

# MEETING MINUTES

## Inner Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee: Meeting 8

### DATE / TIME

5 December 2019  
6:00 – 8:15pm

### LOCATION

Gowrie Progress Association Community Hall

### FACILITATOR

Bill Armagnacq - Chair

### MINUTE TAKER

Willow Hart

### DISTRIBUTION

All

### ATTENDEES

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| ▶ Bill Armagnacq (BA) – IDD Chair (Chair) | ▶ Nicola Mitchell – ARTC Inland Rail (NM) |
| ▶ Larry Pappin – CCC member (LP)          | ▶ Rob Smith – ARTC Inland Rail (RS)       |
| ▶ Jennifer Schmidt – CCC member (JS)      | ▶ Jon Roberts – ARTC Inland Rail (JR)     |
| ▶ Paul Hanlon – CCC member (PH)           | ▶ Andrew Roberts – ARTC Inland Rail (ARo) |
| ▶ Joy Mingay – CCC member (JM)            | ▶ Helen Williams – ARTC Inland Rail (HW)  |
| ▶ Chris Joseph – CCC member (CJ)          | ▶ Willow Hart – ARTC Inland Rail (WH)     |
| ▶ Lance McManus – CCC member (LM)         | ▶ Amanda Reed – ARTC Inland Rail (ARe)    |
| ▶ David Taylor – CCC member (DT)          | ▶ Tara Venturini – ARTC Inland Rail (TV)  |
| ▶ Rob Loch – CCC member (RL)              | ▶ Sarah Delahunty – ARTC Inland Rail (SD) |
| ▶ Jason Chavasse – CCC member (JCh)       |   |
| ▶ Paul McDonald – Proxy CCC member (PM)   |   |

### APOLOGIES

- |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| ▶ Kylie Schultz (KS)  | ▶ Individual          |
| ▶ Adrian Beattie (AB) | ▶ Western Wakka Wakka |
| ▶ Ken Murphy (KM)     | ▶ Individual          |

### NON-ATTENDEES

- |                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| ▶ Geoff Penton (GP)  | ▶ Individual  |
| ▶ Ian Jones (IJ)     | ▶ Individual  |
| ▶ John Cameron (JCa) | ▶ Darling Downs Cotton Growers and Cotton Australia |

