

Meeting minutes

Southern Darling Downs Consultative Committee Meeting

Date / Time

17 March 2022
6.00pm to 8.00pm

Location

Inglewood Civic Centre
18 Elizabeth Street, Inglewood

Facilitator

Mr Graham Clapham (Chair)

Minute taker

Ms Katie Unipan – (ARTC Inland Rail)

Distribution

All

Attendees (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Mr Graham Clapham, SDD Chair (Chair)
- ▶ Mr Robert Barrett, SDD member (RB)
- ▶ Mrs Maria Oliver, SDD member (MO)
- ▶ Mr Kev Loveday, SDD member (KL)
- ▶ Mr Andrew McCartney, SDD member (AM)
- ▶ Mr Robert Webb, SDD member (RW)
- ▶
- ▶
- ▶
- ▶
- ▶ Ms Katie Unipan (KU)
- ▶ Mr Scott Cobine (SC)
- ▶ Mr Robert Smith (RS)
- ▶ Ms Phoebe Moore (PM)
- ▶ Mr David Thompson (DT)
- ▶ Ms Jacqui Neill (JN)
- ▶ Ms Sarah Delahunty (SD)
- ▶ Ms Naomi Tonscheck (NT)
- ▶ Ms Isabell Hall (IH)
- ▶ Mr Adam Barber (AB)

Apologies (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Mr Brett Kelly, SDD member (BK)
- ▶ Ms Georgina Krieg, SDD member (GK)
- ▶ Mr Jeff Chandler, SDD member (JC)
- ▶ Mrs Rosalie Millar, SDD member (RM)
- ▶ Mr Rick McDougall SDD member (RM)
- ▶ Mr Justin Saunders, SDD member (JS)

Guests (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Mr Warren Crowther, BHQ JV (WC)
- ▶ Ms Cindy Thomas, BHQ JV (CT)
- ▶ Ms Kim Hillard, Freight Connect (KH)
- ▶ Mr Reese Deaves, Freight Connect (RD)

Discussions

NO.	ACTIONS
1	<p>Welcome, Actions and Conflict of Interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair welcomed the committee, ARTC staff, guests and observers to the meeting. ▶ KU delivered an acknowledgement of country. <p>Conflicts of interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair requested the committee members consider and declare any conflicts of interest. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No conflicts of interest were declared. ▶ The Chair noted the meeting is recorded for minute purposes and reminded the committee members, guests and other attendees to demonstrate respectful behaviour.

