

Meeting minutes

IDD CCC meeting 11

Date / Time

25 August 2020
6:00pm to 8:00pm

Location

Dial in and in person at the Pittsworth Town Hall

Chair

Bill Armagnacq

Minute taker

Katie Unipan

Distribution

All

Attendees (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Bill Armagnacq – IDD Chair (BA)
- ▶ Chris Joseph - CCC member (CJ)
- ▶ Clinton Weber - CCC member (CW)
- ▶ Gary Garland - CCC member (GG)
- ▶ Ken Murphy - CCC member (KM)
- ▶ Kylie Schultz - CCC member (KS)
- ▶ Lance MacManus - CCC member (LM)
- ▶ Andrew McCartney proxy for Paul McDonald - CCC member (PM)
- ▶ Phoebe Mitchell - CCC member (PM)
- ▶ Rob Loch - CCC member (RL)
- ▶ Vicki Battaglia - CCC member (VB)
- ▶ Thomas Draper - CCC member (TD) (online)
- ▶ Todd Rohl - CCC member (TR) (online)
- ▶ Rob McNamara - ARTC Inland Rail (RMc)
- ▶ Rob Smith - ARTC Inland Rail (RS) (online)
- ▶ Andrew Roberts - ARTC Inland Rail (ARo) (online)
- ▶ Sarah Delahunty - ARTC Inland Rail (SD)
- ▶ Naomi Tonscheck - ARTC Inland Rail (NT)
- ▶ Willow Hart - ARTC Inland Rail (WH)
- ▶ Chris Leslight - ARTC Inland Rail (CL) (online)
- ▶ Giano Terzic - ARTC Inland Rail (GT) (online)
- ▶ Rebecca Pickering - ARTC Inland Rail (RP) (online)
- ▶ Katie Unipan - ARTC Inland Rail (KU)

▶ Office of the Coordinator General

- ▶ Sonya Booth (SB) (online)
- ▶ Gerald Schmidt (GS) (online)
- ▶ Steven Tarte (ST) (online)
- ▶ Rebecca Collins (RC) (online)

▶ Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications

- ▶ Drue Edwards (DE) (online)
- ▶ Mark Babister (MB) (online) Chair of Independent Panel of Experts reviewing flood modelling.

Apologies (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Larry Pappin - CCC member (LP)
- ▶ Paul Hanlon - CCC member (PH)
- ▶ Fiona Kennedy - ARTC Inland Rail (FK)

Guests (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- Kathryn Silk - Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development and Cities (KS)
- ▶ Timothy Vale standing in for Orren Farrington - DNRME representative (OF) (online)
- ▶ John McVeigh - Member for Groom (JMV) (online)

Discussions

NO.	ACTIONS
1	<p>Welcome, introductions and conflicts of interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Chair welcomed the committee both those in the room and those online. ▶ Thomas Draper delivered an acknowledgement of Traditional Owners ▶ Chair noted observers online ▶ Chair noted ARTC staff were online and in person to present and respond to questions during the meeting ▶ Chair noted the meeting was recorded for meeting minute purposes. ▶ The Chair noted the need to abide by COVID-19 safety requirements ▶ The Chair noted the conflicts of interest register and committee to inform Chair of any changes or updates. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No changes were advised. ▶ Committee introduced themselves by name as it was the first physical meeting on the new committee. ▶ VB: Requested a copy of the transcript of the meeting ▶ SD: Noted no transcript will be provided as they are only used for minute taking. ▶ GG: Flagged concern minutes from last meeting are incorrect ▶ BA: We have had the discussion – no recording of that section of the meeting ▶ SD: Noted changes within the engagement team. Willow Hart has focus on land access and acquisition. Naomi Tonscheck is extending her focus from the Southern Darling Downs into the Inner Darling Down as well, with an engagement focus. ▶ BA: Thank WH for all the work she's done for the committee and supporting him.
2	<p>Actions from previous meeting</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Field trip: Due to challenges with COVID-19 no action. Will continue to monitor 2. No update on the acquiring authority 3. Question from Rob Locke re noise: on the agenda for next meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RL: Will put together a list of specific issues that the community would like the feedback on. 4. Drue Edwards joining us again tonight so the questions will be responded to. 5. Tom Draper meetings actioned. 6. Question how many trains need the 24-hour alignment: Dependent on what the market wants; how many trains will need to be coming through on the trip between Melbourne and Brisbane in 24 hours; and projected usage will be taken into account in the final design 7. OCG to attend a meeting: online tonight. 8. Follow up with Phoebe Mitchell on comment about impacts in the Gowrie water flows: Completed and corrected in previous minutes.
3	<p>ARTC staff left room.</p> <p>How the EIS submission process works - Office of the Coordinator General Note no minutes of this section of the meeting were taken at the request of the Office of the Coordinator General</p> <p>ARTC Staff returned to the room</p>
4	<p>Update on the Cecil Plains route review - Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications, Drue Edwards</p>

