

Meeting title	Lockyer Valley Community Consultative Committee
----------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

Attendees

Mark Hohenhaus – Committee Chair	Gordon Van der Est – Committee Member
Kathy Brady – Committee Member	Simon Warner – Committee Member
Linton Brimblecombe – Committee Member	Max Nichols – ARTC Inland Rail
Neil Cook – Committee Member	David Foster – ARTC Inland Rail
Maurice Hennessy – Committee Member	Shane Harris - ARTC Inland Rail
Gary Stark – Committee Member	Mercedes Staff – ARTC Inland Rail
Kenneth Moore – Committee Member	Stephen Brierley – ARTC Inland Rail
Mark Newton – Committee Member	Gail Harris – ARTC Inland Rail
Judy Seppanen – Committee Member	Corey Doran – ARTC Inland Rail
Ian Rickuss – Committee Member	Dee Elliot – FFJV

Apologies

Peter Cahill – Committee Member	
---------------------------------	--

Guests and Observers

Federal Member Jim McDonald and Lockyer Valley Regional Councillor Michael Hagan
 Approximately 20 members of the public attended as observers.

Location	Laidley Cultural Centre
-----------------	-------------------------

Date	8 October 2018	Time	6:00 – 8:30pm
-------------	----------------	-------------	---------------

Agenda No.	Discussion points	
1.	<p>Confirmation of previous minutes and actions</p> <p>Minutes from the previous meeting were confirmed.</p> <p>Actions from the previous meeting were addressed as follows:</p> <p>1a. Provide an update on the status the Inter-Governmental Agreements.</p> <p><i>The intergovernmental agreement for Queensland is an agreement between the Federal Government and the State Government; and as many of you may have seen in recent media, the negotiations are continuing in relation to that agreement.</i></p> <p>1b. Provide an explanation on how councils are going to be paid for the loss of their rates base.</p> <p><i>We are not aware of a mechanism that particularly deals with compensation in this regard. However, Inland Rail, will be dealt with in the same manner as per other Federal Government projects, State Government projects and Local Government projects.</i></p>	MS

Agenda No.	Discussion points	
	<p>2. Extend the closing date of the Social Impact Assessment community survey for an additional six weeks, from the current closing date of 1 July 2018 and advertise and promote it as widely as possible.</p> <p><i>This action was extended until the 31 July and the results of the survey are in the presentation tonight.</i></p> <p>3. Update the Consultation Program to reflect the changed dates to flora and fauna studies.</p> <p>4. Update the Consultation Program to include the Social Impact Assessment community survey.</p> <p><i>Action 3 & 4, the consultation program is a targeted plan and it doesn't require updating. This plan was to illustrate the activities required during the design phase which we are working through moving forward.</i></p> <p>5 Action request for ARTC engineers to meet with engineers engaged by Forest Hill committee members for the purposes of handing over flood data and research.</p> <p><i>On the 20 September, a meeting occurred with members of the Forest Hill Development Committee which included: GV, KM, IR, GS, Roy Somerville (surveyor) Martin Giles (Hydrologist) and Trinity Graham from FFJV and ARTC IR staff to discuss and provide historical flooding information to assist with the Inland Rail flood modelling validation process.</i></p> <p><i>The information was well-received by all attendees of the meeting.</i></p> <p><i>On the 4 October, another meeting was held to exchange further historical flooding information and data; particularly photographs. The Inland Rail representatives also shared their latest GPS rail track and ground level survey data. IR will provide an overview of the flood modelling overlay at this meeting tonight.</i></p> <p>6. Action request for meeting between Inland Rail CEO and engineers and Minister for Transport and Main Roads Mark Bailey, Federal Member for Wright Scott Buchholz, State Member for Lockyer Jim McDonald and Lockyer Valley Regional Council Mayor Tanya Milligan to discuss expansion of the study area to enable consideration of alignment alternatives outside of the current study area.</p> <p>Comment: <i>On the 6 September at Parliament House a meeting with GV, MH, KM and Inland Rail's CEO Richard Wankmuller, Minister Bailey, Jim McDonald, Tania Milligan and Steven Hall from Scott Buchholz's office took place. Unfortunately, Scott Buchholz was unavailable.</i></p> <p><i>"The meeting was advised that in 2016, the Queensland Government indicated support for Inland Rail; adopting Queensland's preferred strategic alignment; Gowrie to Grandchester alignment preserved in the 2003; and the southern freight rail corridor from Rosewood to Kagaru preserved in 2010. The Inland Rail study contains both the above preserved alignments."</i></p> <p><i>"At the meeting, Inland Rail CEO, Richard Wankmuller, clearly stated that between Gowrie and Kagaru, Inland Rail is only looking at options that fall within the existing and publicly advised study area. Further, there is no proposal to amend the study area for the sections of the Inland Rail between Gowrie and Kagaru, to take in further sections of</i></p>	<p>MH</p>

