

<b>Meeting title</b>	<b>Inner Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee: Meeting 3</b>		
<b>Attendees:</b>			
Ken Murphy (KM)	Acting Chair		
Joy Mingay (JM)	Toowoomba Chamber of Commerce		
Lance McManus (LM)	Toowoomba and Surat Basin Enterprise		
Larry Pappin (LP)	Inner Downs Inland Rail Action Group		
Paul Hanlon (PH)	Individual		
Jennifer Schmidt (JS)	Individual		
John Cameron (JCa)	Darling Downs Cotton Growers and Cotton Australia		
Ian Jones (IJ)	Darling Downs Shire Steering Committee		
Rob Loch (RL)	Pittsworth District Landcare Association		
Jason Chavasse (JCh)	Gowrie Junction Progress Association		
Kylie Schultz (KS)	Individual		
Geoff Penton (GP)	Queensland Murray-Darling Committee		
David Taylor (DT)	Individual		
Chris Joseph (CJ)	Individual		
Rebecca Pickering (RP)	ARTC Director, Community and Engagement - Inland Rail		
Mercedes Staff (MS)	ARTC Manager Stakeholder Engagement – Queensland		
Rob Smith (RS)	ARTC Project Manager – Border to Gowrie		
Fiona Kennedy (FK)	ARTC Environment Advisor – Border to Gowrie		
Jon Roberts (JR)	ARTC Design Manager - Border to Gowrie		
Willow Hart (WH)	ARTC Engagement Lead - Border to Gowrie (Inner)		
Laura Jarman (LJ)	ARTC Engagement Lead – Border to Gowrie (Southern)		
Naomi Tonscheck (NT)	ARTC Engagement Advisor – Border to Gowrie (Inner)		
Martin Boshoff (MB)	FFJV Group Lead - Water		
<b>Apologies:</b>			
Adrian Beattie	Western Wakka Wakka		
<b>Location</b>	Southbrook Community Hall, Southbrook	<b>Secretariat</b>	Willow Hart
<b>Date</b>	4 September 2018	<b>Time</b>	6:00 – 8.30pm

<b>1. Welcome (Ken Murphy)</b>	<p>Welcomed members and observers and introduced himself as acting Chair for the meeting</p> <p>Acknowledged the substantial increase in ARTC staff at the meeting and how this is a sign of what stage we are at with the project which now requires more feet on the ground</p> <p>Invited committee members and ARTC staff members to introduce themselves and explain who they are representing in the community or what their role is with ARTC</p>
------------------------------------	--

	<p>Acknowledged and thanked Graham Clapham for filling in as Chair at the last few meetings</p> <p>Acknowledged and thanked Professor Steven Raine for his contributions to the Inland Rail IDD CCC committee and for establishing a process that will ensure nothing is stalled and continues to move forward. Passed on everyone's condolences to Professor Raine's family.</p>
<p><b>2. Update conflicts of interest register</b></p>	<p>No additions or changes to the register.</p>
<p><b>3. Actions arising from last meeting</b></p>	<p>Actions from previous meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ARTC to investigate whether Simon Eldridge committed to looking into paying for landowners to seek legal advice on the Property Access Form.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. RS advised that ARTC would not pay legal fees for this purpose.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. ARTC to investigate opportunities for CCC cross-representation for JCh.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. JCh is a standing invitee to the Lockyer Valley CCC.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Members to provide advice to ARTC about how best to communicate with your community.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. This item remains open.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. ARTC to provide detail around biosecurity and weed/seed washdown procedures.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. FK to advise (see below).</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. ARTC to report on whether a fatal flaws report has been developed.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. ARTC has not developed a Fatal Flaws report.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p><i>New discussion and actions</i></p> <p>CCC members raised concerns about ARTC and contractor vehicles not being branded while in the field - biosecurity issue and a safety issue. CCC requested ARTC consider placing magnets on all ARTC and contractor vehicles.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> ARTC to provide a written response to CCC within 2 days about the identification on vehicles.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> CCC members encouraged to inform their communities to call ARTC if they have concerns about contractors.</p> <p>CCC members raised concerns about the weed hygiene and ARTC's weed management policy (public and private land).</p> <p>FK: ARTC and contractors only enter sites, subject to site access procedures and landowner agreements. Before we undertake any site investigations, ARTC do ecological field reconnaissance to determine where the high-risk areas are.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> ARTC to circulate information about weed management policy and more information about washdown facilities.</p> <p>CCC acknowledged the project update emailed to the committee prior to the meeting was beneficial.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> ARTC to continue to provide project updates prior to meeting.</p>

4. Project update  
(B2G project team:  
Rob Smith)

**NSW/QLD Border to Gowrie (B2G) project – RS**

*Note: also refer to project update*

B2G project team have been meeting with government agencies, carrying out technical investigations and where possible, incorporating community feedback to inform the design.

