

MEETING MINUTES

Kagaru to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton Community Consultative Committee

DATE / TIME

11 February 2019
6:00 – 8:00pm

LOCATION

Greenbank Community Centre, 145 Teviot Road, Greenbank

CHAIR

John Brent

SECRETARIAT

Nicola Mitchell

ATTENDEES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS		ARTC REPRESENTATIVES
Lloyd Stumer	Hon Gary Hardgrave	Mercedes Staff
Anne Page	Stephen Harrison	Nicola Mitchell
Suzanne Corbett	Cameron Thomas	Harminder Bhar
Angela Harlen	Dorinda Hall	Simon Eldridge
David Kenny	Mallory Wuthrich	Gareth Rees
Chantal Swanton-Gallant	Bob Wiley	Kerrin Roberts
Damon Gerebtzoff		Andrew Doe

APOLOGIES (SHOW ORGANISATION IF NOT ARTC)

Phil Manitta – Committee Member

Agenda items

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (CHAIR)	Welcomed members and observers.
MEMBER RESIGNATIONS (CHAIR)	The Chair advised that two Committee Members have resigned. The Committee's representative of the traditional owners, Steven Coghill, resigned. ARTC will consult with the local Aboriginal community regarding a replacement. A second Member, Costas Alexandrou, has also resigned. Committee Members agreed that no replacement for the second member is required, as the CCC has sufficient membership.
CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATION (CHAIR)	<p>A Committee Member confirmed his support for passenger rail and advised he does not believe there is any conflict of interest on this matter with Inland Rail.</p> <p>A Committee Member stated their opinion that representatives of development companies that openly state that passenger trains will be run on the Inland Rail route should not be members of the CCC.</p> <p>The Chair advised an independent process was followed to choose members.</p> <p>ACTION: ARTC to provide confirmation that no members have a conflict of interest.</p> <p>RESPONSE: As per the CCC Charter, conflicts of interest refer to any real or perceived conflict of interest regarding business dealings, community interests, operational interests, commercial interests and/or land owner interests. The presence of such a conflict must be publicly declared and recorded in the Minutes.</p> <p>As addressed at the beginning of each meeting, CCC members are required to disclose any potential conflicts of interest and these must be recorded in the Minutes of the relevant meeting.</p>

<p>UPDATE ON ACTIONS (ARTC)</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>
<p>HISTORY OF INLAND RAIL (ARTC DIRECTOR GOVERNMENT AND STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS)</p>	<p>ARTC provided a history of how the alignment for Inland Rail was decided upon, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Inland Rail Implementation Group (IRIG) was tasked in 2015 with determining if Inland Rail was feasible. ▶ The IRIG report recommended that from Toowoomba, Inland Rail follow the gazetted and protected Gowrie to Grandchester corridor and the Southern Freight Rail Corridor. ▶ That recommendation by IRIG was also made by the Queensland Government in a cabinet decision, which was communicated by the then Minister for Transport to the then Deputy Prime Minister in 2016. ▶ The adoption of the Southern Freight Rail Corridor for Inland Rail, which connects to the interstate railway at Kagaru, effectively determined the use of the Kagaru-Acacia Ridge line as the entry to Brisbane for Inland Rail. ▶ Without Inland Rail, by 2050 most freight would go via road on the east coast. This is a sub-optimal outcome. ▶ About two thirds of the freight expected to travel on Inland Rail is non-bulk freight destined for supermarkets and warehouses, such as beverages, food, whitegoods etc. Around about 9 to 10 per cent will be agricultural product and about 25 per cent is coal and minerals. ▶ The usage of Inland Rail will ultimately be a matter of market demand. <p>A Committee Member asked for clarification on the amount of coal expected to be transported on Inland Rail.</p> <p>ARTC advised that in 2029/2030 coal will account for about 37% of Inland Rail freight but this is forecast to decrease substantially by 2050 to about 25%. This is dependent on several factors. ARTC advised that Inland Rail is being driven by the need to remove inter-capital city freight off the roads and onto rail. It is not being built for the purpose of transporting coal.</p> <p>A Committee Member asked what the decision-making process has been to change the transport of coal from the current line it travels onto Inland Rail?</p> <p>ARTC advised there has not been any decision to that effect. It will be a matter for the coal companies to decide which rail line they prefer to use.</p> <p>A Committee Member asked how ARTC will mitigate the impact to residents from coal transport.</p> <p>ARTC advised mitigation requirements will be determined during the process of environmental investigations.</p> <p>An observer commented on his concerns regarding coal dust.</p> <p>ARTC advised that the responsibility for managing coal dust lies with the transport operators. ARTC will ensure the operators abide by any regulations required of them, as set by the Queensland Government.</p> <p>A Committee Member stated that a representative of the Queensland Government should be at the CCC meetings to respond to questions in their remit.</p> <p>A Committee Member asked if compensation will be paid to property owners as a result of devaluation of their property.</p> <p>ARTC advised that compensation would be paid according to the relevant Queensland legislation.</p>