Agenda No.	Discussion points	
	<p>validated, the model will place the Inland Rail infrastructure into the model to work through the requirements not to make things worse in the area as best as possible.</p> <p>Question: I have to challenge your statement “not to make things worse”. I think your statement needs to be “improving existing/ improve existing status”.</p> <p>Answer: That is something we will be exploring and if we can find a suitable way to make things better, we will absolutely be looking into that with considerable detail. I can’t make any sort of commitments as it stands, until we start getting into the more detailed modelling to find out what those solutions maybe. Your point is absolutely noted, and Inland Rail does want to see a better outcome, if that’s an achievable solution.</p> <p>Integrated Transport Planning (referring to presentation slide 11)</p> <p>The Lockyer Valley Council has discussed with Inland Rail several key points for the area that they are expecting us to address for example; “What are we doing about other transporter opportunities?” The Federal and State Government have set some money aside, for a passenger route to Toowoomba.</p> <p>Inland Rail are also working with the State Government to ensure that we are not precluding the current corridor which was slated for passenger services as well as freight. That means that passenger services can be put in at a later date by providing enough space for the Queensland Government to create a dedicated passenger network through the area.</p> <p>Additionally, Inland Rail are investigating a pedestrian passageway next to and around the rail corridor. We are aware of the pedestrian accesses through towns crossing the corridor and we are committed to maintaining pedestrian connectivity.</p> <p>Geotechnical Investigations (referring to presentation slide 12)</p> <p>Inland Rail are undertaking geotechnical investigations which involve intrusive work such as drilling boreholes and non-intrusive work such as mapping ground vibration.</p> <p>These works are to assist with both our EIS and feasibility designs. The EIS mainly for groundwater and soil. The design to understand the technical solution s we need to develop to make sure that the rail infrastructure stays in place and to meet our performance requirements.</p> <p>A key priority is to understand how private landholders use their land when the land required is severed. The definition of severing of land is: The severed parcel of land becomes a separate lot or parcel. We are in the process of contacting property owners that are impacted by the alignment to discuss the impacts of severance. We need to ascertain whether they need to access to the other side? What infrastructure do they have on their land? How is the land used? This information allows the project team to address the connectivity requirements and work through the appropriate treatment with the landholder.</p> <p>Comment: Regarding flooding and drainage. With the completion of the first round of flood modelling, we want to ensure we capture whatever data we can to reflect the historical rain events. The information can be from stream gauges, people pointing out the afflux on properties, sheds, and trees so we can capture how much water has come through in an event to ensure the flood model matches that event.</p>	<p>LB</p> <p>MN</p>

Agenda No.	Discussion points	
	<p>Response: The calibration exercise has been taking place. The project team are at a stage where the hydrologists have modelled the historical flows from rain events in the current condition (without Inland Rail infrastructure).</p> <p>The next step is to validate the model with the community to make sure that the flood waters have been captured.</p> <p>Once the community have been able to validate the flood modelling, any additional information obtained will be calibrated into the model. This will allow the Inland Rail alignment to be placed into the model. During this process, we will explore types of bridges, and how much drainage is required to provide necessary water movement during rain events to minimise impact to all adjacent landowners and communities.</p> <p>Alignment Update</p> <p>Gowrie to Helidon Alignment:</p> <p>The alignment has been changed in a few locations outside the protected corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Toowoomba tunnel to Six Mile Creek: The exit portal of the Toowoomba tunnel where it pops out at the bottom of the range a deviation of approximately 150 metres. The reason, at the top of the tunnel, the western portal, both the flood immunity and technical requirements were not being met. The model indicated that in a moderate flood, water would travel through the tunnel portal and down into the Lockyer Valley, diverting flood water. As a result, the portal was moved slightly higher, which then meant the tunnel was higher down at the bottom as well. (Refer to slide 14 of the presentation) - This change was made in the Initial Advice Statement. Out Terms of Reference are based on this changed alignment through this area. The original alignment came through and crossed the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing at a very high skew angle as well as a small tunnel in the area. By going around the back in this area, it created a better cut and fill balance and had a perpendicular crossing of the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing and removed the need for a tunnel. (Refer to slide 15 of the presentation). - Withcott Seedlings are a major agricultural business in the region which supplies seedlings for the Lockyer Valley farmers. The protected alignment went straight over the dam water supply. Rather than interrupting the operations though construction, we found an alignment that goes between the dams before going back into the protected alignment. (Refer to slide 16 of the presentation). <p>Helidon to Calvert Alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Airforce Road to Connors Road where an existing APA Gas easement which supplies most of Brisbane’s gas. There are two pipelines in that area. The protected corridor crosses the pipeline twice. We were able to straighten the alignment and run parallel with the gas easement to avoid crossing it altogether. Avoiding the need to build over or relocate the existing gas infrastructure means that construction activities will not be impacted. (Refer to slide 18 of the presentation). - Warrego Highway: we moved slightly left of the protected corridor. After working with TMR regarding their future plans at some stage to increase the number of lanes in either direction. The issue was that the current design when crossing the highway, would have been at a significantly-skewed angle causing the overpass spans to be extremely long. By moving the alignment, the designers were able to design a bridge so there is no interaction between road and the rail. (Refer to slide 19 of the presentation). 	