Initial alignment investigation works for B2G are progressing. This has allowed the B2G project team 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. There are approx. 250 private landowners within the focused area of investigation.

In some areas, the focused area of investigation is down to approximately 100 metres, and a bit wider in other areas. The focused area of investigation allows us to give people some certainty of where we are looking and what we are doing.

The alignment may change as a result of our technical investigations. We will continue to inform the community of these changes.

EIS field studies and geotechnical investigations commenced in July 2018 and will be continuing over the coming months.

Geotechnical investigations are being carried out by Golders. The Geotech works include core sample drilling, installation of groundwater monitoring and walk-through inspections for cultural heritage, flora and fauna. We are preparing to start on the baseline monitoring for noise and air quality. There are also other specialists in the area doing cultural heritage works on behalf of ARTC.

Work is progressing on designing the structures for the B2G section of the Inland Rail including earthworks, bridges, interchanges and level crossings.

*Questions and discussion*

DT asked what criteria was used to define the alignment.

- B2G project team responded by saying they have looked at topography, existing roads, community impacts, impacts to farmland, land severance and the operational requirements for the ongoing rail. Community impact is also a consideration. These factors have been taken into account when focusing the area of investigation. The B2G project team has carried out engineering work to determine what is a feasible alignment. The next step is to consult with landowners in the focused area of investigation to understand how their property works and how this potential alignment would impact their property. This feedback will be fed into the ongoing design development.

The criteria can be found at [inlandrail.artc.com.au/documents/documents](http://inlandrail.artc.com.au/documents/documents) under the Process to Refine the Route.

**ACTION:** ARTC to send MCA factsheet link to the CCC.

**Gowrie to Helidon (G2H) project update – RS**

G2H is at a similar point in the design development and EIS approval, as the B2G project. G2H has had its 30 percent design delivery milestone delivered by Future Freight Joint Venture. G2H has started its geotechnical bore hole and overall

	<p>Geotech campaign. These works will be taking place between Morris Road, Gowrie Junction through to Helidon from October 2018 until approximately March 2019.</p>
<p><b>5. EIS process update (B2G project team: Fiona Kennedy)</b></p>	<p>Submissions closed on 18 June 2018 for the draft Terms of Reference (ToR). The Office of Coordinator General (OCG) has advised that they received 97 submissions - 12 from government agencies, two from the councils and the remainder from the public. The submissions covered all the themes in the draft ToR.</p> <p>Since June 2018, the OCG has been considering the submissions and the ToR is expected to be finalised in the coming days.</p> <p>Data from government databases is being used for our investigations. The next lot of investigations will include ecological investigations, noise and vibration monitoring; and we expect to undertake the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) survey when the final terms of reference is released.</p>
<p><b>6. Hydrology and flood study update</b></p>	<p>MB provided an overview of flood modelling for the B2G project.</p> <p>The flood models are used to set levels for the first alignment, consider the size of cross-drainage, bridge openings and culvert sizes, and carry out flood impact assessment. The flood impact assessment is used to help understand the impacts, so that we can mitigate against those impacts.</p> <p>Our objective is to apply the industry best practice and utilise most up-to-date rainfall and streamflow data. We are applying the Australian Rainfall and Run-off 2016 (ARR) guidelines.</p> <p>The B2G project crosses the Macintyre River, Condamine floodplain, the Westbrook catchment, Dry Creek and then Gowrie Creek.</p> <p>Assessment methodology perspective involves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ gathering available data such as rainfall and streamflow data</li> <li>○ consulting with relevant local authorities and State Government organisations in possession of existing hydrology and hydraulic models</li> <li>○ undertaking site walkovers to understand the local land use and identify existing hydraulic structures (bridges, culverts and roads and so on)</li> <li>○ developing hydrology and hydraulic computer models. Where possible, we calibrate and validate those computer models using historic and anecdotal information. These are used to establish baseline flood conditions.</li> </ul> <p>Developing a feasibility design and assessing potential impacts is an iterative process. When we start looking into designs we will test the design and then ask questions such as "Do we need to increase a bridge opening; do we need to add more culverts?"</p> <p>The overall design objective is to manage existing flow paths and to maintain existing flow paths. We assess potential flood impacts by quantifying things like changes in flood extent, potential changes in level, changes in velocity and changes in duration of inundation. The flood models assess all these things and give an overall picture of potential change.</p> <p>We also undertake sensitivity analysis in our model.</p> <p>We look at the potential for a catchment to mobilise and transport debris and material that could potentially lead to blockages. And then in our design, we</p>

factor a blockage assessment and make an allowance for potential blockages by oversizing, cross-drainage structures.