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ DE: Government has committed to assessment of the alternative route via Cecil Plains. ARTC compiling the data required to assess the service attributes, in terms of transit time, reliability, freight availability and cost competitiveness. Within that process there is an assessment of the cost of the infrastructure; and, also, how it impacts landholders, what type of land areas it's impacting; the nature of the Condamine Floodplain Crossing that will be needed, in terms of the initial reference design. All of these factors will be brought together, both for the alternative routes but also for the current reference route. In terms of the work on the alternative route ARTC has undertaken optimisation work to identify routes that will allow trains to travel at their best speed but also safely; routes/options that can minimise the length of the route; because obviously length equals time in most instances. Engineering work has been undertaken by ARTC, in looking at the Cecil Plains route. Independent consultant has been engaged; and the independent consultant has been receiving data that ARTC has been compiling. Their task in this job is to look at that data, to evaluate it and determine that that data is appropriate; and can be used through the methodologies applied, to calculate things like transit time, costs, designs; and can be used to create a like for like result to allow the two routes to be compared. That work is currently underway; and it is expected that that will continue for a little time yet, as more information comes in. At the end of this process, the reports both the ARTC information report and the consultant's report will be made publicly available by the Government. These reports will go to the Government who will consider the attributes of both routes against each other, in selecting what is the best route for the B2G alignment. ▶ RL: Who is the name consultant who has been appointed ▶ DE: GTA Consultants, Melbourne, business is transport infrastructure; transport infrastructure business cases; design of transport infrastructure. They are a well accredited consultancy in the transport space and the infrastructure space. But, more importantly, they have not previously worked with ARTC on Inland Rail. ▶ RL: Will there be opportunity for local community submissions? ▶ DE: The primary work is assessing the like for like data that ARTC are compiling for the route attributes. But you can provide information to the consultants where it is relating to those attributes or to impacted properties, alignments and those type of issues. And that can be done by emailing the Department of Infrastructure; and I can provide the email address to the Chair later. ▶ ACTION ▶ VB: Is there a map available for the community to review. ▶ DE: I will come back with one for the group. ▶ ACTION ▶ VB: What does cost competitiveness mean. ▶ DE: What it costs to build a route; and how that translates into charges for the freight. But there's also cost competitiveness, in terms of the infrastructure; the train rolling stock, the driver's hours, fuel and all of those components that go to running a rail business; and how they translate into the fees. And looking at how, when you get to an end fee for the operational life or period that you are examining, how that compares to a similar model exercise for other transport modes. ▶ VB: about broader economic benefits that could be seen because the line through Cecil Plains would actually connect into other existing infrastructure that would have to be built on the greenfield line. Did that actually get included in the terms of reference?

