

# Meeting minutes

## Kagaru to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton Community Consultative Committee

<b>Date / Time</b>	<b>Location</b>
3 August 2020 6.00-8.00pm	Online
<b>Chair</b>	<b>Secretariat</b>
Hon Gary Hardgrave (Chair)	Laura Jarman (LJ)

### Attendees

- ▶ Suzanne Corbett – Inland Rail Action Group (SC)
- ▶ Damon Gerebtzoff – Algester Sports Club (DG)
- ▶ Angela Harlen – Beaudesert Chamber of Commerce (AH)
- ▶ Stephen Harrison – Flinders Land Holdings Pty Ltd (SH)
- ▶ Ken Madden – Individual (KM)
- ▶ Anne Page – Logan and Albert Conservation Association (AP)
- ▶ Lloyd Stumer – Individual (LS)
- ▶ Chantal Swanton-Gallant – Bolton Clarke Carrington Aged Care Facility (CSG)
- ▶ Cameron Thomas – Scenic Rim Regional Council (CT)

### Apologies

- ▶ Mallory Wuthrich – Individual (MW)
- ▶ David Kenny – Logan Country Safe Group (DK)
- ▶ Wade Thompson – Yuggera Ugarapul Native Title (WT)
- ▶ Bob Wiley – Individual (BW)
- ▶ Phil Manitta – St Stephen’s Catholic School (PM)

### ARTC

- ▶ Simon Fraser – Transaction Manager – PPP (SF)
- ▶ Karen Hillery – Engagement Advisor – K2ARB (KH)
- ▶ Mark McNamara – Senior Environment Advisor – K2ARB (MM)
- ▶ Nicola Mitchell – Stakeholder Engagement Operations Manager (NM)
- ▶ Max Nichols – Senior Project Manager – G2K (MN)
- ▶ Kerrin Roberts – Project Manager – K2ARB (KR)
- ▶ Peter Sturwohld – Design Manager – K2ARB (PS)

### Discussions

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<p><b>Safety Share</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ KR advised that following concerns raised by our members over the recent COVID-19 cases in South Brisbane and Logan, in the interests of keeping CCC members, ARTC staff and the broader community safe, the CCC meeting was moved online.</li> <li>▶ KR encouraged members and observers to continue to follow advice given by the Queensland Government.</li> <li>▶ KR encouraged community members working from home during this time to assess their personal workspace from an ergonomic and safety perspective.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ KR advised that ARTC required its on-site teams to develop and follow COVID-SAFE plans, including travelling in separate vehicles, reducing contact with community members when travelling and maintaining social distance in site meetings.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Welcome and introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair opened the meeting.</li> <li>▶ The Chair noted and apologised for the technical difficulties experienced by some of the CCC members and welcomed the observers who were observing online from home.</li> <li>▶ The Chair acknowledged the Traditional Owners.</li> <li>▶ The Chair outlined that there will be no opportunity for observers to directly ask any questions in the meeting and advised them to raise questions via a CCC member. CCC members can then send the Chair or ARTC staff a message that they have a question to ask, which can then be addressed in the meeting.</li> <li>▶ The Chair noted the apologies from WT, MW and DK, noting technological difficulties may have prevented others from joining the meeting.</li> <li>▶ KR introduced the K2ARB project team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Peter Sturwohld – Design Manager</li> <li>▶ Nicola Mitchell – Stakeholder Engagement Operations Manager. Nicola will continue to oversee engagement on the project.</li> <li>▶ Laura Jarman – Stakeholder Engagement Lead. Laura will be the main contact point for Committee members.</li> <li>▶ Karen Hillery – Stakeholder Engagement Advisor</li> <li>▶ Mark McNamara – Senior Environment Advisor</li> <li>▶ Simon Fraser – Transaction Manager PPP</li> <li>▶ Max Nichols – Senior Project Manager Gowrie to Kagaru.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair advised that there is a minor change to the advertised agenda. The Gowrie to Kagaru Public Private Partnership project is now the first presentation tonight.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Conflict of interest declaration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair requested members declare conflicts of interest. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ <i>No conflicts of interest were disclosed.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Update on actions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ARTC to report back to the members regarding progress on the development of a business case regarding a dedicated freight line to the Port of Brisbane. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ NM provided an update about the ongoing studies regarding a dedicated freight line to the Port of Brisbane, which involves two elements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Firstly, the joint Australian and Queensland governments' Port of Brisbane Strategic Rail Access Study is a \$1.5m study to assess the future requirements of a dedicated freight rail link between Inland Rail and the Port of Brisbane. A summary document outlining the Study's findings will be publicly released shortly. The Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Development and Communications will keep us updated about this.</li> <li>▶ The second aspect is a business case that was part of the intergovernmental agreement for Inland Rail between the Australian Government and the Queensland Government. This is a commitment of \$20m for a Port of Brisbane further planning study. This further planning will build on the findings of the initial study and look to provide more certainty about the future need and timing for a dedicated rail freight line. It will include further</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ol>