As part of the design development we will also look at erosion and scalar control and potential climate change impact.

*Questions and discussion*

RL: Westbrook Creek and Dry Creek do not have any models or validated survey flood markers. How do you work in that case? And where are you getting the data for "cracking clay soils" from?

MB: On the actual creek there aren't any streamflow gauges that we were able to identify, so we are using an "analogue catchment". We are using the downstream part of Gowrie Creek which has got two streamflow gauges as an analogue, so we calibrate Gowrie Creek hydrology models and then use the parameters for the Westbrook Creek model. After this the sensitivity analysis takes place. Where there is no gauge data we follow industry standards.

MB: We are using critical velocities for the soils and critical flow shear stress for erosion risk.

MB: We are not yet at the stage for gathering data for "cracking clay soils". The geological data needs to feed into that process.

MB: The hydraulic models will pick up turbulence, as well as velocity change, average velocity change.

MB: The models we are using in the major catchments are two-dimensional models in Two-Flow. Two Flow can be refined to half a metre.

DT: How do you work when you can't validate models? Dry Creek bounds my property.

MB: If we aren't measuring the flow, we can't calibrate. We are using the Gowrie Creek streamflow gauges for model.

DT: suggest assumptions will be a long way off.

**MB provided an update on the Condamine floodplain crossing solution**

We have undertaken calibration and validation of the Condamine flood model. We have met with landowners to validate the model and to talk about modelling results, as well as to see how if the model reflects reality.

Our intention is to take initial thoughts around design options out to the community in October. We are running a little bit behind program; mainly due to the complexities involved with the flood modelling.

The final results of the design development and our model as a tool, is subject to the release of the final Terms of Reference. The details of the Terms of Reference will feed that into the design process before we can take out a final preferred solution to the community. We are testing a number of options but a preferred crossing solution for the Condamine has not yet been identified.

The study is not just a flood study. There are multiple disciplines feeding into this process including the heritage assessments, all the environmental assessments, surface water sampling; assessment of public and rail crossing.

The flood model includes a number of tributaries of the Condamine River, like the Rocky Creek and Hermitage Creek and Battle Creek. Our flood models are now calibrated to the 2010 event, which in statistical terms is considered to be close to "1 per cent, or one in 1-year flood". We have calibrated the model to two flood events: a relatively small event and then a large event.

We have gathered flood survey markers from 30 individual Condamine floodplain landowners. The flood markers are used as part of the process to validate the model.

We use a historical event to calibrate the model. Once we are confident that we can replicate a historic event, then we can use that model for design purposes.

We have also used a number of local gauges in the assessment. The Condamine is well-gauged from a rainfall and streamflow perspective.

A blockage assessment has been undertaken using the Australian Rainfall and Run-off 2016 Blockage Guidelines.

We also recognise that the cropping patterns on the Condamine floodplain plays a big role in terms of how water moves around, and this is factored into the model.

The flood model has received very positive feedback from the directly-affected landowners to date.

The next steps involve looking at all options: viaduct through to bridge, embankment and culvert solutions.

No preferred solution has been decided as yet.

#### *Questions and discussion*

- LP questioned the price difference between a full viaduct solution and a culvert solution, and how this would influence the final decision.

RS: We are working towards finding the best solution that minimises impacts and is going to be acceptable to the local landowners, upstream and downstream. Impacts include positive and negative afflux. We are trying to work towards a solution that is fit-for-purpose and the most cost effective. We will be talking to landowners about potential flood changes and whether they would consider these acceptable or not. There is a cost impact with a full viaduct. This does not change the way we progress, we are still working towards that optimal solution.

- GP requested more information about initial model runs.

MB: The flood models are in different stages of progression. The Condamine flood model is the most refined. Gowrie Creek and Westbrook Creek models are still under development. We haven't presented any flood modelling results to the State agencies for B2G.

- RL whether the model had been externally validated with government agencies.

RS: Agency landowners such as TMR and DNRME which own land in the area and are impacted by any potential crossing solution will be consulted and engaged as part of going out to landowners. Their feedback will be incorporated in the model and design.