2	<p>Actions arising from previous meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ CCC membership renewal to be discussed with chairs and communicated back to committee – Complete ▶ The IDD and SDD Chairs will discuss with the CG’s representative exactly what the process will be going forward with any reissuing of the EIS and opportunity for public responses. – Complete ▶ Flood Panel to write to the Federal and State Governments noting that the community would like to make comment on their Final Report’s recommendations. – Complete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Response received from the Flood Panel: <i>“our advice regarding the below action is that the flood panel has not written to the Federal and State government, noting that the community would like to make comment on its final recommendation. The Flood Panel is currently finalising recommendations for this report which is expected to be released soon”.</i> <p><i>MO joined the meeting.</i></p> <p>The Chair welcomed ARTC staff RS, PM, SD, KU, and guest speakers from BHQ JV, WC, CT and from Freight Connect KH.</p>
3	<p>Project update</p> <p>Northern project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KU presented the following staff changes within the Inland Rail team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Introducing, new staff: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Ed Matthews, Deliver Director Northern ▶ David Isbister, Senior Project Manager ▶ Belinda Scott-Toms and Alicia Mackay, Stakeholder Engagement Advisors ▶ Farewell to Sarah Delahunty, Manager Stakeholder Engagement – QLD ▶ KU presented the B2G map and noted, for approval purposes the project is termed as Border to Gowrie (B2G) and noted as the project transitions into the construction the terminology of “northern” and “central” will become more common. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KU acknowledge the guest speakers in attendance, contractors from Freight Connect, who cover the central area (Whetstone – South) and BHQ JV who cover the northern area (Whetstone – North). ▶ KL questioned why it was necessary to change the name ▶ KU reiterated from an approval process the project identifies as B2G, noting the split occurs from where the south-western line changes, so from a construction perspective it made sense. KU added when ARTC communicate with the community it will still be referred to in the broader term - B2G, and as the project transitions into construction, the community will start to hear from different contractors, particularly for the Inglewood, they will be engaged by potentially two contractors, so we are just trying to make people aware as we enter construction, there are two different contractors. She added we are not planning to change any communications to the community (ie Newsletter), it will still be known as the Border to Gowrie (B2G). ▶ KU noted with reference to the Project Timeline, we are still in the approvals process. <p>Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KU presented the stats for B2G communication and engagement activities (FY21-22 YTD). <p>Land Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KU advised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Land Access (LA) will become a standing agenda item.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ We are currently processing Land Access Agreements (LAA's) renewals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Whilst most of the Land Access from an approvals is getting close to being done, we are noting that we will need to do additional investigations as we enter into the detailed design phase with our contractors. With BHQ JV and Freight Connect we will need to negotiate land access and those agreements are happening at the moment. ▶ The s109 Entry Access – all but one is closed out (as a result of the flood we were unable to access that property). We are currently in the process of closing this one out. ▶ KU provided an overview of upcoming works, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 50 different traffic counters (including camera's and ground counters) have been installed throughout the B2G project footprint to monitor traffic, ▶ Conducting a groundwater bore survey, to confirm bore details on properties ▶ Contractor, Ausecology is conducting ecology surveys ▶ Conducting cadastral surveys ▶ Conducting minstaff surveys ▶ Conducting groundwater monitoring of project bores on various properties <p>Flood Panel update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS advised that ARTC are engaging with the Flood Panel (FP) to assist the progression of their review of the B2G hydrology assessments, and have provided them with all the technical notes and digital flood models for each individual waterway intersected by the rail alignment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ FP have provided comments back to ARTC. ARTC (through FFJV) continue to provide responses to comments ▶ Majority of comments, have been closed out and FFJV will continue to work with the FP to finalise the comments for their final report. ▶ RS advised ARTC have updated the B2G Flood Impact Objectives (FIO). The FIO's were developed to provide an increased level of detail on flood parameters including (but not limited to) afflux, inundation duration, flow distribution, velocities, and hazard. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The FOI objectives have been reviewed by the FP, and comments provided back for review and response. These are still in draft format, with the intention to form part of the revised EIS for public review and comment once finalised. ▶ RS advised ARTC will continue to work closely with the FP, noting there is not currently a date proposed for the final report, however we will continue to keep the CCC and community informed.
4	<p>B2G Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Update</p>
	<p>Status update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS presented the Office of Coordinator General (OCG) EIS approvals process, noting we are currently at the "HAVE YOUR SAY, (Public Submission to OCG on draft EIS)" <p>Request for Information (RFI)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS presented the RFI Project Update bar chart. ▶ RS noted that although the formal Request for Information (RFI) was received in January, the vast majority of additional information requested was already quite well known by ARTC, through both OCG feedback and commitments that came through the adequacy check and ongoing consultation from agencies (ie TMR on road rail interfaces) along with having visibility of the submissions received from the first round of public notification. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ There were a number of requests for information that do require ARTC to undertake additional assessment surveys and works that weren't previously known or specified. As a result, ARTC will be re-submitting the EIS to the OCG in the second half of this year. ▶ With reference to some of the site surveys that are rolling out now, (ie traffic counters etc), the reason we are going back out and undertaking those is driven by a degree of extra effort that has been outlined in the RFI from the OCG.

- ▶ KL referred to the bar chart and asked whether the lines represented how far we have come or how far we have to go?
 - ▶ RS clarified the bar chart represents the 554 requests for information, with each bar being a visual representation of the percentage under a specific EIS chapter topic (ie flora and fauna, traffic and transport, noise and vibration etc).
- ▶ KL referred to the flow chart - Project Update EIS, and drew attention to the flow from “WE ARE HERE” (in yellow), to “HAVE YOUR SAY”, and then “Coordinator General accepts EIS as final” and questioned if there are some steps missing?
 - ▶ RS clarified that there will be a number of activities that will occur between the two steps, prior to the OCG accepting the EIS as final and highlighted the steps in the flow chart:
 - ▶ ARTC are developing a response to the OCG’s RFI, this will form the Revised EIS and be submitted back to the OCG,
 - ▶ OCG will release ARTC’s revised EIS to all the relevant referral agencies for review/adequacy check (this is before it goes back out to notification),
 - ▶ EIS will be submitted for public consultation,
 - ▶ EIS submissions will come in from the public,
 - ▶ EIS submissions will be reviewed, noting if there is any additional information required ARTC will be required to submit a supplementary document to address any additional RFI that comes out of the second round of public notification.
 - ▶ KL noted the size and complexity of the EIS document and acknowledged there were some things that required review and questioned if there was much that was right with the first EIS submission that we don’t have to provide additional information for.
 - ▶ RS responded that on the whole it doesn’t represent a failure of that EIS in any way, and noted due to the size, nature and complexity of the project it was always going to be very likely that we were going to have to provide more information following public notification. He further advised it is fairly standard in project this size to be requested to provide additional information in order to satisfy all the submissions that come through.
 - ▶ KL acknowledged RS’s response
 - ▶ RW made reference to the 2 pages in the presentation with the RFI Charts and noted there were more topics listed on one page that then other and asked for clarification on whether that meant some topics were less important.
 - ▶ RS noted the purpose of the second page (with less topics) was to highlight the larger areas of focus that were represented in the RFI and apologised if it caused confusion. He noted that each RFI and topic is equally as important as the next.
 - ▶ GC noted his take on the letter from the OCG was that it wasn’t that the original EIS was a failure, it’s that there was additional information sought as a result of the public responses.
 - ▶ KL agreed with GC’s comments.

Updates on EIS

- ▶ RS handed over the PM to provide further details regarding the EIS update.