evaluation of options, analysis of staged alternatives and operational modelling to more accurately determine rail network upgrade impacts. The Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) is now managing the further planning. A joint steering committee between the Department of Infrastructure and TMR has been established for the preparation of the business case and have agreed governance arrangements. The steering committee is currently looking to appoint a project manager, and further planning is expected to be completed up until 2022.

2. ARTC to include a presentation at a future meeting on how PPPs work.
  - ▶ SF to provide an update on the PPP model at this meeting.
3. ARTC to liaise with Bolton Clarke Carrington retirement home regarding project attendance at their upcoming Family Day.
  - ▶ Complete – Family Day cancelled due to COVID-19 concerns.
4. ARTC to provide information to the Members regarding community concerns about property devaluation as a result of Inland Rail.
  - ▶ Complete.
5. ARTC to include a presentation regarding flora and fauna investigations and feedback from conservation groups at an upcoming meeting.
  - ▶ MM to provide an update at this meeting.
6. ARTC to provide information at a future meeting regarding environmental standards within State Development Areas.
  - ▶ Complete.
7. Notification to the community as to the outcome of the request to the Office of the Coordinator General on the K2ARB project approval pathway.
  - ▶ Ongoing.

#### 4 **Gowrie to Kagaru Public Private Partnership**

- ▶ SF explained that his role involves managing the procurement phase and the external interaction with the bidding teams for this project.
- ▶ SF provided a presentation on why G2K has been procured as a PPP:
  - ▶ A Public Private Partnership (PPP) is a model for the contract between ARTC and the private sector. The decision to proceed with a PPP was taken by the Federal Government in 2017, working with ARTC and informed by the characteristics of the G2K project. There are three projects bundled between Gowrie to Kagaru i.e. Gowrie to Helidon, Helidon to Calvert and Calvert to Kagaru. Scale is an important factor for pursuing a PPP, hence the bundling approach was taken.
  - ▶ There are three tunnels within G2K, the largest of which is through the Toowoomba Range, which is approximately 6.5km long. G2K is the most complex stage of Inland Rail, in terms of engineering complexity. This includes:
    - ▶ 133km of rail
    - ▶ 11 crossing loops
    - ▶ 51 bridges
    - ▶ 11 viaducts
    - ▶ approximately 12km of structures
    - ▶ three tunnels, totalling about 8.5km
    - ▶ significant earthworks and
    - ▶ many millions of cut and fill formation.

- ▶ A PPP model is an optimised risk transfer. It is an output-based technical specification, whereby financiers' involvement introduces additional discipline in project planning. The private sector is required to self-finance construction – the Government/ARTC does not begin payment until the private sector has satisfied all Design and Construct-related contractual obligations. The very substantial private capital at risk (debt and equity) provides a much greater incentive to perform than exists on a Design and Construct contract.
- ▶ PPPs have proven to be a very effective model for achieving excellent and innovative design outcomes. This is critical for Inland Rail, given the significant technical challenges and complexities associated with the Gowrie to Helidon project. The design innovation is a function of the highly competitive PPP procurement process, the output-based brief, the commercial model and the 'whole of life' approach to design.
- ▶ The PPP project includes a proposed maintenance term of 25 years. Maintenance quality is preserved for the duration of the PPP contract, including effective transfer of maintenance/whole of life risks, and is reinforced by detailed requirements relating to handback condition at the end of the 25-year contract term. This minimises the risk of assets being handed back to ARTC in poor condition.

