

<b>Meeting title</b>		<b>Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee</b>	
<b>Attendees</b>			
Mr Graham Clapham – Committee Chair (Chair)		Ms Rosalie Millar – Committee Member (RM)	
Mr Robert Barrett – Committee Member (RB)		Mr Justin Saunders – Committee Member (JS)	
Mr Barry Bowden – Committee Member (BB)		Ms Kim Stevens – Committee Member (KS)	
Mr Graeme Clarke – Committee Member (GC)		Mr Ross Donnelly – FFJV (RD)	
Mr Jeff Chandler – Committee Member (JC)		Ms Laura Jarman – ARTC Inland Rail (LJ)	
Mr Norm Chapman – Committee Member (NC)		Ms Fiona Kennedy – ARTC Inland Rail (FK)	
Mr Brett Kelly – Committee Member (BK)		Mr Jon Roberts – ARTC Inland Rail (JR)	
Ms Georgina Krieg – Committee Member (GK)		Mr Robert Smith – ARTC Inland Rail (RS)	
<b>Apologies</b>			
Mr Brad Christensen – Committee Member (BC)		Ms Maria Oliver (MO)	
Mr Gary Hayes – Committee Member (GH)		Ms Marcia Smith (MS)	
<b>Location</b>	Yelarbon and Districts Soldiers Memorial Hall	<b>Secretariat</b>	Laura Jarman
<b>Date</b>	5 September 2018	<b>Time</b>	6:00 – 8:00pm
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion</b>		
<b>1. Introductions and welcome</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chair opened the meeting, welcomed committee members and observers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Noted apologies from BC, MS, GH and MO.</li> <li>○ 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.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Committee members and project team members introduced themselves.</li> </ul> <p><b>Actions from previous meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide information on weed/seed certificates. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ FK advised that ARTC and its agents undertaking all activities in the field are aware of their general biosecurity obligation under <i>Queensland’s Biosecurity Act 2014</i>. Some of the procedures in place include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In all circumstances ARTC and its agents will only enter properties with landowner consent/ agreement.</li> <li>- Prior to any ground disturbing activities, a site reconnaissance is undertaken to better understand the existing conditions and identify any potential issues at each site, including the presence of any existing weeds and potential pest animals.</li> <li>- Where activities are undertaken on private property, ARTC and its agents implement the same strategy, in addition to seeking information from the landholder about the potential known location of existing weeds and potential pest animals and any specific management activities that they are implementing on their land.</li> <li>- All machinery will be regularly inspected to ensure weed and seed hygiene, and cleaned, following relevant guidelines prepared by the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries to ensure that weeds and seeds are not dispersed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All ARTC personnel are required to follow the ARTC Weed Hygiene Procedure and Work Instruction.</li> <li>o RM – Requested copy of the procedure.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FK – Will confirm with manager that is ok, and if appropriate, will send through.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Update on procurement for the project.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o RS advised ARTC is in the process of determining a procurement model for the project. We anticipate that following market testing and ahead of the detailed design and construction phase, ARTC will hold industry briefings to enable local businesses to partner with contractors. ARTC will look to hold these briefings in key towns in the project area, such as Millmerran and Pittsworth.</li> <li>o Chair – requested RS provide this information to MO as she was the one who originally requested it.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Confirm that property-specific data will be made available to the specific landowner.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o FK advised ARTC can provide property-specific data to landowners, where requested. The most appropriate format or the way that information/data will be supplied is subject to discussion and agreement with the individual landowner.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Clarify the meaning of property in the Land Access Agreement form.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o RS advised that following the combined CCC meeting of 22 May, ARTC updated the Land Access Agreement to include a definition of the term “property” - for the purposes of indemnity, property means all real and personal property including plant and machinery, crops and livestock.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Conflicts of interest</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No new conflicts of interest were raised.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Project update</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RS provided an update on site investigations:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o EIS field studies and geotechnical investigations commenced in July 2018 and are ongoing. The studies and investigations are primarily being carried out by contractors Golders and FFJV. Additional specialists will be used as required for activities such as cultural heritage. Studies and investigations occurring between September and December 2018 include:                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- core sample drilling on private properties and road reserves (Millmerran-Inglewood Road)</li> <li>- installing groundwater monitors on private properties and road reserves (Millmerran-Inglewood Road)</li> <li>- walk through inspections for cultural heritage, fauna and flora, water sampling, and landscape and visual impact assessment on private properties and road reserves</li> <li>- baseline monitoring for noise and air quality</li> <li>- traffic surveys</li> <li>- cadastral surveying.</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Some study and investigation work on road reserves may require short periods of hold and release traffic control.</li> <li>o We have received feedback from the Inner Darling Downs community that they would like more detail on the site investigations being carried out across the study area and all vehicles to be branded so they can be sure of who is working in the area, and we are working to make that happen as a priority.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

