

# MEETING MINUTES

Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee  
Meeting # 6

## DATE / TIME

13 June 2019  
6:00pm – 8:30pm

## LOCATION

Millmerran Cultural Centre, Walpole Street, Millmerran

## FACILITATOR

Mr Graham Clapham – Chair

## MINUTE TAKER

Ms Laura Jarman – ARTC Inland Rail

## DISTRIBUTION

All

## ATTENDEES

- ▶ Mr Graham Clapham – SDD Chair (Chair)
- ▶ Mr Robert Barrett – individual member (RB)
- ▶ Mr Jeff Chandler – individual member (JC)
- ▶ Mr Norm Chapman – individual member and proxy for Millmerran Commerce and Progress Association (NC)
- ▶ Mr Brad Christensen – individual member (BC)
- ▶ Mr Justin Saunders – representative for Bigambul Native Title Aboriginal Corporation (JS)
- ▶ Ms Kim Stevens – individual member (KS)
- ▶ Mr Barry Bowden – individual member (BB)
- ▶ Mr Lindsay Krieg – proxy for Central Downs Irrigators (LK)
- ▶ Mrs Georgina Krieg – individual member (GK)
- ▶ Ms Rosalie Millar – individual member (RM)
- ▶ Mrs Maria Oliver – individual member (MO)
- ▶ Ms Laura Jarman – ARTC Inland Rail (LJ)
- ▶ Mr Andrew Roberts – ARTC Inland Rail (AR)
- ▶ Mr Robert Smith – ARTC Inland Rail (RS)
- ▶ Ms Mercedes Staff – ARTC Inland Rail (MS)
- ▶ Ms Helen Williams – ARTC Inland Rail (HW)
- ▶ Ms Dee Elliott – Future Freight Joint Venture (DE)

## APOLOGIES

- ▶ Mr Graeme Clarke – representative of Millmerran Commerce and Progress Association (GC)
- ▶ Mr Brett Kelly – representative of Central Downs Irrigators (BK)
- ▶ Ms Marcia Smith – individual member (MSm)

