. We will explain it to you. We will answer your questions." They have kept their interpretation of their flood modelling to themselves and I think that's integrity as well.</li> <li>▶ I would like to have a meeting with the community in Brookstead to explain the process so they understand. I would like them to raise specific concerns and ask for specific issues on a map to be translated in a way that is easily understood. I will get back to them individually on the basis of the graphics that are attached to the report with rational explanation.</li> <li>▶ My objective is that the community is able to make an informed decision as to the nature and extent of the potential impact from the railway.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ JM explained the process he went through to verify the calibration of the flood model:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The process of flood modelling, of calibrating models and preparing it with observed levels (flood markers etc) is not a new topic and the challenges of doing that is not a new topic. I am familiar with other people's work in going through this exercise. The key to it is their method of collating the information and then interpreting it for the purposes of their modelling exercise.</li> <li>▶ With the work FFJV has done, there is never enough information to get it perfectly right. There're always more unknowns than what you would like. The value of the flood modelling is that it provides you with a consistent platform against which to compare to reality. It will never exactly replicate what is observed in a particular instance in time but it will capture the proper characteristics on a level playing field.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ BK – Did you personally check any of the levels that were supplied for calibration of the model by FFJV?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JM – No I did not personally check them.</li> <li>▶ BK – That is our first problem.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ JM addressed BK's concern regarding the 1-in-100-year flood model:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ In the strategy presented I have a map for a 1-in -100 event and it outlines what gets wet. This particular event is not one single flood event, it is a compilation of many to show the maximum outline. If you have got a 1-in-100 flood occurring in Warwick, it is not a 1-in-100 flood by time it gets down to Brookstead. They are different and it dissipates out differently. It's driven by the same initial storm, which is might be a 1-in-100 somewhere, but the point is that it translates as it goes through the system.</li> <li>▶ When it comes back to exact flood level matches, what I am looking for is to see that it provides the middle line between the whole lot. It's a reasonable representation of the event, about which there is plus and minus. What is the plus and minus? Is it error in the flood modelling or is it error in the measurement, or is it both? It's probably a whole range of them. I ask, "is the model fit for our purpose? Is it going to give us the information we need for the purpose it was built for?". Now, this flood model, it's been developed primarily, for our purposes, my purposes, to look at relative impact. "What's the impact of this rail line likely to be?" Now, the impact is how much things are going to change. So when it comes to the "1-in-5 flood or the 1-in-10 flood, 1-in-100", I'm not particularly concerned as to whether the "1-in-100" is 1-in-100 or really if it's 1-in-20; but what I am really concerned is that, "With that particular flood, how much is the relative change going to be with or without the rail line?" That's what I am really concerned with and this is how I judge the flood modelling work that's been done. I am not worried about the differences within the plus and minus, if it represents the general spread of water and is a good relative assessment. That is what fit-for-purpose means.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ BK – What is the margin of error that you think is fit-for-purpose? What measurement?</li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JM – It is not an absolute difference but relative impact differences. In the strategy document, there are colour-coded graphs that show changes in flood level. The 1-in-100 flood means that there is a 1-in-100 chance of it occurring in any year, or a one percent chance. They are rare events. The colour-coding on the map shows the relative difference which is the sensitivity. The biggest difference in green is between two and five centimetres in a 1-in-100-year flood. The reason the rail line would not likely cause higher impact is because of the parameters and how the flood waters flow. The water is slow and spreads out. I am looking to see whether the “bathtub” effect is represented well. The water comes down and spreads out, it fills up, and then the water goes down. The model captures that and it’s reflected in the numbers. It meets my expectations and that is why I say it is fit-for-purpose. Fit-for-purpose also means consistency between flood events. I would expect, and I see this in the information, the smaller the event the smaller the differences. This is consistent with other information such as the flood flow velocities.