

MEETING MINUTES

I2S Inland Rail Illabo to Stockinbingal Community Consultative Committee

DATE / TIME

28 November 2019
1pm

LOCATION

Junee Ex-Services Memorial Club

FACILITATOR

Garry West

MINUTE TAKER

Garry West

DISTRIBUTION

Illabo to Stockinbingal CCC

ATTENDEES

- ▶ Garry West (Independent Chair)
- ▶ Rod Chalmers (Community Member)
- ▶ James Coleborne (Community Member)
- ▶ Geoffrey Larsen (Community Member)
- ▶ Tony Nichols (Community Member)
- ▶ Heath Martin, Stakeholder Engagement Manager
- ▶ Cameron Simpkins, Project Director
- ▶ Rene Provis, Stakeholder Engagement Advisor
- ▶ Daniel Lumby, Senior Project Environmental Advisor
- ▶ Jody Meier, Social Performance Team Leader
- ▶ David Carter (NSW Farmers)
- ▶ Martin Honner (NSW Farmers)
- ▶ Cr Pamela Haliburton (Junee Shire Council)
- ▶ Grant Johnson (Junee Shire Council)
- ▶ Sharon Langman (Cootamundra-Gundagai Regional Council)
- ▶ Laura Schweiger (Cootamundra-Gundagai Regional Council)

APOLOGIES

- ▶ David Carr (Community Member)

GUESTS

- ▶ NIL

Discussions

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
1. Welcome	The Chair welcomed all to the meeting.
2. Declarations of Interest	Declarations received from Sharon Langman and Laura Schweiger, Cootamundra-Gundagai Regional Council representatives.
3. Minutes of Previous Meeting	It was noted that the minutes of the meeting on 8 August 2019 had been approved on 16 August 2019 and placed on the proponent's website.
4. Business Arising	The Chair noted the actions from the previous have been resolved: they are, hard copy of presentation provided for the meeting; overbridge heights will be review by Management Team in the detailed design phase; and health and wellbeing issues are listed on the agenda for the current meeting.
5. Correspondence	<p>NIL – Replies to letters tabled at previous meeting were sent directly to each stakeholder. It was noted not all had been received at the time of the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair indicated future correspondence will be noted as received in minutes but not attached and replies will be responded to directly by either the Management Team or other appropriate person.</p>
6. Proponent's Presentation	<p>Project Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cameron Simpkins (Project Director) provided a brief update indicating the project is on schedule and to budget. 100% reference designs had been completed and will be included in the EIS submission. Detailed designs will be undertaken in the next phase.

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIS is 95% complete and hope to receive full EIS from the contractor early in Q2 2020. It will then go to the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment for review prior to it going on public exhibition which will be for a minimum of 28 days. • After receipt of all submissions Inland Rail will compile a 'Response to Submissions' and hopefully will receive project approval Q1 2021. <p>Stakeholder Engagement Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heath Martin (Stakeholder Engagement Manager) provided an update on stakeholder engagement activities since the August CCC meeting, including the Regional Emergency Management Committee (REMC), Local Emergency Management Officers (LEMOs) and Rural Fire Service (RFS). Primary feedback was to locate the rail maintenance corridor on the eastern side of the line to facilitate firefighting activities in the Bethungra Range and details of vehicle sizes to enable adequate widths and clearances at crossings to permit access across the line. • Additional meetings occurred with Crownland NSW and Local Land Services to discuss TSRs and other Crown Land impacts. • Conducted further meetings with MPs and Councils and further one on one meetings with landowners. • Held community drop-in sessions in Temora, Cootamundra and Illabo and gave presentations and briefings to several community groups. • Reported briefly on recent sponsorships and donations. • Q1 2020 will see re-engagement with the community, including impacted landowners and community information drop-in sessions which will help in the finalisation of the consultation chapter for the EIS. • During the public exhibition of the EIS further drop-in sessions with technical experts present to explain relevant details of aspects like flooding and noise. <p>Q: At the drop-in sessions are you recording the names or numbers of people supporting or opposed to the project?</p> <p>A: No, only recording numbers of attendees. Not everyone provides their names or expresses a view. All attendees are offered the opportunity to complete a questionnaire to see if enough and the right type of information is received.</p> <p>Q: Will you ensure the batters are not too steep to allow emergency vehicles ease of access across the line?</p> <p>A: That will be done during the detailed design phase of the project.</p> <p>Q: Noticed recent advertisements seeking expressions of interest for virgin country for biodiversity offsets. Will the project be providing any of its land for this purpose?</p> <p>A: Inland Rail is managing biodiversity offsets in accordance with the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. Several options are being considered however the primary strategy for sourcing and retiring biodiversity offsets is to secure biodiversity stewardship sites directly with local landowners that are located within the same bioregion as the I2S proposal. This is the driver for the recent EOI advertisements. Depending on the success of direct engagement, Inland Rail may also opt to pay directly into the Biodiversity Conservation Trust to satisfy its offset obligations. Inland Rail has recently obtained results from biodiversity assessments and are now forming a good understanding of its biodiversity offset obligations.</p> <p>Social Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jody Meier (Social Performance Team Leader) provided an overview of ARTC's mechanism for delivering social outcomes and the development of the Social Performance Program • Mr Meier explained there are two parts to social performance, they are the pre-approval phase and the construction phase. • The five pillars of social performance are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Workforce management; ○ Local and indigenous industry participation; ○ Housing and accommodation; ○ Health and community wellbeing; and