---

*Questions and discussion*

- GK – suggested that contractors could have a “contractors for ARTC” sign on their vehicles, rather than their own logo as it is difficult to remember all of the contractors on site. I recently saw two ladies walking on the rail line through Brookstead and didn’t know where they were from.
  - RS – We are working through issues with co-branding. Stepping things up with the level of detail provided. You can expect site presence to increase over the coming months.
- GK – When are traffic counts occurring?
  - JR – Traffic counts will occur over the next two months to obtain average traffic counts. Recognising that school holidays are coming up, we won’t be able to count the traffic over that period.
  - GK – In a rural area, school traffic is not as significant as seasonal, agricultural traffic which isn’t happening.
  - RM – There is less traffic due to the drought. Local knowledge needs to be considered.
  - RS – We are aware of that and it is being considered.
- JC – Are traffic counters out already? I have seen some around.
  - RS – Not yet, but they will be in the coming weeks.
  - *Update: subsequent to the meeting, ARTC advised that the traffic counters were associated with the B2G project.*
- JC – I have had contractors on my property and haven’t had any issues. One went to the trouble of calling me to tell me he was an hour late.
  - RS – It’s good to get some positive feedback. We do our best to keep everyone informed and give reasonable warning.
- JC – What is the reason for monitoring the standing water level and quality of the underground water table at certain locations within the area of interest between Inglewood and Millmerran. What will be the ultimate use for this information? Is the objective to find a water supply for use during construction and operation.
  - FK – We have installed some groundwater monitoring bores. They are for the purposes of the EIS. We have to collect data on groundwater, to inform the EIS. They are not production bores. If we need construction water down the track, we are going to have to lodge permits and approvals with the Department of Natural Resources.
- JC – Will ARTC be seeking input from landowners and key stakeholder regarding flood levels for the Macintyre Catchment as has been the case with the Condamine floodplain?
  - RS – I have received information on this from Martin, the flooding and hydrology lead from FFJV, who is unable to join us tonight.
  - He has advised that we are completing 2-dimensional models for the following major floodplains along B2G: Macintyre River, Macintyre Brook, Condamine River, Westbrook Creek, Dry Creek & Gowrie Creek.
  - All the major crossings will be assessed from a hydrologic and hydraulic perspective but using more simplified models such as 1-dimensional HEC-RAS models. This is deemed appropriate for creeks that don’t have extensive floodplains.
  - The Macintyre models originate from the OEH and have been calibrated and validated by the OEH against the 1976 and 1996 events. We have added the

2011 event as a further calibration event, and we used flood marker data for the 2011 event that were collected by the OEH for model validation.