## Discussions

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p><b>Safety share</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair delivered a safety share regarding electrical safety. He recently had an incident with an electric blanket scorching a bed. The Chair reminded the committee to get electric blankets checked after they have been in storage.</li> </ul>
1	<p><b>Welcome</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair welcomed public interest and reminded observers that the meeting was for the business of the committee and asked that any questions from observers be withheld until the end of the meeting.</li> <li>▶ LJ delivered an Acknowledgement of Country.</li> </ul> <p><b>Apologies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair acknowledged apologies from SDDCCC members MSm, GC and BK, and introduced NC as a proxy for Millmerran Commerce and Progress Association and LK for Central Downs Irrigators.</li> <li>▶ NC requested that as a proxy for Millmerran Progress Association, whether the committee would grant permission for him to record the meeting to assist with his reporting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ <i>The committee consented.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Introductions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair invited introductions from committee members and ARTC Inland Rail representatives at the table. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS gave a background of his career as an engineer in Australia and the UK, before moving into project management. He worked with Aurizon on the Wiggins Island rail infrastructure project.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ LJ is from a regional background and has worked as a communication and engagement professional on major infrastructure projects for more than 13 years. With bachelor and masters degrees, she has worked on projects through all stages from planning, to construction and close out.</li> <li>▶ The Chair acknowledged he is a farmer in the Central Darling Downs area and was nominated for Chair on behalf of Queensland Farmers Federation. He has experience with agriculture communities and as an independent moderator, hopes to raise and deal with issues in a satisfactory manner.</li> <li>▶ KS is an affected landowner in Millwood and has a family-run farm. Her issues are farm dissection and road closures as a result of Inland Rail.</li> <li>▶ RM is an individual on the committee and her husband is a fourth-generation farmer in Bringalilly. Her main concerns are farm dissection, loss of lifestyle and impacts to prime agricultural land.</li> <li>▶ RB acknowledged he previously worked for Queensland Rail for 54 years. He is an individual on the committee, but is representing the community of Yelarbon who encouraged him to apply.</li> <li>▶ GK is a Brookstead landowner and her husband's family have been on the property for 120 years. She was previously an agronomist and is passionate about agriculture. GK is an individual and has concerns about the impacts of Inland Rail on prime agricultural land.</li> <li>▶ BB has a long farming history in Brookstead. Main concerns are with noise and drainage in Brookstead, and the Condamine floodplain crossing.</li> <li>▶ AR is a Project Engineer for ARTC on the NSW/QLD Border to Gowrie (B2G) project. He has a Bachelor of Civil Engineering and previously worked for Aurizon in Mackay. His background is in asset renewal and track and culvert replacement.</li> <li>▶ JC has an affected property in Canning Creek and is an individual representing local issues.</li> <li>▶ JS is representing Bigambul Native Title and seeks to preserve title rights and cultural heritage. He is also facilitating a relationship between Traditional Owners, farmers and property owners.</li> <li>▶ NC has a building construction and transport background. He is on the committee as an individual but is tonight representing Millmerran Commerce and Progress Association.</li> <li>▶ HW is the Social Performance Principal - Queensland for ARTC and has a regional community background. She is interested in managing impacts and developing opportunities across Inland Rail.</li> <li>▶ DE is the Social Impact Lead for Future Freight Joint Venture (FFJV). She is present at the meeting to present the preliminary findings of the Social Impact Assessment (SIA). She is the director of her company and has over 20 years' experience in major infrastructure projects.</li> <li>▶ BC is an individual and owns a small property out of Millmerran. He is an Advanced Skills Nurse and has concerns about the medical effects and effects on the community and the hospital.</li> <li>▶ LK is representing BK and the Central Downs Irrigators. He is concerned about the impacts of Inland Rail on water flow across the Condamine floodplain.</li> <li>▶ MS is the Stakeholder Engagement Manager – North for ARTC. Her background is in stakeholder relations, property and land, y on major projects such as the Clem7 and Legacy Way.</li> <li>▶ MO is a landowner and small business owner in Millmerran. She is looking for the best result for the community.</li> </ul> <p><b>Acknowledgements and conflicts of interest</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair acknowledged the Inner Darling Downs CCC Chair Bill Armagnacq who was present at the meeting and called for any conflicts of interest. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair noted he has a land access agreement with ARTC for flood modelling.</li> <li>▶ JC acknowledged he is an impacted landowner and has a land access agreement with ARTC.</li> <li>▶ GK and KS acknowledged they are both landowners within the study corridor.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair acknowledged the elected representatives following the recent federal election: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Hon Dr John McVeigh – Member for Groom</li> <li>▶ The Hon Mr David Littleproud – Member for Maranoa and Minister for Water Resources, Drought, Rural Finance, Natural Disasters and Emergency Management</li> <li>▶ The Hon Michael McCormack - Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Development</li> <li>▶ The Hon Mr Mark Coulton – Minister for Regional Services, Decentralisation and Local Government.