

Meeting minutes

Inner Darling Downs Consultative Committee Meeting

Date / Time

15 March 2022
6.00pm to 8pm

Location

Pittsworth Service Centre
85 Yandilla Street, Pittsworth

Facilitators

Bill Armagnacq, Inner Darling
Downs CCC (BA)

Minute taker

Katie Unipan – (ARTC Inland
Rail) (KU)

Distribution

All

Attendees (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Paul McDonald, Southern Queensland Landscapes (PM)
- ▶ Chris Joseph, Individual (CJ)
- ▶ Ken Murphy, Individual (KM)
- ▶ Vicki Battaglia, Individual (VB)
- ▶ Rob Loch, Pittsworth District Landcare Association (RL)
- ▶ Phoebe Mitchell, Individual (PMo)
- ▶ Gary Garland, Individual (GG)

Apologies (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Todd Rohl, Toowoomba Chamber of Commerce (TR)
- ▶ Kylie Schultz, Individual (KS)
- ▶ Larry Pappin, Inner Downs Inland Rail Action Group (LP)
- ▶ Clinton Weber, Individual (CW)
- ▶ Lance MacManus, TSBE (LM)
- ▶ Thomas Draper, Indigenous representative (TD)
- ▶ Paul Hanlon, Individual (PH)

Guests (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ David Dique, Environmental Resources Management (DD)
- ▶ Matt Davis, Department of Resources Management (MD)
- ▶ Dianne Loughnan, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications (DL)
- ▶ Craig Sleeman, Toowoomba Regional Council (CL)
- ▶ Trevor Mitchell, Toowoomba Regional Council (TM)
- ▶ Cindy Thomas, BHQJV (CT)
- ▶ Warren Crowther, BHQJV (WC)

ARTC

- ▶ Rob Smith, Senior Project Manager (RS)
- ▶ Phoebe Moore, Senior Environment Advisor B2G (PM)
- ▶ Sarah Delahunty, Manager Stakeholder Engagement QLD (SD)
- ▶ Katie Unipan, Stakeholder Engagement Lead Northern (KU)
- ▶ Belinda Scott-Toms, Stakeholder Engagement Advisor Northern (BST)
- ▶ Alicia Mackay, Stakeholder Engagement Advisor Northern (AM)
- ▶ Vanessa Gorecki, Program Environment Advisor (VG)
- ▶ David Isbister, Senior Project Manager (DI)
- ▶ Andrew Roberts, Design Manager (AR)
- ▶ Ed Matthews, Delivery Director Northern (EM)
- ▶ David Thompson, Project Manager (DT)
- ▶ Emma Meyer, Stakeholder Engagement Lead (EM)
- ▶ Michael Price, Senior Environment Advisor G2H (MP) online

Members of the public

A number of members of the public were in attendance

Discussions

NO.	ACTIONS
1	<p>Welcome, introductions and conflicts of interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BA delivered an acknowledgement of Traditional Owners. ▶ BA welcomed the committee and thanked committee members, guests and observers for their attendance. ▶ BA noted that this is the first IDD CCC (only) face to face meeting for some time. ▶ BA explained that during the meeting, committee members can ask questions throughout the proceedings whilst observers can ask questions at the end of the meeting. ▶ BA noted the meeting was recorded for meeting minute purposes. ▶ BA noted that anyone asking questions should wait until a microphone is handed to them and mention their name. ▶ BA said all committee members terms expired at the beginning of March 2022. All members had been offered a renewal. ▶ BA noted the conflicts of interest register and asked committee members to inform Chair of any changes or updates. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No changes were advised.
2	<p>Actions arising from previous meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BA noted G2H groundwater management would be addressed later in the meeting ▶ BA reiterated that all committee members had been offered a membership renewal. BA added that his role had also been extended. ▶ BA said Graeme Clapham (Chair, SDD CCC) had contacted the Coordinator General (in advance of writing a letter to the OCG) who advised the revised EIS will be on display for comment. Therefore, a letter to the OCG requesting this information was not deemed necessary. ▶ BA said the Independent Flood Panel has advised that their recommendations are currently being finalised. The final report is expected to be released soon. The Panel has not written to the State and Federal Governments requesting that the public be able to make comment on the recommendations. ▶ BA asked the committee if there were any questions. ▶ VB stated that it was disappointing that the Flood Panel had not written to the State and Federal Governments, as this was specifically requested at the previous joint SDD/IDD CCC Meeting and stated that the action had not been resolved. ▶ RL requested that ARTC respectfully advise the committee and community of the details before any further soil surveys are undertaken. ▶ BA seconded RL's request and is in discussions with ARTC regarding this. ▶ VB asked that soil surveys be a standing agenda item. ▶ PM requested that all upcoming works be part of every agenda. ▶ PM asked for clarification on whether the public will be able to make comment on the flood panel's report. ▶ BA clarified that the Panel had put in writing that: they 'have not written to the government, the recommendations are being finalised, and the report is to be released soon'. There was no mention of opening the report for public comment or discussion. ▶ BA handed the meeting proceedings to Ed Mathews to discuss the Project Update.