**7. Consultation and communication**

WH provided an overview of recent community engagement on the B2G project.

The B2G project team has been meeting with landowners about gaining voluntary access to properties for environmental investigation and studies.

We have heard from the community that they would like more information about the works we are carrying out. We have now sent out the first B2G e-newsletter and sent out a geotechnical investigations and field studies update.

We will commence contacting landowners potentially impacted by the B2G focused area of investigation in September 2018 prior to public announcement.

Engagement with road authorities and landowners will also begin occurring to assist in determining the use of the land and likely access options and capture current use of the land and details of any existing infrastructure that may be impacted/needs to be considered.

Naomi and I are based in our Toowoomba office, which is currently on Neil Street.

*Questions and discussion*

- RL requested two weeks' notice prior to works commencing.
- **ACTION:** to ask ARTC that in future, any work program will be publicised at least two weeks prior to commencement.
- **ACTION:** ARTC to include information about site restoration in notifications.
- GP requested more information about sponsorship and social investment activities.
- **ACTION:** ARTC to provide an update about sponsorship and social investment at the next meeting.

**LJ provided an update on the Condamine floodplain crossing engagement**

The project team has carried out meetings to validate the flood model with a number of landowners whose properties were surveyed for historic flood markers. The model was well received at these meetings and we received feedback that it accurately reflects existing flood behaviour.

As the next step, the team will update the flood model based on feedback in the validation meetings and run a number of preliminary design solutions to identify which properties may experience potential changes to flood behaviour (i.e. levels, velocities, duration etc.).

In early October, we will be meeting with landowners to talk through results of a potential preliminary design solution and discuss the degree of change to flood behaviour with them. Priority will be given to those landowners whose buildings are predicted to be affected by positive afflux (increased water level).

After consulting with landowners, we will be in a position to determine the preliminary design solution and share the results with key stakeholders, landowners, the community consultative committees and broader community.

## 8. General business

**Livestock management during the construction**

JS: Raised a concern about how will stock control be undertaken during construction. The community do not have the acreage within these small holdings to move stock to another section of their holding.

Mr Clapham's reply was "do not underestimate the goodwill of ARTC. They will agist your cattle while they go through your property." On what basis is the chairman empowered to make this offer on behalf of ARTC; or has he grossly misrepresented the way in which ARTC does business; and why has this happened?

- **ACTION:** ARTC to understand where Graham Clapham's comments about goodwill for stock control during construction came from and provide an update to the CCC.
- JS and RL: Is there a policy with respect to agisting cattle? *Refer to attachment 2 for JS points for ARTC to consider for agisting livestock.*
- **ACTION:** ARTC to provide an update about managing livestock during construction.

**Role of the Chair**

- RL: CCC requests clear guidelines for the role of the Chair. RL distributed suggestions for the role (*attachment 3*). Suggests Chair guidelines include ensuring meetings are conducted in accordance with normal protocols, committee members get their say, discussions are clarified and effective, relevant information comes from ARTC and action items are followed through. And the Chair will not attempt to influence decisions made by the committee

MS: There is a process for appointing a Committee Chair. ARTC will be commencing this process in line with the committee charter; and we will consider your suggestions in terms of more clarity around the role of the Chair.

- **ACTION:** RL to email copy of suggested CCC Chair guidelines to the committee.
- **ACTION:** ARTC to commence process to appoint a new Chair.

**The Pittsworth Sentinel**

- JS: provided a copy of the paper and highlighted the letter to the editor which talks about the cumulative impacts of Inland Rail and the drought, on mental health.

**Field trip**

- JCh: requested a field trip.
- **ACTION:** JCh to provide more information about what they would like included in the field trip.

**Independent review of flood modelling**

- KM: Graham Clapham, SDD CCC, has put forward a name to undertake an independent review of the flood modelling.
- **ACTION:** CCC to discuss SDD CCC recommendation for independent review of flood modelling at the next meeting.