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Action items arising from previous meeting</b></p> <p>Action item 1 – ARTC to confirm how are out from the crossing the train starts to blow its horn.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ AR advised the general rule is 200 metres. That is where the whistle boards are place, where the train driver will then sound the horn.</li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ A train would also sound its horn as it departs from a passing loop, when it enters and exits tunnels and at level crossings for safety.</li> </ul> <p>Action item 2 – ARTC to find out if police were present at the Brookstead pop-up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ LJ advised she was not at the Brookstead pop-up consultation, but has confirmed with colleagues that the police did drop by for a few minutes.</li> <li>▶ As part of ARTC’s usual safety process, the police are notified of when and where engagement activities are taking place, and sometimes they pop in to have a listen and find out what is going on. ARTC didn’t specifically ask them to be there.</li> </ul> <p>Action item 3 – John Macintosh to look at whether 25% allowance for blockage at culverts is sufficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair advised that Dr Macintosh is overseas, but did send an email in his absence, which the Chair will send to the committee.</li> <li>▶ The Chair summarised Dr Macintosh’s email, advising that there is a 25% allowance for culverts and 6% allowance for bridges, based on flood debris collecting around the pylons.</li> </ul> <p>Action item 4 – ARTC to determine whether impacts on existing South-West line are taken into account in the SIA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW advised that impacts to the SW line are outside the Terms of Reference for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and therefore not considered. The project is required to maintain the connection as a viable option going forward; however, impacts are not required to be considered.</li> </ul> <p>Action item 5 – ARTC to determine whether recordings should be given to Inland Rail CEO and ARTC CEO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ MS confirmed that both CEOs receive a brief before and after the CCC. While they do not receive a recording, they receive the Chair’s Summary and the meeting minutes. The minutes are prepared from the recordings and are reviewed by committee members.</li> <li>▶ RB asked whether the recordings were kept on file? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ MS advised they are not retained. They are only taken for the purpose of preparing accurate meeting minutes. Once the committee has signed off on the meeting minutes and they are placed on the ARTC Inland Rail website, the recording is deleted.</li> <li>▶ The Chair reiterated the importance of the committee reviewing the minutes prior to them being finalised. If there is something that a member does not feel reflects what was said, that matter should be raised. The recording is just used for the preparation of the minutes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Action item 6 – ARTC to email committee a copy of the acquisition fact sheet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ LJ advised the action was outstanding. ARTC is currently updating the property acquisition fact sheet to better reflect the design phase of the proposed project, and discussions with the Queensland Government about a future acquiring agency for the proposed project. The updated fact sheet is expected to be available on the ARTC Inland Rail website in the coming weeks. ARTC understands that the impact of the proposed project will impact on many properties; and ARTC apologises for any inconvenience the review of the fact sheet may cause. LJ advised that if anyone had any questions, she would forward to property team.</li> <li>▶ RM asked why there was a delay in informing the committee about the review of the fact sheet. There is the expectation that if something is not available, the committee would be informed at the time via email, instead of waiting until the next CCC meeting to be told it is not available. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ LJ advised that if there are actions arising from the meetings that the committee would like taken care of between the meetings, then please raise that at the time.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair requested that if actions could not be completed, could LJ please email the committee to let them know why and when it will be completed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ LJ agreed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Action item 7 – Determine whether Rob Loch can be engaged for erosion advice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair advised he had discussed the matter with independent experts about whether engaging Rob Loch was timely and/or the right person. The Chair noted there is nothing to discuss yet regarding erosion as it will depend on the outcome of the floodplain crossing, when it is known where the openings will be and what the water flows are at those openings. Then, erosion mitigation can be discussed. When the time comes, and if the committee and community represented agree, it can be revisited.</li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS agreed that erosion mitigation measures had not yet been shared.</li> <li>▶ The Chair stated that the independence of the person must be unquestioned. He acknowledged Dr Loch's world-wide expertise, and also that Dr Loch is a member of the Inner Darling Downs CCC and has previously had conversations regarding the Condamine floodplain crossing, which could possibly be considered to be conflicts of interest.