3	<p>Project update Ed Matthews, Delivery Director Northern Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ EM introduced himself to the committee as the Delivery Director for the Northern program of works on the B2G alignment.▶ EM said he has been in the role since July 2021 and this meeting is the first opportunity he has had to attend in person.▶ EM introduced team members who have joined since:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ David Isbister – Senior Project Manager▶ Belinda Scott-Toms - Stakeholder Engagement Advisor▶ Alicia Mackay - Stakeholder Engagement Advisor▶ EM informed the committee that SD will be leaving her role as Manager of Stakeholder Engagement (QLD) at the end of March 2022. EM thanked SD for her support and effort on the project and with engaging with the B2G community. <p>Northern Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ EM explained the difference between the Northern Package of works for B2G as compared to the entire B2G alignment as represented in the EIS. The Northern section begins at Whetstone just south on Inglewood and continues to Gowrie. The other section is known as the Central section of the alignment and travels from Whetstone to the NSW/QLD border.▶ EM said this does not change anything from an EIS perspective. However, when the project is in the execution phase of the project, the contractors will divide the B2G project into these Northern and Central sections.▶ EM introduced Warren Crowther, Program Manager for Bilby Hull QBirt Joint Venture (BHQ) who will present later in the meeting. BHQ are the appointed contractors for the Northern Package of works to deliver the Detailed Design and progression to project execution.▶ EM explained that the project was in the approvals phase of the EIS. Construction will not commence until the EIS is approved. Some work on the Detailed Design has commenced. <p>Questions from the committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ PM asked if Gowrie was situated at the top end of the Northern section of the B2G alignment and whether the CCC will remain the same.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ EM displayed the map of the Northern section on the PowerPoint slide which shows Gowrie at the northern (top) end of the alignment and the stated that the CCC will cover the same area as it does now.
4	<p>Engagement Katie Unipan, B2G (Northern) Stakeholder Engagement Lead</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ KU presented the engagement activities undertaken in the calendar year from June 2021.▶ KU said that during this time, 1264 individual conversations had been undertaken. These were mostly made up of one-on-one conversations with directly impacted landholders and the Department of Transport and Main Roads as well as advising owners of newly bought land along the alignment of any potential impacts. Continued conversations were also happening via the website, interactive map and 1800 number.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ KU said that after previous feedback from the CCC meeting was to have Land Access as a standing agenda item. KU also said the Inland Rail website was regularly updated with what land investigations were being undertaken and community members can contact the engagement team via 1800 732 761 number or inlandrailqld@artc.com.au to learn what investigations were current. <p>Questions from the committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ RL asked whether the work being undertaken by BHQ had been tendered.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Yes, tendered and appointed by ARTC.
5	<p>Land Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ KU advised the committee that when undertaking land investigations, all contractors must be in a branded vehicle. This will assist landholders know which contractors are onsite and if there are any concerns – landholders and community members are encouraged to call Inland Rail.▶ KU said that currently the team was actively pursuing land access agreement renewals. The project's land access agreement requirement will be ongoing. With BHQ onboard, they will have their own requirements for land access which will be negotiated with Inland Rail and landholders.▶ KU noted that the recent S109 process had been closed out, except for one landholder which got delayed due to a recent flooding event and access will be renegotiated with that landholder.▶ KU explained the current investigations being undertaken are available on the Inland Rail website at www.inlandrail.artc.com.au and currently include bore surveys, traffic counting, ecology surveys, cadastral surveys and groundwater monitoring. <p>Questions from the committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ PM asked about what washdown facilities and protocols ARTC used prior to access properties.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ KU responded that within the Land Access Agreement, the landholder can request clean vehicles only or a third party signed certificate which is done in Toowoomba. Consideration of another washdown facility will be undertaken as the project progresses.
6	<p>Flood Panel</p> <p>Rob Smith, Senior Project Manager, B2G (Northern)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ RS explained that the flood panel process is an independently run process through the State and Federal Governments. As part of the Flood Panel's review of the Border to Gowrie hydrology assessments, ARTC has provided technical notes and digital flood models for each individual waterway intersected by the rail alignment▶ RS said that the Flood Panel has reviewed this detail and provided comments. ARTC (through Future Freight Joint Venture) continue to provide responses to comments, with the majority now closed out▶ RS said that on the back of the Flood Panels feedback, ARTC has updated the B2G Flood Impact Objectives (FIO's). The FIO's developed provide an increased level of detail on flood parameters including (but not limited to) afflux, inundation duration, flow distribution, velocities, and hazard. The FIO's have also been reviewed by the Flood Panel and comments taken by ARTC▶ RS advised that ARTC will continue to engage with the Flood Panel towards to the release of their Final Report.▶ RS said ARTC do not have the official date of when the Flood Panel will release the Final Report and will keep the committee updated on this date in due course.