	<p><i>****ARTC would like to provide additional clarification on this point subsequent to the meeting. Please note, there is no legislative requirement to pay compensation for a proven loss in value unless land is acquired from a property. There are no private land acquisitions anticipated as part of the K2ARB project at this time ****</i></p> <p>A Committee Member asked what is the fatal flaw that could result in Inland Rail not proceeding.</p> <p>ARTC advised the project could not proceed if connectivity was not possible between Tottenham through New South Wales and through Queensland to Kagaru.</p> <p>A Committee Member asked what mitigation will be put in place for potential health impacts on residents from the operation of Inland Rail and who will sign off on the project.</p> <p>ARTC advised that they have now lodged an application with the Coordinator General's Office for the K2ARB project to be declared coordinated, requesting an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) be required. ARTC will be required to investigate the impacts of various environmental matters to get project approval.</p> <p>A Committee Member asked why the Committee has not been consulted regarding the request to the Coordinator General.</p> <p>ARTC advised the community will be involved in the process moving forward, including with the draft Terms of Reference for any EIS, should the project be declared coordinated. It was explained that what had been lodged was an application and accompanying Initial Advice Statement, it is not the EIS that has been lodged. There would be many opportunities, both formally and informally, for public comment and input during the EIS process.</p> <p>A Committee Member asked if there are plans for healthcare cover and regular health checks for residents impacted by Inland Rail.</p> <p>ARTC advised such matters can be considered during the process of environmental investigations.</p> <p>A Committee Member asked if there are alternate routes being considered from Kagaru.</p> <p>ARTC advised alternate routes are not being considered. The purpose of Inland Rail is to go to the intermodal freight terminals at Acacia Ridge or Bromelton.</p> <p>A Committee Member asked if there is a reason why the transport of coal would transfer from the current line used to Inland Rail.</p> <p>ARTC advised this is a matter for the transport operators and the mines.</p>
<p>UPDATE ON PROGRESS OF PROJECT (ARTC PROJECT MANAGER KERRIN ROBERTS AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGER QLD GARETH REES)</p>	<p>ARTC provided an overview of progress on the Kagaru to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton (K2ARB) section of Inland Rail, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Community information sessions held in December 2018 at Calamvale, Browns Plains and Jimboomba ▶ The submission of an application for coordinated project status (Initial Advice Statement) to the Office of Coordinator-General in February 2019 ▶ The commencement of mobilisation of technical consultants and planning for field investigations. <p>A Committee Member asked what the timeframe is for the Coordinator General to make a decision regarding the project's application.</p> <p>ARTC advised it is anticipated to take 6-8 weeks.</p> <p>ARTC provided a presentation on the EIS process, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Discussion on the integration between the design and approvals processes.