Additional investigations

- ▶ PM introduced herself and noted it has been over a year since the submission of the Draft EIS.
 - ▶ Since that time there has been a number of ongoing environmental surveys undertaken and a considerable amount of analysis, noting the results of this information will be captured in the next iteration of the EIS / the revised Draft EIS.
- ▶ PM advised the main updates will be:

Flood and Hydrology

- ▶ Flooding and hydrology and surface water - The draft EIS will include the results of the ongoing surface water and groundwater baseline sampling, 18 months of ongoing monitoring

at various locations along the alignment, additional supporting information around construction water supply with a lot more detail (ie updates as to how the water will be sourced etc), flood impact objectives (ie results of the afflux, inundation duration, flow distribution and velocities), more mapping, results of the velocity modelling of the culverts will be presented (including modelling for erosion thresholds for the different soil types)

Geomorphology

- ▶ Geomorphology assessment, will be included in the revised draft EIS, noting it wasn't in the Terms of Reference (TOR), but came through via the FP and the RFI. That scope is around the fluvial geomorphology assessment which is the study targeting the water courses intersected along the alignment – this scope will bring together the flooding and soil components, ensuring the upstream and down stream potential impacts are properly understood and managed. Close look at channels, culverts, bridge crossings, water course crossing – along the alignment there are 17 defined water courses and a number of undefined water course and drainage lines.

Land Resources

- ▶ Land resources – will have significant updates, a soil base line assessment will be undertaken, with the intent to define spatially the extent of the various soil profiles along the alignment and a soil management plan, detailing what the actual soil measurements are for the construction of the rail infrastructure. The draft report for the soils and management plan will be reviewed by ARTC, then an independent Certified Practising Soil Scientist (CPSS) and the Department of Resources (DoR). Once finalised these documents will form an appendix in the draft EIS.

Groundwater survey and Bore “make good” strategy

- ▶ Groundwater, a bore survey and make good strategy is underway. Land owners have been contacted to undertake a bore survey, aimed at identifying the impacted and potentially impacted water bore owners throughout the alignment, this will be followed by the Make Good Strategy, which is aimed at ensuring that appropriate mitigation and compensation for all impacted bores throughout the alignment is undertaken.
 - ▶ KL asked for clarification on the Make Good strategy and asked how Inland Rail compensate a bore owner if their bore fails as a result of recharge effected by project.
 - ▶ PM noted it will not be treated like for like, adding there are two (2) types of impacts; directly impacted, which is associated with project disturbance footprint – these bores will be decommissioned, and would have a different form of make good as opposed to the second type, which are bores that are impacted but are outside the disturbance footprint, and where groundwater modelling has predicted there might be an impact from draw down (this is called bore impairment). The process at this point in time is not aimed at outlining exactly what arrangements will be made, it's just demonstrating that there is a process. The make good agreement will be finalised with the land owner and the contractor, prior to construction – this is where the landowner can negotiate compensation, replacement etc, which will be assessed on a case by case basis, dependant upon a number of factors that contribute to a bore baseline such as yield, quality of the bore etc.
 - ▶ KL noted there are no guarantees if you drill a replacement bore that you will get water.
 - ▶ PM advised ARTC have engaged a Hydrogeologist who have undertaken detailed modelling analysis, with predictions for drawdown in particular in areas impacted by cuts.

	<p>Ecology updates (incl Koala's)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Ecology – the revised draft EIS will include the results from the detailed and field verified survey data and some other specialist studies and management plans that have been undertaken. ▶ The status of the Koala has recently changed from vulnerable to endangered – ARTC are working with agencies and sub-consultants to understand what that means for the project. We have recently engaged two (2) sub-consultant specialist, ERM and WSP to assist with the impact to Koalas. ERM will assist in developing a Koala Habitat Management Plan, detailing how impacts to Koalas will be managed during construction and operation of the project. Dr Rod van der Ree from WSP, who specialises in biodiversity corridors, will be reviewing and updating the Fauna Fencing and Connectivity Strategy from the Draft EIS, this will detail how fauna corridors are impacted and how connectivity will be maintained (including all fauna, not limited to koala's). ▶ KL noted there has been engagement with the Pittsworth Landcare concentrated in the Brookstead to Toowoomba area, and asked if there will be any studies conducted for the Millmerran South area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PM advised the whole alignment will be subject to a detailed survey, with no preference to a particular area. ▶ KL acknowledged PM's response and comment that is good. ▶ PM added that the Koala genetic study is also QLD wide, noting that is looking at scats of the Koala and the DNA tracking to get good understanding of how the Koala's move through the region and how healthy their populations are. ▶ KL noted Dr Dique explained at the IDD CCC Meeting on Tuesday, that they would be doing scat collection subject to a DNA test and he sought clarification on if the studies were being undertaken at the Sunshine Coast University. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PM noted her colleague Vanessa is managing the study aspect and advised she hasn't been able to manage the scat collection due to wet weather. She advised she was she is unsure if they will be using the Sunshine Coast laboratory, and took the question on notice. ▶ KL advised the Pittsworth Landcare will also be undertaking their own scat collection for DNA tests, noting they have agreed to share their data with ARTC and asked if ARTC will share their data with them to see if there is any correlation between genotypes etc. ▶ PM noted the timeframes and objective of the study are based on the long term, however took the question on notice.
5	<p>Reference Design</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS acknowledged his colleague Andrew Roberts is an apology and noted he will provide the update for Reference Design in his absence. ▶ RS presented the timeline Design update and noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Submitted Draft EIS to OCG for adequacy check, which has been approved. ▶ Went out to public exhibition mid last year. ▶ Continued to meet with Road Managers (TMR, TRC and GRC) for their review and comment on the Draft EIS. ▶ Received community and agency feedback, with visibility of the submissions. ▶ Continued to refine the design in the background. ▶ Finalising design for scope definition to allow the EIS to be assessed against the design updates ▶ RS advised there are three (3) main design refinement categories for discussion; Road Rail Interfaces, Horizontal Alignment Changes and Constructability and Environmental, noting these will impact across various chapters of the revised EIS. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Road Rail Interfaces – the focus was with the removal of road rail crossings through engagement with road authorities, level crossings that have now become grade separated,