## Discussions

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
1	<p><i>Welcome and introduction</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair welcomed the committee and noted KS and AB as apologies.</li> <li>▶ The Chair introduced proxy member PM as a representative of SQ Landscapes.</li> <li>▶ The Chair introduced NM who is replacing Mercedes Staff as Acting Stakeholder Engagement Manager for the B2G project.</li> <li>▶ The Chair noted the committee should deal respectfully with one another. It was acknowledged observers are welcome to attend but are not invited to participate in the general proceedings. Feedback forms are available if any further questions or comments need to be raised.</li> <li>▶ The Chair advised of the Senate Inquiry and International Panel that will review Inland Rail's proposed structures for crossing floodplains. ARTC welcomes the Inquiry, which is an important opportunity to hear different perspectives about the project. This is a regional infrastructure project that has gone through 15 years of route analysis, engineering design and business case development.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RL noted the media implied the panel will review modelling, including impacts such as erosion. There have been two separate statements made.</li> <li>▶ RS advised the terms of reference for the panel had not yet been set, but drainage structures are a focus. The scope for the panel has not yet been passed on to ARTC.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair acknowledged the signing of the Inter-Governmental Agreement (IGA) between the Federal and State governments. All three states have signed for delivery, leading to 7,000 jobs. 21% of Inland Rail is in Queensland, costing \$6 billion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ DT asked whether Mayor Paul Antonio had any part in signing the IGA.</li> <li>▶ RS noted he believed it was an agreement between the State and Federal governments and was independent of ARTC, though ARTC will deal with the outcomes.</li> <li>▶ SD said there were two agreements signed on the day, with one signed by Councillor Carol Taylor. SD took the question on notice. <i>Update: Councillors Paul Antonio and Carol Taylor were witnesses to the agreement between the State and Federal Governments.</i></li> <li>▶ LP raised the media report of 15 years of route analysis.</li> <li>▶ SD noted this likely referred to the announcement of study areas in 2006 which have become more defined in recent years.</li> <li>▶ LP acknowledged the four route options announced for the B2G project in 2017 did not have 15 years of analysis, which has led to flooding and local road issues.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair advised nominations for the committee in 2020 would be addressed in General Business.</li> </ul>
2	<p><i>Conflicts of interest:</i> No changes.</p>
3	<p><i>Actions from previous meeting:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. JCh to provide more information about what the CCC would like included for a field trip – ongoing.</li> <li>2. ARTC to report back on biosecurity management plan – ongoing.</li> <li>3. Regional benefits to be added to the agenda when the studies are complete – ongoing.</li> <li>4. ARTC to offer mental health training for CCC members – completed. A small number of members have expressed interest and will attend the Southern Darling Downs or Lockyer Valley sessions. An additional session in the New Year can be arranged if required.</li> <li>5. Presentations to be sent to CCC members – completed.</li> <li>6. ARTC to provide information about whether ballast supply was considered in the alignment selection as part of the PRG process – completed.</li> <li>7. ARTC to provide Chair more information about the CCC format in 2020 – addressed in General Business.</li> </ol>
4	<p><i>Gowrie Junction community update</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair invited JCh to provide an update on concerns and challenge for the Gowrie Junction community.</li> <li>▶ JCh explained the Gowrie Junction community consists of a shop, hall, school and community centre. There are approximately 2,000 residents in and around the area, with more in the surrounding areas. Gowrie Junction is a growing community and many residents commute to Toowoomba for work. There are still farming and dairy properties in the area.</li> <li>▶ JCh acknowledged the project in the area uses the existing rail line out to Gowrie Mountain. Where the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing (TSRC) meets Boundary Road is the start of the tunnel which is greenfield.</li> <li>▶ JCh listed the following concerns and issues for the community regarding Inland Rail: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased noise and air quality impacts as a result of increased train traffic and the location of tunnel vents, which will extract fumes and emissions</li> <li>2. A grade separation is proposed for Gowrie Junction Road. This reduces waiting times, but creates noise and amenity impacts for neighbours where the road is raised</li> <li>3. Road closures</li> <li>4. Property severance and access</li> <li>5. Location of tunnel infrastructure. The use of a tunnel-boring machine 24/7 will create noise and dust, especially on service vehicle routes and near laydown areas</li> <li>6. Visual amenity, however area already has existing trains</li> <li>7. Cumulative impact from TSRC, Inland Rail, InterLink terminal, and a planned sports complex in the area. How does this be addressed?</li> <li>8. Operation of freight – what will be transported and what happens if there is an accident with dangerous materials?</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>9. Timeframe to comment on the EIS and the time needed to digest and get assistance on the detail.</p> <p>10. Political predetermined outcomes and things changing without community input</p> <p>11. Social impacts and how it ranks against economic ratings. Short-term cuts impact long-term lives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JCh advised that Facebook, community meetings and meetings with ARTC are used to spread the word and share concerns between the Gowrie community and ARTC.</li> <li>▶ RL asked how many houses would be affected by the B2G section of Inland Rail. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS reinforced the point made at the previous meeting, stating the number of dwellings will not be released due to the project still requiring approval.