- ▶ Both streams of work are supported by site investigations. These will include air and noise monitoring, geotechnical investigation, soil investigation and a range of flora, fauna and social impact assessments.
- ▶ Discussed the relationship between engineering, environmental investigations and community consultation. Primary approvals relate to an EIS and the assessment of a project and its potential acceptance to move through to the next phase; which is the secondary phase. The secondary phase typically involves more detailed engineering investigations. Following the EIS, there are subsequent approvals required, which are referred to as secondary approvals and then if approved, the project moves through to construction and ongoing into commission.
- ▶ The Initial Advice Statement has been prepared with support from an external consultant. It provides information on the:
 - ▶ size and nature of the proposed project
 - ▶ environment in and around the project location
 - ▶ scale and extent of the project's potential environmental impacts.
- ▶ If the project is declared coordinated, the Coordinator General will release draft Terms of Reference for public comment. These are the set of rules ARTC has to comply with in preparing the EIS. Comments on the draft Terms of Reference are made directly to the Coordinator General's Office.
- ▶ Site investigations will commence shortly.
- ▶ Some investigations may be required on private property. If that is the case, then a Land Access Agreement would be required with the property owner.
- ▶ Land Access Agreements aim to achieve the following objectives:
 - ▶ Outline the protocols negotiated between ARTC and the property owner in relation to obtaining access to their property
 - ▶ Outline the manner in which third parties are to make contact with the property owner in relation to access including notice provisions
 - ▶ Indemnify the property owner against any loss, damage or injury incurred as a result of project activities on the property
 - ▶ Specify the activities proposed on the property, and their intended duration.
- ▶ The project will identify priority sites for field investigations within and outside of the rail corridor
- ▶ A land access consultant and the stakeholder team will engage with private property owners to request temporary access to their properties to position investigation equipment
- ▶ Terms of access agreement are documented and agreed with property owners
- ▶ Field studies will be managed by the project team to ensure compliance with relevant terms and conditions
- ▶ The process excludes longer term occupation and any agreement covers specified durations. Participation in the process is voluntary

A Committee Member asked for confirmation that the Coordinator General would consider input into the draft Terms of Reference.

ARTC confirmed this is the case.

A Committee Member asked if it was the Coordinator General who determined the route for Inland Rail.

ARTC advised the Coordinator General did not determine the route of Inland Rail. Various parties played a role in the determination of the route.

A Committee Member asked if alternate routes were considered, and if so, was that advised in the Initial Advice Statement.

ARTC advised the Initial Advice Statement outlines alternatives to the project. These alternatives are outlined in publicly available documents.

ACTION: ARTC to provide links to reports regarding the development of the Inland Rail project.

	<p>RESPONSE: Please find these reports at https://inlandrail.artc.com.au/route</p>
<p>COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE (ARTC STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT LEAD NICOLA MITCHELL)</p>	<p>A presentation was made regarding project communications, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Three information stands ran at Jimboomba, Calamvale and Browns Plains in December with more than 300 people attending. ▶ The locations and dates for these stands were determined in collaboration with the CCC. ▶ Key issues raised by community members at the stands were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Increase in rail traffic on the interstate line ▶ Noise and vibration impacts ▶ Coal transport, and associated health impacts ▶ Desire for passenger rail in the area ▶ Property devaluation ▶ Location of the crossing loops ▶ Upcoming communications activity will focus on advising the community of the Coordinator General's decision regarding the Initial Advice Statement once this is received, and notification to residents regarding investigations along the alignment. ▶ Mentioned upcoming meetings on 7 May and 5 August. <p>A Committee Member noted her concerns about flora and fauna walk-throughs on properties in other Inland Rail project areas that have not happened as planned.</p> <p>A Committee Member expressed interest in being informed about the locations for environmental investigations.</p> <p>ACTION: The provision of maps of the locations where environmental investigations will take place, once known.</p> <p>A Committee Member asked if all potentially impacted residents have been communicated by letter.</p> <p>ARTC advised this has not been the case. This will take place once a decision is received from the Coordinator General.</p> <p>ACTION: Notification to the community as to the outcome of the request to the Office of the Coordinator General on the K2ARB project approval pathway.</p>
<p>GENERAL BUSINESS</p>	<p>A Committee Member asked if it was possible to move a motion that an alternate route for the Inland Rail project between Kagaru and Acacia Ridge should be found.</p> <p>ARTC advised the purpose of the K2ARB CCC is to consider the project as it is currently proposed.</p> <p>A Committee Member asked if it is the case that Members do not have the ability to develop a different alignment.</p> <p>ARTC advised that the development of an alternate alignment between Kagaru and Acacia Ridge is not within the scope of ARTC or the CCC.</p> <p>The Chair stated that the Committee should focus on the process as outlined in the presentations, and the associated opportunities for the community to provide input.</p> <p>ARTC advised the purpose of an EIS would be for ARTC to determine, through detailed studies, if the project in its current form is acceptable. If the Coordinator General does not consider the project to be acceptable, this will be a matter for ARTC's consideration.</p> <p>A Committee Member asked if it was possible for ARTC to make requests for information to State Government bodies.</p> <p>ARTC confirmed that it is possible to do so.</p>