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Community and stakeholder engagement. ● Mr Meier outlined the mechanisms for delivering social outcomes which are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary approval processes; ○ Social Impact Management Plans (SIMP); ○ Stakeholder and community engagement; ○ Supply chain opportunities; ○ Procurement and contracts; and ○ Project delivery. ● Mr Meier explained the SIMPs are a process of identifying mitigation, management and enhancement measures that also provide a monitoring and reporting framework. ● Mr Meier discussed opportunities for local business and clarified expectations as to when opportunities arise and how to participate through the supply chain process. Workshops are conducted to assist local communities as to how they can participate. Primary contractors will be required to use local content where possible. <p>Q: What is a primary contractor?</p> <p>A: These are tier 1 companies and there will only be one for I2S project, other sub-contractors (tier 2) will then come in under this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Housing opportunities are dependent on the individual communities such as availability and need to be balanced with ongoing local needs. These issues are assessed through the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) process. ● Engagement with local communities aims to upskill eligible residents in a timely manner for employment on the IR project. Timing of this engagement process is vital. ● The social investment program provides mental health support for impacted communities and their members. This is done by working with Primary Health Networks (PHNs) across the Inland Rail Alignment. For the I2S project that will be the Murrumbidgee PHN. ● This partnership aims to support good community health and wellbeing through awareness and access to mental health services available locally. ● Mr Meier explained mental health issues are difficult to baseline. Monitoring and assessments are the best tools to ensure adequate mitigation measures are in place. ● Mr Meier noted there are a range of issues that impact on the mental health of communities at any one time and where there are cumulative impacts. ● Mr Meier indicated that the ARTC could provide a program for the CCC if it was felt necessary that help how to identify and how to react with appropriate strategies to support the community. At this stage, it was felt there are adequate opportunities and services to help those in need. ● Mr Meier provided an overview of outcomes for the Parkes to Narromine outcomes regarding social performance. <p>Environmental Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Daniel Lumby (Project Environmental Advisor) provided an update of the project planning timetable, the project description (see details in presentation), an EIS update and key findings. ● All field investigations are complete and 100% EIS is planned for March 2020 with public exhibition planned for Q2 2020. It is anticipated that the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment would finalise their assessment by Q4 2020. ● Daniel outlined they were seeking approval for construction hours from 6am to 6pm, Monday to Sunday, with respite provided on every second weekend with works ceasing at 1pm on Saturday and not occurring on Sunday. Where night time works may be required, additional consultation and approval would be required. ● The work roster allows for a 10 on 4 off roster approach, however this would be at the discretion of the contractor. Benefits of this approach include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Shorter overall project duration; ○ Increased efficiencies in delivery of project works; ○ Minimising disruption around public interfaces (for example, level crossings and bridges)