</li> <li>▶ When it comes to tolerances, or differences, we are talking about small numbers. We are talking about a system which doesn't change much, to big changes in flows. Substantial work across the floodplain is picking that up quite accurately. Tolerance of the survey and accuracy of the topography in the model is controlling things. Hydrology and flood volumes need to be well captured and modelled. Gauging stations and recorded data should be reflected in the hydrology. FFJV’s work has been done in accordance with the Australian Rainfall and Run off guideline, of which I chaired the committee and am familiar with. It is a technical document with a lot of statistics and is used by engineers. I have checked through other methods that this work has been done correctly, and it has. This gives me confidence that we are dealing with good numbers we can rely on to look at the relative changes.</li> <li>▶ BK – Are you are saying we are going to see less than a five centimetre rise in water levels upstream?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JM – Yes, that is the number coming out of the work.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ BK – What is the change in the water velocity on the downstream side?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JM – The velocity of the existing flows is really slow. The effect of the rail embankments is to channel flow and concentrate through the culverts. I have looked very closely at the embankment, and there is an approximate increase from 0.5 metre per second for the larger floods, up by 0.2/0.25 metres per second at the worst part, where the embankment stops and where there would be scour protection. Move away a short distance from the embankment and this dissipates out. The increase is only in a small area. The embankments are placed well and they follow the ridgelines to where the water depth is shallowest. FFJV have left it open where the water depth is the largest and where the flood flows are going. I looked at the problem areas to the spot where the velocity was the highest and it is fairly shallow depth, and I expected it to have greater impact. The impact is confined largely to the railway corridor and is minimal.</li> <li>▶ JM – I am not going to say whether it is good or bad, but I will allow you to understand it so you can make your own assessment for your property. You know where the damage has been previously, so you can ask questions about that location. The 1-in-100-year flood is not of great relevance to you, but the 10 percent and 20 percent chance floods are of better relevance, and whether the frequency of those events change. I want to put this in context for you so you can go to ARTC and show, for example, how a 10 percent increase in damage for 20 percent chance in a year starts to add up.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair thanked JM and reminded the committee that the forum is not for discussing technical details and invited members to comment on whether they thought other avenues should be investigated.</li> <li>▶ BK – Any change in water height or velocity is not acceptable by the floodplain community. I would also like to propose engaging Dr Rob Loch as an independent advisor to look at soil damage caused by velocity.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JM – I would support that.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ GH – Should we be allowing for extra blockages? I understand there has been an allowance of 30 percent above the required number of culverts, and I wonder if this should be looked at beyond the modelling. If we are looking at 50 culverts that are insufficient in size and a stack of 100 hay bales goes over and blocks a kilometre, have we modelled to see what effect that will have on velocities and erosion?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JM – I will take that question on notice.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ GK – On the sample station locality map, what did a “sample station” mean, or where did those numbers come from?</li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JM – I chose them without looking at the data as typical locations where people might be interested in. I wanted to obtain representative information to test the process and satisfy myself it worked correctly.</li> <li>▶ The Chair thanked JM for his presentation and noted that if no objections, it was assumed the committee is on board with this process and the way forward.</li> <li>▶ The Chair invited MS to respond to the earlier discussion about security.</li> <li>▶ MS – We very much respect the views and opinions of the community that we work in. ARTC Inland Rail is a no harm organisation. We have a duty of care not just for our own staff but our contractor staff.</li> <li>▶ MS – The safety procedures that we apply in this community are certainly no different to those applied across the program. It is not particularly directed at this community.</li> </ul>
8	<p><b>Social Impact Assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW presented an overview of the social impact assessment process:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Social Impact Assessment is process that assesses a project’s potential effects on people and communities and is one of the technical studies for the EIS. It considers:                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Matters required by the Coordinator-General’s SIA guideline</li> <li>▶ Stakeholders’ inputs</li> <li>▶ Social baseline data</li> <li>▶ How major projects typically affect communities</li> <li>▶ The results of other technical studies, e.g. noise, air quality, vibration, traffic, visual amenity, flooding</li> <li>▶ The significance of change for stakeholders and communities.</li> <li>▶ Workshops with community and government agencies. We have visited Toowoomba, Pittsworth and Goondiwindi and invited different community groups and stakeholders, such as police, emergency services, health, general community service groups from all the localities to come and participate in workshops. We also held dedicated business workshops to understand that environment. We have discussions with the Traditional Owner groups in the area; and then we hold targeted interviews with council.