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ DE: there is some broader examination of economic benefit in relation to the two routes. But as the Government's terms of reference for the assessment is primarily around the Inland Rail service offerings for the two routes, as set out in the business case, the main focus is in that area; but there's some further economic analysis of opportunities that the different routes bring. ▶ PM: Have GTA worked with ARTC on any project? ▶ DE: I would have to take that question on notice ▶ ACTION
5	<p>Update on the Independent Panel of Experts – flood model reviews in Queensland – Mark Babister, Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ MB: Chair of the Independent Flood Panel looking at how the work is done by ARTC's consultants in each of the different sections in accordance with best practice in Australia; and also looking at the nuts and bolts of how the work has been done. There are very detailed terms of reference available online. <p>Five members drawn from firms around Australia and internationally with extensive experience in linear infrastructure - motorways, highways and railway lines and dealing with the flooding. Flooding is a big issue with rural communities. He has spent a lot of time with farmers; and understands that if these things are not done well, it can really impact upon landholders and the same with people in towns.</p> <p>In parallel with the EIS process and reviews by the Coordinator General and the Federal Government, the Panel will independently look at the detailed calculations that have been carried out by the consultants. The Panel obviously liaise with those consultants; have some complex questions for them to answer; and for each of the sections, the Panel will be producing a detailed report that will set out findings. It will be published and will be publicly available; It will really aid the Queensland Coordinator General in their decision making and the Federal Government in their decision-making process.</p> <p>The Panel will certainly be taking submissions from the community; and he encouraged Committee members and the public to do that. There is no need to go to a great length of detail, but there's a simple online process where you can email the Panel; and if you think something should be brought to the Panel's attention which will be looking at all of the issues and there are a lot of them. If you have a concern about any bridge, structure, how it affects a property, your own individual property, please feel free to put some details in an email which is on the Inland Rail site and the Transport and Main Roads Queensland site. The Panel will have a very good look at all submissions. It's really important that if there are concerns in the community, people draw that to the Panel's attention. Email address up on the screen for those who can read it; which is InlandRailFloodPanel@TMR.qld.gov.au.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RL: What extent will assessment consider potential erosion impacts of the structures? ▶ MB: We will certainly be looking at the erosion calculations and what's been assumed and how flow is concentrated. In any agricultural area, when you put a piece of linear infrastructure across a floodplain, there's people carrying out legitimate farming activities there and. hey really want the impact from that embankment and the openings to minimise the impact on their land. They don't want flow concentrated, certainly not on their property. And they certainly don't want places where there's openings/flows now, where flow paths are blocked; because there could be problems upstream but there can also be problems downstream of that natural flow. <p>So what you try and do when you build a piece of infrastructure, you try and mimic as best as possible all those flow paths across the floodplain; and you try not to concentrate flow any more than necessary. You can't build something like the Harbour Bridge from one end of the floodplain to another; so you tend to put your openings where there's lots of flow; and put your embankments where the flow is quite slow or there's no flow at all. And that is the sort of optimisation process that consultants normally go through, to try and work out how to get a good</p>

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>design with minimum impacts. And there's usually, and this is on this project criteria that the consultants are meant to meet, which the Panel will be checking. And sometimes they can't meet them and they have to come up with different compensatory measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PM: Will reports be published online and how distributed? ▶ MB: Unsure if it will be available online and how it will be distributed throughout communities. ▶ VB: Are you limited only to looking at the models; or are you capable of looking at what's actually going on onsite? ▶ MB: Our job is to make sure that the models represent the current state of reality, which will include all of the existing development and flow paths and bridges, whether they are part of the railway line; anything that will affect the proposed line, to make sure that the proposed case is a fair representation of what's proposed. If you have local knowledge that you don't think the model is correct, you should be letting us know during the submission process. <p>The first thing I do when I do a study like this is speak to the landholders, though it's a little bit hard with COVID-19, to get a good understanding of what they know has happened. There will be people here who have lived here for four/five generations. They will have been there in those floods in the '50s; they would have seen what happened. And when you are running a project like this, you need to tap into that knowledge; because if you don't, what will happen is: you will do your grand design and then somebody up the back will just put their hand up and go, "But that's not what happened in 1950," or whatever. If you have got concerns, please let the Panel know; because that's part of our job to check that these models are a fair and reasonable representation of the existing situation and all the things that influence flooding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ VB: Where there is no data currently on flooding – how do you accommodate that? There has been infrastructure built since the 2011 floods; and the floods that we have had since do you accommodate that? ▶ MB: You are referring to a calibration/validation process. When you set up a flood model, what you want to do is make sure it represents recent, historical floods. Usually, you can't do ones too far in the past because we just don't have the data that we have today. So what you make sure is that it represents/reproduces reasonably well. They are never perfect. Big floods and small floods that you have seen; and that when you model those floods, it takes into account any changes in the floodplain; like, a road has been built or something like that, or a bridge has been enlarged. <p>The Panel will be checking that the calibration of each of the models is fair and reasonable; and if we don't think it's fair and reasonable, we are making suggestions on how it should be improved/changed or what else needs to be done. That's a pretty standard thing in any review process, "Is the calibration fit for purpose?"; because if it is not, you can't really do an assessment fairly. I probably should say: on most of the projects that I have worked on, too, the actual proponent is pretty keen on having good models. Because this is an EIS phase, and assuming the project goes ahead, it goes to the design phase, and they need good models that properly represent what they are going to have to build.</p>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ General Business <p>B2G Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS: Submitted the draft EIS in December 2019 for adequacy assessment. Feedback was received from the Office of the Coordinator General(OCG) and the relevant Government agencies; and incorporated it into an update of the draft EIS; and that has been resubmitted to the OCG for their further consideration, moving towards the next step, which is the public exhibition period. ▶ VB: So how large will the EIS be? Is there any way that we can get a jump on it?