- JC – Do they believe that they were the biggest floods they had in those catchments? Some of the contractors that were on my property seemed pretty surprised when I told them where the water levels go to.
  - RS – We will take that question on notice.
- GC – I spent almost a day with people on the Condamine and they were concerned that Grasstree Creek was not accounted for.
  - RS – I can confirm that Grasstree Creek is included in the Phase 2 model.
- RS provided an update on design development:
  - Over the last three months, the project team has been meeting with government agencies and councils to ensure our design supports existing and future infrastructure projects, carrying out technical investigations and, where possible, incorporating community feedback into the design.
  - We engaged with the Brookstead community to inform the multi-criteria analysis for the alignment through the area.
  - We will be running similar processes for the Millwood area and Yelarbon highway area. As a first point, we need to talk to asset owners (council and TMR) and property owners.
  - Our initial alignment investigation works for the B2G section of the Inland Rail are complete. This has allowed us to focus the area of investigation.
  - The focused area of investigation is expected to be released publicly after consultation with directly affected landowners and stakeholders.
  - The design for the preferred alignment is considering the technical viability, safety, operational restrictions, constructability, environment, and community and property impacts.
  - Work is commencing on designing the structures for the B2G section of the Inland Rail including earthworks, bridges, interchanges and level crossings.

#### *Questions and discussion*

- Chair – The Brookstead meeting was pre-empted by a committee member of the IDCCC who called for a meeting of Brookstead community and started this process. To those committee members who are in those areas mentioned by Rob, you need to talk to your community about what is acceptable.
- KS – How much notice will you give us before meetings?
  - RS – At least two weeks.
- BB – I agree that the Brookstead meeting was good and think that each community along the alignment should be have a similar process.
  - RS - Not all areas are able to have an options analysis process due to technical constraints.
- GC – If you find a better alignment outside of the study area, can you look outside of it?
  - RS – We are focussed on finding an alignment within the study area and any alignment outside of the study area would be subject to discussions with the Coordinator-General.
- JC – When are you hoping to have spoken with directly affected landowners?
  - RS – We are working towards November.
- KS – Before you come to Millwood, will you have narrowed it down to one side of the

	<p>road?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RS – We will be talking to people individually first. There are still technical assessments that have to take place.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● FK provided an EIS update:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The draft Terms of Reference (ToR), the submission period closed on 18 June. The Office of Coordinator-General (OCG) received 97 submissions. Of these, 12 were from government agencies, two were from the councils, and the remainder were from the public. The submissions covered all the topics in the draft ToR. Since June, the OCG has been considering those submissions and we expect the final ToR will be issued shortly.</li> <li>○ To date, our investigations have been focusing on investigations using government databases. The next steps for us will be doing the site investigations which includes the ecological investigations and noise and vibration monitoring. We will be undertaking a social survey after the final ToR are issued.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Questions and discussions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● RM – How do you go about the social survey and who is surveyed?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ FK – We have a specialist consultant who administers that through FFJV. The survey has been rolled out for the Gowrie to Kagaru section of the alignment and we will be following the same sort of methodology as they have been. They will be surveying a sample of each of the communities along the alignment and they will be interviewing people as needed.</li> <li>○ LJ – On the other Queensland Inland Rail projects, the survey was available online and via email.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● JC – What sorts of things are covered?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ FK – We can send through a copy of the survey once it is available.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Condamine floodplain crossing update</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● RS provided an update on the Condamine floodplain crossing on behalf of FFJV flooding and hydrology lead Martin Boshoff (MB):             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Background                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Early deliverable to identify potential solutions for the crossing of the Condamine floodplain within the existing rail corridor and report back to key stakeholders</li> <li>- Calibration and validation of flood model is ongoing</li> <li>- Design option feedback to commence in October</li> <li>- Final results are subject to alignment with the Terms of Reference</li> <li>- A preferred crossing solution has not been determined.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Methodology                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Study informed by investigations within the rail corridor across the Condamine floodplain including:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Cultural heritage assessment, terrestrial flora and fauna survey</li> <li>● Aquatic ecology survey and surface water sampling</li> <li>● Geotechnical investigations</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Assessment of public and occupational rail crossings.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- During the current Phase 2 of the project the following flood events have been included in the design process:
  - 50%, 20%, 10%, 2%, 1%, 0.2% AEP
  - 1 in 2000 & 1 in 10000 year ARI.
- A more detailed hydrological and hydraulic flood model has been prepared for the Inland Rail Phase 2 works and includes tributaries such as Rocky Creek, Back Creek, Hermitage Creek etc.
- The flood models are also calibrated to:
  - the 2010 (Close to a 1% AEP) and other flood events
  - flood survey markers from 13 individual Condamine floodplain landowner sites
  - local gauges.
- blockage assessment – ARR2016 Blockage of hydraulic structures
- sensitivity analysis including Manning’s roughness values, cross drainage structure blockage, variable crop patterns and climate change.
- Next steps
  - A number of design options are being considered as part of the Condamine River Floodplain Solutions assessment including:
    - embankment with culverts and viaduct (multiple variations)
    - ‘full’ viaduct.
  - Potential impacts investigated including:
    - potential changes in flood extent
    - potential positive and negative changes in water level (or afflux)
    - potential changes in flow velocities, flow direction, flood durations or frequency of inundation
    - potential blockage caused by debris mobilisation
    - potential risk of scour and erosion.

