

Meeting minutes

IDD CCC meeting 12

Date / Time

1 December 2020
6:00pm to 8:00pm

Location

Pittsworth Town Hall, Yandilla Street
And online

Chair

Bill Armagnacq

Minute taker

Katie Unipan

Distribution

All attendees

Attendees (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Clinton Weber, Individual (CW)
- ▶ Gary Garland, Individual (GG)
- ▶ Ken Murphy, Individual (KM)
- ▶ Kylie Schultz, Individual (KS)
- ▶ Lance MacManus, TSBE (LM)
- ▶ Chris Joseph, Individual, (Virtual) (CJ)
- ▶ Paul Hanlon, Individual (PH)
- ▶ Phoebe Mitchell, Individual (PM)
- ▶ Rob Loch, Pittsworth District Landcare Association (RL)
- ▶ Todd Rohl, Toowoomba Chamber of Commerce, (Virtual) (TR)
- ▶ Vicki Battaglia, Individual, (Virtual) (VB)
- ▶ Paul McDonald, Southern Queensland Landscapes (Virtual) (PM)
- ▶ Rob McNamara - ARTC Inland Rail (RM)
- ▶ Rob Smith (Project Manager) (RS)
- ▶ Andrew Roberts (Project Engineer) (AR)
- ▶ Max Nichols (Project Manager G2H) (Virtual) (MN)
- ▶ Simon Eldridge – Chief of Staff (SE) (Virtual)
- ▶ Sarah Delahunty (Manager Stakeholder Engagement QLD) (SD)
- ▶ Naomi Tonscheck (Stakeholder Engagement Lead B2G & NS2B) (NT)
- ▶ Giano Terzic (Stakeholder Engagement Lead G2H) (Virtual) (GT)
- ▶ Nelson Wallis (P2N) (Virtual) (NW)
- ▶ Shane Harris (Principal Environment Advisor Queensland) (SH)
- ▶ Helen Williams (Program Social Performance Principal) (Virtual) (HW)
- ▶ Katie Unipan (Stakeholder Engagement Advisor) KU

Apologies (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Larry Pappin - CCC member
- ▶ Thomas Draper, CCC Indigenous representative
- ▶ Mark Babister Chair of Independent Panel of Experts reviewing flood modelling
- ▶ Pat Weir MP – Member for Condamine
- ▶ Fiona Kennedy (Environmental Advisor)
- ▶ Jon Roberts (B2G Design Manager)
- ▶ Rebecca Pickering (Director Community & Environment)

Guests (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Andrew Bourne - Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications (AB) (Virtual)
- ▶ Craig Sleeman - Toowoomba Regional Council (CS) (Virtual)

- ▶ Tina O’Connell - Member of Independent Panel of Experts reviewing flood modelling (TO)(Virtual)
- ▶ Kathryn Silk - Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development and Cities (KS)
- ▶ Kerry Shine – Toowoomba Regional Council
- ▶ Megan O’Hara – Sullivan – Toowoomba Regional Council
- ▶ Trevor Mitchell - Toowoomba Regional Council (TM) (Virtual)
- ▶ Orren Farrington - Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy (Virtual) (OF)

Discussions

NO.	ACTIONS
1	<p>Welcome, introductions and conflicts of interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Chair delivered an acknowledgement of Traditional Owners ▶ Chair welcomed the committee both those in the room and those online. ▶ Chair noted observers both those in the room and those online. ▶ Chair noted that anyone asking questions should wait till a microphone is handed to them ▶ Chair noted the meeting was recorded for meeting minute purposes. ▶ Chair acknowledged Graham Clapham is attendance, Chair of the SDD CCC ▶ Chair noted that he had extended an invitation to Garth Hamilton the member-elect for Groom but he was unable to attend. ▶ 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.
2	<p>Actions from previous meeting</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Field trip: Will cover in general business 2. Who is acquiring authority? No update on the acquiring authority – since confirmed to be Department of Transport & Main roads 3. CCC members to send Chair suggested agenda items: No specific agenda items but questions submitted will form part of agenda tonight 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: Given within Chairs report 5. Inland Rail to confirm if landowners be made to give water to infrastructure projects, similar to compulsory acquisition: No landowner can be made to give water to the project 6. Inland Rail to confirm what percentage of cut may end up as spoil on B2G : At this stage just under 150,000 cubic meters - which will be up to the constructor to manage and minimise with the preference to reuse where possible. 7. Send Inland Rail questions on noise. No additional questions to those submitted by RL <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ GG: Will questions sent by VB on 23 November be answered? ▶ BA: AB has been provided the questions and will respond to them in the next presentation.
3	<p>Update on Inland Rail B2G Alternative Route Comparison</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcome Andrew Bourne, Assistant Secretary, Inland Rail Stakeholder & Regional Delivery Branch; Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications ▶ AB: The review process is now complete and the Australian Government has confirmed the selected route for the Border to Gowrie section of Inland Rail remains the current reference design route as announced by the Australian Government in September 2017. ▶ The announcement follows on from the release of the independent consultant’s report on 2 November 2020 which sets out the findings of the review