7	<p>EIS approvals process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ RS gave a brief overview of what EIS approvals ARTC has undertaken, including undertaking public exhibition in 2021 and receiving public submissions. In January 2022, ARTC received the OCG's request for additional information on the EIS.▶ RS said that whilst the request for additional information was received in January 2022, ARTC has had ongoing discussions with the OCG and had visibility of submissions which has helped advise on what additional information may have been required.▶ RS said ARTC will be resubmitting a revised EIS to the OCG in the second half of 2022. The next steps will be for OCG to review the revised EIS for adequacy and ARTC will then hold a second round of public exhibition. The dates for this second round of public notification is yet to be confirmed by the OCG.▶ Further to this, the OCG may request supplementary information from ARTC before declaring the EIS as final and approved.▶ RS said the OCG had received 554 requests for additional information.▶ RS said the key requests for additional information include Traffic and Transport, Noise and Vibration, Flooding and hydrology, Land resources, Geomorphology, Groundwater and Flora and Fauna.
8	<p>EIS and RFI update Phoebe Moore, Senior Environment Advisor and EIS Lead, B2G</p> <p>Soils investigations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ PMo said there have been ongoing investigations since the draft EIS was made public in January 2021. These field investigations are now complete and will be presented in the revised EIS.▶ PMo said the draft Soil Assessment and Management Plan is currently being finalised. The draft report will then undergo technical review by ARTC and our independent CPSS (Certified Practising Soil Scientist) and updated to address RFI requirements. <p>Questions from the committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ RL asked whether in some instances whether hand augers were being used for soil investigations or was another method used.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ RS replied that hand augers were mostly used for soil investigations. These soil investigations were 1:10,000.▶ RL commented that there was a zero missing, that the original recommendation to the OCG was 1:100,000 not 1:10,000.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ RL responded that ARTC did make every effort to maintain the 1:10,000 resolution that was requested by the OCG. By using a hand auger, contractors were able to move around properties without disrupting sensitive farming operations such as cropping.▶ VB asked whether ARTC had considered releasing reports as investigations are completed instead of waiting until the revised EIS.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ RS responded that the release of a report is different to releasing an assessment in the EIS. Releasing a report prior to the EIS would be challenging but is happy to talk through the assessment methodologies.▶ PMo further explained that the sample of locations were a mixture of check sites and hand augers. Aurecon is the contractor used and they are finalising their assessment which will be documented in a report. This will form a draft report which will undergo a technical review by ARTC and our independent CPSS which ARTC is currently onboarding. The report will be updated to reflect the RFI requirements. This will then go to the Department of

Resources (DoR) for review. The report will then become finalised and form an appendix of the revised EIS.

- ▶ AR provided an update on the construction on black soils. Over the next 12 months, BHQ and ARTC will be working on a construction methodology for working on black soil through the Detailed Design phase. The N2NS (Narrabri to North Star) project has also constructed on black soil. ARTC will be analysing the design and construct used on this project.
- ▶ AR asked the committee whether there was value in the Principal Geotech Engineer providing a focussed workshop on the concept used on N2NS project. This would not be specific to the Condamine.
- ▶ VB asked for clarity on whether the N2NS section had already been built on the black soil.
 - ▶ AR responded yes.
- ▶ PM asked for clarity on whether the ARTC already had modelling for constructing on the N2NS black soil.
 - ▶ AR said ARTC had the approved design which had already been constructed over the black soil. This will not be the same design for the Condamine however it is a similar concept.
- ▶ PM asked which section of N2NS.
 - ▶ AR took this question on notice as an Action Item.
- ▶ RL commented that he would be interested in seeing the detailed soil analytical data from the N2NS project to compare to the Condamine.
 - ▶ AR said ARTC and BHQ were about to undertake a scoping exercise to understand Geotech testing, soil sampling and analytics.
 - ▶ PMo added that there will be data presented in the baseline soil report.
- ▶ SD asked the committee to clarify whether they were interested in attending the N2NS black soil workshop.
 - ▶ The committee responded that yes, it would be good to hear from N2NS experience and to know how the rail withstood the recent rain event.

Groundwater survey

- ▶ PMo explained a survey to identify and confirm the presence and location of registered or unregistered bores within the alignment groundwater study area was underway. This would compile a complete dataset from landholders to inform the EIS and had been stipulated by the OCG from public submissions on the EIS.
- ▶ PMo said the draft EIS assessment indicated potential for minor groundwater drawdown up to maximum extent of 80 m from the rail centreline of select deep cut locations but the modelling has not been finalised
- ▶ PMo said landowners had been contacted via phone/ email/ post to gather known data about their bore and use
- ▶ PMo said the project team will follow up with some landowners who wish to have either a bore logger or baseline bore assessment carried out on their bore
- ▶ PMo said groundwater surveys will continue through design and construction to monitor impacts and inform modelling.