Agenda No.	Discussion points	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Brookes Road, Placid Hills: the alignment changed slightly based on discussions with Lockyer Valley Council. There is land that is being investigated to be an industrial estate and to provide connectivity for potential future connections to the Warrego Highway. By shifting the alignment slightly, the future connection is possible, and the design removes the need for a level crossing, as instead the rail will go over the road. (Refer to slide 20 of the presentation). - Laidley area and the Little Liverpool tunnel: The alignment stays within the protected corridor through Valley Vista Estate. Our challenge in this area is the existing Queensland Rail (QR) lines and round the range. As a result, we would have to close the QR lines for an extended period, interrupting the existing operations of trains through the area. To avoid interacting with an operating line, we ran the alignment parallel. This change however, changed the alignment through the Range causing a slightly different tunnel alignment. This change found an improved way through the ridgeline and reduced the need for substantial earthworks however, meant introducing a few curves to make the alignment more perpendicular which moved the alignment out of the protected corridor. (Refer to slide 21 of the presentation). - Grandchester; an area of concern with the previous design for a fourteen-metre-high viaduct through the area. By going into the existing rail corridor sooner, we impact land which has already been impacted then follow as close to the existing Rosewood/Laidley Road. This limits the impact to the most amount of people. (Refer to slide 22 of the presentation). <p>Now that the alignment changes have been adopted, we will commence with the more detailed EIS studies as part of the Terms of Reference. We need to look at noise, flooding, air quality, social impacts.</p> <p>Question: Between Grandchester and Laidley, there was some talk of a cutting or is it going to be a tunnel or is that up to the PPP or contractors?</p> <p>Answer: There is some cutting and a tunnel.</p> <p>Question: There are going to be tunnels through the Second Range?</p> <p>Answer: Yes. Inland Rail is continuing detailed studies to work through whether there will be a bridge/embankment or a cutting/tunnel. It is a tunnel.</p> <p>The EIS is being developed based on a tunnel. If the PPP/contractor wanted to change to a cutting, that would invoke a whole change process and would require to undertake the EIS process again.</p> <p>Question: Will the QR line still exist after the ARTC line is completed?</p> <p>Answer: We are working under the assumption that the track will remain therefore we are not going to build over the top of the existing track, rather the new infrastructure will be placed parallel, adjacent. We will stay in the corridor as best as possible throughout the area.</p> <p>Until the Intergovernmental Agreement is in place we can only design to the assumption that existing track will remain.</p> <p>Question: With constructing an identical new track adjacent to the existing track, will this not create continued flooding issues? What about climate change and the potential impacts with this additional infrastructure?</p>	<p>IR</p> <p>MN</p> <p>IR</p> <p>MN</p> <p>DF</p> <p>IR</p> <p>MN</p> <p>GS</p>

Agenda No.	Discussion points	
	<p>Answer: We are working through the detailed design as well as working through historical flooding data. Additionally, climate change is something we need to consider as part of our design as well as potential increase in rainfall generally.</p> <p>Question: Electrification of the line, is that anywhere in your planning; because throughout the world, I have travelled on most passenger lines and freight lines are all electrified. If this is going to turn into electrification down the track, as it would change the visual amenity of the Lockyer Valley.</p> <p>Answer: Inland Rail are not looking at electrification, diesel operations only. Part of the technical challenges with electric is that we are looking to have double-stack container trains with electric wires very high in the air. We are working with the State Government, to allow extra land adjacent to the infrastructure for future passenger network services which could be electrified.</p>	<p>MN</p> <p>GS</p> <p>MN</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Environmental Matters (refer to slides 24 & 25 of the presentation)</p> <p>Inland Rail’s core environmental team has five strong environmental members to support the project.</p> <p>We acknowledged that although flooding is a key area of interest for the group, focus on noise, vibration, air quality and amenity need to be assessed.</p> <p>To assess environmental impacts, requires an understanding of the current conditions, level of potential impact incrementally as well as understanding how we maintain the amenity of the area to a level that is acceptable; acceptable to the regulators/community and consistent with the land use and zoning for the region.</p> <p>One of the main drivers for going through the EIS process is to make sure that there are mitigation measures and management measures that protect the community.</p> <p>Noise and vibration are a real impact that will be felt. The community will hear it and there will be noise. The rail operations can make some sort of noise. It is just making sure that we understand what the level of impact is; and are providing an approach that doesn't erode what's called 'amenity conditions. So that's something that we are very aware of and something Inland Rail are working very hard to understand, particularly from an operational noise point of view.</p> <p>Visual aspects; we acknowledge there are going to be earthwork/cuts and embankments through the terrain as well as having an operational rail line going past existing communities and houses. Again, as part of the EIS process we are continually working through these infrastructure impacts.</p> <p>Air quality is viewed in two aspects. There is the dust that falls out and lands on surfaces and there are the potential health issues which again we are working through potential impacts.</p> <p>A point raised by the Lockyer Valley Regional Council including a number of stakeholders are concerns regarding maintaining good quality agricultural land; keeping the land use consistent with what's been used in the past, not eroding on the agricultural viability of the area.</p>	<p>SH</p>