- passive level crossings that are now proposed to be active level crossings and updates stock route interfaces. All these updates are an improvements to the Draft Reference Design.
- ▶ Horizontal Alignment Changes – include Millmerran alternative alignment and other minor horizontal alignment changes to minimise property impacts.
 - ▶ Constructability an Environmental – include laydown area optimisation, which was driven by feedback from landowners, EIS temporary and permanent footprint optimisation accounting for latest ecology works and design refinement.
 - ▶ RS referred to the Road Rail Interfaces, and noted it is ARTC's overarching strategy to seek alternatives to the building of new level crossings, with the key objective to minimise the number of level crossings, so far as is reasonable and practicable.
 - ▶ Elimination of additional road interfaces includes:
 - ▶ McDougall's Road – providing an alternative access can via Cremascos Road.
 - ▶ Hall Road – the Crossing was to provide access to 1 property as the road reserve dead ends (no connectivity issues) work with TRC to provide an alternative access to that property.
 - ▶ Lindenmayer Road - No longer impacted due to horizontal alignment change.
 - ▶ Introduction of additional grade separations to avoid the need for the road and rail to meet at grade, which is a much safer outcome for the community and rail operations alike. The additional grade separations include:
 - ▶ Bybera Road - rail bridge over road
 - ▶ Heckendorf Road - road bridge over rail, elimination of road detour and intersection upgrade
 - ▶ Gilgai Lane - rail bridge over road
 - ▶ Commodore Peak Road and Scragg's Road - rail over road, consolidate both roads to grade separation location.
 - ▶ Owen Scrub Road - road bridge over rail
 - ▶ Athol School Road - rail bridge over road, consolidate Purcell Road to under the rail line at Athol School Road.
 - ▶ KL referred to the proposed rail bridge at Gilgai Lane and asked what the clearance for that bridge will be.
 - ▶ RS noted he didn't have that spec in-front of him and noted that all clearances are in accordance with Road Authorities clearance requirements and are also informed by ARTC's understanding of the machinery that needs to be able to pass underneath the bridge. He added he will take the question on notice and provide a specific height and width.
 - ▶ KL acknowledge RS response and further commented the road is mainly used by people shifting machinery, adding the clearance may need to be 5 m high, which could create an impact to the viaduct
 - ▶ KU noted that ARTC are currently in the process of updating the social pinpoint maps which will illustrate the bridge at Gilgai Lane and advised she will send the Committee a link to the updated map once it becomes available.
 - ▶ MO noted that not everyone will have access to a computer, so it would be great to have the maps with the changes displayed publicly.
 - ▶ KU advised she is happy to discuss potential locations to display the update maps once they become available.
 - ▶ Treatment changes – RS noted the difference between passive and active level crossing – passive level crossings provide warnings through signs and line markings, while active level crossing provide warning with lights and booms. In collaboration with TRC and GRC road managers, it was agreed that updated traffic surveys would be undertaken for their roads and that the Inland Rail Level Crossing Risk Tool would be re-run using the updated inputs from ALCAM. The timing of the updated traffic surveys would also include a TRC harvest period (from Nov 2020). Received updated traffic data from GRC in Dec / Jan 2020/21. There are a number of passive level crossings moving to active, including; Kooroongarra Road, Paton Road, Nicol Creek Road, Millwood Road, Harris Road (Pampas – overall design update), Mann Silo Road, and Linthorpe Valley Road.