Bore 'make good' strategy

- ▶ PMo said ARTC are preparing a bore 'Make Good' process for inclusion in the revised draft EIS, based on potential impacts to water bores identified in the draft EIS.
- ▶ PMo explained that the process is likely to be informed by where the bore is located i.e., within the project disturbance footprint or the outside of the disturbance footprint where groundwater has been predicted to be drawdown. Will continue to monitor groundwater through its monitoring network and this will inform the assessment of potential impacts to water bores.

Questions from the committee

- ▶ VB asked what a make good agreement would consist of.
 - ▶ PMo replied it is a case-by-case solution and depends on the wishes of the landholder and the negotiations for each individual case. E.g., a replacement bore, or request for compensation.
- ▶ VB asked what timeframe this make good agreement would be undertaken.
 - ▶ PMo responded that timeframe would be detailed in the make good strategy.
- ▶ PM asked if the make good strategy would only be for property owners within the rail alignment footprint.
 - ▶ PMo clarified that there are two zones of impacts. 1. Directly impacted, which have bores directly impacted by the project that will be decommissioned. 2. Potentially impacted bores by drawdowns of the water table that are within 80 metres of the edge of the alignment. The make good agreement will have two separate strategies for these impacts.
- ▶ PM asked for clarity on whether 80 metres is what ARTC has allowed for on either side of the alignment.
 - ▶ PMo said that the hydrological modelling has predicted that it would be a maximum of 80 metres from the alignment (from the point of dewatering).

Ecology update

- ▶ PMo said the revised EIS will have results of the detailed surveys.
- ▶ PMo explained that ARTC has brought in some specialists to help address concerns flagged in the RFI. This includes Dr Rob Vanderlee from WSP who will be reviewing and updating the existing Fauna Connectivity Strategy. Rob will be onsite next week to commence that scope. David Dique and Matt Davis will also undertake a Koala Management plan. David and Matt have been involved with B2G's Koala habitat mapping and a Koala Genetics study, all of which will form an appendix in the revised EIS. David will be presenting this evening.
- ▶ PMo handed the meeting proceedings to David Dique to discuss Koala Management.

Koala Management

David Dique, Environmental Resources Management – Guest Speaker

- ▶ RL greeted DD and explained that he is the CCC member that represents Pittsworth Landcare which has done a lot of work with koalas. Recently Ausecology has requested some of Landcare's data. RL said the consultation thus far has been disappointing. There has been one meeting at which he feels there was not a great deal of cooperation, and it comes as a surprise that these other studies are happening as there has been no information provided. RL requested information in advance of the studies so that Landcare and other organisations can value add.
- ▶ DD thanked RL for his comments and PMo for the invitation to speak this evening. Part of the scope for ERM is to talk to community. ERM has two sessions they have been engaged for. This evening is the first of those sessions.
- ▶ DD responded to RL's comment by stating ERM had only recently been engaged on the ARTC koala studies. Part of the conversation this evening is to provide an update on what is planned.
- ▶ DD introduced himself and background work he has done studying koalas, including a PHD in the 1990s, Principal Advisor to the Queensland Government in 2004 for vulnerable listing of koalas in QLD, sat on the threatened species scientific species for the Federal Government in 2012 for the listing of koalas as vulnerable species across Australia's East coast.
- ▶ DD is working with the Australian government to have a thorough understanding of the new listing of endangered species in terms of koala management.
- ▶ DD said he is assisting ARTC with two pieces of work. 1. Koala genetics study to understand genetic diversity across koala populations that occur across the B2G alignment. This will be undertaken in collaboration with the University of Sunshine Coast. This will assist ARTC in the

management of impacts and conservation of koalas along the B2G alignment and local area.
2. Koala Management Plan, which is a requirement of the RFI.