Agenda No.	Discussion points	
	<p>KPMG has been engaged to look very closely at the economic issues - social considerations will come up in a few slides - but potential economic impacts which we want to understand and make sure that we address; make sure that we don't cause any adverse impacts in terms of that. It is something that our CEO is very passionate about as well. We understand it's one of the non-negotiables that have been presented by the technical working group.</p> <p>Preparing the methodologies and drafting the EIS:</p> <p>We are currently preparing the methodology documents which outlines what we need to do for the EIS assessment process; how we are going to document our findings to minimise potential issues and how we will present the information to the Coordinator General and various regulatory bodies. This outline will occur for every technical stream required for the EIS submission.</p> <p>Question: Regarding noise and vibration, will it be less than what is currently experienced?</p> <p>Answer: No. ARTC will need to mitigate the effects of noise and vibration. For example; continuous weld rail to prevent the clicking noise. Additionally, an area of noise is 'annoyance' which we need to minimise to ensure there is no 'tonal impacts' or low frequency noise.</p> <p>Question: What is the plan for noise barriers through towns?</p> <p>Answer: Noise barriers are one way of controlling noise and barriers will be installed where required. Another control is controlling at the source, which is preferred, for example using continuous weld rail. There is also controls at the receiver, so fences or potential treatment at the receiver's house.</p> <p>Question: I always thought that noise barriers were solid; so that brings us back to flooding. How is flooding prevented if noise barriers are installed?</p> <p>Answer: Noise barriers are solid. Barriers are manufactured to meet the requirements of the design and hydrology that would be taken into account.</p>	<p>MH</p> <p>SH</p> <p>LB</p> <p>SH</p> <p>LB</p> <p>SH</p>
5.	<p>Social Impact:</p> <p>The Social Impact Assessment is part of the Environmental Impact Statement; it doesn't stand alone. It fits within the Environmental Impact Statement. It is about 25 different technical studies that make up the EIS. The word "social", it's about looking at social impacts; looking at impacts on communities, on social infrastructure, on housing, on the way the population is distributed; on the way that people live, work and play.</p> <p>The first thing we do is work out the existing conditions, where people are; housing trends, community trends, community values. We look at how the project interacts with the settlement pattern, with the way that people live, work and play around the community.</p> <p>We work out what the impacts are in relation to, for example, impacts on amenity, impacts on social infrastructure, impacts on the way people move around.</p>	DE

Agenda No.	Discussion points	
	<p>The key sources of information are provided by the community and the technical inputs that the EIS team provide. For example, working out what changes to amenity might look like, we need to look at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - what changes to noise looks like - how changes to dust looks like - whether there would be changes to the road pattern etc. <p>We bring together issues and views from the community with the technical findings from the EIS, the other technical information to develop is a Social Impact Assessment. The final stage is to work out, "What are the mitigation strategies to avoid or reduce or off-set the social impacts that would be experienced?"</p> <p>One of the key sources of input to the Social Impact Assessment is community input; we have completed a survey for the Gowrie to Kagaru section of the project that resulted in 403 people responding to a survey with approximately 78 people from the Lockyer Valley and Local Government area which is about 18 per cent of the sample.</p> <p>The purpose of the survey was to work out what people's existing community values are, what they think are most important; and to get a sense of what they think we need to look at in terms of Social Impact Assessment and what they think the priorities are.</p> <p>For example, we know from looking at the responses to community values and what people tell us about community well-being, that on the whole, the fact is that support community well-being, and feeds into community values and very strong/positive in this area. People know and appreciate they have a clean and green community and are a close community. The responses indicated a good range of factors, such as affordable housing and access to services that support quality of life.</p> <p>Looking at "what people think the impacts might be". Issues such as the "amenity of towns and farms" were a real key issue for people in Lockyer Valley; "access around the district", obviously very important; "how people live, work and play, impacts on local businesses, potential for industry and economic development and benefits in that respect, potential for employment and training options and the benefits; potential to impact on health and safety; potential impact on community values such as connectedness and cohesion between neighbours and between communities".</p> <p>The social performance team seek interaction with members of the communities to understand what the issues are that people are most concerned about; and to hear the colour/texture of what people are talking about. We have been along to info sessions; we have been to specific meetings; we have social infrastructure/workshops, where we bring the health and schools and those sorts of providers together, so that we understand what that looks like from that angle; and we talk to councils, obviously, to get a range of inputs from councils as well. So that's just a bit of an overview of what we're up to.</p> <p>In terms of potential opportunities, the things that the communities identified is the potential for employment, potential for businesses to benefit, the potential for access to markets. In terms of the impacts, there's a lot of information about impacts on amenity, impacts on the way people move around; connections between communities and between landholders and neighbourhoods, for example.</p>	