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Review available on the website at: inlandrail.gov.au/about-us/publications-and-reports/inland-rail-b2g-alternative-route-comparison-review ▶ Scope and purpose of review. Assess which route would allow Inland Rail to best meet its service offering of as defined by 2015 business case: transit time, reliability, availability and cost competitiveness ▶ Review was to provide data to the government on the two routes so that it could compare them on a like-for-like basis ▶ The Government tasked ARTC to compile the detailed information required to compare the service offering attributes of two routes and the Department engaged an independent consultant to review the compiled data to analyse and report on the data and methodologies used by ARTC ▶ GTA, the independent consultants, found the comparative analysis of the two routes was like-for-like in terms of methodology and data. In terms of the service offerings, the route via Cecil Plains was found to increase the travel distance by more than 25km, add more than 17 minutes to the north bound travel time, would not deliver the 98% Inland Rail reliability and would reduce freight availability. There would also be an increase in Inland Rail construction and maintenance costs between \$379m and \$408m (in today's dollars). <p>Response to questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Q1: The consultants are in no way "independent". They were appointed by the Government/ARTC and were provided with all the data from ARTC. Why were public submissions not called for? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Response: The consultant was selected and appointed by the department. Selection was through competitive tender. ARTC had no involvement in the selection, appointment or management of the work undertaken by the consultant. ▶ Public were able to make submissions on the review via the department as advised to the last CCC meeting. (Noted: email details were printed in August 2020 CCC Chair's report) ▶ Q2: The analysis is nowhere near "like-for-like". You cannot compare a route that is 70% Greenfield (the current route) with one that is 95% brownfield (the alternate route through Cecil Plains, Mt Tyson to near Oakey, accepting that the forestry is government owned land and most of the rest is gazetted rail line). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Response: The purpose of comparing routes on the Inland Rail service offering attributes is to ensure different routes can be compared with each other on a like-for-like basis so as to determine which route would deliver the best service outcome. In terms of brownfield v's greenfield, Appendix A Section 4.1 of the independent report provides details of the makeup of each route. In terms of percentages it states that the current reference design route comprises of 66% greenfield and 34% brownfield. The route via Cecil Plains and Wellcamp comprises of 67% greenfield and 33% brownfield. The route via Cecil Plains and Kingsthorpe comprised of 63% greenfield and 37% brownfield. ▶ Q3: That there are more directly impacted properties on the alternate route than the current route. Completely ridiculous, as the alternate route is through State Forest and then follows gazetted rail line to near Oakey. With 6 to 10 properties to go around Cecil Plains and My Tyson and another 6 to 10 to cut across south of Oakey to get onto the western rail line, this would be 10 % of the number of properties directly impacted by the current route. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Response: The review is clear the terms of impacted properties is reported on the number of residences and commercial premises that lie within 200m of the centre line of each route consistent with EIS requirements for new projects. Public data sources, Queensland government GIS data, land use mapping and aerial imagery were used to collect data. ▶ Q4. The costings for the current route are based on the 2015 route comparisons and have been shown many times since to be totally wrong. For example, there is no accounting of the significant costs for numerous rail- over-road crossings or creek crossings (for example, the 5 crossings in the Wellcamp to Gowrie section alone).