#### Questions and discussion

- ▶ SC asked if the PPP covered C2K only or the whole corridor.
  - ▶ SF advised that the PPP covers Gowrie to Kagaru (G2K).
- ▶ LS asked if the PPP was going to be successful, and who had applied for it.
  - ▶ SF advised that there was a short-list which is confidential, but we hope to be going to the request for proposals stage of the project soon. It is hoped to be successful – we are leveraging best practice with precedent projects, we have good engagement with our bidding parties and have strong support from stakeholders within the company and the Federal Government.
- ▶ LS queried risk management if any damage or legal actions were to occur.
  - ▶ SF advised that this was a complex question and it depended on which stakeholder is involved. However, if it is about delivery risk, those risks are transferred to the project companies. For other stakeholders, such as the state and local authorities, the position in terms of liability is under discussion to reach an agreed position.
- ▶ The Chair asked about the timing for the PPP.
  - ▶ SF advised ARTC was planning to go to market with a request for proposals (RFP) before the end of the year. The RFP month period would typically be six to seven months, followed by several months for evaluation and selection for a preferred bidder and a further short period to finalise the contract.

#### 5 Project update

- ▶ KR thanked DG and the team at Algester Sports Club for their efforts in organising a face-to-face CCC meeting, which was then changed to an online meeting due to recent COVID-19 cases in south Brisbane and Logan.
- ▶ KR congratulated the Chair on his appointment.
- ▶ KR provided a K2ARB project update:
  - ▶ K2ARB is a rail enhancement project, meaning works undertaken are to allow 1,800m double-stacked freight trains to travel along the alignment.
  - ▶ The project aims to retain all of our permanent enhancement works within the existing rail corridor and therefore does not anticipate any private property acquisitions.

- ▶ K2ARB is currently in 'phase 2' in the project life cycle, producing a reference design, conducting environmental investigations and producing primary approvals documentation during this phase.
- ▶ The current project timeline, includes a construction start in 2023, following project approval and production of detailed design.
- ▶ Engineering investigations have been completed on site, including geotechnical investigations, topographical survey, contaminated soil testing and utilities investigations.
- ▶ Environmental studies, including flora and fauna, cultural heritage and heritage studies have been completed.
- ▶ Air quality monitoring which assesses the baseline air quality is ongoing to November 2020, providing up to 12 months of data across three sites. This is supplemented by 12 months of data from three State Government monitoring stations.
- ▶ Baseline noise and vibration data is completed on site and being used to assess impacts and potential treatments which we propose to share with you later this year.
- ▶ Social impact assessment survey and workshops have been undertaken with community and stakeholder organisations and the data received is being used to inform the Social Impact Assessment report.
- ▶ Primary approvals
  - ▶ ARTC has made an application to the Office of the Coordinator-General for Coordinated Project status, which would require ARTC to complete an environmental impact statement. ARTC is awaiting notification of the outcome of this application.
  - ▶ Regardless of the decision, the documentation will be produced to the same standard as an Environmental Impact Statement.
  - ▶ This work is currently underway by consultants who are reviewing the output of the baseline investigations and are undertaking modelling activities. This includes modelling the likely impacts, including air, noise and vibration and then developing potential mitigations.
  - ▶ ARTC plans to share these potential impacts and mitigations with the community in the last quarter of this year.
- ▶ Community consultation
  - ▶ In spite of COVID-19, the engagement team has been working hard to find ways to continue to engage with the community and the committee, so that the design and approvals we're working on continue to be informed by your concerns.
  - ▶ We encourage the community to continue to utilise your committee representatives to raise any concerns you may have.
- ▶ Loop locations due diligence
  - ▶ ARTC has undertaken a high level of engineering assessment of alternative locations to consider these options are viable from an operations perspective. The output of these assessments will inform the decision on whether the loop locations can be amended.
  - ▶ We hope to have information to share on this in the last quarter of this year.

#### Questions and discussion

- ▶ The Chair sought clarification of the meaning of the word "loop".
  - ▶ KR advised that a passing or crossing loop is a track installed next to the main track for about two kilometres to allow one train to pull over and another to pass in the opposite direction.