	<p><b>Next meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Late October/early November 2018. 6 – 8pm in Gowrie. CCC would like an updated on the focused area of investigation and flood modelling.</li> </ul>
<p><b>9. Close and confirmation of actions</b></p>	<p>Meeting closed at 8.30pm</p> <p>Actions arising from this meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ARTC to provide a written response to CCC within 2 days about the identification on vehicles.</li> <li>CCC members encouraged to inform their communities to call ARTC if they have concerns about contractors.</li> <li>ARTC to circulate information about weed management policy and more information about washdown facilities.</li> <li>ARTC to provide project update prior to meeting – ongoing.</li> <li>ARTC to send MCA factsheet link to the CCC.</li> <li>ARTC to notify about works two weeks prior to commencement.</li> <li>ARTC to include information about site restoration in notifications.</li> <li>ARTC to provide more information about sponsorship and social investment activities at the next meeting.</li> <li>ARTC to understand where Graham Clapham’s comments about goodwill for stock control during construction came from and provide an update to the CCC.</li> <li>ARTC to provide update about managing livestock during construction.</li> <li>JCh to provide more information about what they would like included in the field trip.</li> <li>RL to email copy of suggested CCC Chair guidelines to the committee.</li> <li>ARTC to commence process to appoint a new chair.</li> <li>CCC to discuss SDD CCC recommendation for independent review of flood modelling at the next meeting.</li> <li>Ongoing - members to provide advice to ARTC about how best to communicate with your community.</li> </ul>

**Attachment 1: Conflict of interest declaration**

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

**Attachment 2: JS livestock management concerns**

If ARTC’s project makes it necessary for the landowner to agist their livestock during the construction of Inland Rail, there are concerns we the landowners need to have addressed.

1. Where will this agistment be? We are in a tick free zone here and hence cattle in particular would need a tick free zone as 99% of cattle in this area are not vaccinated with 3 germ and it is extremely risky to vaccinate older cattle let alone pregnant cows.
2. Who will source the agistment?
3. Will this agistment paddock meet biosecurity standards and will it meet the relevant J BAS? rating of the stock holders home property.
4. Who will pay for the movement of said stock from and to their home place? “Cartage costs”
5. Who will be responsible for the stock whilst on agistment – feed and in particular water availability
6. Who will be responsible for the external and internal carrying of weed seeds and parasites between properties?
7. If for example stock need to be weaned, castrated, vaccinated, mated (AI) program whilst on agistment who pays for the travel, time, inconvenience etc of the owner to undertake such animal husbandry?
6. If movement of cattle is necessary - procedure must follow the steps outlined in the Australian Animal Welfare Standards and Guidelines.

7. If movement is necessary within the danger period - too close to calving or have too young a calf at foot to be transported – what happens then.
8. Who will do the reading of the NLIS tags on and off the agistment property?
9. Who will do the actual office work of transferring said tag numbers with the NLIS data base both to and from said properties?
10. Who will be responsible if cattle lose condition whilst on agistment?
11. Maintenance of the breeding herd is absolutely essential and simply selling off animals, especially a forced sale, is not an acceptable option.

ARTC needs to address these issues and act upon its said Goodwill. Let all landowner know where they stand. We the CCC committee need to have you address these concerns and provide us with written evidence that they are being addressed.

### **Attachment 3: RL suggestions for Chair role**

#### **ROLE OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS – AS SPELT OUT BY ARTC WHEN MEMBERS WERE ANNOUNCED**

As a Member of the Committee, you will:

- Receive briefings and updates on the Project;
- Discuss and provide comment or feedback on negotiable aspects of the Project;
- Represent community views regarding local issues, impacts and benefits; and
- Act as a conduit to provide information about the project to the broader community.

To ensure the Committee achieves its aims, members agree to the following principles:

- Respect the rights and views of other members;
- Provide constructive input; and
- Agree to disseminate information to and gather feedback from the community or group they represent.

#### **INDEPENDENT CHAIR – INFO PROVIDED BY ARTC WHEN COMMITTEES WERE ESTABLISHED**

The Committee will be facilitated by an independent person, referred to as the Chair, with the ARTC Project Team providing secretarial services and project expertise.

ARTC will appoint a suitable person to serve as independent Chair of the Committee for a period of two (2) years. A Chair will need to be an experienced facilitator and while he or she does not need to live within each project area, they do need to have an understanding of the region.

#### **SUGGESTED ROLE OF INDEPENDENT CHAIR – AS TABLED AT MEETING (SOUTHBROOK, 4 SEPT 2018)**

The chair shall ensure that:

- meetings are conducted in accordance with normal meeting protocols;
- all committee members are encouraged to ask questions and to raise issues without restrictions;
- discussions are clarified and effective;
- appropriate information is supplied by ARTC, with opportunities for points of clarification and discussion;
- any action items arising from votes taken by the committee will be followed through; and
- any public statements by the independent Chair are consistent with the stated independence of that position.

The chair shall not:

- attempt to influence decisions made by the committee;
- have a casting vote;



- take actions on behalf of the committee unless authorised to do so by a majority vote of the committee; and
- purport to speak on behalf of the committee unless authorised to do so by a majority vote of the committee.