Questions from the committee

- ▶ A community member commented that the PowerPoint slides were difficult to read and requested more details on the slides, in place of large images.
- ▶ RL had a question on the distribution of koala genetics along the B2G alignment, if the sampling is restricted to the alignment, then only an east west transcript of the region will be taken. What happens if the major koala movements are north south?
 - ▶ DD replied that there will be some limitations in the ability to collect the required data of the landscape. The intent is for the first round of study to look at proximity to the B2G alignment where there is access. Recommendations will be made for future work to get a better understanding of the genetic diversity of the local area landscape.
 - ▶ PMo discussed the work that WSP will be undertaking to look at the biodiversity corridors and in particular the fauna passage and fencing design. There are important biodiversity corridors in the region to combine the field verified element to ensure ARTC's proposed fauna passage is appropriate and matched to the impacts. WSP will be onsite next week as the first step and then will commence their assessment.
 - ▶ VB asked for clarity on what 'onsite' meant and whether appointments had been made with CCC members who understand koala movements in the area.
 - ▶ PMo clarified that 'onsite' in this instance meant driving the B2G alignment. PMo said the person doing the investigations is a trained ecologist and will viewing the site as the first step and will set meetings with the community once he understands the landscape.
 - ▶ RL said he feels the message ARTC are providing is that ecologists are not wanting to meet with the community.
 - ▶ RS responded to RL by stating ARTC has made the offer of consultation with the ecologists on the B2G alignment, however it is not unusual for people to familiarise themselves with the landscape first and then consult with the community. This assists with being informed when they reach out and meet with the community. Consultation will be organised with the committee.
 - ▶ VB asked for the timeframe for this consultation as it is important it suits the committee's availability. RS made this an action from the meeting.
 - ▶ PM asked whether the consultation will be in the same forum as this evening (information meeting), or will it be consultation in the form of engagement.
 - ▶ RS said ARTC is happy to take the committee's advice on the way they would like to be consulted. This will be a targeted session rather than a CCC meeting.
 - ▶ SD added that ARTC has offered to provide an update at every Landcare meeting which could also be an opportunity to engage with the wider community.
 - ▶ RL said ARTC's attendance at the Landcare meeting occurred after the project had been done.
 - ▶ SD reiterated that ARTC is offering to attend Landcare meetings, moving forward, and have been attending as of late 2021. If ARTC are invited, we will attend and provide an update.
 - ▶ RL said Landcare will work with ARTC and contractors if they attend the meetings however said with regards to the specialist studies, there has not been that engagement to date.

9

B2G Reference Design updates

Andrew Roberts, Design Manager

- ▶ AR provided a timeline update. In January 2021, the OCG completed the adequacy check of the B2G draft EIS, and this was released for public exhibition. Comments from the community and agencies were collected. The OCG formalised the responses in May 2021 at which time was formally presented to ARTC. The B2G team then went on to responding to the comments.
- ▶ AR highlighted that ARTC has maintained its technical meetings with road managers, i.e., TMR (Transport and Main Roads) for state-controlled roads and local council authorities for local roads.
- ▶ AR said that in January 2022, ARTC received the RFI from the OCG with additional assessments that need to be completed.
- ▶ AR explained the three major milestones for the B2G Reference Design refinement as:
 - ▶ Road rail interfaces, which includes the removal of level crossings and level crossings that are now proposed to be grade separations (either road bridge over rail or rail bridge over road), passive level crossings now proposed to be active and stock route interfaces.
 - ▶ Horizontal alignment change around Millmerran and other minor horizontal alignment adjustments
 - ▶ Constructability and environment optimizations.
- ▶ AR explained road rail interface – ARTC is proposing the elimination of what were three level crossings in the draft EIS. One is in the GRC, which was not spoken to at this meeting. Within the Toowoomba Region, no crossing provided at Hall Road. This was a complex level crossing for access to one property only. ARTC are proposing an alternative road reserve connectivity access solution and removing the level crossing. Thirdly, Lindenmayer Road is now no longer impacted due a horizontal alignment change.
- ▶ AR explained in terms of grade separations, these were the roads that were previously proposed level crossings in the draft EIS and are now proposed grade separations. Within GRC, there is Bybera Road which is now rail over road, Heckendorf Road (just south of the mine) will be a road bridge over rail line.
- ▶ AR said within the design update, ARTC has eliminated a road detour and a significant road intersection of Millmerran Inglewood Road.
- ▶ AR said that within the Condamine flood plain, Gilgai Lane will have bridges spanning either side with a rail over road (instead of a level crossing) in that section without affecting the embankments.
- ▶ AR said Commodore Peak Road and Scraggs Road level crossing is now proposed for a rail over road.
- ▶ AR said Owen Scrub Road is now a road bridge over rail and forms the Millmerran realignment.
- ▶ AR said Athol School Road will be a rail bridge over road and consolidate Purcell Road to Athol School Road. AR referred to an image (pg. 30) in the PowerPoint presentation which explains the proposed changes. This network solution, ARTC is proposing a new road connecting Purcell Road to Athol School Road with an intersection.
- ▶ AR explained the treatment changes (passive upgraded to active level crossings) include:
 - ▶ Kooroongarra Road
 - ▶ Paton Road
 - ▶ Nicol Creek Road
 - ▶ Millwood Road
 - ▶ Harris Road (Pampas – overall design update)
 - ▶ Mann Silo Road