Agenda No.	Discussion points	
	<p>All the information is evaluated as part of the Social Impact Assessment that forms part of the EIS. It goes forward as part of the documents that ARTC will put forward seeking approval for the project.</p> <p>The key aspects that ARTC will be looking at in relation to management of social impacts and enhancement of benefits/opportunities, are around workforce management. For example, working with communities, with local training providers, with TAFE for example, maybe with schools, to develop the capacity of local people, local young people, to be involved in potential for project construction work; and then, whilst they are much smaller numbers in terms of the operational workforce, there's also potential for those kids who want to be train drivers or rehabilitation specialists or track maintenance engineers or whatever, to look at those potential opportunities.</p> <p>Question: Are you going to benchmark those businesses in terms of turnover, before/after the line goes through? If so, what sort of avenue of compensation would be available for those businesses if they are impacted?</p> <p>Additionally, as this is a low socio-demographic area, a lot of the houses fall within the Queensland Government definition of "railway corridor", which is 25 metres or less. The valuations on those properties will be significantly impacted. Wouldn't that have to fit within this component of "social/economic assessment".</p> <p>What plans are in place or will be in place to help those impacted?</p> <p>Answer: We are at a very early stage in terms of working out what the mitigation strategies will look like which can't be done until we work out what the impacts look like.</p> <p>In relation to businesses: the approach is it to look at what sorts of impacts would be on businesses; that includes farms, agricultural businesses, businesses in town where, for example, their access/amenity might change. We can't look at the value of every business in the study area. We can't benchmark, and it would take another ten years to understand. This is a longitudinal study to work out what a change might look like to the value of a business.</p> <p>Property values are affected by a whole range of factors and as such ARTC are not able to comment on this sensitive issue.</p> <p>Question: Will the new alignment impact on the social economic study outcomes? Will the alignment change again? As the alignment has changed to what was previously provided, will this new change any of the social economic outcomes from the study?</p> <p>Answer: We need to look at the alignment that has been put forward for assessment which has not been assessed. The baseline surveys are to collect community region-wide information. Now that we have the detailed alignment, which generally is within 100/200 metres of where the original protected corridor alignment was, we need to go into the deeper studies; do the collation of the businesses and the community amenity areas that are impacted and do those detailed assessments. We needed the final location, so that we could assess in detail those types of impacts.</p>	<p>GV</p> <p>DE</p> <p>LB</p> <p>DE</p>
9.	<p>Community update:</p> <p>As part of the geotechnical investigations Inland Rail staff walk landholders through all the activities required to take place on the property. These investigations are not just</p>	GH

Agenda No.	Discussion points	
	<p>cultural heritage or reconnaissance; it is explaining the types of activities required such as drilling, trench pits, vibration monitoring or testing to take place over a period of time.</p> <p>During discussions with the landholders, Inland Rail staff go through the alignment to make sure the landholders understand how the project/alignment will impact their property and answer any questions about the investigations and impacts.</p> <p>Question: What is Inland Rail doing to raise public awareness and would Inland Rail consider using Facebook advertising?</p> <p>Answer: We have used the Australian Postal Service to distribute invitations to the information display sessions and the latest project newsletter to over 14,000 information to properties, post boxes, business and schools, Enews and newspaper advertisement. ARTC are working on setting up Facebook however, until this is completed we will rely on Enews in the first instance.</p> <p>Inland Rail staff seek:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Historical information on how the property has been affected in the past and location of any underground infrastructure; i.e. inundation of flood waters; where did the flood waters go? Did it inundate the house? What levels did it take hold on the property? - Location of existing underground services. - How is the land used? Livestock, agricultural, quarry etc. How is access/egress achieved, what type of equipment is used? <p>Landholder meetings occur with the directly impacted properties, where the alignment impacts the property as a priority.</p> <p>All information captured is put into the design process. This information is important during the construction phase. The contractors will need to know what type of infrastructure and its location on the property to understand/mitigate potential impacts.</p> <p>The next stage of consultation is about presenting the alignment to the community.</p> <p>ARTC/Inland Rail will have staffed information displays at Gatton and Yamanto and Toowoomba.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gatton Shopping Centre: 5, 6 and 10 October - Yamanto Shopping Centre: 12, 14 & 17 October - Toowoomba ARTC office: 20 & 22 October. <p>The updated Interactive Mapping Tool will allow you to comment or ask a question at a selected location. The updated mapping tool now asks if you want us to answer your question or "how do you want to be addressed to the question?" We are here to help you follow the process and to answer the questions as quickly as we can and as thoroughly as we can.</p> <p>If you or anyone you know have questions, please direct them to the 1800 732 761 or website: inlandrail.com.au or email: inlandrailqld@artc.com.au</p>	<p>KB</p> <p>GH</p>
10.	What is Public Private Partnership (PPP)?	DF