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ SIA process                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Identify potential social impacts and benefits</li> <li>▶ Describe existing social values and characteristics</li> <li>▶ Assess the likelihood and consequence of impacts and benefits</li> <li>▶ Develop social impact management plans to avoid or reduce social impacts and maximise benefits</li> <li>▶ Provide a monitoring strategy to track delivery and effectiveness</li> <li>▶ The scoping stage identifies the types of impacts that could result, and the study area for the SIA. The SIA is required to respond to the EIS Terms of Reference and the SIA Guideline published by the Queensland Government in 2018.                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The study area includes the towns and rural localities that could be affected and includes:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Kurumbul Yelarbon and Whetstone</li> <li>▶ Inglewood</li> <li>▶ the Bringalily, Millwood and Clontarf rural localities</li> <li>▶ Millmerran</li> <li>▶ the rural localities of Canning Creek, Yandilla and Pampas</li> <li>▶ Brookstead</li> <li>▶ the rural locality of Yarranlea, Stoneleigh and Linthorpe</li> <li>▶ Pittsworth</li> <li>▶ Southbrook</li> <li>▶ Umbiram and Athol</li> <li>▶ Rural area of Westbrook</li> <li>▶ Biddeston and Wellcamp</li> <li>▶ Gowrie Mountain</li> <li>▶ Kingsthorpe</li> <li>▶ Gowrie Junction.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The scope of the assessment will include effects of people within the corridor, near the corridor, in nearby communities, and in the Toowoomba/Goondiwindi region as a whole.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The type of issues considered include:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Impacts on the size of the population or demand for housing</li> <li>▶ The impacts of accommodation camps</li> <li>▶ Impacts of the amenity or use of properties near the project corridor</li> <li>▶ Impacts on community values such as community cohesion or identity</li> <li>▶ Impacts on other industries, such as construction, tourism or transport</li> <li>▶ Business and employment benefits</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The social baseline identifies the study area’s existing characteristics, as the basis for seeing how the project could change social characteristics and values.</li> <li>▶ The assessment considers stakeholders views and the results of other EIS studies, such as noise, air quality, traffic and visual amenity, with a focus on how communities and stakeholders could be affected, either positively or negatively.</li> <li>▶ At the end of this process, the SIA develops management measures including actions to mitigate effects on people and communities, and enhancement strategies to enhance potential benefits.</li> <li>▶ Social impacts can be positive or negative. There might be negative impacts around access or connectivity in a community; but there may be positive impacts around opportunities for employment or business participation.</li>   <li>▶ SIA Community Survey                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The B2G SIA Community Survey was undertaken between 7 November and 21 December 2018, to identify community views on social values and the project’s potential social impacts and benefits. A total of 121 surveys were received.</li> <li>▶ Survey participants indicated that they expected the project to cause negative impacts on social values. This graph presents the weighted average of survey responses (using a scale of 1 = strong negative effect, 2 = some negative effect, 3 = no effect, 4 =some positive effect, and 5 = strong positive effect).</li> <li>▶ It shows that most people who responded thought the project would have negative impacts on local values. The potential for employment or business benefits were also identified, but not rated highly.</li> <li>▶ The community survey is then balanced or considered with the findings from other consultation e.g. workshops and statistical information e.g. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). This allows us to identify the key concerns and potential social impacts for the project. We then data determine how to manage or address it.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>▶ Key issues identified in consultation to date:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Impacts of project construction and/or operation on rural and town amenity</li> <li>▶ Property impacts, e.g. property acquisition, severance, impacts on farms, impacts on property values, impacts on water access</li> <li>▶ Impacts of any changes to flood patterns</li> <li>▶ Impacts on connectivity, e.g. disruption of movements across the rail corridor, or on the road network</li> <li>▶ Impacts on public transport e.g. bus routes or future passenger rail</li> <li>▶ Traffic delays (including delays to emergency services) and safety at level crossings</li> <li>▶ Effects of Project-related stress on mental health</li> <li>▶ Impacts of noise, vibration, and air quality changes on community wellbeing</li> <li>▶ Access to employment for local people</li> <li>▶ Business opportunities to supply the project</li> <li>▶ Health and well-being. Some of the feedback received was around the stress, uncertainty and how that’s impacting communities. That has been a key driver in implementing the partnership that MS spoke about, where we are putting in place support as one of our management actions against that.