*Questions and discussion*

- GK– How far apart were the flood survey markers?
  - RS – Believe they were spaced up to five to ten kilometres upstream. We will show at a future presentation.
- NC – Has erosion caused by dry banks been covered in the model?
  - RS – I know there has been some consideration of erosion of levee banks; however, we will take this on notice.
  - Chair – from my few hours spent with MB, I believe that scenario is captured by roughness aspect of model.
- Chair – I wish to inform the committee about a few things:
  - I allowed MB and team onto a property to take readings from historic flood markers. I spent a few hours with MB validating the model and was happy with what the model showed in relation to my property. I was happy with the representation that the model has of what happens on my property; in terms of what are flow heights, directions, velocities, duration, all of those aspects. It was so close to reality, that you couldn't have got it any better. I was amazed at the level of detail you could drill down to into this model.
  - You will all have received an email from me about the independent review of the flood work. To give the community confidence that their issues are dealt with properly without having to use their own resources to fund this, I made a request

of John Fullerton (ARTC CEO) to get financial support to fund an independent review. I have been active in sourcing an independent person to conduct the review. The person has submitted his proposal. As soon as ARTC has granted this request, I will share it with the committee.

- GK – I can't recall when this was raised as an action.
  - Chair – It was an action arising from the inaugural meeting.
- BK – I have a few questions on behalf of landowners on the Condamine floodplain. There is a concern that the modelling is based on the 2010 event.
  - RS – The model was validated against the 2010 event, but we can test a range of rainfall scenarios in the model.
- BK – Generally the heights seem not too bad. A few people are concerned that there are no heights taken to the west of Grasstree Creek. You must remember that Back Creek becomes part of the Condamine floodplain when it joins Grasstree Creek, so it needs to be involved in this modelling. You need to test a scenario like the one in Mango Hill that inundated those houses in that newly constructed rail line and see what happens.
  - RS – I know that a number of different scenarios are tested – they do not just try to simulate one historical event.
  - RD – The calibration is against historical events (2010, 1991) and that sets flood levels for those events. Once we are confident that the model is accurately representing those events, we can test a range of different events which is where the probabilities of rainfall come into it. We can show a map of the rainfall distribution and intensity for calibrated events and the design events. We are looking at extreme events like 1 in 2000 year and 1 in 10000 year events too, which is similar to what you are talking about.
- BK – What are your margins of error in this model saying in centimetres in water height and metres per second in velocity; what are your velocity margins of error?
  - RD – We will have to take that on notice.
- BK – Where were historic flood markers surveyed? I only know of six or seven landowners where levels were taken.
  - RS – There were 29 markers surveyed across 13 landowners. We will show you on a map at a following meeting.
- BK – Is Dr Mark Jempson still involved?
  - RS – Dr Jempson is involved in a peer review role. He is not part of the core team developing the model. He comes in and tests it and asks questions and makes sure that they are doing what he believes they need to be doing. It was one of ARTC's requirements for the FFJV team to have a relatively independent person coming in and testing them and doing peer reviews. He is available to talk to. We will be looking to involve him in future meetings.
- BK – the Condamine floodplain community would like some acknowledgement from ARTC that a viaduct is on the table. We have not received any confirmation. We are not hydrologists. We are concerned about increasing the velocity of water. We don't deserve, or should have to tolerate, any additional flood height or velocity. This is why we proposed a bridge viaduct.
  - Chair – I can assure you the request has been formally documented. MB confirmed that the viaduct has been modelled. When I sent the brief to Dr John McIntosh, he wanted to know in my own words what were the community concerns. One of the first things in his agenda is arranging a meeting with this committee and the community about this process. There will be an opportunity to