- ▶ Linthorpe Valley Road
- ▶ AR explained the Harris Road upgrade.
- ▶ AR explained that no changes were proposed to stock routes within the Toowoomba Region.
- ▶ AR moved onto the horizontal alignment changes.
- ▶ AR said there were a substantial number of submissions received specific to the Millmerran alignment. As part of the ongoing alignment development, ARTC had reviewed alternate routes to this area where impacts were further understood to a significant agribusiness operator and regional employer impacted by the draft EIS. A proposed realignment avoids impacts to this major regional employer and agribusiness operator by realigning the route south of the reference design. Two level crossings have been removed and a new grade separation (previously discussed). The road geometry and safety are improved with this design. A sharp bend has also been removed as part of the revised design as well as a more formal access to the tip.
- ▶ AR noted that this realignment is subject to review and approval of the Queensland State Government Coordinator General. The CCC and the broader community will have the opportunity to provide feedback on these design changes during the second round of public consultation later this year.
- ▶ AR noted other more minor alignment changes, including:
 - ▶ location 1 – CH115km to CH117km
 - ▶ Requirement to achieve Heckendorf Road grade separation.
 - ▶ Maximum 60m horizontal shift.
 - ▶ No additional adverse impact to landowners
- ▶ Location 2 – CH121km to 125km
 - ▶ Short stacking at Commodore Peak Road have been removed due to grade separation
 - ▶ 20m horizontal shift.
 - ▶ Reduces landowner impacts and land acquisition requirements.
- ▶ Location 3 – CH166km to 168km
 - ▶ Eliminates landowner impact on a property
 - ▶ 20m horizontal shift.
 - ▶ Positive earthworks balance
- ▶ Location 4 – CH166km to 168km
 - ▶ Eliminates landowner impact on a property
 - ▶ 30m horizontal shift.
 - ▶ Optimised for Athol School Road grade separation

Constructability and Environment – EIS temporary and permanent footprint review:

- ▶ AR explained Minor adjustments to other laydown areas throughout B2G based on consultation feedback.
- ▶ AR explained Whetstone and Bringalily State Forest review and justification for impact to state forest, relocating one laydown area into TMR road corridor and EIS boundary rationalisation to minimise impact.

Questions from the committee

- ▶ VB said connecting Purcell Road to Athol School Road would be an unnecessary road. Community feedback that VB has received is there are only four or five houses on Purcell Road who would prefer to go back onto the bitumen road. VB asked if the road diversion is necessary.