</li> <li>▶ Other comments have included the desire for better information and support and changes on community well-being, project benefits and access.</li> </ul> </li>   <li><i>Questions and discussion</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW asked the committee whether this information is representative of what is being heard in the community.                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ BK – referring to community response data Are these figures actual?</li> <li>▶ HW – Yes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ BK – In relation to “community wellbeing”, through the Senate Estimates, we heard John Fullerton say that on the floodplain, everyone is quite happy with what has been happening. We can’t find a landholder that is adjacent to the rail corridor that is happy about it. We are all angry. I don’t know how the result of 1.8 for community wellbeing was achieved, but it depends where you are sampling. If you are sampling in town where someone has been told their business is going to flourish because of this project, the sample will be skewed.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW – The results shown are overarching and community health and wellbeing encompasses a number of things e.g. how safe people feel, services available to them. It is not a direct response relating to local support. They are indicators. When the report comes out, it considers a range of information collected through the SIA, identifies key themes and then outlines management or enhancement of identified social impacts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ BK – It depends on where you take your sample and how it’s skewed.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW – The sample covers all of the engagement undertaken by the engagement team. We look at consultation information, SIA workshops and other elements. The sample is from across the whole region and is ongoing.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>▶ Chair – Will there be a chapter in the EIS on the SIA informed by this process?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW – Yes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair acknowledged that individuals who are unhappy with the social impact can express this to the Coordinator-General through the EIS process.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW – I am presenting key things we are hearing. We now identify and assess and develop management strategies and mitigations which is important to lessen, improve or enhance (for positive) impacts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ BK – I don’t feel comfortable with FFJV doing the SIA. We dealt with them during the Project Reference Group (PRG) and I believe they lied to us during that process. The Queensland Farmers Federation President walked out.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Chair – You have a process open to you in the EIS.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ GK – What do you define as “local people” for employment? Is it someone 100 kilometres away? The Toowoomba and Surat Basin Enterprise run seminars in Toowoomba for people looking to engage in Inland Rail. Businesses in Toowoomba will have different impacts to those here.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW – Our intent when it comes to looking at maximising local and economic benefits is to work on 125 kilometres from the rail corridor with preference (where possible) for communities that are located closer. The reason we go broad is because there’s certain needs that the project has that can’t be serviced by smaller businesses, and we want to capture regional benefit.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ GC – So how are you going to be able to control what the principal and the secondary contractors do for employment?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW – There will be social requirements and social criteria for tier 1 contractors and the major tenders. They will have to address how they plan on maximising local employment; how they plan on utilising local content. That then will be converted to targets or specific requirements within contracts for those tier 1 contractors. It will be written into the major contracts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ GC – Will they report on this?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW – Yes. On the Parkes to Narromine project they need to report to us on what their local spend is, how many local residents they have working on the project. We then verify that and we can audit them under the contract terms. We have also committed to quarterly public reporting on our social performance outcomes; so that the community can hold us accountable for the outcomes that have been achieved.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ GH – If they close the line through Warwick, that’s going to have a huge impact on us and on other freight operations on the existing south-west line. Has that been taken into consideration in your social and economic impacts that you are looking at? It seems to me you are just looking at the immediate line here rather than some bigger issue?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW – Taken on notice. FFJV have looked at cumulative impacts across different areas.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS – It is part of Inland Rail’s scope to maintain connectivity to all those existing lines that you mentioned. The south western line and out through to Warwick and the Millmerran branch will still have a connection through to Millmerran. We need to maintain connectivity unless, for example, Queensland Rail (QR) says we don’t need to.</li> <li>▶ BK – QR don’t even use those lines.