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Response: The costings used for the review are based on ARTC's current rail operating costs and the 2020 costings for the Border to Gowrie reference design. The costings for both route options does take into account the cost of rail-road interfaces and major waterway structures. ▶ Q5: What was the costs for new roads on the forestry route - it appears that there would be little need for diversions unlike the huge number of diversions and new roads for the Wellcamp airport route? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Response: The cost of all road rail interfaces have been included in each of the route costings. Road rail interfaces contributed approximately 10% for the estimated construction costs. In terms of the rail road interfaces in the Wellcamp area I would note for the route option via Cecil Plains to Wellcamp to Gowrie that this route follow the current reference design route from west of Wellcamp through to Gowrie and as such the rail road interfaces for this section of both routes are substantially the same. ▶ 6. Why was the cost any different for the forestry route compared to the Base Case Modified route which was \$135M cheaper than the Wellcamp Airport route? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Response: The result of these two reviews cannot be compared on a like for like basis. The Forestry Route is significantly different to the base case modified route. They have different costing parameters and different starting points. The costings used for the review are based on ARTC's current rail operating costs and the 2020 costings for the Border to Gowrie reference design. ▶ 7. The people on the brownfield sections were counted in the comparison but there were not counted in the Wellcamp airport route - this cannot be "like for like". Did the consultants realise that the existing rail line from Cecil Plains could be re-commissioned at any point by the Queensland Government, extinguishing the argument of the Bongen farmers about this line disrupting their farming practices? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Response: The review identifies residential and commercial premises that exist within 200m of the centre line of each proposed route. Important to note that regardless of whether properties are adjacent to existing rail corridors or greenfield zones they all have to be treated equally in terms of needing to be identified as requiring assessment for potential noise and vibration impacts associated with the development of a new infrastructure project. ▶ 8. Did the significant economic benefits of the forestry route get considered as "like for like" comparison with the Wellcamp airport route? The export meat works, export sawmills, export cotton gins on the forestry route would generate far more economic benefits to Queensland than the 1 container a year that will be exported from the Wellcamp airport. ▶ 9. Did the consultants take into account future economic benefits of the forestry routes with the forestry itself having significant mining and exploration leases over it which would only need to be developed and having a rail to export would have only enhanced this resource industry? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Joint response to 8 and 9: The assessment of future economic potential of the alternative route was not undertaken as it was outside the scope of the review. The independent advisor, GTA, were tasked with analysing the data and methodologies used to assess the service offering attributes consistent with the inland route assessment methodology. This detail is important to ensure that the routes were compared on a like for like basis to examine which route enables Inland Rail to best meet the service offering. Setting a consistent set of benchmarks to assess route options is important to ensure that other factors do not obscure the basic service requirements of the project. ▶ 10. Are we able to be provided with the submissions that were given to the consultants? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Response: There were no submissions received by the department in relation to the review. However, ARTC, as tasked by the Government, did provide detailed information to compare service offerings which was included as Appendix A in the independent consultant's report. ▶ VB: You haven't answered any of the questions. You have given us percentages, vague inuendo. We want the questions answered. We want to know what the costs of the route are in figures. And we want the submissions that ARTC provided which include the costings. I ask that the