A Committee Member asked if it was the current or former State Government that had the discussion with the Federal Government regarding the alignment for Inland Rail, and if there were varying solutions provided in the Initial Advice Statement.

ARTC advised it was the then Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Stirling Hinchliffe, who made the response on behalf of the State Government in 2016. The Initial Advice Statement is focused on the current proposed route.

A Committee Member advised she believes the community is concerned about what is being proposed and feel they do not have any choice.

ARTC advised this feedback is valued and it is their intention to continue to discuss the concerns of the community with them moving forward.

The Chair advised it is not in the ambit of the Committee to consider alternate alignments.

A Committee Member advised he would like to move a motion that the CCC is concerned the project ARTC is considering is not the best option and seeks alternative routes to be considered for Inland Rail after Kagaru.

ARTC undertook to provide a response to this comment and to provide further clarification as to the remit of the CCC.

ACTION: ARTC to provide a response to the following statement: “The CCC is concerned that the project we are considering is not the best option and seeks alternative routes to be considered for Inland Rail after Kagaru.”

RESPONSE: An extensive process of investigation and analysis was undertaken to determine the proposed route of the Inland Rail project between Tottenham in Melbourne and Acacia Ridge in Brisbane. As part of this process, it was determined that the finishing point for Inland Rail in Brisbane would be the Acacia Ridge intermodal facility.

On 11 January 2016, then Queensland Minister for Transport Sterling Hinchliffe wrote to the Deputy Prime Minister indicating that the Queensland Government’s support for Inland Rail was conditional on the adoption of Queensland’s preferred strategic alignment (the Gowrie to Grandchester alignment preserved in 2003 and the Southern Freight Rail Corridor preserved in 2010).

The adoption of the Southern Freight Rail Corridor for Inland Rail in the 2010 Inland Rail Alignment Study, which connects to the existing interstate railway at Kagaru, effectively determined the use of the Kagaru-Acacia Ridge line as the entry to Brisbane for Inland Rail.

The Australian Rail Track Corporation (ARTC) is delivering Inland Rail on behalf of the Federal Government in accordance with the alignment developed through these investigations and the Inland Rail Business Case.

A request has been made to the Coordinator General for the Kagaru to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton (K2ARB) project to be declared a coordinated project. Should the project be declared coordinated, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will likely be required to be completed. Regardless of whether or not an EIS is required, a process of stringent environmental investigations will be undertaken, and the community will be consulted regarding the results of these investigations.

The investigations will not look at alternative project alignments. The final report will ultimately advise if the Inland Rail route between Kagaru and Acacia Ridge is considered feasible or not.

The Members of the K2ARB Community Consultative Committee have the opportunity to feed into and influence this process by providing input from their local communities as to the potential impacts they expect may be experienced by residents and other stakeholders as a result of the operation of Inland Rail between Kagaru to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton. It is also their role to provide information to the community on the project and engage with ARTC as to how the community can be best kept informed of progress on the project.

All community members will have the opportunity to provide comment on the final report. There is no scope through the environmental investigation process to alter the alignment of the Inland Rail project between Kagaru and Acacia Ridge.

ARTC is committed to engaging with the local community and taking their feedback into consideration in the design of the Inland Rail project.

Questions regarding the alignment of the Inland Rail project between Kagaru and Acacia Ridge should be directed to the Federal Department of Infrastructure.