</li> <li>▶ The Chair noted he valued John Macintosh's independence and third-party credibility in the work he produced.</li> <li>▶ LK agreed that independence was a key factor and suggested that perhaps the committee should consider a more independent person to add a second opinion to the process.</li> <li>▶ NC asked whether, if the details on erosion mitigation were realised prior to the next CCC, this information would be shared with committee members prior to the meeting.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised that erosion mitigation will be determined with the proposed alignment. If the proposed alignment was determined too far in between meetings, ARTC would consider an extraordinary meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair acknowledged that when the information on the Condamine floodplain crossing was first released, there was a special meeting with both the Inner and Southern Darling Downs CCCs.</li> </ul>
3	<p><b>Ratification of updated CCC Charter</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair referred to the highlighted changes in the CCC Charter that were discussed at the previous meeting in Inglewood:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "If a member representing an organisation is unable to attend a committee meeting, they're able to appoint a proxy as notified to the Chair prior to the meeting."                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair reiterated that "representing an organisation" excluded an individual appointing a proxy for themselves.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. "On conclusion of the business of the committee and time permitting, the Chair will provide the opportunity for observers to ask questions of ARTC."                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair noted that observers are welcome to ask questions, however it is not a forum to make comment or present opinions.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> </li> <li>▶ The committee accepted the changes to the CCC Charter.</li> </ul>
4	<p><b>Project update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS gave an overview of the design work done in the three months since the last CCC in March 2019:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ 70% design and EIS packages received for review from FFJV. Review process is taking longer than anticipated due to the data and detail to get through and comment on. ARTC was hoping to share more information at this stage, however, more work is still required so we apologise the level of uncertainty remains.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Road/rail interface</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Community data collected about road usage – pop-up stands in the community, individual meetings with landowners on properties within the focus area, consultation with road users, emergency services, trucking companies, transport companies and council. All of this information is being used to further develop road/rail interface designs, including level crossings.</li> <li>▶ Some of the proposals for road/rail interface were presented at the last CCC. Some development of the associated roads may be required, which in some instances means re-diversions and closures leading to those diversions.</li> <li>▶ Release of the road/rail interface is closely linked to the proposed alignment. Once the proposed alignment is determined, detail on the road/rail interface and level crossings can be shared. It is difficult to share in a piecemeal fashion.</li> </ul> <p>Hydrology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ As well as work done on the Condamine floodplain crossing previously discussed, the project team has assessed changes to afflux, duration of inundation, velocity for a 1-in-10 and 1-in-100 flood event at the following waterways:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Back Creek</li> <li>• Bringalily Creek</li> <li>• Bybera Creek</li> <li>• Cattle Creek</li> <li>• Native Dog Creek</li> <li>• Nicol Creek</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pariagra Creek</li> <li>• Macintyre Brook</li> <li>• Macintyre River.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ We have taken on board some additional flood modelling details, including the Inglewood flood study to update our hydrology modelling, down in around that area and through Yelarbon to understand what our proposed design - our railway design was going to do in regard to water flows.</li> <li>▶ In coming weeks, the team will be consulting with these landowners and others who are predicted to experience changes in a 1-in-100 flood. The discussions will include talking through the quantity and the sort of extent of impacts, to start gaining an understanding of how that might impact people's operations and local land uses.</li> </ul> <p>Drainage structures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The longitudinal and cross-drainage structures, including culverts and bridges, are being reviewed. Culvert size and location, and bridge length and height is also being reviewed. Longitudinal drainage runs parallel to the rail corridor next to rail maintenance access roads within the corridor.</li> <li>▶ The fencing design and development has also been progressed and will be released with the proposed alignment.</li> </ul> <p>Cuttings and embankments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Currently review is underway to determine what the cuttings and embankments look like, how they are benched, how they are protected and the implications for scour and erosion.</li> <li>▶ The design of scour protection at the inlet/outlet of culverts based on the predicted velocities will be made available with the proposed alignment.</li> <li>▶ The design will need to demonstrate sound modelling and understanding of the soils in the area.