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS: I will be talking a little bit to that at the end of my section; on how we are looking to get some more information out to the CCCs in advance of the EIS coming out. We are looking to bring some more technical and construction details forward. ▶ RMc: This is a formal process that ARTC don't run would be very surprised if OCG gave advanced copies out because they are actually discriminating one group against another - not a question for ARTC to answer. ▶ RL: Questioned if consultant reports would be made available? ▶ RMc: It is a question for the Coordinator General. ▶ RL: Give good reason to ask the OCG for an extension or a greater length of time. ▶ VB: We asked the Coordinator General about provision of funding for us to do alternate consultants' reports, once this EIS came out; and they said that was a question for ARTC. We will just put that on notice for your consideration. ▶ RMc: If the Committee, through the Chair, was to approach ARTC on specific aspects, it would be considered. ▶ BA: Offer has been made to this Committee previously. ▶ RMc: I would like to put on the record. ▶ SD: ARTC provide some scholarships for students or people living along the alignment. They open in September and details are available on the website. ▶ RS: We are undertaking a range of field investigations (details on ARTC website) ▶ RS: Seeking to put together an information pack looking at some specific elements, including access and haulage; those elements of construction, including track structure and bridges, as an example, not limited to those only; and also material sources, including water and earthworks with a high level example in the presentation) ▶ There is a very high-level example and one piece of factual information about the total earthworks; was a particular query that was put forward, where we're including certain elements of detail like that. The cross section of a railway track corridor, effectively, the impact of the formation with the trains on top and the sleepers and the dual gauge rail track, will be considered breaking the various elements down into more detail. about the materials included and how those materials are put together to form the track. Always important to remind everyone that those are the reference design quantities. They will be subject to change during detailed design; and through the EIS approval process. The information has been the result of questions asked and a pack is being developed at this stage. ▶ Discussion about value of pack and suggestion for ARTC to draft a pack and distribute to committee for comment ▶ KS: Have you worked out where you are getting all this water from, to help with the construction of it? ▶ RS: There is a general breakdown of assumed sources. But as we move forward and complete those water surveys and as we move through and award the contract and get a better understanding of available sources, it will be confirmed in later stages and bedded down. At this stage, there's a degree of confidence of being able to achieve and source that water; but it is certainly to be confirmed at a later stage, as we move forward. ▶ KS: Where are you getting the water from? ▶ JR: There is a hierarchy of water. The first point of source will be public surface water storages, dams and weirs. Secondly then, we go for permanent, perennial, flowing water courses. Next, on the agenda is privately held water sources; ring dams and tanks, and that will be by private agreement. Then we go through existing registered and licensed biresand then it will be mains water. Each case will be based on legal access, the volumetric requirements over the alignment, and where we need that water. The water quality is another thing that we take into account, and the source location; so where the water is in relation to the works. And in the EIS, what it does: it plots out especially on the public water sources, the dams where the dams are in relation to