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>questions are provided in the minutes and the questions are answered in detail. Note there is about 3000 people in Pittsworth if you add that to the line. I don't think your numbers stack up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ AB: The data used to determine the costs of each route is based on the costs of the current reference design route and we cannot disclose these as public release of this information would prejudice ARTCs ability to undertake commercial tendering and negotiations in relation to the construction of Inland Rail. ▶ VB: Confused by this – if a culvert costs \$50 and there are 10 of them that's \$500. It's not that hard. Surely the people who are losing their homes should know what tax payer money they are investing in this thing. ▶ AB: I do understand your question but I think in terms of tendering for the sections along Inland Rail we have serious concerns about disclosing this information clearly because in doing so could significantly put ARTC at a disadvantage of achieving value for money along this very important route. In best practice for tendering this sort of information is not made public. ▶ VB: It's public for all the other parts of the route. My next question is about the appendix you mentioned. In that appendix it says that there will be one train a day that may need make this 24 hour time line. Would it not be better to pick a route that have economic advantage over a route that is going to service perhaps one train a day. ▶ AB: There are many opportunities across the entire alignment where there will be opportunities for regions to tap into Inland Rail. It's just not Melbourne to Brisbane. There has been a report undertaken by Ernst & Young that indicates the significant economic benefit that can be achieved through Inland Rail. In terms of the Queensland area figures are in excess of 500 full time jobs by the 10th year of operation and in excess of \$3.1 billion in gross regional product within the first years of operation. A further boost with the number of jobs to build the line and the future operation of that line. Those things are considered. ▶ VB: Yes from the route you have selected. But if you selected a route that connected in with economic opportunity that could be doubled or tripled. ▶ BA: We will move on – the report has been prepared and a clear decision made. ▶ PM: Can you please clarify how the independent consultant was chosen and who it was. What type of mapping was used to assess population as they are far from accurate? You mentioned you couldn't compare like for like and then at the end of the conversation you said it was. Clarification. Can we have a written copy of your responses tonight. ▶ AB: Independent consultant was GTA consultants, who were selected through a competitive tender process by the Department of Infrastructure. ARTC had no involvement in this process. In terms of like for like the review itself was done on a like for like basis, my reference of not being able to assess things like for like refers to previous reports undertaken, like the 2017 route report which looked at 4 different corridors – you cannot compare the work done in that report with this independent review. Mapping – refer to Simon Eldridge. ▶ SE: The like for like basis on the costings and the transit time calculations were done for the current reference design route against each of the two options to go via Cecil Plains. The confusion comes when there was a question asked “why don't you pare it back to the base case modified route that was one of the 4 routes that were assessed at a concept level back in 2016/2017.” It was only concept level at that stage comparing 4 routes between Border to Gowrie and did not have the benefit that we now have of 3 years of reference design development that has given us more detailed cost estimates that we are able to apply across the 2 Cecil Plains routes. In relation to the mapping we did use publicly available mapping because the task was to do it on a like for like basis and given the timeframes, the requirements and specifics of the terms of reference, which was to look at transit speed, cost competitiveness, freight availability and reliability, it was determined as acceptable to use. ▶ SE: Also note the report doesn't say one reference train per day, it refers to a reference train. The reference train is defined in the Inland Rail business case as a 1800m long train, 2.7 horsepower per tonne ratio with 40% wagons double stacked. The business case makes it clear that even by 2045 there will be somewhere in the order of 3.5 to 4 reference trains per day each way. There will be additional trains as well.

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ VB: That is not what it says in the report and not what the EIS submitted in New South Wales says. ▶ SE: I can assure you that is what it says. ▶ MG: From the Darling Downs Soil Conservation Group who submitted the Forestry Route via Cecil Plains to David Littleproud and Michael McCormack. Have looked at the 97 pages of your review and believe there is at least 5 factual discrepancies and a few other points. I have spoken to Drue Edwards regarding this issue and he promised me a meeting with ARTC which we were trying to organise for Friday but ARTC do not want to talk to us about the Cecil Plains Forestry Route. We are a group of ex government soil conservation officers with up to 40 years' experience each. Our initial submission to the Senate committee was the design across the floodplain is not satisfactory and will cause major dramas to the train line and the land below. We believe the Cecil Plains to Mount Tyson route has different floodplains to those at Pampas hence our involvement. We are a volunteer group. ▶ AB: Understanding we were looking to facilitate that engagement and will get back to him on that. ▶ RM: ARTC position is it is not our report and we are not going to speak to it. We are directing all questions to the group managing the report which is the government. We have agreed to meet on Friday but the discussion will be based on the route that the Deputy Prime Minister, followed by the Prime Minister, followed by David Littleproud have said it is going. ▶ PM: You said that before the submission was even put in ▶ VB: McCormack said it was going back to the base case in his speech – that is confusing. ▶ RM: ARTC did not choose the route. ARTC have been given the route to deliver and that is what we are working to. If we get told to go somewhere else we will go somewhere else. No hidden agendas. ▶ VB: AB said no one gave submissions – we were to be given an email address to put submission in which was not forthcoming. ▶ AB: Will follow this up. Action to sit with me please. [Note: As noted in Agenda Item 2 above, an email address was included in the CCC Chair's summary of the August 2020 meeting]. ▶ BA: Thanked AB for his participation in the meeting and if there were any further questions could be directed through him.
4	<p>Update Independent Panel of Experts – flood model review in Queensland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BA: Mark Babister is unfortunately not able to join us, but I welcome Tina O'Connell, Principal Engineer, Hydrology & Hydraulics from HDR who is a member of the Independent Panel of Experts is reviewing the Flood Modelling . <p>TO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Here to provide an update on what the Panel has achieved since the last meeting. Want to reiterate that the panel are open to submissions from the CCC and any members of the public on the flood modelling of Inland Rail. ▶ Concentrated on the Border to Gowrie section - specifically Condamine and Gowrie Creek flood models. Continuing to review all the information provided by ARTC from FFJV. These flood models are hydrology models (models that model rainfall that converts to run off) and hydraulic models (models that define flood levels and velocity and depths). ▶ Aim to provide report soon to the client which is a joint working group between the Department of Infrastructure and Queensland Transport and Main Roads. ▶ PM: Is there a time limit on the report you are bringing back or will there be stages for release? ▶ TO: Yes there is a process. Soon there will be a draft EIS released and it is anticipated that our draft flood review report will be issued at the same time. So if people want to make direct