****RESPONSE ENDS****

A Committee Member asked if ARTC is aware of how many schools are near the Inland Rail alignment.

ARTC confirmed they are aware of nearby schools, aged care facilities and other community organisations. As ARTC moves through their environmental assessment, the potential impacts on these facilities will be considered and described.

ACTION: That information provided by a member regarding schools located along the project alignment be considered in environmental investigations.

Two Committee Members advised they had additional questions to present to ARTC for response.

ACTION: That questions tabled by two Members at the meeting be answered prior to the next meeting, and responses provided to the Members for dissemination with their communities.

The Chair opened the meeting to questions from observers:

An observer asked if the project was declared unfeasible by the Coordinator General, what are the alternatives.

ARTC advised that various alternatives have been considered, and it has been concluded that the project in its current form is the best option to take through the environmental approvals process. The purpose of an EIS would be to test the project's feasibility. It is ARTC's strong view that the project in its current form is suitable for feasibility studies and a detailed EIS.

An observer reminded the Committee that there are a lot of other people along the other project alignments in Queensland who are affected. Many of these people are in greenfield sites.

An observer asked who is responsible for maintaining fencing along the ARTC rail lines.

ARTC advised it is their responsibility to maintain the fencing along operational rail lines. They will follow up on this matter with the observer.

ACTION: That the concerns of an observer at the meeting regarding the repair of fencing along the existing ARTC rail alignment be recorded.

An observer noted his belief that the project is a 'done deal.'

	<p>The Chair advised a process is now underway, and the community has the opportunity to feed into this, and to indicate any concerns.</p> <p>An observer asked if there is scope for the Coordinator General to refuse the request for K2ARB to be declared a coordinated project, and if that happens, will ARTC still undertake an EIS.</p> <p>ARTC advised it is possible for the Coordinator General to refuse to declare K2ARB as a coordinated project. If that were to occur, ARTC would then need to consider alternative approval mechanisms available to proceed.</p> <p>An observer asked if community feedback was included in the Initial Advice Statement submitted to the Coordinator General.</p> <p>ARTC advised that issues/concerns previously advised by community members were included in the Initial Advice Statement. The Initial Advice Statement will be made public on the Coordinator General’s website after a decision is made.</p> <p>An observer asked if the Initial Advice Statement included a request for a material change of use.</p> <p>ARTC advised it did not. The legislation regarding this matter states that a material change of use applies only to a specific parcel of land or property. This is a planning term and contained within the Planning Act. An example would be converting a farm field into a shopping centre. There are provisions within the planning regulations that say that these sorts of requirements under the Planning Act for a material change of use do not apply to transport-related infrastructure. Exemptions apply for what are called ‘beneficial assets.’ These are assets/infrastructure that serve a purpose for the community more broadly. Information regarding changes in train numbers and the operational performance of the rail line will be considered as part of the environmental assessment.</p>
	MEETING CLOSED

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	ARTC to provide confirmation that no members have a conflict of interest.	ARTC	Next meeting
2	ARTC to provide links to reports regarding the development of the Inland Rail project	ARTC	With the Minutes
3	The provision of maps of the locations where environmental investigations will take place, once known.	ARTC	TBC
4	Notification to the community as to the outcome of the request to the Office of the Coordinator General on the K2ARB project approval pathway.	ARTC	Once the CG makes their decision
5	ARTC provide a response to the following statement: “The CCC is concerned that the project we are considering is not the best option and seeks alternative routes to be considered for Inland Rail after Kagaru.”	ARTC	With the Minutes
6	That information provided by a member regarding schools located along the project alignment be considered in environmental investigations.	ARTC	Note
7	That the concerns of an observer at the meeting regarding the repair of fencing along the existing ARTC rail alignment be recorded.	ARTC	ASAP. Note this is underway

MEETING MINUTES

Kagaru to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton Community Consultative Committee

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
8	That questions tabled by two Members at the meeting be answered prior to the next meeting, and responses provided to the Members for dissemination with their communities.	ARTC	Next meeting

Next Meeting

6:00 – 8:00pm, 14 May 2019 at the Algester Sports Club