- ▶ RS advised the private crossings are generally passive, noting they need to be positioned and set up with all the appropriate site distances.
- ▶ RS presented the Pampas Road Layout change community brochure, including maps and noted on the left side was the initial Draft EIS concept solution and on the right is the proposed update for inclusion in the revised EIS.
 - ▶ Harris Road active level crossing is designed to replace the existing Fysh Road level crossing, as a result of a non-compliant stacking distance between Gore Highway and rail line.
 - ▶ The purpose of initial draft EIS concept solution was to locate the intersection as close to the existing level crossing as possible, as a result of the feedback from the community to facilitate machinery movement across the Gore Highway and up Pampas-Bostock Road.
 - ▶ Further assessment and development of the design through consultation with the Road Authorities, (TRC and TMR) revealed that the initial concept design created complex turning movements with up to 5 lanes required on the Gore Highway and created challenges in formalising the entry and exit positions into the fuel station at Pampas and had significant operational impact to motorists during the construction of that solution. Identifying these issues enabled ARTC to acknowledge the draft concept EIS design didn't achieve a satisfactory or safe outcome for the South to North movement of machinery across the highway.
 - ▶ The revised solution (on the right), utilises the existing Harris Road corridor, which simplifies movements and removes any clashes with the fuel station entries and exits, removes the junction impact at Pampas-Bostock Road and facilitates better machinery movements across the Gore Highway.
 - ▶ KL asked what the distance will be from the actual crossing to the Gore Highway.
 - ▶ RS noted he didn't have the exact distance in front of him and advised he would take the question on notice. He noted his colleague John Roberts is listening to the meeting online and may be able to answer.
 - ▶ KL noted the elevations of the road where the road crosses the rail, will result in a concentration of traffic, including B-Doubles and other long vehicles, and asked if there will be enough room for these vehicles to stop for trains when required.
 - ▶ RS advised ARTC have determined the slip lanes can accommodate for traffic backing out from the highway, through studies and analysis including updated traffic counts and considering feedback from the community on the types of vehicles accessing the road, as well as consultation with the Road Authorities, who will also ensure that we can accommodate harvest and other peak traffic seasons.
 - ▶ KL noted RS response is to accommodate current traffic condition, and asked if there has been consideration for future traffic increases (ie in 30-40 years).
 - ▶ RS noted there are sensitivity tests conducted on future increases in traffic, which is also included in the analysis.
- ▶ RS presented the Stock Route at Kildonan Road, noting the Draft EIS Proposal shows a realignment of the stock route underneath the rail bridge location to eliminate the crossing interface. Over all there are no stock route changes in the TRC and GRC areas. There are changes to stock corridor widths to align with the latest design policy, noting the Draft EIS proposal was for 20m corridors to minimise impacts and align with road requirements, the updates include a requirement to meet the existing junction width that stock corridor connects to (i.e. 60m junction = new 60m stock corridor), in line with the latest planning policy – [Stock Route Management Strategy 2021-2025](#).
- ▶ RS presented the proposed horizontal alignment change in the Millmerran area, noting the current alignment is indicated in orange, with the proposed amendment to the alignment in green, which will be included in the revised EIS.
 - ▶ MO asked if the red section indicated a passing loop.
 - ▶ RS confirmed the red section indicates the passing loop.
 - ▶ KL noted at the IDD CCC meeting held in Pittsworth on Tuesday, that the proposed realignment was discussed and ARTC advised it changed at the behest of the Coordinator

General, as a result to the submissions made the impacts it's going to have on the Halls Poultry and Pigs and he asked if he could point to something out on the map he wishes to discuss.