</li> <li>▶ RL asked what numbers the EIS would produce.</li> <li>▶ RS advised information will be included regarding property impacts.</li> <li>▶ JS asked why the numbers cannot be shared now.</li> <li>▶ RS noted the approach being taken is consistent with other projects in the Inland Rail program. The reference design submitted in the EIS is subject to change. Providing numbers on such a sensitive subject is not required under the Terms of Reference for the project.</li> <li>▶ SD reinforced that the design is subject to change at this stage. Adequate time for consultation on the EIS will be provided by the Coordinator-General.</li> <li>▶ RL asked whether the detailed design will be submitted with the EIS.</li> <li>▶ RS advised the reference design is what will be submitted. ARTC recognises there are impacts to houses and is in contact with landowners who will engage to provide information.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ DT asked JCh whether the Gowrie Junction community had identified any positive impacts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JCh acknowledged the community is looking to minimise and mitigate impacts where possible. A benefit is that new and quieter trains to replace old trains leaves them in a better position in that regard. This is different to areas where there are currently no trains running.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
4	<p><i>Project update</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS gave a project update.</li> <li>▶ EIS status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Fieldwork is complete.</li> <li>▶ Draft reference design and constructability assessments are key input into EIS – completed.</li> <li>▶ All draft technical assessments are currently being finalised.</li> <li>▶ Stakeholder consultation for the EIS is ongoing.</li> <li>▶ The public exhibition period for the EIS will be set by the Office of the Coordinator-General (OCG) and may be longer than the standard four-week period. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JCh asked whether ARTC has requested a longer submissions period.</li> <li>▶ RS advised they had, however the OCG was still deliberating.</li> <li>▶ JCh asked whether the committee could write to the OCG to request a longer timeframe.</li> <li>▶ The Chair agreed to prepare a letter and share with the committee.</li> <li>▶ RS noted there will also be Community Information Sessions held by ARTC to guide the community through the EIS and how to make a submission.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Consultation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ B2G has implemented an extensive program of consultation to support the EIS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ landowners</li> <li>▶ peak bodies</li> <li>▶ interest groups</li> <li>▶ community groups</li> <li>▶ environment groups</li> <li>▶ local businesses</li> <li>▶ all levels of government (21 agencies)</li> <li>▶ involvement by design, engineering and environmental specialists</li> <li>▶ lessons learnt: experience from other linear infrastructure projects.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ RL asked whether changes to the EIS were being made based on feedback from the State Government. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised the B2G team has met with the State Government at various points to discuss methodologies and how impacts would be identified and assessed. Feedback from the Calvert to Kagaru (C2K) project and the adequacy review from the C2K EIS has also informed B2G EIS development.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RL noted he had heard that materials being reviewed by the State Government were not of a high quality. RL would not comment on whether this was in relation to the B2G project.</li> <li>▶ EIS topics             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The EIS covers the following 18 topics:                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ project description (Design &amp; Constructability)</li> <li>▶ land use and tenure</li> <li>▶ ecology</li> <li>▶ surface water and hydrology</li> <li>▶ groundwater</li> <li>▶ land resources (soils)</li> <li>▶ traffic, transport and access</li> <li>▶ social impact</li> <li>▶ economics</li> <li>▶ noise</li> <li>▶ air quality</li> <li>▶ landscape and visual amenity</li> <li>▶ waste management</li> <li>▶ cultural heritage</li> <li>▶ hazard and risk assessment</li> <li>▶ cumulative impact</li> <li>▶ sustainability</li> <li>▶ legislation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The chapters talk about the existing environment first and what assessments have been done to establish the existing environment. The chapters then discuss what assessments were done to understand the impacts, and the proposed mitigations.</li> <li>▶ Assessing cumulative impact is important in describing the challenges associated with timing all of the Inland Rail projects, Interlink, Cross River Rail and other projects.</li> <li>▶ Sustainability looks at the sustainability rating score that the project has been working against. It looks at achieving a low carbon footprint, re-use of materials, efficient design/construction methodology, reducing airborne impacts.                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JCh asked whether the sustainability chapter covered operation of the rail line.</li> <li>▶ RS advised it did.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ EIS Structure             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ 25 chapters and 25 technical appendices</li> <li>▶ Chapters:                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ explain the topic</li> <li>▶ description of existing environment</li> <li>▶ assessment of potential impacts</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Environmental Management Plan                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ management/mitigation measures</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Technical appendices                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ modelling, research &amp; supporting data</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Executive summary</li> <li>▶ Alignment drawings.</li> <li>▶ LP asked if ARTC has requested an extension of the timeframe to deliver the EIS.                