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A questionnaire is proposed on this aspect so community feedback (and this CCC) can be included in the EIS. • The project description for the operational phase was discussed, including the requirement for the EIS to adequately assess and mitigate operational impacts. Discussion of operational assessment included visual amenity and operational noise. • Discussion occurred around numbers of trains that currently travel on the existing line and the numbers proposed for the project. It was explained that the number of train traffic will not increase substantially at the completion of the new line. It will take time for an increase in freight demand to be realised. Several members expressed concern that they believe that the project was sold on the false premise on the number of trucks that will be taken off the road when the line is complete. • Cameron Simpkins advised the business case for the inland rail project is to provide the line, that is 'the spine' with the capacity for the operators to build their business to utilise that asset. • The CSIRO is currently undertaking a substantial study to identify where all current activities are for the full project, that Brisbane to Melbourne. The details won't be available until next year. • The numbers of rail movements need clarifying at the next meeting. [SEE ACTION] <p>EIS Update and Key Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity assessment completed in accordance with the Biodiversity Assessment Method (BAM) which is established under the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. All desktop (database searches, biodiversity mapping) and fieldwork are now completed. Timing of fieldwork has been undertaken in compliance with BAM requirements. • Key flora and fauna impacts were discussed including key findings that approximately 105 Ha of native vegetation would be removed. This includes some potential habitat loss for threatened fauna including the Squirrel Glider, Superb Parrot, Swift Parrot, Regent Honeyeater and Corben Long-eared Bat. The full details will be documented in the Biodiversity chapter of the EIS. One member requested clarification of the amount of vegetation loss. [SEE ACTION] • It was noted that the proposal would not have a significant impact on the threatened fauna species as the highly modified, fragmented and disturbed nature of the proposal site would not become further fragmented from construction of the proposal. The extent of potential habitat to be removed is a small component of the available habitat locally with an abundance of similar quality habitat and that of much higher quality in the greater locality. • It was advised that EIS provides the approach to avoiding or minimising impacts during the design development. • Cultural Heritage assessment has included desktop database searches, consultation with Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs), pedestrian surveys and a series of test excavations. • Where aboriginal artefacts have been identified, the approach to mitigation, including avoidance, consultation with RAPs and relevant government departments and salvage operations were discussed. Full details of the findings will be detailed in the EIS. • Noise and vibration assessments for both the construction and operational phases have been completed. and detailed in the meeting presentation. Approach to the assessment, example noise modelling scenarios and example mitigation were discussed. • Landscape and visual amenity assessments have been undertaken with reference to the relevant standards which cover landscaping, visual, bridge and urban green cover. Example photomontages were presented as well as examples of proposed mitigation. • Baseline studies and example mitigation were discussed regarding various aspects of the Land Use and Property assessment including property severance, farming operations, TSR's and biosecurity. No TSRs directly interact with the proposal site however there are TSRs within the wider study area that need to be considered. An agronomist has previously been made available to allow for the project to understand farming operations. Further engagement will occur at the detailed design phase to further consider property management processes (i.e. placement of private level crossings, stock crossings).

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flooding and hydrology baseline assessment has considered relevant baseline data and studies, including LiDAR survey for topographic analysis. Example impacts (i.e. operational, construction, flood management) and mitigations were discussed. <p>Q: Is the LiDAR survey data available for a Council? A: Will check and let you know [SEE ACTION] Q: Will there be economic opportunities for agricultural producers to access freight rail services? A: That ability has been designed at a couple of points. Q: Will Councils be compensated for the impact of the additional traffic loads on local roads? A: Yes. That will be negotiated when tenders are being considered in the construction phase. Q: Will private level crossings have some controls with warning devices? A: At this stage that detail is not known. Details of requirements will be discussed with individuals.</p>
7. General Business	<p>Q: What is the status of the Senate Committee inquiry into the Inland Rail Project to bring in a report by September 2020 and what impact will it have on this project? A: The terms of reference are currently being drafted. Information is on the Inland Rail website. It is about the alignment and the funding arrangements for the entire alignment. The EIS will be done on the current alignment and the process will continue as planned. The outcome and recommendations of the inquiry will obviously be considered by government and the ARTC in due course.</p> <p>Q: How much time is being saved by building the new line rather than using the existing corridor? A: That information is available and will be reported to the next meeting. [SEE ACTION] Geoffrey Larsen expressed his continued opposition to the project and indicated this was a sentiment expressed by others in the community and that the money would be better spent on water related issues which were of higher importance. Not convinced on the business case.</p>
8. Proposed Meeting Schedule 2020	27 February 2020; 28 May 2020; 27 August 2020 & 26 November 2020

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	The numbers of rail movements need clarifying at the next meeting.	CS & HM	Q1 2020
2	Clarification of the area of native vegetation to be cleared was requested.	DL	Q1 2020
3	Check to see if the LiDAR survey data is available for Council.	CS	Q1 2020
4	How much time is being saved by building the new line rather than using the existing corridors via Cootamundra?	CS & HM	Q1 2020

Next Meeting

1pm. Thursday 27 February 2020. Cootamundra