- ▶ RS clarified there was no claim that the OCG requested the amendment, noting that ARTC proposed the change following feedback from the community, through the EIS submissions.
- ▶ KL apologised for the misinformation and asked the chair if he can point something out on the map on the screen
- ▶ The Chair allowed it.
- ▶ KL pointed to the little green line, adjoining the proposed alignment and the existing rail line and sought clarification on what it represented.
- ▶ RS responded in order to maintain consistency across the whole Border to Gowrie project ARTC committed to keeping connections to the existing QR rail network, confirming that the small green line KL referred to indicates the connection back into the Millmerran branch, noting this connection was also included in the previous alignment proposal, as the proposed line already adjoined the existing line.
- ▶ KL asked if the purpose of the connect was for future development.
- ▶ RS responded that ARTC proposed the connection under the assumption that it's possible that branch line, which is now disused, may be reinvigorated in the future, and didn't want to preclude that as an option for QR.
- ▶ KL sought clarification if would then be a QR initiative.
- ▶ RS clarified that the operation of the branch beyond that green line doesn't form part of the scope for ARTC.
- ▶ KL pointed to map and indicated, a landholders property where the green line now goes through, noting it previously went adjacent to his property and he proposed an alternative route to eliminate the need to go through this property and down through Owen Scrub Road. He asked why less disruptive alternatives have not been considered.
- ▶ RS clarified that a number of different options were considered for this alignment and noted the proposed green line, was the alignment that met a number of requirements for the project, including flooding impacts. He further noted that the outcomes of the original hydrology model assessment indicated that the previous model didn't represent the full amount of water that was coming through that area, so the model was extended to capture all the water coming into the area. This demonstrated that there was a lot of water coming through in a 1% event, which meant we needed to consider the option between minimising the challenges and avoiding as much of the flood area as possible.
- ▶ The Chair noted there is a flood map that can be made available that KU has offered to send to the committee.
- ▶ KL acknowledged RS response, in particular that the realignment was proposed to reduce the impact of flooding, and he advised he will take this information back to the LH.
- ▶ KL noted it would be good in the future, if ARTC could consult with the community on the proposed amendments in order to give the community the opportunity to provide feedback.
- ▶ RS presented the Horizontal Alignment Changes – Other, 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.
- ▶ RS presented the EIS Temporary and Permanent Footprint Review, and noted:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Construction Laydown Areas - Minor adjustments to other laydown areas throughout B2G based on consultation feedback. Optimised for the field validated ecology. Further input expected from contractor once onboarded. ▶ Whetstone and Bringalily State Forest - Thorough review and justification underway for impacts to state forest. Investigation into relocating the 1 laydown area into TMR road corridor instead of state forest. Rationalisation of EIS boundaries to minimise impact. ▶ The Chair asked if there we any questions ▶ MO asked if the changes to proposed laydown areas will be included on the new map. ▶ KU confirmed that the lay downs are not include on the Social PinPoint Mapping, noting they will be included in the Draft EIS. ▶ MO asked if the laydowns in the Millmerran district can be displayed to the public with the other mapping as well (for those who cannot access online). ▶ RS advised he would take the question on notice. ▶ KU referred to KL's question from earlier regarding distances advised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ At Pampas the distance from the railway line to the centre of the Gore Highway is 185m. ▶ With reference to Gilgai Lane, when ARTC undertook the engagement LH indicated that they need to allow for 4.5m in height and 8.5m wide for machinery, noting we have allowed a bridge clearance of 5.4m. ▶ KL acknowledged KU responses.
6	<p>Contractor Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RS advised ARTC have engaged contractors from BHQ JV, and introduced representatives Warren Crowther, Program Manager, as a guest presenter.
	<p>BHQ Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ WC introduced himself and noted that BHQ JV have been awarded the contract by Inland Rail for the Northern Civil Works Program between Whetstone and Gowrie ▶ WC presented an overview of the 3 companies that form BHQ JV; Bielby Holdings, JF Hull Holdings, QH&M Birt. All 3 companies were founded in Queensland in the late 70's / early 80's and are all 100% privately owned, with the ownership in Queensland. All 3 companies all have direct owner involvement with the operation of the businesses. The 3 companies have been around for approx. 40 years and have worked together during this time for around 30 of the 40 years in various joint ventures on a number of projects over many years. Although all 3 companies have a lot in common, they are very different in their expertise and capability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Bielby Holdings – is the largest of the 3 companies and is a general civil works contractor, building all types of public infrastructure, mainly for government clients, mostly throughout Queensland. ▶ JF Hull Holdings – is a specialist bridge builder, building all types of public infrastructure, mainly for government clients, throughout Queensland. ▶ QH&M Birt – is a specialist bulk earth moving contractor, who have one of the largest fleet of privately owned earth moving equipment in Australia. They operate in the Civil Infrastructure Market as well as in the Resources Sector. Their area of operations is a bit broader than the other 2 companies, operating not only in Queensland but in Mining regions throughout Australia. ▶ Complimentary expertise between the 3 companies. ▶ BHQ JV has been appointed to the Northern Civil Works Program forms 162km of rail between Whetstone and Gowrie. The Company was appointed late last year, so is in the very early stages of the project. ▶ WC Introduced the key team members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Himself, Warren Crowther, Program Manager

- ▶ Cindy Thomas, Manager Stakeholder Engagement and Social Performance, noting Cindy was present at the meeting and will become the key contact for the community in the years to come when the work begins.
- ▶ Andrew Howgate, Construction Lead.
- ▶ WC reiterated it is very early stages for the business, having recently signed the contract and are in the process of forming a team and gave an overview of their plans for the next 12 months:
 - ▶ Process of setting up an office in Brisbane and moving team into the office, which is a mixture of representatives of BHQ JV, ARTC and FFJV.
 - ▶ Proceed with engineering development, writing management plans and preparing management systems that will be used for the delivery of the project.
 - ▶ Undertaking global value engineering (ongoing process of refining the design).
 - ▶ Undertaking a gap analysis for the geo-tech investigations, reviewing at all the geo-tech investigations done to date to figure out what needs to be done to finish the design.
 - ▶ Continue with geo-tech investigations (after the gap analysis is completed).
 - ▶ Working out strategy and approach for dealing with supply chain and methodology for construction.
 - ▶ BHQ JV shares ARTC's strong commitment to social performance and maintaining relationships in the community and has a key focus on training people and engaging with local businesses.
 - ▶ Working on strategies to accommodate the workforce, taking into account the challenges with the available accommodation and the social impact of having rental housing accommodation for construction workers.
 - ▶ Looking at community health and well being issues and how we can engage with the community using best practice community engagement principles.
- ▶ Thanked the committee for the opportunity to introduce himself and welcomed questions.
- ▶ The Chair thanked WC and asked if there were any questions.
- ▶ MO asked if there has been a decision made where the workforce camp will be located at Millmerran.
- ▶ WC advised there has not been a decision made as to where the workforce camp will be, noting they have not gone to market to request formal proposals. Further noting over the past 3 months, since their appointment, they have been undertaking investigations to understand what options exist for camp facilities and identifying potential locations.
- ▶ MO asked how long it might be before there is more information available for the community and noted to leave a positive legacy the camp would have to be close to the town for the town to benefit from it.
- ▶ WC advised a tender process will need to be undertaken which will involve some time, noting he would not expect a definitive decision to be made in the next few months.
- ▶ MO thanked WC for his response.
- ▶ The noted that an observer had a question and invited them to speak.
- ▶ Observer (Tom Minouge) asked if there has been development on the Inglewood camp.
- ▶ WC advised it is the same answer, no decision has been made on a workforce camp at Inglewood and acknowledged that there is a need for more than one workforce camp along the 162 kms alignment. Research has been undertaken to identify, who the parties are in the community who are interested in providing a camp and what the options are.
- ▶ The Chair thanked WC for his presentation.