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised yes, to allow time for adequacy checks and drafting and to ensure the EIS ticks the right boxes. B2G has not required significant changes. ARTC wishes to move the process forward and get started to give landowners more certainty.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ DT asked if the economics section would show the costing for the whole program, narrowed down to the proportionate cost of the B2G project.                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS acknowledged there is some detail around costings to support the economic assessment, however final figures will not be given.</li> <li>▶ HW advised the assessment includes economic impacts and the local economy, jobs, workforce etc.</li> <li>▶ DT asked whether the cost of the project has ever been questioned.</li> <li>▶ RS advised shareholders are updated based on current estimates, which are continually refined and re-forecasted as the project moves forward.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ JS noted in a previous committee meeting, it was indicated that 'local' meant anywhere in Australia, and not necessarily the immediate area.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW explained an analysis is undertaken of what skills, businesses and services are available in the local area. ARTC is required to abide by The Australian Industry Participation Strategy which defines local as Australia and New Zealand. However, additional requirements and targets will be built into contracts that address local at a Local Government Area (LGA) and regional level. This includes targets for local spend and employment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ RL asked what benefits would be provided for communities once construction finishes.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW advised the EIS will address benefits. Work is being done to look at building capacity and skills in communities. A focus is on transferable skills that can be used beyond the construction period.</li> <li>▶ JM acknowledged the positive work done by Nexus on TSRC to boost local content and recommended a similar process be taken for Inland Rail.</li> <li>▶ LM asked why Everick is being used for cultural heritage studies if it is not a local company. If there is a skillset missing from the local area, that needs to be identified and people need to be trained. Alternatively, a local office for the company should be opened. The project should start how it intends to finish.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Release of the EIS               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Submit to the OCG - 4th quarter 2019</li> <li>▶ Adequacy review by OCG &amp; government agencies</li> <li>▶ Public exhibition/ EIS submission period (minimum of four weeks – to be confirmed by OCG)</li> <li>▶ OCG and government agency formal review – technical content &amp; submissions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
5	<p><i>Fly through video</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ ARo introduced the 3D fly through video of the proposed reference design between Brookstead and Gowrie.</li> <li>▶ RS acknowledged that a question was raised by the Pittsworth community as to whether there is an opportunity during detailed design to lower the vertical height of the proposed design to reduce noise impacts. RS advised ARTC has taken these comments on board and will investigate in future stages of the project.</li> <li>▶ WH advised when the video of the proposed reference design is completed, skippable chapters will be included as the length of the video is approximately 20 minutes. The video shows embankments, cuttings, roads and public level crossings. It does not include private crossings or culverts.</li> <li>▶ ARo showed the fly through video.</li> <li>▶ DT asked whether access roads will be located along the corridor.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ ARo advised access roads will be located throughout most of the project.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ LM asked whether the project will have a net cut, or a net fill balance.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ ARo advised at this stage, there will be more cut than fill for the rail line.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
6	<p><i>Gowrie to Helidon update</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ SD gave an update on the Gowrie to Helidon (G2H) project.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ G2H held Community Information Sessions in October and November. 35 people attended at Gowrie and raised concerns such as noise, vibration, alignment, access and geotechnical investigations.</li> <li>▶ The geotechnical investigation program is almost complete and groundwater monitoring is ongoing. SD thanked landowners for their cooperation during this phase.</li> <li>▶ Social Impact Assessment (SIA) workshops have been undertaken to inform the EIS.</li> <li>▶ The Chair of the Lockyer Valley committee is also writing to the OCG to request additional time for the submissions period of the EIS, and to seek assistance in responding.</li> <li>▶ SD thanked JCh and the Gowrie Junction Progress Association for working between G2H and B2G.</li> <li>▶ SD advised of the G2H fly-through video available on the website.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ LP asked what company delivered the geotechnical work and whether they worked on TSRC.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ SD advised the work was done by Golders, and she is not sure whether they worked on TSRC. Knowledge has been shared between TMR, the TSRC project and Inland Rail on ground conditions and slippage.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ LP referred to the maximum cutting depth on B2G of approximately 25 metres and asked how this will impact bores that are drilled to 30 metres, and water levels that draw from 10 metres.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised this would be discussed in the next segment.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