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>submission to us they are welcome to do so or if they want to make submission to the draft EIS we can review those. After the draft EIS period is over we can look at any other areas that the community may want us to address in the draft before the final report is submitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RL: With original flood modelling some landowners felt the predicted flood levels were at odds with the levels they recorded in recent floods. Have those people provided information to you? ▶ TO: No direct feedback from the community. But have been direct contact with the local government authorities and review the consultation reports from ARTC. When you review the technical reports that go with the flood modelling you get see where FFJV have nominated where they have discussed with individual landowners the flooding and how it matches or doesn't match the historical event records. As the modelling has progressed with time it has indeed looked at more and more data for calibration. The panel's job is to review that data is fit for purpose. ▶ RL: Flood shadowing as a result of culverts will have an impact on the downstream crops. IS this an issue that will be considered? ▶ TO: Yes. A requirement of any linear infrastructure is it looks to address connectivity between upstream and downstream land uses. One of the things the panel will review is – is there sufficient resolution in the culvert geography along the alignment eg not concentrating flows. ▶ Kerry Shine: Were the panel asked to do similar modelling on Cecil Plains route? ▶ TO: Panel were appointed before the decision to look an alternative route. Panel are not undertaking any flood modelling, only reviewing the existing modelling. ▶ VB: What happens when there is no data? There has not been a flood since a significant infrastructure levee bank has been built at the Wellcamp Airport so what do you do there. ▶ TO: Panel tasked to look at the range of calibration events that FFJV have used is appropriate. Are they recent enough? Are they well related to what infrastructure is now on the floodplain? The review will draw conclusions about the available data and the currency of those calibration events. ▶ VB: Can you tell if what they have put in is correct if it doesn't take into account what's on ground now? ▶ TO: Yes, we are able to look at the most recent topographic information available. ▶ VB: There is a number of approved and planned infrastructure projects for the floodplain – have you been tasked to overlay the approved and planned infrastructure at the Wellcamp floodplain? ▶ TO: Panel tasked with making sure that FFJV have overlayed any approved planning scheme, infrastructure and/or development to their modelling. ▶ VB: Would that include developments at Westbrook because all of that water does flow into that creek. ▶ TO: Yes any development that is in a catchment that will contribute to any location along the line, we will look at whether that has been considered in the flood modelling. ▶ VB: Where do we send submissions? ▶ TO: as per previous minutes: inlandrailfloodpanel@tmr.qld.gov.au ▶ BA: Thanked TO for providing an update of the Flood Panel Review and answering questions.
5	<p>P2N Project Lessons learnt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BA: Due to running behind schedule we will hold this presentation over to a later meeting.
6	<p>Construction pack feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BA: At the last meeting in August Inland Rail took on board the request for more detailed information regarding construction and committed to developing and sharing a construction pack with the committee for consideration. Information pack sent out some time ago for feedback. Any questions of the team?