Freight Connect Introduction

- ▶ NT introduce herself and her team (Whetstone to the Border), Adam Barber, Senior Project Manager and Isabell Hall, Stakeholder Engagement Lead and advised ARTC have engaged contractors from Freight Connect, and introduced representative, Kim Hillard as a guest presenter.

- ▶ KH thanked NT and acknowledge it is fabulous to be able to come and meet the CCC and talk to you a little bit about Freight Connect – who we are and what part of the project we will be delivering, which is the central package.
- ▶ KH noted the topics she will cover are, about Freight Connect, the team and commitment to the community and the Central Package.
- ▶ KH like Warren and his team, Freight Connect is a Joint Venture between Laing O'Rourke and FKG, which is a Toowoomba based business and noted both companies are privately owned:
 - ▶ Laing O'Rourke, which is the lead company was established in the UK in 1978, with the Australian hub being established in 2004 and run as its own right, the Australian hub has its own board.
 - ▶ KH presented an overview of the Organisational Structure of Laing O'Rourke and noted that the current Manager Director, Cathal O'Rourke will be stepping down from this position at the end of the month and will continue on the Australian Board, and will Rebecca Hanley, will commence in the position of Managing Director.
 - ▶ Work across Australia with experience in major projects in mining, rail and major road infrastructure.
- ▶ Will be working on the central package throughout NSW and QLD, starting at North Star, across the Macintyre, through to Queensland and have received the first work package C2 and part of C3 (part of the abutment that goes over the bridge of the Macintyre river).
- ▶ 29 week development phase during which we will develop and submit a price to Inland Rail for approval, then get into the detailed design. During the development of our the price and program (TOC period), there will be about 20% of design but the design continues into QLD, however the construction will only go to the southern abutment of the Macintyre river.
- ▶ Expecting to receive approval for the Ancillary packages, which includes Cultural Heritage, Geotech, Utilities and this will for the 20-30% during the TOC period.
- ▶ Reese Deaves, Project Director and his project management team are all extremely experienced in major infrastructure projects in regional areas- many of them have just completed works on the Woolgoolga to Ballina major highway upgrade. Very experienced with dealing with sensitivities with the communities and environment.
- ▶ The project team are committed to “no surprises” which is about delivering proactive engagement right from the start, because local people know, they understand their environment and can provide so much useful information to contractors.
- ▶ We have already commenced meetings with ARTC and stakeholders.
- ▶ We will be present, listening and learning from locals and working together to find solutions.
- ▶ We believe continuous improvement is important, ensuring we learn from our mistakes and we honour our commitments.
- ▶ We want to leave a legacy behind, something you will endure after we are gone.
- ▶ Community Support Programs - have already sent an ICN Gateway portal – where local companies can go to the website and register their expression of interest and the procurement team have commenced reviewing these applications, with well over 100 received to date.
- ▶ Social Performance – we have tried and tested examples used across other projects that we will be looking to explore with the local community. We will be supporting local events, including agricultural shows in Moree, Goondiwindi, and Warialda and other community events. We pride ourselves on our staff volunteer program and currently provide a day paid leave to all staff annually – and will support local projects using our volunteer workforce. We will commit to memberships of local chambers of commerce.
- ▶ Honouring Our Commitments – with design, we will engage right from the get go. We focus on environment and sustainability. Innovation and value for money – we will be looking for opportunities early and sharing ideas. Interface Management - we will have regular interface with key stakeholders. Health and Safety is important to everyone, not just the construction team, but