#### Engineering studies and design update

- ▶ PS provided an update on some of the engineering work that has been progressed:
- ▶ Clarified that 'reference design' can also be called a 'feasibility design'. Its purpose is to ensure the project going forward can meet its objectives.
- ▶ Confirmed all permanent works can be accommodated within the existing rail corridor boundary.
- ▶ Topographical survey

- ▶ We have undertaken a topographical survey, in which surveyors measure all of the features than can be seen and touched on the ground in the rail corridor.
- ▶ The survey has confirmed that all our works e.g. earthworks, track lowerings or crossing loops will fit inside the fence lines.
- ▶ Geotechnical survey
  - ▶ We have undertaken a geotechnical survey to examine the conditions below the ground, including the potential for finding water that might come through a cutting when we cut down.
  - ▶ Existing geological conditions will support the proposed works; however, some additional retaining will be required at a number of sites. These retaining solutions include retaining walls, shotcrete and soil nails, aiming to stay within the fence lines.
- ▶ Flood study
  - ▶ We are assessing the impact of proposed works on existing flood conditions.
  - ▶ The existing situation is modelled and checked against recorded events.
  - ▶ If there is a potential change to flood conditions, we will contact the impacted landowner/s by the end of this year.
- ▶ Utilities
  - ▶ We have identified underground and overhead utilities using survey, dial before you dig and potholing
  - ▶ Potholing works have been underway in recent days.
  - ▶ We will work with utilities owners to ensure proposed design solutions accommodate any necessary asset protection or relocation, working to maintain continuity of service to the community throughout construction and operation.
  - ▶ This includes a water main at the Learoyd Road Bridge track lowering site, and some gas and water services on an old services bridge crossing the track at the Johnson Road track lowering site. A temporary road closure may be required for the relocation works.
- ▶ Construction interface with the community
  - ▶ There are two key constraints to the construction process:
    - ▶ the width of the existing corridor and
    - ▶ the need to maintain an operational railway during the construction period.
  - ▶ Some of the proposed works can be undertaken during the day and other works will require closure of the railway for an agreed number of hours to undertake the work.
  - ▶ Mitigation of impacts during the construction phase is being investigated and will continue to be developed as the project progresses. These include:
    - ▶ actively trying to reduce the amount of night works
    - ▶ mitigation plans for light, noise and dust pollution
    - ▶ working with councils on concept of construction traffic impacts and materials management plans.
  - ▶ There may be temporary land requirements for construction outside of the corridor e.g. laydown areas.

### Environment update

- ▶ MM presented an environmental update:
  - ▶ Ecological surveys
    - ▶ ARTC had planned on providing an update on flora and fauna at the May CCC meeting, but as this was cancelled due to COVID-19, we contacted 10 local conservation or local government authorities to discuss their interest in engaging with ARTC to discuss the results. Presentations occurred with some groups, but due to COVID-19 concerns there was limited uptake. We committed to engaging with these groups as the project proceeds through the reference design stage.
    - ▶ Three specific survey campaigns undertaken:
      - ▶ 2016 – Phase 1 reference stage investigations
      - ▶ 2018 – enhancement work areas and



- ▶ 2020 – detailed surveys within the Glider Forest near the proposed track lowering at Johnson Road.
- ▶ Key results
  - ▶ All permanent infrastructure will be located within the existing rail corridor; therefore, there is no need for land resumption or additional clearing outside the rail corridor.
  - ▶ The Queensland Government has mapped the entire corridor as ‘non-remnant’. Approximately 83% of the enhancement work areas consist of predominantly introduced grasslands vegetation and approx. 17% of regrowth vegetation.
  - ▶ Invasive and declared weed species – eight invasive weeds (eg common lantana) and six invasive fauna species (e.g. cane toads, foxes, etc) identified. No fire ants were observed when the surveys were undertaken; however, ARTC will have all of the necessary permits and plans in place for movement of machinery in/out of the corridor, and managing spoil disposal (i.e. excess materials transported out of the corridor).
  - ▶ Habitat for threatened species – suitable habitat identified for both Commonwealth and State species, being the koala and Greater Glider. There was suitable habitat identified within the enhancement work areas. Surveys identified approx. 2.2ha Greater Glider and approx. 4.2ha of koala habitat, noting that this habitat consisted of regrowth vegetation only.
  - ▶ No individuals were sighted during the survey program, however there was potential evidence that both gliders and koalas used these areas as evidenced by animal scatts, suitable habitat types and nesting locations and the presence of scratch marks on trees.
- ▶ Air quality
  - ▶ Three monitoring stations installed in the study area (Algester, Boronia Heights and Flagstone), with the program due for decommissioning in November 2020. The program also included dust deposition and diesel particulate monitoring.
  - ▶ The findings show a strong correlation with the baseline air quality results and the results from three government stations. This provides a high level of certainty that the monitoring program is representative of the receiving environment and that we can draw upon long term air quality trends by the nearby government-run monitoring stations.
  - ▶ As the next step, ARTC will be undertaking operational modelling.
- ▶ Baseline noise and vibration monitoring
  - ▶ noise loggers installed at 10 locations and vibration monitors installed at six locations to measure background noise and vibration levels.
  - ▶ Attended monitoring occurred at 20 locations, to allow further correlation of noise sources as well as to provide infill assessment of the study area.
  - ▶ A draft baseline report is being prepared.
  - ▶ Monitors were located at the following distances:
    - ▶ 25 – 70m from the rail line in the northern and central sections of the alignment for noise and vibration loggers.
    - ▶ 600 – 650m from the rail line in the southern section for noise loggers. This is representative of the rural location and sparse number of sensitive receptors. No vibration monitoring was undertaken in the southern section of the rail corridor due to the rural location and the distance of the sensitive receptors.
- ▶ Next steps
  - ▶ Operational air quality, noise and vibration modelling will now be undertaken to determine potential impacts from both construction and operations. Two scenarios will be modelled:
    - ▶ 2025 – commissioning of Inland Rail
    - ▶ 2040 – typical rail operations at their forecasted peak train movements.
  - ▶ We will work with State Government agencies to develop appropriate management and mitigation measures. These mitigation measures will be progressed during the next stage of project design. We are planning further engagement activities that are scheduled for later this year, where we will share the findings of the studies and discuss the proposed mitigations.