</li> </ul> <p>Utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ All of the utilities on the alignment have been picked up. Significant work required to manage the utilities within the corridor and how they will be re-diverted or protected as required.</li> </ul> <p>Constructability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Constructability report has been delivered which considers assumptions around how the infrastructure will be built, such as the area required to build and then operate the rail corridor.</li> <li>▶ That information informs the project footprint, which will be released with the proposed alignment. Maps will include the project footprint and will also represent the construction area required to build the project.</li> </ul> <p>Traffic impact assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Traffic impact assessment report and methodology has been workshopped with Toowoomba Regional Council and Goondiwindi Regional Council to ensure their comments and feedback has been considered. The key interest for them is understanding how we are proposing to change any roads.</li> <li>▶ Councils are holding ARTC to account with regards to what their requirements are and making sure the community is being considered. They want to see how ARTC is engaging with the community and capturing feedback to put forward into the design. Further feedback will be captured and fed back to the councils and into the EIS.</li> </ul> <p>Noise and vibration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ We have just started to receive the results of the noise and vibration assessment. We acknowledge that it is an important aspect that many people are interested in; however, as it is dependent on the inputs of design, we are not yet in a position to share it.</li> <li>▶ We use a digital model to simulate a reference train to determine the expected noise and vibration that people would experience as a result of that train.</li> <li>▶ ARTC will work with individuals first to gain an understanding of what the results mean and how they will be managed and mitigated.</li> </ul> <p>Environmental Impact Statement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The EIS and design development is an iterative process. EIS chapters have been workshopped with government agencies and positive feedback has been received. Considerable effort is being put in to make sure environmental impacts and issues raised through interaction with the community are being considered.</li> </ul> <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair asked if the design of passing loops had been determined.</li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised the positions had been determined and will be released with the proposed alignment. It will be a specific point of conversation with individuals and where the passing loops are in proximity to their property. Noise modelling will also reflect passing loops.</li> <li>▶ MO asked about the timeframe for consulting with landowners on the proposed alignment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ ARTC is issuing comments to FFJV to be actioned on the design. Engagement is likely to be late in the third quarter of 2019 before the EIS is released and before the end of the year. ARTC places a lot of value on it.</li> <li>▶ Feedback from the community will be sought before the EIS is submitted. ARTC intends to give the community time and opportunity to comment on the design and give feedback.</li> <li>▶ The Chair suggested that ARTC consider overestimating in time, rather than underestimating and extending the timeframe.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair asked whether ARTC will explain noise and vibration in layman's terms as some of the data and terms used are not familiar. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised effort will be taken to translate it into reasonable terms so that people can understand it. Decibel ratings will be converted to equivalent sounds where possible. The obligations under the code for mitigation will also be discussed.</li> <li>▶ The more stringent noise mitigation code from NSW will be adopted, rather than the QLD code.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair asked whether noise mitigation measures will be available for discussion at the same time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised the mitigations would be a work-in-progress. Areas requiring mitigation will be shown with the specifics, such as a noise wall or boundary, to be determined in the detailed design phase.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ JC asked whether background noise will be measured close to residences to determine how much louder the railway will be. He lives on a main road and would like to know how much louder trains will be than trucks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised background noise has been measured in some areas on the alignment, which will be used in modelling to understand impacts. It is likely specific noise monitoring would have to increase during detailed design.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ LJ discussed the staged approach for releasing the project design. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The design will be released progressively. Following a briefing to government agencies and elected representatives, the design as it relates to specific properties will be released to the directly-affected landowners in the first instance. After the landowners have been consulted, ARTC will release the design to the broader community, through its website, a printed newsletter and community consultation sessions in key towns within the study area. Newsletter, e-news, website, interactive map, community information sessions.</li> <li>▶ It is vitally important that landowners impacted by the rail alignment, public road rail crossing design and/or project footprint learn about the impacts on their properties directly from ARTC rather than from a third party.