	<p>the community as well. Project delivery – we will deliver collaboratively with the client and community as well</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KH asked if there we any questions ▶ The Chair asked if there we any questions for KH. No questions were taken. ▶ In response to the contractors presentation, the Chair advised the CCC is one conduit to the local community, noting there are a number of conduits to hook into local community. He noted it was his understanding that the need for CCC will cease to exist once the project has approval, however there will be a different process to engage with the community once we are at that stage. He noted there are 11 of this Southern Downs CCC, who contribute and are excellent conduits to our local communities, and encouraged the Contractors to use them.
<p>7</p>	<p>General Business</p> <p>Sponsorship</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair acknowledge the ARTC Sponsorship Program and encouraged attendees to highlight this program to their local communities, adding ARTC are keen to support local organisations and local events, and encouraged if they are aware of a local organisation or event that needs sponsorship or support he encouraged they reach out to ARTC. <p>Request Change to previous Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair noted there is a request for change in the minutes for the Joint IDD & SDD CCC Meeting that was held in Millmerran, adding it is a minor change relating to discussion held regarding roads, the request if for the removal of two words to improve the readability. <p>Acknowledgements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair acknowledged that it is Sarah Delahunty's last meeting with the Committee and spoke on behalf of the SDD Committee, wishing her well and thanking her for the work she has done with Stakeholder Engagement.
	<p>Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair asked for suggestions for the location for the next meeting. ▶ RB suggested the next meeting be held in Yelarbon. The Committee agreed the next meeting would be held in the June/July period, with the date yet to be confirmed. ▶ The Chair reminded the Committee if there are any issues in their community that they wish to put on the agenda for discussion, and encouraged they send requests to KU. ▶ KL there has been a fair bit of talk about the southern end of this rail line tonight, both from us and the contractors, but there is a bit of an anomaly and I am not sure if you know about it. Where the rail line crosses the Macintyre river, the centre line of the river is actually the start of B2G and that's a chainage 30.6, which means its 30.6 km from North Star to there. Now but the strange thing is the chainage continues on into QLD in fact it goes for another 9.2km to 39.869 chainage and that's where the chainage for B2G starts and if you look at a map of some of the design drawings, you will find it at Gowrie its 206 km, yet the EIS says its 216 – why is this so? Why does the chainage not stop as you would logically think, in the middle of the Macintyre river and then the B2G chainage starts from there. Now you may not know, I don't expect you to know, but it's a question I would like answered so I will put that on notice and I'll hand it over, but its just strange that you come over the border for 9kms before you start the B2G chainage. ▶ RS responded it is as a result of the way in which the projects were divided from the outset across the whole of inland rail. Noted the NS2B Project does cross the Macintyre and the point at which the two designs join is up at the QR southwest line, so from a design perspective those two

	<p>projects have the chainages assigned at that interface, at the QR alignment. As far as Border to Gowrie goes as defined in the EIS, it a Queensland project so it needs to take into account both the design from Gowrie to the end of B2G as defined in a design, as well as a component of the NS2B, so it's the plus the 9 km that you have picked up on and that's how you get the 216.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KL the amazing thing is though on a design drawings as the line crosses the river, it plainly states the start of B2G. ▶ RS responded, from an EIS assessment perspective. – Take an action to explain that further with KL. ▶ The Chair drew attention to the presentation which displayed the successful recipients for the B2G Spons and Dons from rounds 11 and 12 and acknowledged it is a significant sponsorship for some of the organisations. ▶ The Chair acknowledge RB hand raised. ▶ RW requested a question on notice – he noted the Inland Rail travels from Melbourne to Brisbane and noted some sections of the project (ie Parkes to Narromine) are completed and ready for train, whereas on the Queensland side we are still shuffling paper, between Narromine and North Star they are moving dirt. He requested an overview of the status of the entire Inland Rail project from Melbourne through to Brisbane, be provided indicating if they are train ready, moving dirt or are they shuffling paper. ▶ The Chair acknowledged RB question on notice and advised that ARTC will provide a response at a later date.
8	<p>Questions from observers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ NA ▶ The Chair thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting at 7.45pm
9	<p>Conclusions and confirmation of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KU noted the following actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ ARTC are to confirm where the Koala scat will be tested and responded that it is being tested at USQ, and noted the action is now closed. ▶ ARTC committed to come back to Pittsworth Landcare as to whether they are able to share the Koala genetics study information with that group. ▶ ARTC to share the flood map overlay against the Millmerran alignment change with the SDD. ▶ KU to liaise with MO regarding some low tech options about sharing the updated design changes. ▶ RS committed to meet with KL to further explain the chainage methodology. ▶ ARTC committed to providing a presentation on what is happening across the entire alignment, to be presented at the next CCC Meeting. ▶ ARTC committed to providing a presentation from the NS project team on how they are constructing on black soil, to be presented at the next CCC Meeting.

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY
1	ARTC committed to come back to Pittsworth Landcare as to whether they are able to share the Koala genetics study information with that group.	ARTC Inland Rail
2	ARTC to share the flood map overlay against the Millmerran alignment change with the SDD.	ARTC Inland Rail

3	KU to liaise with MO regarding some low tech options about sharing the updated design changes.	ARTC Inland Rail
4	RS committed to meet with KL to further explain the chainage methodology.	ARTC Inland Rail
5	ARTC committed to providing a presentation on what is happening across the entire alignment, to be presented at the next CCC Meeting.	ARTC Inland Rail
6	ARTC committed to providing a presentation from the N2NS project team on how they are constructing on black soil, to be presented at the next CCC Meeting.	ARTC Inland Rail

Next meeting

To be advised