### Questions and discussion

- ▶ SC asked if ARTC could investigate alternative locations for crossing loops, given community concerns about the current locations.
  - ▶ KR replied that ARTC was undertaking additional work to consider alternative locations for the new crossing loops. ARTC has done some geographic, environmental and operational studies and have a few more environmental studies to undertake to determine whether the options are viable. ARTC hopes to be able to share this information later this year.
  
- ▶ SC asked whether ARTC had considered the Logan Motorway for use as an alternative rail corridor.
  - ▶ KR advised that, to her knowledge, this had not occurred. She explained that the justification for using the existing rail corridor was to mitigate new impacts and reduce those impacts on the community. ARTC can look into this further and provide a more detailed answer about whether this was considered.

**ACTION: ARTC to advise if the Logan Motorway had been considered as an alternative rail corridor.**

*Postscript: SC clarified that the intended question was, “Has ARTC carried out structural design checks on the rail bridge over the Logan Motorway and other bridge and viaduct structures on the K2ARB route to ensure that they are capable of carrying the increased Inland Rail train loads?”*
  
- ▶ SC asked whether ARTC had considered bridge replacements as some of the other projects are doing, as opposed to lowering the track under the bridges.
  - ▶ KR advised that these were considered at a high level at the phase 1 concept assessment stage. Bridge works/replacement requires assessment of road approaches, and likely means closures to the road and potential impacts to the road corridor and possibly adjacent private properties, as well as potential impacts to nearby intersections and property access, if roads were changed or closed. Track lowering aims to keep all of the permanent impacts of the work within the existing rail corridor.
  
- ▶ SC asked about the appetite for the PPP if the K2ARB project is yet to receive an environmental approvals pathway and ultimately an approval.
  - ▶ KR advised that as a program, there had been market-sounding activities undertaken; however, as the question was outside of her remit and PPP representatives had left the meeting, the question was taken on notice.

**ACTION: ARTC to advise how it would affect the PPP if the K2ARB section were not approved.**
  
- ▶ SC asked whether ARTC or TMR were responsible for the fences bordering the rail and the residents. Due to the high-density residential suburbs, some of these fences are in a poor state of repair and people use the actual corridor. Residents would like to see better fencing.
  - ▶ PS responded that fencing was the responsibility of the rail infrastructure manager there i.e. ARTC for our corridor. We are leasing that corridor off TMR. There is a process available for raising issues about fencing, which is via Enviroline, which we will share after the meeting.

**ACTION: ARTC to provide the contact details for Enviroline.**

*Postscript: SC clarified that maintenance was required to protect children, pets and stock.*
  