</li> <li>▶ Landowner maps will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Property boundaries</li> <li>▶ Proposed rail alignment</li> <li>▶ Proposed road centrelines</li> <li>▶ Proposed project footprint.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Community maps will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Proposed rail alignment</li> <li>▶ Proposed road centrelines and proposed crossing treatments</li> <li>▶ Proposed project footprint.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The proposed project footprint includes the areas to construct the rail, changes to roads, ancillary works, the rail corridor from fence to fence.</li> <li>▶ Information about private crossings and stock crossings is not included on the map. The design of these will be determined in the detailed design stage. Information from landowners has been collected and will be fed into the design process. ARTC will continue to work with landowners to develop the design of private level crossings and stock crossings.</li> </ul> </li></ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ NC asked whether noise modelling will be available on the interactive map. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ LJ advised the interactive map will be updated with the proposed alignment so that people who can't come along to community information sessions can view it. Community members can also ask questions and make comments on the map.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>▶ GK asked what the time period would be between Stage 2 and Stage 3. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ LJ advised it would be similar to when the focused area of investigation was released, so approximately four to five weeks. It will be dependent on whether all of the landowners can be contacted.</li> <li>▶ GK noted that affected landowners often make comments to her about issues she is not aware of.</li> <li>▶ LJ advised that they would let CCC members know what the expected timing of the talking to landowners would be but that ARTC could not share the details of the impact to properties without speaking to the landowners first.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>▶ MO asked whether landowners will be informed if a passing loop is planned through their property. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ LJ showed an example of the map that would be released to impacted landowners showing the property outline, project footprint, centre line of the alignment and local roads.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>▶ JC asked when that engagement would begin. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised that it would be with the release of the proposed alignment before the end of the year. When ARTC discusses the maps, it is important to note that the corridor will still be unapproved at that stage. ARTC won't have powers of resumption so won't be negotiating with the maps. It is the same detail that will be presented in the EIS that landowners can comment on.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>▶ GK asked RS to confirm that Stage 4 would be completed by the end of the year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS confirmed that was the intention, but there is always the risk of design rework being required, which hopefully is not the case.</li> <li>▶ MS reiterated that directly affected landowners would be contacted in the first instance, and the intent is to share with the committee and broader community as soon as possible after that.</li> <li>▶ MS encouraged GK to re-direct any questions from landowners to ARTC.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>▶ JC asked when private level crossings would be negotiated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised private crossings and stock crossings won't be included on the maps provided at this time, and there will be ongoing negotiation and discussion with landowners.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>▶ BB asked whether, if one area of design was delayed, would ARTC consider releasing other aspects first. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised if there is an outlier, ARTC would possibly consider a release of the proposed alignment to meet obligations to landowners and the process; however, it's not currently being considered.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>▶ JC asked whether detailed plans would be made available for access to private property from a main road. He noted a neighbour of his says he has a written plan in email from ARTC for access to his property. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised that that information has not been released in detail, however is happy to discuss with JC after the meeting.</li> <li>▶ AR acknowledged that ARTC must maintain access to private property.</li> <li>▶ JC commented that the sooner information about property access is released, the better. There are many properties affected or cut off from main roads.</li> <li>▶ RS reiterated that ARTC has an obligation to maintain the same access as before, and that AR had spoken to most landowners about access requirements to feed into design development.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>▶ KS asked what the width and height of maintenance tracks would be. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS noted access roads would be built at natural surface level.</li> <li>▶ AR advised approximately 3.5 metres wide within the corridor, similar to a typical dirt road.</li> <li>▶ RS commented that longitudinal drainage and cross drainage if required would also be contained within the corridor.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ KS asked about the general width of the rail corridor.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised approximately 60 metres, however wider in areas with large cuttings and embankments. That information will come with the proposed alignment.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>▶ JC asked what the separation width would be between the road and the rail corridor, if they ran parallel.