Agenda No.	Discussion points	
	<p>The Australian Government asked ARTC to use the Public Private Partnership as the delivery method for this project. PPP refers to the way that the project from Toowoomba through to Kagaru would be delivered.</p> <p>What that means is, the government has requested ARTC/Inland Rail to go and find someone who is interested in the detailed design, to construct the project, maintain it and potentially operate the project between Toowoomba and Kagaru. This particular section is the most technically challenging part of the alignment between Melbourne and Brisbane; and it requires some very specialist expertise to come in from the private industry.</p> <p>Recently, ARTC/Inland Rail went to the marketplace to ask for registration of interests for the PPP project.</p> <p>Interested parties' approach ARTC to highlight their interest. The next step is called "market sounding", where there's interaction with those interested parties; like banks, construction companies, the big design companies, that will form teams and submit an expression of interest, next year.</p> <p>The process of engaging the PPP takes 18 months to two years, generally; and it happens in parallel with the development of the feasibility design and the EIS. We are starting this process of forming this PPP to deliver the project down the track, after ARTC/Inland Rail have all approvals in place.</p>	
11.	<p>General business</p> <p>Comment: <i>It is extremely important that committee members raise concerns or ask Inland Rail questions about aspects of the infrastructure. Any issues or questions raised should be forwarded to the Chair and the Secretariat a week prior to the meeting to allow Inland Rail time to respond at the meeting.</i></p> <p><i>It should be noted: The Forest Hill community have been extremely proactive in bringing points through their committee members. I would encourage all areas - most of the areas are represented along the alignment with members who sit around this particular table. I would encourage members of the general public to bring their concerns/issues to either the CCC members or to Inland Rail, to be discussed at these meetings. It is very important that we get these things brought to the attention of those concerned.</i></p> <p>Questions to the Inland Rail project team:</p> <p>A landholder advised that there is a perception in the community that a high-level rail might cause flooding; even if it has been designed not to flood. He felt that the negative community perception would be reduced if viaducts with continuous culverts were used, instead of high walls of earth mound embankments.</p> <p>We note that several community members and the committee members of Lockyer Valley Tourism feel viaducts are a more prudent approach than solid earth mound embankments.</p> <p>We request that the visualisations and interactive maps of the project include clear illustrations of the old-fashioned bridges and viaducts, when the public consultation sessions occur at the end of this year and the first month or two of next year, under the topic of "land".</p>	<p>MH</p> <p>KB</p>

Agenda No.	Discussion points	
	<p>The Lockyer Valley Tourism committee believe that using old-fashioned viaducts could be a tourism attraction.</p> <p>Question: What is Inland Rail doing to make the rail line a tourism attraction rather than a detraction? Feedback was given at the initial stage in April to June in the land section, "visual amenity input" from the community. Please provide an update on the inclusion of old-fashioned bridges and viaducts.</p> <p>Answer: The Future Freight Joint Venture (FFJV) design consultants and the structural engineers were asked to address KB question about "old-fashioned bridges" in terms of stonemasonry and some of the old structures that were forwarded to ARTC.</p> <p>The finding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very labour intensive and expert stonemasons around the world are hard to find. - Due to construction costs and schedules this type of construction isn't utilised in today's industry. - This type of infrastructure increases the footprint which isn't something that we are going to be looking to do. We want to minimise the footprint to be as narrow as possible. Very bulky piers, for old-fashioned structures are going to make it very difficult to minimise footprint. - During construction, temporary structures are required which increase scheduling and can be a potential risk during wet weather events. - The structure designers adhere to the Australian Standards. Although we probably think a lot of these old structures are very durable, as they have been around for 100 years the Inland Rail freight size was not used back then. - The structure design is reinforced steel and concrete that are lightweight and has flexibility to mitigate noise and vibration yet strong to accommodate the tonnage required. Stone fashioned bridges are only in compression which means no flexibility to mitigate noise and vibration. <p>Question: Is an architectural façade possible? So why don't you take your structure and give it to an architect and tell them to make this beautiful.</p> <p>Answer: It is possible for a façade to designed on a structure however, structural design requirements may predicate what we are able to achieve.</p> <p>Question: Regarding potential sinkholes resulting from train vibration. A resident who lives between Grandchester and Calvert advised that the Rosewood/Calvert area has underground mines and she was wondering what the effect of double-stacked train vibration would have on the land around these mine shafts. Over time, could it cause sinkholes or subsidence?</p> <p>Answer: Vibration is something that we are looking at. The question is referring to underground mines being impacted by surface infrastructure. We will engage the Department of Resources and Mines, Natural Resources and Mines, to determine whether there is any potential issue based on the predicted vibration levels that could cause long-term issues.</p> <p>Questions: Very concerned that the noise from the railway line would have a negative impact on recreational activities, such as bird watching and the location of her property</p>	<p>KB</p> <p>SB</p> <p>KB</p> <p>SB</p> <p>KB</p> <p>SH</p> <p>KB</p>