	<p>speaking to our independent expert.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GC – Has the same detail been put into the assessment of the Macintyre River? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RS – The Macintyre is a major floodplain and so it is subject to the same methodology as the Condamine.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• GC – Has that process progressed yet? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RS – It has started, but is not as far advanced as the Condamine floodplain. Calibration is ongoing. It also needs to be in accordance with the Terms of Reference requirements.</li> <li>○ Chair – when I initially made contact with John MacIntosh, I commented that this committee covers the alignment from the border to Brookstead and requested he look at that too. He has included it in his proposal.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• RB – Do you know when there will be any results for the Macintyre River? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RS – We will get back to you on that.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>5. Communication update</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LJ provided an update on communication and engagement activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Two new community engagement specialists are based fulltime in our Toowoomba office – Willow and Naomi. Please drop into our office in Neil Street to speak with them. I am also there a few days a week too.</li> <li>○ A key focus has been land access for field investigations. The Inner Darling Downs CCC advised us last night that they would like more notice and information about the activities that were ongoing throughout the area and we are endeavouring to provide that.</li> <li>○ If you ever have any questions or if people in your community have questions, please encourage them to get in contact with us, through the 1800 number; and we will always endeavour to answer questions.</li> <li>○ Over the past few months, we have been engaging with landowners on the Condamine floodplain crossing. In October, we will be carrying out some more one-on-one meetings with landowners and then we will be bringing out the solution to the broader community, including yourselves.</li> <li>○ Another significant piece of work over the next few months will be engaging directly with landowners within our focused area of investigation.</li> <li>○ We recently supported the Brookstead P &amp; C Black and White Bash. ARTC does sponsor community events; so if something is coming up, I would encourage you to write to ARTC with details of your request; and we can see if that fits within our criteria for sponsorships.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>6. General business</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair – I have learnt that there is Federal funding available to individuals and organisations to undertake economic research into how they might benefit from the Inland Rail Programme. The Queensland Farmers Federation is making enquiries into whether the funding programme is still operating, and how access might be made. I will forward details to the committee when it becomes available.</li> <li>• Next meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The next meeting will be held in late October to coincide with the release of the initial solution for crossing the Condamine floodplain.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• RB - Thank you for holding this meeting in Yelarbon.</li> </ul> <p><i>Questions and comments from observers</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observer #1 – We are experiencing a 100 year drought at the moment and I would put money on there being a 100 year flood after this. There are huge amounts of water in this catchment – bigger than Condamine. This project will lob vast amounts</li> </ul>

	<p>of water into Goondiwindi.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ RS – There is still a lot of work on that model to go to give community confidence in model and test design.</li><li>● Observer #2 – Does model take into account soil saturation?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ RD – Yes, that is a parameter built into the model. The model can consider a range of different scenarios.</li></ul></li></ul>
<b>7. Conclusion and confirmation of actions</b>	<p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● FK – look to provide copy of ARTC weed hygiene procedure</li><li>● RS – provide information on procurement to MO</li><li>● RS – confirm whether 2010/11 flood event is considered the largest</li><li>● FK – send through copy of social survey once it is available</li><li>● RS – clarify if dry banks have been accounted for in flood model</li><li>● RS – provide detail on margins of error in model</li><li>● RS – provide map of surveyed flood markers</li><li>● RS – provide update on timing of Macintyre River flood modelling results</li><li>● Chair – forward details of Federal funding.</li></ul> <p>Meeting closed at 7.45pm.</p>