- ▶ LS queried how air quality would be mitigated.
  - ▶ MM responded that this would be looked at in two phases:
    - ▶ In the construction phase standard mitigation measures would be employed, including managing dust, water, minimising the disturbance footprint etc.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ In the operational phase, if the modelling indicate there is a potential exceedance, we'll look at locomotive upgrades etc.</li> </ul>
6	<p><b>Communication and engagement update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ LJ provided a communication and engagement update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Engagement activities undertaken from May – July 2020, included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ an informal catch up with CCC members</li> <li>▶ online community information sessions,</li> <li>▶ Social Impact Assessment (SIA) workshops</li> <li>▶ SIA community survey</li> <li>▶ business workshops to inform our SIA</li> <li>▶ a project e-news</li> <li>▶ Project Manager update video</li> <li>▶ key stakeholder meetings and</li> <li>▶ landowner meetings.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Upcoming engagement on findings of the environmental investigations, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ workshops</li> <li>▶ SIA workshop to discuss potential mitigation measures and preliminary SIA findings</li> <li>▶ landowner and key stakeholder meetings</li> <li>▶ community information sessions on the findings of our environmental investigation – hoping to hold community information sessions face-to-face, pending COVID-19 guidelines and</li> <li>▶ a project newsletter which will be letterbox dropped to the project area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ LJ requested CCC members provide feedback regarding how they would like to be engaged regarding the upcoming environmental investigations e.g. workshops about particular interest areas.  <b>ACTION: ARTC to share the CCC presentation with members.</b></li> <li>▶ NM provided an update on the CCC membership renewal process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ CCC members were appointed for a term of two years and K2ARB CCC is now coming up to the end of the initial two-year term as the first meeting was held in November 2018. The process for doing this will be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ We will call for nominations for people who would like to be a CCC member around October.</li> <li>▶ The call for nominations will be advertised via email, local newspaper ads and on our website. The nominations will be open for a month.</li> <li>▶ We will send the current members information with all the details of how to re-apply for the CCC as we are very keen for you to consider doing so. We have seen some fantastic representation from the committee over the last two years and we are very keen to see that continue.</li> <li>▶ The current committee will sit for the 2 November meeting.</li> <li>▶ We will aim to complete the process and advise nominees if they have been successful before Christmas.</li> <li>▶ Our first meeting with the new committee will be in February 2021. It is our intention that the CCC would continue up until the point that we obtain statutory approval for the project.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
7	<p><b>General business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair opened the session to general business from the CCC members.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ AP asked what fauna movement design features were planned for the corridor and what information was being collected about fauna species impacted along the current rail corridor. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ MM advised that ARTC's primary consultant had carried out baseline assessments throughout 2018 and 2020 to add to the data collected in the concept phase. This included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Field-verified vegetation mapping, both in existing and adjacent corridors.</li> <li>▶ The field-verified data from the survey indicated there was no remnant vegetation within the enhancement work areas where the construction works will occur. There was only a small percentage of regrowth and weeds; most of it was introduced grasslands.</li> <li>▶ The two fauna species of interest to K2ARB at both the Federal and State level are the koala and the Greater Glider, from a threatened-species perspective.</li> <li>▶ Regarding fauna connectivity, we are currently working through the reference design, such as potential mitigation measures that could be employed. This could include culverts or glider poles and rope ladders etc. We need to go through a process of determining their suitability for an enhancement project as we are very constrained from the engineering aspects of it. As this is an operational rail corridor, there are specific health and safety requirements that must be undertaken regarding any measures put in place.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ LS raised a question on behalf of community member in Algester regarding what ARTC would say to a resident of an aged care facility regarding the expected impacts of 45 trains per day. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ KR advised ARTC had carried out consultation with residents in aged care facilities. ARTC is aware there will be impacts, and we are going to work through what those impacts might be and find the best possible way that we can help to mitigate them.</li> <li>▶ KR advised that ARTC did not yet have all the answers and she appreciated that was frustrating for the community, but the team was working towards getting the answers through the environmental investigations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
8	<p><b>Conclusion and confirmation of actions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ LJ confirmed the actions for the meeting as per the action list below.</li> <li>▶ LJ noted that SC had emailed a list of questions prior to the meeting, which will be responded to and circulated to the CCC members.</li> <li>▶ The Chair thanked the presenters and everyone for attending the meeting or listening from home and noted that the next meeting is planned for 2 November 2020, at Jimboomba Hall.</li> <li>▶ The Chair closed the meeting.</li> </ul>

## Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY
1	ARTC to report back to the members regarding progress on the development of a business case regarding a dedicated freight line to the Port of Brisbane.	ARTC
2	Investigate if the Logan Motorway had been considered as an alternative rail corridor.	ARTC
3	Advise how it would affect the PPP if the K2ARB section were not approved.	ARTC
4	Provide the contact details for Enviroline.	ARTC
5	Share the CCC presentation with members.	ARTC