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RL: Good first draft but some numbers need to be easier to read. You will need to show a bit more detail on the types and quantities of materials the project will use. Maybe a better glossary of terms or explanations what everything is – not everyone is able to read more technical information. ▶ LM: What is the difference between a reference design and what will be in construction? More information about what this looks like. ▶ AR - Reference design will inform the tendering process – it's not what will be finally constructed as there is a final detailed design process to be complete. The narrow corridor will be investigated and optimised on things like balancing earth works, soils and scour protection, hydrology modelling and bridging structures etc. ▶ PM: A previous action from last meeting was where the proposed stockpile and contaminated spoils would go. ▶ AR: FFJV will have done their Geotech investigations and then broadly looked at earthwork specifications which identifies and classifies the material for general use or more suitable for construction material closer to the ballast, such as structural fill. Where it doesn't meet material specifications it is classified as spoil, although contractor will be encouraged to reuse where possible, where material blending may occur or other techniques to meet the specification. PM: We asked where the stockpiles will be -specifically contaminated. ▶ RS: Yet to be determined ▶ RS: In regard to contaminated soils we are commencing a more detailed soils survey at the moment and also including contamination testing. ▶ LM: Are those tenders being advertised at the moment – through a panel arrangement ▶ RS to confirm offline. ▶ VB: What people want to know about is the black soil plains and how you plan to stabilise that. If it is to be excavated – how much being removed and what will go back in. Can we get that detail or when can we get it? ▶ AR: We are doing ongoing testing to analyse those soils to come up with the detail design for construction. This will determine the suitability of materials, whether we need to stabilise, or if we need to utilise different geotextiles to stiffen the soils but this is all in detail design. ▶ VB: When will this be known and available to see? ▶ RS: No current plans to release detail design specifications. ACTION: Will take on notice and confirm. ▶ VB: Are the fill and cut figures related as not necessarily the cut will be used for the fill or have you done that analysis already? ▶ AR: Yes, they are very related and well balanced. We have identified that 150,000 cubes metres of the cut cannot be used in fill. ▶ VB: 198000 truck movements to move dirt from tunnel. Has council approved where the stockpile will be and the roads that will be destroyed in moving the dirt? ▶ RS: Yes we do consult with council extensively on this. This level of detail is within both EISs. ▶ VB: Does it include roads? ▶ RS: Yes it does include traffic management and road movements. ▶ VB: Does it include compensation to council? ▶ RS: Council are aware of what's in the EIS in regard to this. ▶ VB: Bill can I confirm the EIS is released by the OCG not Inland Rail? ▶ BA: Yes.
7	<p>Noise questions / answers</p> <p>BA: Noted that a full noise presentation was given to the previous CCC committee but there were some specific questions asked by RL which will be addressed in this presentation. Welcomed Shane Harris, Principal Environment Advisor, Queensland.</p>

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>See attached presentation</p> <p>SH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Noise triggers, what ARTC aim to be at or below is below what is required by OCG and Department of Transport and Main Roads re <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ New rail <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Daytime (7am – 10pm): LAeq 60dBA, Max 80dBA ▶ Night time (10pm – 7am): LAeq 55dBA, Max 80dBA ▶ Upgrade existing rail <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Daytime (7am – 10pm): LAeq 66dBA, Max 85dBA ▶ Night time (10pm – 7am): LAeq 60dBA, Max 80dBA ▶ RL: Is the noise measurement on the centre line? ▶ SH: Noise levels are applied at the location of the trigger ▶ RL: Is there a base line construction target near railway line? ▶ SH: Sound power levels reference data is available from Queensland Rail. But noise is measured at receiver to protect people from the impact ▶ PM: Where is the receptor a specific location or distance from the railway line ▶ SH: To ensure the most number of receptors considered ART looked at the corridor plus 2 kilometres (1600 houses in B2G). <p>PH: Is there a time scale to the noise measurements</p> <p>SH: LAeq is an average so for night time of 55dBA it is an average of all the night time movements between 10pm and 7am. LMax is the 95th percentile for a second to pass by.</p> <p>SH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Noise triggers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Applied externally ▶ LAeq – total overall noise during a railway event (most noticeable noise) ▶ LMax. - Maximum level of noise during a railway event – most noticeable noise ▶ More stringent than current Queensland criteria ▶ Consistent across Inland Rail Projects ▶ Allows for rail noise to be managed equitably (across the alignment) ▶ Assessment Modelling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Reference design: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> horizontal and vertical alignments earthworks; embankments; cuts ▶ Regional topography included, weather conditions considered ▶ All rail infrastructure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> main line; loops; bridges; crossings; turn outs; alarms, horns—best practice ▶ Accounts for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> exhaust; engine; wheel/rail—locomotive and wagons ▶ Sensitive receivers: alignment + 2km <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approx.: 300,000+, M2B; 63,000+, QLD; 1,600+ B2G ▶ Outcomes of Draft EIS