Agenda No.	Discussion points	
	<p>which is situated on a hill; the noise is likely to travel up to her house like an amphitheatre.</p> <p>Other people have concerns around noise and vibration as well. A gentleman living on Range Crescent is extremely worried about noise and vibration caused by the rail line passing underneath his house.</p> <p>Stakeholder advised that she relocated from Sydney and purchased her new home in Laidley and had no idea that there was a proposed rail line in the area. While the rail will not come directly through the property, there is considerable concerns about the noise as the Stakeholder's child has autism and is very sensitive to noise. Additionally, the preferred alignment for the proposed rail line passes very close to the school that her child attends, Laidley District State Primary School. There is concerns that the noise could potentially impact upon the learning of all the children at the large local school and particularly the children with special needs who are very sensitive to noise.</p> <p>At the last community consultative committee meeting, concerns were raised about the location of passing loops which cause additional noise and it was noted in the minutes that the community feedback showed a preference for the position of the passing loop not be positioned on the Valley Vista side of Laidley Plainland Road but to instead be positioned on the other side, as far away from the populated areas and as a result, further away from Laidley District State School.</p> <p>In the minutes of the last meeting it was stated by Gary Graeme that ARTC would have finalised the location of the passing loops by August or September 2018.</p> <p>Question: As it is now October 2018, could you please let us know if the passing loop will be located on the densely populated side of Laidley Plainland Road?</p> <p>Answer: We do not have 100 per cent confirmation of the loop locations. We are currently running the operational models internally. We are expecting confirmation of the loop locations shortly.</p> <p>Answer: How will Inland Rail mitigate the noise and vibration concerns, that the residents that I have just mentioned are extremely worried about?</p> <p>Answer: Noise impacts are assessed based on land use, based on existing noise levels. We have a day-time level and there is a night-time level that we aim for; and further to that, there's also a maximum noise level that we aim for.</p> <p>Within Queensland, there are no specific requirements for noise for rail operations.</p> <p>ARTC are striving above and beyond the state requirements and adopting the Rail Infrastructure Noise Guidelines for New South Wales. We are applying these guidelines throughout the program. As part of the guidelines, there is a day-time level which is what's considered acceptable for a new rail line and there's a night-time level which is lower, because more people get annoyed. Schools and places of worship are considered sensitive receivers and have particular noise levels to adhere to.</p> <p>Question: What is the access and responsibilities of Inland Rail contractors when entering private premises on the proposed rail line?</p> <p>Answer: Inland Rail representatives meet landholder to discuss the locations of the geotechnical work and seek permission and requirements to enter the property.</p>	<p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p>KB</p> <p>MN</p> <p>KB</p> <p>SH</p> <p></p> <p>JS</p> <p>GH</p>

Agenda No.	Discussion points	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access requirements are issued to the geotechnical team to follow through. - This could be anything from number of days/hours to advise when access is required or to knock on the door, go to the property office and sign in to advise that entry has taken place. <p>Question: What is the percentage of individuals or basically how many people have not allowed access onto their land, in this area?</p> <p>Answer: There have been four landholders that have not granted access in this area.</p> <p>Question: Has anyone had any issues with Inland Rail representatives not adhering to entry requirements?</p> <p>Answer: There was no response from the group.</p> <p>Question: How many problems have you had with the contractors not adhering to the access requirements?</p> <p>Answer: I can't place a number on this, if a problem has occurred, the contractors would rectify and make good on the situation immediately. Every time Inland Rail representatives enter onto someone's land, there is always something to learn.</p> <p>Question: How many unresolved issues and complaints have been received as a result of geotechnical investigations?</p> <p>Answer: We have had no complaints about the geotechnical work in this area. If a complaint is raised, Inland Rail is committed to resolve the issue as quickly as possible. It is very important for us to respect the land and the landholders.</p> <p>A request for an update on recent meetings between ARTC and the Forest Hill Community Group:</p> <p>There were three meetings to date with a potential for a fourth meeting.</p> <p>The meeting with the Minister didn't go particularly well and I believe he left prematurely.</p> <p>The LVRC Mayor Tania Milligan and ARTC CEO Richard Wankmuller had a discussion regarding LVRC five 'non-negotiables' as they call it; No loss of connectivity, no flood impacts, mitigation and promotion of integrated transport planning.</p> <p>GV commented at there is nothing wrong with the 'non-negotiables' however, there were no details to respond to the headings. Particularly in relation to flood impacts.</p> <p>Question: During the Brisbane meeting was there an outcome on whether there would be a realignment along the Warrego Highway?</p> <p>Answer: Minister Bailey asked a representative from TMR if there could be an alignment change? From my recollection the response was that there was a process to enable it however, I do not think it's been enacted. The latest information I received last week was that due to the timelines, there wasn't enough time in the project plan to investigate another alignment or route.</p> <p>The study area will not be re-opened. For that to occur, it would require restarting the EIS process causing delays in the whole of the Inland Rail program from Melbourne to Brisbane.</p>	<p>JS</p> <p>GH</p> <p>JS</p> <p>GH</p> <p>JS</p> <p>GH</p> <p>JS</p> <p>GH</p> <p>MH</p> <p>GV</p> <p>KM</p> <p>GV</p> <p>MN</p>