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ AR advised approximately 50 metres, depending on short-stacking requirements as determined with the Department of Transport and Main Road or Council.</li> <li>▶ RB commented that in some areas in Yelarbon and Kurumbul, some dirt and bitumen roads that follow the rail line are only three metres from the rail corridor. There is also a feedlot there.</li> <li>▶ RS advised that if a road is possibly impacted by the rail corridor, ARTC would engage with Council on how to move the road as required. Stacking distances would also need to be considered.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>▶ The Chair confirmed with RS that the community would be able to view and understand technical detail such as noise and vibration before the EIS is released.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS agreed that the intention would be for the community to have as much time as possible to understand the detail before the EIS is submitted. ARTC will likely consult with the Committee to understand the best way to do that.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
5	<p><b>Social Impact Assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ DE presented on the preliminary findings of the Social Impact Assessment (SIA)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ SIA process                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Identify potential social impacts and benefits</li> <li>▶ Describe existing social values and characteristics</li> <li>▶ Assess the likelihood and consequence of impacts and benefits</li> <li>▶ Develop social impact management plans to avoid or reduce social impacts and maximise benefits</li> <li>▶ Provide a monitoring strategy to track delivery and effectiveness of mitigations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Community and stakeholder engagement feeds into each stage of the process.</li> <li>▶ SIA study area                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Statistical Area 1s within and near the project footprint</li> <li>▶ Towns and rural localities in or near the project area</li> <li>▶ Goondiwindi and Toowoomba LGAs</li> <li>▶ Consideration of broader labour force regions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Project workforce and accommodation                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Construction                       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Up to 900 personnel, including local people and groups that are disadvantaged in the labour market</li> <li>▶ Average of 400 full time employees (FTE) across full construction period.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Operation                       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Direct permanent employment for up to 20 people</li> <li>▶ Indirect employment benefits are likely (assessed in Economic Impact Assessment).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Expectation that some workers will be drawn from outside a safe daily driving distance.</li> <li>▶ Two or three accommodation camps needed (up to 400 beds each), near:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Millmerran</li> <li>▶ Inglewood</li> <li>▶ Potentially, Yelarbon.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Consultation with councils to identify potential sites.</li> <li>▶ ARTC will consult communities when potential sites are identified.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Social baseline key features               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Bigambul people are the traditional owners for much of the SIA study area. Other Indigenous stakeholders in the area are the Western Wakka Wakka people and The Gap people. Indigenous populations are well-represented in most communities.</li> <li>▶ Local towns and rural localities are quiet, safe communities. Quality of life is supported by affordable housing, a rural lifestyle, and strong community connections. More than half the potentially affected communities had higher median ages compared to Queensland.</li> <li>▶ Median incomes are differentiated by proximity to Toowoomba city, i.e. inner areas have higher median household incomes than the Queensland median, while the rural areas had lower than average median incomes. SEIFA IRSAD scores indicate potential disadvantage in and near the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>project footprint. There is limited to no access to public transport and communities are heavily reliant on private transport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The SIA study area has a higher level of home ownership than is typical in Queensland. Rental vacancy rates are low at below 2.5% in all communities except Brookstead (2.9%).</li> <li>▶ In 2016, all communities except Yelarbon had lower unemployment rates than Queensland. In Goondiwindi, the top five industries of employment (in order) were Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing, Retail Trade, Education and Training, Health Care and Social Assistance, and Construction. In Toowoomba LGA, the top five industries were Health Care and Social Assistance, Education and Training, Retail Trade, Construction and Manufacturing.</li> <li>▶ The business profile in Goondiwindi LGA is dominated by agriculture, but with strong construction and transport sectors. Toowoomba hosts a wide variety of businesses, with the construction sector strong. Quarries, transport companies and manufacturers are located in the study area.</li> <li>▶ Drought has stressed individuals, families, businesses and communities.</li> <li>▶ Community members, particularly those living in or near the project footprint, are experiencing anxiety and stress about the project's potential impacts on properties, amenity and flooding.