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>the alignment. So there is something in the EIS for that to tell you the volumetric requirements and where that water will come from. And I can't give you that, obviously.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PM: Are you utilising the fill from where you have actually taken it from in other areas and bringing it forward? ▶ RS: We go to great effort to try and balance the earthworks. And what I mean by that is basically what you have said there; where there is a cut, we seek to use that, if it's in close proximity to an area of fill. Balancing the earthworks is a really important first step in the earthworks design; and we certainly try to do that efficiently. So not only does it minimise the impact to the local environment, but it also reduces costs. We also do look at local quarry supplies and see their proximity to the project; and how that fits into them being an available source into the project. There is also sometimes the situation where we need to get rid of surplus material that's considered to be geotechnically not suitable, to be able to be re used. So all of that is taken into consideration in the EIS. And on the back of that, impacts to the local environment is considered because we have to calculate how much of that has to be hauled in, or hauled out, either way. I think I answered your questions there. We also have been in contact with local quarries, to understand their availability of material; and we would also be open to any parties that would be looking to open up new quarries. But it is also important to note that a lot of what we have calculated and determined that for our reference design, during detailed design and with the on boarding of a contractor, they might seek to use alternate sites or come up with other plans. But it will be important to ensure that traffic calculations and impacts are updated on the back of that as well. It is an iterative process, as we move forward. ▶ KS: Where are you going to get the water from? Are we going to be made to give you the water? ▶ RS: I don't think anyone can be made to give water. As John has mentioned, we have got our hierarchy of sources and we will be looking to execute that, to ensure we get the water. If someone's bore is impacted as a result of the rail line, ARTC don't get the ownership of that licence. <p>CJ: how much water are we talking here - how many ML? I don't think you'll have any trouble getting water. You have just got to pay for it. That's already happening - Main Roads are doing that now on the western area of Toowoomba. There are people besides me selling water for \$3,000 a meg. You have just got to pay for it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ VB: Do you know, from your current studies, what percentage of the cut can be used for the fill, from your geotech; so we know what spoil you will be looking at? ▶ RS: I would have to take that one on notice. At this stage, the Border to Gowrie EIS, doesn't involve dumping anywhere within the existing corridor. ▶ ACTION ▶ VB: Can we actually find out whether we can't be forced to provide you with water? Because, in fact, legislation could be changed tomorrow to do that.? ▶ RS: Yes, we will investigate ▶ ACTION ▶ RL: When you move to the EIS stage will you define the sources of fill? ▶ JR: The EIS doesn't include boundaries around the quarry pits. EIS footprint doesn't include the burrowed pits and quarries. We don't dictate where a contractor takes the material from. They do have to have all relevant approvals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ G2H Update ▶ MP: Gowrie to Helidon submitted the preliminary draft EIS to the Office of the Coordinator General on 30 June. ▶ GT: There are currently some geotechnical investigations and utility identification, as well as cultural heritage. We are at the Helidon RSL, to provide an information display for communities to come and have a chat. We had five successful recipients of sponsorship in Toowoomba; three of them were G2H. Worthy of mention were two of our local community groups; one of them was Teem Challenge and the other one was Riding For Disabled.

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ VB: Is the electricity that's required to run the tunnel included in the EIS at all? ▶ MP: Are you talking about as part of the greenhouse emissions or the cost? ▶ VB: Yes, both ▶ MP: It will be part of the emissions aspect - sustainability. Not looking at actual operations ▶ CJ: Are ventilations and air vents away from urbanisation or houses? Is there a certain distance away from the nearest dwelling and the prevailing winds? ▶ MP: Yes - air emissions will be released at the portals; so the western portal, around the Boundary Street, Toowoomba Bypass Interchange, and the eastern portal, so just below Mount Kynoch and just south of Harlaxton Quarry in the Valley is where the two portals are proposed. There's a central shaft around Cranley which will draw the air in. Air will be released near the portal, as the train moves through the tunnel. The Environmental Impact Statement - focussed heavily on air quality and emissions from those portals, and sensitive receptors, and so forth. ▶ CJ: Do you think two portals will be enough for that area? ▶ MP: Modelling suggests that the trains can operate based on that design. The portals are the openings where the trains come in/out; so not actual shafts, like air vents. ▶ GT: They look like really large industrial sheds. ▶ CW: Toowoomba Regional Council are in the process of constructing Morris Road. Just looking at the slide here, I am wondering where Morris Road is going to be when you build the railway line? ▶ GT: Yes, we are working very closely, with Toowoomba Regional Council and also the Department of Transport and Main Roads in regard to all the rail/road interfaces. With our current proposal, there's that whole section where we are proposing that part of Morris Road to be closed.
7	<p>Observer questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BA: Any other questions? If you do have any questions please channel them through Naomi, Katie or myself.
8	<p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BA: The next meeting probably be in November, unless the EIS comes out ahead of that time. Also, we will be looking at the bus trip, subject to COVID-19 requirements. Thank you. ▶ The meeting closed at 8.19 pm

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	Provide update on field trip	CCC member	Ongoing
2	ARTC to advise of the acquiring authority for Inland Rail in Queensland - ARTC will inform members when there is a formal agreement/announcement	Inland Rail	Ongoing
3	CCC members to send Chair suggested agenda items	CCC members	Next meeting
4	DE to provide email address for community comment, provide a map of the proposed alternative route through Cecil Plains and confirm if GTA has worked with ARTC on any projects and if so which ones	DE	Next week and next meeting
5	Inland Rail to confirm if landowners be made to give water to infrastructure projects, similar to compulsory acquisition?	Inland Rail	Next meeting
6	Inland Rail to confirm what percentage of cut may end up as spoil on B2G?	Inland Rail	Next meeting

7	Send Inland Rail questions on noise	RL and CCC members	18 September
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------

Next meeting

To be confirmed but likely to be in November 2020