- ▶ AR responded that a traffic survey data had 200 – 300 vehicles on this section per day.
- ▶ VB agreed with this, however explained that this is because traffic can travel straight through, but once they cannot travel through, they will continue across the bitumen up Biddestone Southbrook Road down to Athol School Road.
- ▶ AR thanked VB for the feedback and will take this feedback to the local road authority (TRC (Toowoomba Regional Council)).
- ▶ RL noted that some level crossings had been eliminated due to noise and asked why specifically were the level crossings deemed to be noisy.
- ▶ AR said that was some EIS feedback provided to ARTC for McDougalls Road within the Goondiwindi Region, not Toowoomba Region.
- ▶ VB asked for the PowerPoint presentation be sent electronically to the committee so that they can review the proposed changes.
- ▶ KU responded yes; it will be on the website and she will send the slide pack to the Committee.
- ▶ VB asked if the Millmerran realignment was within the EIS boundary.
 - ▶ AR responded no, to avoid the stakeholder mentioned was realigned outside the 2km EIS corridor.
- ▶ VB asked what criteria ARTC had used to make the realignment decision outside of the EIS corridor. The committee had requested two other realignments that would take the impacts away from the community which had been denied (not considered) because they were outside of the 2km EIS corridor.
 - ▶ RS responded that the criteria for assessing the alternate alignments is the same multicriteria analysis that was used to assess the entire alignment that was within the original 2km radius. This realignment is in response to the EIS submissions received.
- ▶ VB asked – you would have received several submissions on two other realignment sites as well. How do we get those sites be assessed. If the answer is that the alignment can go outside the 2km study area, then consideration should be undertaken throughout the alignment.
- ▶ RL changed VB's question slightly to: there would have been quantitative criteria applied in terms of whether to move the line.
 - ▶ RS said the movement of the alignment to outside the 2km study area is in response to the EIS submission received and the assessment of that agribusiness and the ability to avoid impacts to it.
- ▶ RL asked what the key metrics ARTC used to form that decision e.g. how many employed people, what size of staff turnover. RL said the number of employees was not a metric used. Metrics used is a case-by-case scenario.
 - ▶ RS replied that he considers employment an important metric in this case.
- ▶ PM asked, when ARTC say it was in response to the amount of EIS submissions, was the Millmerran realignment something that the OCG requested that ARTC look at as part of the RFI or was it something that ARTC identified as major and how did ARTC quantify as major as minor impact or impact to the local business.
 - ▶ RS said it was not a request by the OCG, however ARTC must show that they have assessed and minimised impacts to local business and broader community as best as possible. Given the sizeable number of responses to this area, ARTC determine a realignment was the most appropriate response to avoid this business.
- ▶ PM asked if more submissions were received pertaining to one area over another, that would be considered for a realignment than another site.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS said when there are a considerable number of responses, it does draw attention to that area and an issue, however it still must be assessed on its merits and on the ability to avoid that issue. RS said ARTC was still constrained by several factors which is one of the reasons ARTC decided to move the alignment outside of the 2km study area. This is still in the reference design and still to be approved. ▶ PM asked if the newly impacted landholders had been directly consulted with. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS confirmed that ARTC had contacted each of the landholders and consulted with the landholders within each of the alignments regarding the change to their impacts. ▶ VB said the community had asked for another change to the alignment that is not as significant but is also outside of the 2km study area at Southbrook to protect koalas, does ARTC not deem koalas as important even though they are going to be extinct in 2050? How does the community get ARTC to reconsider other sections of the alignment that we would like slightly moved to make Inland Rail better for our community and impacts to koalas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS said the community's opportunity is during the upcoming revised draft EIS notification period and for ARTC to ensure it has effective mitigation strategies in place. ▶ VB said that once the trees are bulldozed, these koalas have nowhere to go and will not be able to live. If the community is suggesting to ARTC that there are corridors that can be followed that there are no trees and koalas will not be impacted, surely that is a better option. It is disappointing that we have been consistently told that we cannot go outside the 2km radius, but clearly, we can. Here is our opportunity to look at these other sites. ▶ BA suggested if the committee has suggestions for sites, that this be taken up with ARTC outside of this meeting. ▶ A member of the community said that equally ARTC need to be considering the impacts on humans living close by to the alignment, for example the Pittsworth area. KU responded that she would speak with the community member after the meeting.
<p>10</p>	<p>Introduction to BHQ (Bielby Holdings, JF Holdings and QH&M Birt Joint Venture) Warren Crowther, Program Manager</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ WC introduced BHQ JV which stands for three companies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Bielby Holdings ▶ JF Hull Holdings ▶ QH&M Birt ▶ WC stated the three companies were founded in Queensland between 1975 and 1981 and are privately owned. ▶ WC said the three businesses had worked together over a 30-year span previously and are familiar with how they work together. ▶ WC said all companies have vast experience working in Queensland and Northern NSW (New South Wales) whilst QH&M Birt is also associated with the resources sector and has a wider breadth of knowledge of the Australian landscape having worked in areas such as the Bowen Basin and the Pilbara. Bilby and Hull are more focused on the construction of infrastructure. ▶ WC said within the JV, each company brings a different area of expertise. Bilby Holdings (the largest of the three JV partners) is a general civil contractor. JF Hull Holdings is a specialist bridge works contractor. QH&M Birt is a specialist bulk earth mover. ▶ WC said all three companies had worked in the B2G local area. Most recently, QBirt was involved in the construction of the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing. JF Hull are currently involved in a project with TMR near Warwick. ▶ WC said the JV are proud to have been selected by ARTC to build the Northern section of Inland Rail from Whetstone to Gowrie. This contract was signed late 2021 and the JV is now in the process of forming their team, familiarising with the INland Rail project, and planning its approach to construction.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ WC introduced two further team members:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Project Director - Andrew Howgate (not present at meeting)▶ Manager Stakeholder Engagement and Social Performance - Cindy Thomas (present at meeting)▶ WC provided notes on their plans for the next 12 months:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Forming a team with design partners (Future Freight JV)▶ Building relationships with key stakeholders▶ Developing management plans and setting up systems▶ Global value engineering (refinement of the Inland Rail design)▶ Analysing the Geotech and site investigations already done and looking at any gaps▶ Progressing with further investigations and surveys such as Geotech and surveys▶ Working with the procurement team▶ Looking social performance strategy.▶ WC said the team were committed to creating relationships, local development and workforce, training and leaving a positive legacy. <p>Questions from the committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ VB asked who would be building the alignment from the NSW/ QLD border to Whetstone.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ WC explained a different group of companies would be building the B2G Central alignment.▶ VB asked how the committee and wider community can engage with BHQ.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ WC said initially, the engagement will be through ARTC, however BHQ will also have its own community relations team led by Cindy Thomas. ARTC will start handing over its stakeholder responsibility and direct engagement to BHQ.▶ VB asked if BHQ were able to do anything 'on ground' until the OCG gives project approval.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ WC said BHQ cannot start building the railway until OCG provides approval.▶ WC thanked the committee for the opportunity to introduce the BHQ team.
11	<p>Gowrie to Helidon update Sarah Delahunty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ SD said G2H draft EIS submissions are currently being processed by the Office of Coordinator-General▶ SD said it is highly likely that there will be a request for additional information (same process as for B2G). The project is awaiting formal request from OCG▶ SD advised sixty (60) submissions were received by Coordinator-General. Key topics raised included:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Project justification (e.g. alignment and passenger rail)▶ Noise and vibration▶ Flooding▶ Construction haulage routes▶ Property, lifestyle and wellbeing▶ Tunnelling – groundwater and spoil