Agenda No.	Discussion points	
	<p>We have posed the question on several occasions with Martin Giles at BMT, hydrologists in Brisbane to review the flood modelling. The biggest concern is what events is Inland Rail modelling for example; one in 100-year flood? Our argument is that it is not a one in 100-year flood it is a one in 10/20-year flood.</p> <p>Martin remodelled the initial council data including QR data and super-imposed the run-off that came off the Grandchester Range into Laidley. The flood flows on the southern side of the railway line totalled in excess of 1000 cubic metres a second which is more than was understood. It was this data that we provided to Inland Rail at the second meeting.</p> <p>The third meeting took place at Forest Hill last Thursday. We gave Inland Rail six years of research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Records back to 1916 of Forest Hill/Laidley - Floods in 1923 - Photographic evidence of 1974,2010,2011,2013 and 2017 for both Forest Hill and Laidley. - Over 400 pieces of data and photos provided to Inland Rail. <p>Now Inland Rail is in possession of the information, they have an obligation to act and address the issues.</p> <p>Question: 'No flood impacts' means, is 'no more new flood impacts'? For example: if the current alignment goes through Forest Hill, comes in at the west at sort of Sandy Creek and exists by Laidley Creek following the current alignment what that means is: potentially the height of the new line will not exceed the current line. What does that mean for the residents of Forest Hill? It doesn't raise the flood height.</p> <p>Answer: Inland Rail design team were instructed to review all scenarios to reduce flooding impacts and apply a design solution. ARTC is most appreciative of the data that has been provided and the contributions and willingness to share your information with us, thank-you.</p> <p>Member Comment: What can we do better to address the issues of the towns? If we know there's a problem with an individual or there's an issue that affects the whole community, that we take a separate working group offline of this committee and sit down to discuss potential issues impacting the town for example: level crossing, flooding noise and work through what options can be offered to work through their issues and concerns. With noise, how does the community feel about noise barriers? Do they want concrete barriers or is there an option to landscape with trees? This group can work through ideas to ensure the area remains picturesque as possible to blend in.</p> <p>Response: The specific consultation with groups on specific issues to their community is something that we are doing in other areas. We just haven't got to that point with the community groups in the Lockyer. We need to work with the Forest Hill community and other communities along the alignment to make sure that the community is on board with the best solution for their area.</p> <p>Comment: I need to thank Gordon, Ken and Gary for their contributions in providing historical flood data to the Inland Rail project teams. Your contributions are greatly appreciated and very important to Inland Rail.</p>	<p>GV</p> <p>GV</p> <p>MN</p> <p>GV</p> <p>DE</p> <p>MH</p>

Agenda No.	Discussion points	
	<p>Comment: I would like to raise the issue about the EIS, there is an obligation to undertake a survey to identify landholder bores, their locations including licenced groundwater extraction and potential for bores. There is a lot of stock and domestic bores that aren't licensed and in past didn't need to be license. In the area west of Gatton bores are not controlled so there is a real impact. I want to thank Peter Deuter for pointing this issue out to me.</p> <p>A motion for the former delegation from this group to meet with the Coordinator General to seek clarity. The motion was seconded by Mark Newton and Jim McDonald agree to arrange the meeting.</p> <p>Comment: I would like to mention the protocol relating to these motions and action items. This motion has been noted however, these matters will be progressed through the Chair and the Secretariat in consultation with the committee members. ARTC will consider the motion and come back with a response.</p> <p>Comment: For Inland Rail's information, there is cynicism relating to the flood modelling because the original QR flood model indicated that there is no effect on the flooding by the railway line. We as a community disagreed with QR and then they restated their previous comments and found some different results the second time.</p>	<p>IR</p> <p>MH</p> <p>KM</p>
12.	<p>Administrative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request for committee's travel kilometres. - Observers, because the meeting is running over time, observers were requested to leave their details/emails. - Note to the observers, if there are any issues or comments you would like the committee to address to contact the CCC member. - 2019 meeting dates: Postponed 5 February – Grandchester, 7 May – Postman's Ridge, 6 August – Grantham, 5 November – Gatton. Venues to be provided. 	GH
13.	<p>Confirmation of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide information in relation to workforce management and opportunities. As well as investment opportunities. - Provide examples of modern aesthetic structures. - Note only, not an action: we have given a commitment to undertake community group meetings around specific issues. - Note only, IR's motion that you passed will be considered. - Note This group can work through ideas to ensure the area remains picturesque as possible to blend in. 	