NO.	ACTIONS																					
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #008080; color: white;">Level above trigger</th> <th style="background-color: #008080; color: white;">Project Open</th> <th style="background-color: #008080; color: white;">Design Year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1-3 dB</td> <td style="text-align: center;">58</td> <td style="text-align: center;">58</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3-5 dB</td> <td style="text-align: center;">14</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5-10 dB</td> <td style="text-align: center;">36</td> <td style="text-align: center;">36</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10-20 dB</td> <td style="text-align: center;">22</td> <td style="text-align: center;">22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>20 dB</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: center;">130</td> <td style="text-align: center;">131</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Vibration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Types: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> continuous; impulsive; intermittent; and, dose levels ▶ Structural damage ▶ Annoyance/building contents ▶ Human Comfort—vibration dose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> achieved at <13 m offset distance (9 trains) ▶ Regenerated noise: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> habitable rooms—night-time 35dB 50m from outer rail—3 receivers conservative—sub-surface damping conservative—no coupling losses ▶ Potential for perceptible levels—mainline line dominates ▶ Mitigation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 1. Control of noise and vibration at source ▶ 2. Control of the pathway for noise to reach receptors ▶ Control of noise impacts at the receptors ▶ Strategy based on reasonable and practicable approach (DTMR, 2019) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Reasonable: community preferences; cost factors; benefits provided; existing/future levels ▶ Practicable: conventional; readily available; tested technology; build/maintenance considerations (environmental, safety, engineering) ▶ Barriers generally considered for groups of triggered receivers ▶ For isolated triggered receivers, barriers are generally not considered—for any infrastructure project ▶ Received noise levels <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ External <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessed externally—for calculated worst-case façade ▶ Internal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building type, construction Goals to maintain function of building Times of use; type of use Ventilation—windows open, closed ▶ At property <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Mitigation for receivers is expected to include: Upgrades to boundary fencing to improve screening; and/or ▶ At-property architectural treatments to the building (increased glazing or façade, ventilation)—to control rail noise inside building. ▶ Future circumstances <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Retrofitting targeted components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> windows—glass thickness; number of layers; seals 	Level above trigger	Project Open	Design Year	1-3 dB	58	58	3-5 dB	14	15	5-10 dB	36	36	10-20 dB	22	22	>20 dB	0	0	TOTAL	130	131
Level above trigger	Project Open	Design Year																				
1-3 dB	58	58																				
3-5 dB	14	15																				
5-10 dB	36	36																				
10-20 dB	22	22																				
>20 dB	0	0																				
TOTAL	130	131																				

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>external walls—plasterboard; insulation; masonry roof—plasterboard; insulation floors—tongue and grooved boards; plasterboard; insulation entry doors—solid core; seals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ All options are assessed on a case-by-case basis ▶ Agreed solutions are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> equitable—consistently applied sustainable—consider whole of cycle costs
	<p>Project presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - B2G and G2H update ▶ KU: Engagement update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Many ongoing field investigations happening: cultural heritage, flora and fauna, geotech, cadastral. Will be lots of contractors around the region – all will be in branded vehicles. ▶ Last round of sponsorships and donations there were 2 successful applicants in this area: Brookstead Hall and Southbrook State School. ▶ Outreach continuing in Pittsworth fortnightly either out the front of Woolworths or in the main street near the newsagency. Also fortnightly in Millmerran near the IGA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Of the 150 people spoken to in outreach sessions since they commence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 8% negative towards the project ▶ 92% positive or neutral towards the project. ▶ HW: Business Capability Workshops happening across the whole of QLD alignment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Toowoomba tomorrow and Thursday ▶ Next week – Pittsworth, Millmerran and Goondiwindi ▶ Still spots available if businesses are interested ▶ Aimed at local businesses who might supply to the project . ▶ GT: G2H update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Gowrie to Kagaru section of Inland Rail is divided into three separate projects – Gowrie to Helidon (G2H), Helidon to Calvert (H2C) and Calvert to Kagaru (C2K) – for the purpose of undertaking Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) and reference designs. These projects are considered the most technically complex section of Inland Rail and will be delivered by a Public Private Partnership. ▶ Inland Rail Public Private Partnership one step closer. Earlier this month, three world-class consortia have been invited by the Australian Rail Track Corporation (ARTC) to submit proposals for the section of Inland Rail from Gowrie outside Toowoomba to Kagaru near Beaudesert in Queensland, to be delivered as a Public Private Partnership (PPP). ▶ Sponsorship: Toowoomba Lapidary Club, Teen Challenge Toowoomba, Riding for Disabled Toowoomba and many others. ▶ The draft EIS is expected to be available for public comment and submission in early 2021.
	<p>General business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ FK: EIS update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Draft EIS submitted December '19 – adequacy assessment ▶ Feedback received from Office of the Coordinator General (OCG) and Government agencies ▶ All feedback closed out and incorporated into draft EIS ▶ Draft EIS submitted to OCG early Oct '20 ▶ Next step will be the public exhibition period. ▶ BA: Noted that last year the committee asked that I write on behalf of them to the OCG asking if the normal 4 week period could be extended. They indicated that that would be the case. They recently contacted me again regarding what sort of timeframe and indicating it may be out before Christmas and I indicated that if before Christmas at least 6 weeks.