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SD said a total of 366 stakeholders engaged with the G2H Project team throughout the dEIS public notification period either via phone, email, Gatton office drop-in, community events, CCC dEIS briefing and community information sessions. ▶ SD said there were 323 engagement events, primarily phone calls (121) and emails (104). The sentiment of the incoming interactions was recorded as 64% neutral and 31% positive (which is much higher than our program average of 10% in that same period). the top stakeholder groups were local residents (150), general community (40) and local business (36). A total of 366 distinct stakeholders were consulted. ▶ SD explained the next steps are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Ongoing studies and assessments ▶ Consultation with our stakeholders ▶ Social performance ▶ Support the office of the coordinator general <p>Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SD said the PPP Preferred bidder announcement will be soon ▶ SD advised the G2H team will the Inland Rail presence at the Toowoomba Show, March 25 and 26 if any stakeholders would like to call in and have a talk about the Qld projects. ▶ SD said a groundwater bore survey is planned, pending a G2H updated ground water modelling ▶ SD advised an interactive map with operational noise modelled levels is available for review by stakeholders ▶ SD said G2H team are currently undertaking a review of the existing G2H Interactive Map, updating older responses to reflect progression in the project and conclusion of the dEIS exhibition ▶ SD said early works have been identified in the Boundary Street/Western Tunnel portal area; engagement will commence once works receive necessary approvals. <p>Questions from the committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ VB asked if an advertisement could be sent to get more Toowoomba representation on the IDD CCC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SD took this as an action item. ▶ SD also acknowledged that there was an outstanding action item (groundwater management) from the previous committee meeting which will be addressed between now and the following meeting. ▶ BA thanked SD for presenting and for her time as the Engagement Manager and wished her all the best for the future. ▶ BA informed the meeting attendees that the meeting would go overtime and asked that question time be kept to ten minutes, with direct questions only, no statements.
12	<p>General Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PM, member of the CCC, suggested an extra meeting be held prior to the June CCC due the substantial number of upcoming investigations and works. PM further suggested that the next meeting be an open question and answer forum open to the public. PM said a combined CCC with H2C would be beneficial to obtain a full understanding of alignment changes etc. ▶ BA thanked PM for her comment.
6	<p>Questions from observers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A member of the public (Kev Loveday, Pittsworth), with regards to the discussion about the alignment change at Millmerran, residents of Pittsworth also do not want the Inland Rail running beside their town. When the EIS was submitted, the TRC and community members objected about the rail line going close to Pittsworth. Why did ARTC take notice of submissions from Millmerran, but not Pittsworth?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ AR thanked Kev Loveday for his question. The further Inland Rail moves, the greater the corridor gets due to the greater earthworks impact by moving the alignment away from the transport corridor. Topographically, there is a reason transport corridors are located where they are, and Inland Rail will follow that corridor as close as possible. ▶ A member of the public (Kevin Bond) of Pampas and Pittsworth. Are you going to shift the Pampas Hall. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ AR responded that Inland Rail does not impact Pampas Hall. ▶ A member of the public, (Theresa Tickle, Pittsworth Landcare) stated Landcare is undertaking extensive studies and has connected with some ARTC staff, is waiting for the minutes from the last meeting and asked Dr Dique for a meeting asap so that Landcare can be consulted before any works go ahead. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BA responded that the minutes had been sent to Landcare last week. ▶ BA asked if there were any further questions. ▶ No further questions from the committee or observers were asked.
7	<p>Conclusion and confirmation of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BA reiterated the Action Items. ▶ Next meeting dates are to be confirmed. <p>▶ Meeting closed 8.15pm</p>

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ ARTC to provide the CCC which section of N2NS had the black soil construction methodology. ▶ ARTC to organise a N2NS Black soil workshop 	ARTC Inland Rail
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ ARTC to ensure PowerPoint slides are easy to read on screen with relevant details to the conversation – in place of large pictures. 	ARTC Inland Rail
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ ARTC to provide the committee with the timeframe for ecology consultation. 	ARTC Inland Rail
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ ARTC to contact Toowoomba Regional Council to look into the traffic count at Athol School Road as at the moment traffic can travel straight through, but once they can't travel through, they will continue across the bitumen up Biddestone Southbrook Road down to Athol School Road. 	ARTC Inland Rail
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KU will send the slidepack to the committee 	ARTC Inland Rail
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ IDD CCC members to provide suggestions for alternative sites outside of the alignment to ARTC. 	IDD CCC Members
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ VB asked if an advertisement could be sent to gain more Toowoomba representation on the IDD CCC. 	ARTC Inland Rail

8	▶ PM query on another meeting date and format will be considered.	ARTC Inland Rail
9	▶ SD also acknowledged that there was an outstanding action item (groundwater management) from the previous committee meeting which will be addressed between now and the following meeting.	ARTC Inland Rail

Next meeting

To be advised