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS – We know which ones are not being used so the agreement in regards to whether they will be connected to the Inland Rail and maintained or misused and decommissioned is yet to be confirmed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ BK – Can we record these meetings and have a complete copy available to send to John Fullerton?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Chair – the minutes are available on the website. For an unedited recording I would need to liaise with ARTC and get back to the committee.</li> <li>▶ MS – Taken on notice. The recording of these minutes is purely for preparation of the minutes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>9</b></p>	<p><b>General business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair invited general business items from the committee.</li> <li>▶ GK – I personally would like to stand by the position that "no flooding is acceptable." I find it very hard that if someone’s house and their sheds or farm wasn’t flooded before, to ever accept that it can possibly be now. GK thanked JM for the explanation of flood events.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Chair – I think that is well understood by ARTC.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair noted the next quarterly meeting would be held in June.</li> <li>▶ The Chair invited questions from observers.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Observer 1 – What is the life expectancy of the project? Who will be responsible for dismantling or decommissioning structures when the time comes? If they are abandoned, it will silt up unless someone maintains them. Who is regulating that? Also, can this railway line one day in the future ever be sold to a foreign body? If so, do the rules change?                 <p>RS – The 100 year design life is a specification the rail is built to. As part of the EIS submission, we do have to include a decommissioning plan and that would be up to ARTC to undertake that decommissioning. ARTC would have to as part of that EIS develop a high-level maintenance plan; but that maintenance plan would be further developed after EIS submission and during the detail design and construction phase. Before it's fully commissioned, we would need to have a fully developed and internally approved maintenance schedule in play. Whether ARTC chooses to employ their own maintenance team or subcontract that activity out, is yet to be confirmed; so that would also have to take place as part of that detailed design and development phase. There is currently a plan in play for a section of Inland Rail to be a public private partnership (PPP). If that comes into play, that section would be privately-owned in collaboration with the government. That agreement would need to be unpicked and on-sold to an independent party. It is more likely that that agreement would run for a certain amount of time under that contract. The actual ARTC track outside of the PPP section could be sold to a foreign entity subject to the Federal Government's agreement. It is certainly not part of the current plan.</p> </li> <li>▶ Observer 2 – Has the B2G concept been costed? Is that cost publicly known, or where do community members find out that cost, if it has been done? How do you know that the section you have proposed is the most cost-effective route, if you are yet to do the cost during the detailed design?                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS – There was a concept level cost comparison done under the corridor options report. In order to understand all of the criteria that were assessed on comparison of the four options, you can refer to that report. The Federal Government made their decision based on that and their interpretation of that report. As we move through our design development of the preferred alignment within the two- kilometre study corridor, we continuously update our estimates and risk range those to understand how we are tracking. We don’t currently make those available to the public. We continually update the cost estimate to understand how we are tracking.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Observer 3 – Is ARTC putting out an information package or disseminating some information in the community and landholders about the acquisition and resumption and compensation process?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ AR – There is a fact sheet that's been recently developed that describes how the resumption process runs. It mainly talks about the compulsory acquisition process. It steps out the process which is outlined in the relevant legislation. The acquisitions will be undertaken under the <i>Acquisition of Land Act</i> which is a Queensland-based legislative process. We do have a fact sheet available that details the process, if you would like to have one of those.</li> <li>▶ LJ – I will email a copy of the fact sheet to the members.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>10</b></p>	<p><b>Conclusion and confirmation of actions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ARTC to advise if police were present at the Brookstead pop-up consultation stand.</li> <li>2. ARTC / Chair to determine whether Rob Loch can be engaged for erosion advice.</li> <li>3. John Macintosh to determine whether 30 percent allowance for blockage at culverts is sufficient.</li> <li>4. ARTC to provide information on whether impacts on existing QR South-Western line are taken into account in the SIA.</li> <li>5. ARTC to advise whether recordings of CCC meetings should be given to Inland Rail CEO and ARTC CEO.</li> <li>6. ARTC to provide the committee with a copy of the acquisition fact sheet.</li> </ol> <p><i>Meeting concluded at 8.23pm</i></p>