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ VB: The reason the EIS is not out yet is because it hasn't met the adequacy as far as the coordinator general is concerned. We see in the press the line "Get on and build this". But this is a process that needs to be followed. ▶ Contractor incident <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS: During current Geotech campaign we had an incident that occurred last week where a contractor who despite being fully inducted was working in a rail corridor, with no clear boundary fencing, and made turning movements into private property where we do not have a land access agreement. ▶ We do not condone that behaviour and induct all contractors with a very clear set on guidelines on how they are to behave when onsite. ▶ Contactor have been sent formal notification of the breach and issued a strike ▶ Encourage community to reach out to us as soon as possible. ▶ VB: This access would be considered trespassing. Wouldn't be appropriate to reach out to ARTC it would be most appropriate to reach out to authorities ▶ RS: As mentioned anyone is within rights to contact authorities but encourage them to also contact us to ensure we can rectify situation as soon as possible. Not an obligation ▶ BA: Proposed seminar on land acquisition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ I have been approached by a couple of advisers who would be willing to address a public meeting covering legal, taxation and valuation issues. It would be an information session on issues to consider as part of the acquisition or resumption process. It would be general advice only and advice should be considered on individual circumstances. I have spoken with the Chair of the SDDCCC who supports the idea. ▶ I have discussed this with ARTC Inland Rail and they have agreed to provide a venue and record the presentations which would potentially be made available on the ARTC website if there is interest from the community/ committee ▶ GG: Think there should be a representative from the Land Court ▶ PM: Yes, in total agreement and the sooner the better. ▶ PM: At no point have the communities of Wellcamp, Gowrie Mountain and Gowrie Junction had engagement opportunities available to them on a regular basis. There is a real feeling that they are not considered – all the meetings are in Pittsworth in the past 12 months. Meetings should move around. Needs to be more extensive adverting around that end eg Zimms corner, Kingsthorpe, Gowrie Junction. ▶ BA: Meetings are normally held in different locations. The previous meeting was due to be a public meeting but we had to close it down due to covid so decision was made to hold it again in Pittsworth the give community opportunity to attend. Previous one was at Gowrie Junction. ▶ GT: Held many meetings in Gowrie Junction and have also held pop up displays in Gowrie Junction. Very regularly meeting with community and community groups in Gowrie Junction. ▶ PM: Disagree with you – Need to be aware that if you live on southern side of the highway you have little to do with Gowrie Junction. Alienating due to concentration in Gowrie Junction. Tried to arrange a meeting with Gowrie Junction onsite but had to cancel once but second time engineer wasn't able to come. ▶ KU: Meeting is still to happen and has never been cancelled only postponed with an offer of engagement team being declined. After direct feedback from yourself the Gowrie Junction pop up sessions were arranged. Feedback from those was only Gowrie Junction community and will continue to investigate options within the community but are open to suggestions of locations of where we should be. Also as a CCC member it also up to you to take information back to your community.

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ VB: We don't want pop up sessions we want the engineers to come and explain to us what the impacts are and what they are going to do about them.
8	<p>Observer questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BA: If you do have any questions, please channel them through myself or Katie.
8	<p>Conclusion and confirmation of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Next meeting will hopefully coincide with EIS public notification period in early new year. ▶ Looking to lock in bus tour early in the new year now restrictions have lifted. <p>PM: Any further information on mental health workshops offered to the committee? KU: Only had one person interested and will happily organise if more interest.</p> <p>Meeting closed 9.05pm</p>

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	ARTC to confirm if the detail design specifications will ever be publicly released and if so when in the process.	Inland Rail	Next meeting

Next meeting

To be confirmed but will coincide with the B2G EIS release