7	<p><i>Groundwater and soil questions</i></p>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>▶ The Chair introduced questions asked by RL following the previous committee meeting. The Chair acknowledged that the consultants were not able to attend, however a follow-up meeting will be arranged at a later date.</p> <p><i>Land questions</i></p> <p>▶ <b>Q1: Describe the purpose of your investigation. How is it used?</b>  A1: Geotechnical investigations have been undertaken to inform development of the reference design. The objectives of these investigations were to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ reduce the geotechnical design risks associated with the project</li> <li>▶ report the factual and interpretive geotechnical and hydrogeological conditions for the EIS and future phases of design.</li> </ul> <p>The below provides a combined summary of the investigations undertaken for the reference design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Geotechnical boreholes – 53</li> <li>▶ Auger boreholes – 48</li> <li>▶ Dynamic cone penetrometer probes – 51</li> <li>▶ Seismic refraction surveys – 37 lines.</li> </ul> <p>RL commented that he was referring to land investigations, and not geotechnical investigations.</p> <p>▶ <b>Q2: Geotechnical investigations – are particles 75 microns or 2 microns?</b>  A2: Particle size distribution was tested by a National Association of Testing Authorities accredited laboratory in accordance with Australian Standard 1289: Methods of testing soils for engineering purposes, Method 3.6.1.</p> <p>This Standard sets out the method for the quantitative determination by sieve analysis of the particle size distribution in a soil, down to the 75 micron sieve.</p> <p>By using this method, the combined silt and clay fraction can be obtained by difference.</p> <p>RL commented that clay is 2 micron and silt is between 2 – 20 micron. Using 75 micron in this situation would not be effective as you cannot estimate below 75 micron.</p> <p>▶ <b>Q3: What are the locations of the 12 boreholes drilled, and over what distance?</b>  A3: A total of 53 geotechnical boreholes and 48 auger boreholes were completed along the alignment of the B2G reference design.</p> <p>Investigations locations targeted the proposed positioning of bridge abutments, culverts and locations of significant earthworks (cut and fill).</p> <p>RL commented the question was not appropriately answered.</p> <p>▶ <b>Q4: Data from ASRIS – what is the map scale?</b>  A4: Soil types were identified using the ASRIS Level 5 (1:100,000 or better) Australian Soil Classification soil order.</p> <p>RL commented that the Queensland Government has geotagged vast amounts of soil. ASRIS is not correct. The data source is very rough and simple in terms of describing the land.</p> <p>▶ <b>Q5: Why were no other information sources considered?</b>  A5: Information sources used for the assessment of existing conditions for land resources in the EIS included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ detailed solid and surface geology – (DNRME 2017)</li> <li>▶ atlas of Australian Soils (Northcote et al. 1960-68)</li> <li>▶ Queensland Agricultural Land Audit (DAF 2013, updated in 2017)</li> <li>▶ contour mapping (Department of Natural Resource, Mines and Energy (QLD) 2017)</li> <li>▶ Australian Soil Resource Information System (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) 2014)</li> <li>▶ Australian Government, Department of Defence Unexploded Ordnance website</li> <li>▶ DNRME Soil Conservation Plans (under the Soil Conservation Act 1986)</li> <li>▶ DES Contaminated Land Register and Environmental Management Register.</li> </ul> <p>Additional information was also gathered from geotechnical investigations, including soil sampling and laboratory analysis, soil type, landscape, anthropogenic material assessment etc.</p> <p>RL commented these data sources indicate research was superficial. Detailed soil research for the Darling Downs is available elsewhere.</p> <p>▶ <b>Q6: How were Class A and Class B agricultural land designated?</b></p>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>A6: The Queensland Agricultural Land Audit 2013 (the Audit) identifies land important to current and future agricultural production in Queensland.</p> <p>The Audit identifies agricultural potential using a rule-based approach that combines biophysical characteristics of the land, such as soil, climate and landform as well as native vegetation, and socio-economic spatial data.</p> <p>The characteristics of land/soil resources are a fundamental determinant of potential for most agricultural land uses. Soils are classified using a four-tier hierarchy ranging from Class A (arable land) through to Class D (land that is unsuitable for agriculture).</p> <p>Further information is available here: <a href="https://www.business.qld.gov.au/industries/farms-fishing-forestry/agriculture/agribusiness/agricultural-land-audit/land-classes">https://www.business.qld.gov.au/industries/farms-fishing-forestry/agriculture/agribusiness/agricultural-land-audit/land-classes</a></p> <p>RL commented the answer did not address the question of how the assessment was done.</p> <p>▶ <b>Q7: Soil erosion – what is the basis of the choice of input parameters in determining erosion risk?</b></p> <p>A7: Erosion risk was assessed using:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ detailed solid and surface geology – (DNRME 2017)</li> <li>▶ Atlas of Australian Soils (Northcote et al. 1960-68) (this includes soil chemistry and properties to understand erosive potential and problematic soils)</li> <li>▶ Queensland Agricultural Land Audit (DAF 2013, updated in 2017)</li> <li>▶ Australian Soil Resource Information System (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) 2014)</li> <li>▶ soil sampling and laboratory analysis undertaken as part of the EIS (including geotechnical assessment).</li> </ul> <p>RL commented that the calculation of erodibility that was put into the presentation was incorrect because of a heavy focus on dispersive soils that skew the assessment of erosion. The Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy has maps of soil erodibility for the region online.</p> <p>▶ <b>Q8: The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) will have a soil management sub-plan and a rehabilitation and landscaping management sub-plan. Will it have an erosion and sediment control plan?</b></p> <p>▶ A8: The Soil Management Sub-plan will include erosion and sediment controls as a component of the Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP).</p> <p>The erosion and sediment control measures will be developed by a Certified Practitioner in Erosion and Sediment Control in accordance with the International Erosion Control Association Best Practice Erosion and Sediment Control (2008) and will be implemented during construction of the Project.</p> <p>The Soil Management Sub-plan will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ locations for specific temporary/permanent erosion and sediment control measures, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ sediment retention basins (17 included in the reference design)</li> <li>▶ scour protection (included in the reference design)</li> <li>▶ sediment fencing</li> <li>▶ berms and other surface flow diversions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ nomination of location-specific erosion controls will include consideration of site conditions, proximity to environmental receptors, adjoining land uses, climatic and seasonal factors, and will be based on an erosion risk assessment</li> <li>▶ minimise the area of disturbance during each stage to enable the safe construction, operation and maintenance of the rail corridor</li> <li>▶ scheduling of works with consideration to periods of higher rainfall (summer months)</li> <li>▶ establish and specify the monitoring and performance objectives for handover on completion of construction.</li> </ul> <p>RL commented this was satisfactory.</p> <p>▶ <b>Q9: Will there be specification that such plans be prepared by suitably qualified professionals?</b></p> <p>A9: The erosion and sediment control measures will be developed by a Certified Practitioner in Erosion and Sediment Control in accordance with the International Erosion Control Association Best Practice Erosion and Sediment Control (2008).</p> <p>RL commented that the Certified Practitioner course was a four-day course A certified professional in soil science would be more appropriate.</p> <p><i>Groundwater questions</i></p> <p>▶ <b>Q1a: Data sources: what investigations and measurements have been carried out?</b></p>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>▶ A1a: Geotechnical and hydrogeological investigations for the reference design and EIS were carried out within the project footprint.</p> <p>Hydrogeological investigations were conducted by qualified hydrogeologists or qualified field engineers with advice from a qualified hydrogeologist. Field investigations included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ 27 groundwater monitoring bores</li> <li>▶ hydraulic aquifer testing (falling head test or rising head test) in groundwater monitoring bores</li> <li>▶ groundwater level monitoring</li> <li>▶ groundwater quality sampling in accordance with AS/NZ 5667.1:1998 and AS/NZ 5667.11:1998</li> </ul> <p>Analysis was undertaken by a National Association of Testing Authorities (NATA) accredited laboratory. The following parameters were analysed for each groundwater sample:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ major anions and cations (Ca, Mg, Na, K, Cl, F, SO<sub>4</sub>)</li> <li>▶ carbonate and bicarbonate alkalinity and hardness</li> <li>▶ pH</li> <li>▶ conductivity</li> <li>▶ total dissolved solids</li> <li>▶ total and dissolved metals (As, B, Ba, Be, Cd, Cr, Co, Cu, Mn, Fe, Ni, Pb, Se, V, Zn, Hg)</li> <li>▶ nutrients (nitrate, nitrite, ammonia, reactive phosphorus, Total Nitrogen, Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen, Total Phosphorus)</li> <li>▶ sodium adsorption ratio.</li> </ul> <p>RL commented that the analysis displayed a good range of anions, cations and nitrates. RL encouraged the information being shared with landowners.</p> <p>▶ <b>Q1b: Data sources: locations of monitoring bores</b></p> <p>A1b: Twenty-seven piezometers (groundwater monitoring bores) were installed to target hydrogeological conditions.</p> <p>Maps were shown with the locations of the piezometers.</p> <p>RL commented the maps were satisfactory.</p> <p>▶ <b>Q2a: MRVs: What info on connectivity of aquifers?</b></p> <p>A2a: The connections between aquifers have been identified and are outlined in the EIS. Data sources used to identify these connections include (but are not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ site specific aquifer tests on project groundwater monitoring bores</li> <li>▶ published data</li> <li>▶ drill stem tests and other relevant data from publicly available databases.</li> </ul> <p>RL explained MRVs (Main Range Volcanics) and the location in proximity to the Darling Downs. Bores need to be tested as to how they react, compared to a bore on a neighbouring property.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ PH asked how many aquifers were located between Pittsworth and Gowrie</li> <li>▶ RL noted the purpose of the question was to ascertain whether investigations would be done to establish connectivity of bores. A bore in basalt on one property may have little connection to a bore in basalt a kilometre away.</li> <li>▶ DT noted local knowledge should be a key part of the investigation</li> <li>▶ JCh noted it is important for landowners to understand water levels of their bores.</li> </ul> <p>▶ <b>Q2b: MRV's: Spatial scale of variation?</b></p> <p>A2b: It is not clear from the question what information is being sought.</p> <p>RL commented he was seeking information on whether investigations on bores were done in close proximity in basaltic region, which is more variable than the Condamine Alluvium for example.</p> <p>▶ <b>Q2c: MRV's: Recharge areas? Where specifically does recharge occur?</b></p> <p>A2c: Recharge areas and discharge areas have been identified for all of the aquifers that the project may impact. These areas are included in the EIS.</p> <p>RL commented he was seeking to ascertain whether an attempt was being made to identify key recharge areas which could potentially be affected by cuttings. In prolonged wet periods, landowners try to grow trees on recharge areas to stop groundwater salting from water tables rising was pouring into cultivation.</p> <p>▶ <b>Q3: Walloon coal measures: Where between Pittsworth and Yarranlea is transition from MRV's (blown up map, please, showing chainage from 163 to 206.9 with registered bores shown)</b></p> <p>▶ A3: The transition from the Main Range Volcanic (MRV) to Walloon Coal Measures between Pittsworth and Yarranlea can be viewed on the Queensland Globe mapping tool (<a href="http://qldglobe.information.qld.gov.au/">qldglobe.information.qld.gov.au/</a>) by viewing Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy's (DNRME) Detailed Surface Geology dataset.</p>



NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>Registered bores can also be viewed on the using the Queensland Globe mapping tool and DNRME’s registered water bores dataset.</p> <p>The EIS includes figures with registered bores along the proposed project rail alignment.</p> <p>Maps were shown with the location of registered bores between Pittsworth and Gowrie.</p> <p>RL commented the data sources listed were desktop only, and asked whether ARTC would investigate the location of unregistered bores.</p> <p>▶ <b>Q4: Why does the water quality data for the basalt area in particular not show Calcium and Magnesium? They are likely to be much more important ions than Na.</b></p> <p>A4: Groundwater samples were analysed for Ca, Mg, Na, K, Cl, F, SO4.</p> <p>RL commented this was satisfactory.</p> <p>▶ <b>Q5: How are you going to carry out a bore census? Will it include some form of monitoring programme to assess impacts?</b></p> <p>A5: The Terms of Reference (11.40) state: <i>“Undertake a landholder bore survey to identify the location and source aquifer of licensed groundwater extraction in areas potentially impacted by the project (e.g. near cuttings and bridges).”</i></p> <p>A search of registered groundwater bores, licensed for groundwater extraction, within the impact assessment area has been completed using the DNRME groundwater database.</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of construction, ARTC or its contractor(s) will carry out bore surveys to ground truth the location of landholder bores within the project footprint that may be decommissioned to enable construction and operation of the project. The survey will involve engagement with each licensed user to determine and agree upon an appropriate mitigation approach (replacement or compensation).</p> <p>RL commented that unregistered bores should also be ground-truthed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised ARTC is required to address registered bores in the EIS. Further work is to be done on identifying unregistered bores by asking landowners. ARTC encourages landowners with unregistered bores to provide this information.</li> <li>▶ RL stated the information received from monitoring bores should be shared with landowners.</li> </ul> <p>▶ <b>Q6: Modelled drawdown depends on water height. How did you get your heights to consider possible intersection by cuttings?</b></p> <p>A6: Groundwater levels at cutting locations were derived using several publicly available data sources, including bore logs from the DNRME database and measured standing water levels in the project monitoring bores.</p> <p>RL asked what the water levels were based on, acknowledging the variance of low, average and high-water levels.</p> <p>▶ <b>Q7: Please provide detail on drainage blanket design and function?</b></p> <p>A7: Drainage blanket design is a level of detail not provided in the reference design.</p> <p>Cross-sectional modelling of finalised cut dimensions will be conducted through the detail design process to reconfirm potential drawdown and potential seepage rates at deep cut locations (&gt;10 m). Seepage analysis will be used to advise drainage blanket specifications, or alternative design controls, for deep cuts into hard rock.</p> <p>Drainage blankets, or similar design controls, will be included in the design for all cuttings into hard rock.</p> <p>Please note seepage prevention measures will be investigated through the detail design process for inclusion into design specific to each cutting.</p> <p>RL questioned the efficiency and evidence of controlling seepage by placing something on the cut-face.</p> <p>▶ <b>Q8: How will potential impacts of construction on bore levels, flows, and quality be assessed. How could landholders determine whether there has been an impact? What would be the process of convincing ARTC that there was impact?</b></p> <p>▶ A8: The potential for impacts to groundwater will be assessed through the development and implementation of a Groundwater Management and Monitoring Program (GMMP).</p> <p>The GMMP will be developed from baseline groundwater monitoring data (levels and quality) obtained from monitoring bores established for the project through the EIS process, as well as from additional bores installed through the detail design process.</p> <p>Collected data will be used to establish a groundwater condition baseline for the project against which construction phase impacts can be monitored and compared. Baseline groundwater monitoring data will be used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ derive location/bore specific groundwater monitoring procedures</li> <li>▶ establish location/bore specific impact thresholds</li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ establish responses to impact threshold exceedances, including 'make good' agreements.</li> </ul> <p>These details will be incorporated into the GMMP, which will be subject to approval from DNRME and the Department of Environment and Science prior to implementation.</p> <p>RL suggested a guideline be developed to advise landowners what they should look at to determine whether bores have been impacted. RL also commented that in a highly variable climate, bore qualities go up and down. Monitoring should look at normal and abnormal variance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised an additional geotechnical investigation campaign will be undertaken in 2020. There is scope in this program to ensure monitoring is sufficient.</li> </ul>
8	<p><i>General business</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair advised that the two-year period of the committee has come to an end. The Chair encouraged committee members to reapply and advised independent assessment will be undertaken on experience and community representation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ NM advised local papers will advertise the application process. Information will be sought about the individuals' community connections.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ JS raised an issue first discussed 14 months ago. Landowners are waiting for a response about how ARTC will manage agistment of livestock and impacts to how people manage their property. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ ARe advised an agreement will be negotiated with individual landowners during construction about the management of their properties. This includes establishing and maintaining property access, fencing and agistment.</li> <li>▶ JS acknowledged that decisions made on these properties are made years in advance and the timeframe to construction is creating uncertainty.</li> <li>▶ RS noted ARTC has always provided the advice that landowners should continue to make decisions and run property as they would without the project taking place. He acknowledged this may be hard to implement. Compensation may be available down the track.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ JCh asked whether the committee would now be dissolved, with the intention of being re-established in 2020. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ WH advised the intention was that the committee be reformed in 2020. Letters have been emailed to the committee with application forms if they wish to re-apply. WH thanked the committee for their involvement for the last two years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
9	<p><i>Observer questions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair invited questions from observers.</li> <li>▶ Observer 1 asked for the cost of the B2G project to date. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS reiterated that these numbers will not be made public.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ JS asked again how landowners were expected to keep livestock alive with the knowledge that properties may be dissected in three years' time. Landowners want to know what decisions ARTC will make. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair took the question on notice.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Observer 2 asked if ARTC is going to identify and provide the number and details of dissected properties to the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised ARTC is developing a list for TMR. Now that the IGA is formalised, this has allowed discussions with TMR to progress.</li> <li>▶ Observer 2 asked whether TMR has been identified as the acquiring authority in the IGA.</li> <li>▶ RS took question on notice. The IGA allows ARTC to move forward with the sub-agreements, one of which will be ARTC working with TMR to incorporate their power of acquisition for transport corridors.</li> <li>▶ ARe advised any arrangements with TMR could not progress until the IGA was signed. During the detailed design process, ARTC will be able to identify severance to properties and intolerable impacts. Under the Acquisition of Land Act, there is provision for a landowner to ask for land to be acquired if severance leaves a parcel of land unviable.</li> <li>▶ ARTC is pushing forward to reduce the delay between EIS approval and acquisition. ARTC will identify severe and intolerable impacts. The <i>Acquisition of Land Act</i> says if a property is severed and the whole lot is not required, a landowner can request the rest of the parcel is acquired if it is not viable.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Observer 3 asked if ARTC had entered into any contractual agreements to purchase properties. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ ARe advised that less than six contracts had been entered into and the circumstances of those are confidential.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Observer 4 agreed with members of the committee in that there are many unregistered bores in the area that are old, shallow and uncased. Observer 4 also advised that she is a landowner in Gowrie Junction and</li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>was not advised of any land resumption requirements. A family member found out at an information session. Observer 4 questioned how many other landowners were in the same situation. The information was made public before she was advised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ ARe noted consultation should have occurred with all directly affected landowners.</li> <li>▶ SD apologised to Observer 4 and agreed to address the issue after the meeting.</li> <li>▶ Observer 4 asked whether ARTC would be compensating for dry bores. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised further work on assessing properties is required.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair closed the meeting at 8.15pm.</li> <li>▶ The Chair thanked the committee for their input and attendance over the last two years. The next meeting will likely be in March 2020, with communication if required in the interim.</li> </ul>

## Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	JCh to provide more information about what the CCC would like included for a field trip.	JCh	Ongoing
2	ARTC to report back on biosecurity management plan.	ARTC	Ongoing
3	Regional benefits to be added to the agenda when the studies are complete.	ARTC	Ongoing
4	ARTC to provide detail on what agreements were signed with the Intergovernmental agreement, and by who.	ARTC	December 2019
5	ARTC to arrange a meeting between RL and the groundwater and soil consultants. Meeting either via skype or in person and to be attended by Chair. Chair and RL to report back at the next CCC meeting.	ARTC, RL and Chair	March 2020
6	The Chair to prepare a letter to the Coordinator General seeking an extension of time for the public display and submissions period of the EIS, and share with the committee.	The Chair	January 2020
7	ARTC to provide guidance on agistment of stock during construction and operation.	ARTC	March 2020
8	ARTC to advise of the acquiring authority for Inland Rail in Queensland.	ARTC	March 2020

## Next Meeting

Next meeting to be held in March 2020 (TBC).

## Conflict of interest declaration

NAME	DECLARATION
Adrian Beattie	Potential for MOU with Indigenous community employment.
Jason Chavasse	Works for Queensland Government, Department may assess the Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Would exclude himself from this process if the CCC role would directly conflict with work responsibilities.
Rob Loch	Owns property within the study corridor. May potentially provide a resource to planning groups working/bidding on project but no current plans in place. Would exclude himself from the consulting work if this arose.
Paul Hanlon	Owns property within the study corridor. Interested in potentially sourcing Brisbane treated water for irrigation through a pipeline that could possibly use the rail corridor.
Ken Murphy	Has taken on the role as the CEO of the Kath Dickson Family Centre and successfully applied for Inland Rail sponsorship.

**MEETING MINUTES**

Inner Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee: Meeting 8



NAME	DECLARATION
Larry Pappin	Owns property within the study corridor.
Jenny Schmidt	Owns property within the study corridor.
Kylie Schultz	Owns property within the study corridor.
David Taylor	Owns property within the study corridor.