</li> <li>▶ Key issues identified in consultation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Property impacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Property acquisition and property severance</li> <li>▶ Impacts on cultural heritage values and landscapes</li> <li>▶ Impacts on farm access, productivity, management, movements</li> <li>▶ Effect of any changes to flood patterns on farms, homes or towns</li> <li>▶ Potential for negative impacts on property values</li> <li>▶ Impacts of construction on groundwater access (bores).</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Connectivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Impacts on movements within /between properties, across the rail corridor, on road network</li> <li>▶ Impacts on school bus routes – project use and/or re-alignment</li> <li>▶ Level crossings – traffic delays.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Amenity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Impacts of project construction on rural and town amenity noise, vibration, dust, visual amenity</li> <li>▶ Impacts of project operation on rural and town amenity.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Health and wellbeing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Effects of project-related stress on mental health</li> <li>▶ Desire for better information and support</li> <li>▶ Accommodation camp impacts on service access (e.g. police, health) and local character</li> <li>▶ Impacts of noise, vibration and air quality changes on community wellbeing</li> <li>▶ Safety of level crossings</li> <li>▶ Delays to emergency services</li> <li>▶ Community benefits as the result of project legacies (e.g. infrastructure, business and workforce capacity).</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Training, employment and business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Need for locally-oriented training and development</li> <li>▶ Access to employment for local people</li> <li>▶ Business opportunities to supply the project during construction and operation.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Potential social impacts during construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Potential to affect Indigenous cultural landscapes.</li> <li>▶ Property acquisition discussions causing stress and anxiety.</li> <li>▶ Acquisitions will disrupt family circumstances and community networks.</li> <li>▶ Impacts on rural land severance, intrusion on farm infrastructure, disruptions to property access, effects on water access, impacts on on-farm and off-farm movements.</li> <li>▶ Noise, dust and increased traffic related to laydown areas and bridge construction may affect amenity.</li> <li>▶ Impacts on community cohesion through displacement, severance, disruption to road network and/or community conflict.</li> <li>▶ Property owners have anxiety regarding potential for property values to decrease.</li> <li>▶ Additional demand on local health and police services.</li> <li>▶ Workforce accommodation camps near Millmerran, Inglewood and Yelarbon potential impacts on town character, perceptions of safety and the capacity of local services.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Potential for impacts on rental housing availability.</li> <li>▶ Construction labour demand may contribute to shortages in specific trades and labour (cumulative).</li> <li>▶ Potential for construction noise at Brookstead, Southbrook and Yelarbon State Schools.</li> <li>▶ Potential social impacts during operation           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Amenity – landholders near the project may be impacted by rail noise or vibration (tbc).</li> <li>▶ Connectivity – periodic disruptions to traffic, including potential to delay emergency vehicles.</li> <li>▶ Safety – potential increase in risk of road/rail accidents and rail suicides.</li> <li>▶ Flooding impacts – 1 in 100 event flood modelling of the rail line indicates an increase in flood levels at a number of homes and sheds that are already experience ground level flooding during a 1 in 100 event.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Project benefits and opportunities           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Construction employment for up to 900 personnel (average 400 FTE), including local people and groups that are disadvantaged in the labour market.</li> <li>▶ Significant opportunities for local and regional businesses in construction supply chain.</li> <li>▶ Local businesses would benefit from increased trade from workers and potentially from supply opportunities offered by accommodation camps.</li> <li>▶ Operations will provide permanent employment.</li> <li>▶ Training and career pathway development for young people, Indigenous people and unemployed people.</li> <li>▶ Potential to increase Indigenous business opportunities, and other enterprise development.</li> <li>▶ Transport, logistics and warehousing industries may be catalysed by the project.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Social Impact Management Plan (SIMP)           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Will address the Guidelines' requirements for five management plans:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Community and Stakeholder Engagement</li> <li>▶ Workforce Management</li> <li>▶ Housing and Accommodation</li> <li>▶ Health and Community Wellbeing</li> <li>▶ Local Business and Industry Content.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Will include ARTC's established commitments and actions recommended in SIMP, by phase (starting with post-approval).</li> <li>▶ SIMP will include a monitoring framework (outcomes, performance measures, data sources and frequency), reporting framework and review requirements.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ SIMP sample strategies           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Communities and stakeholders               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Build dialogue between landowners and ARTC about land access and acquisition</li> <li>▶ Work with local communities to understand concerns and identify ways to address concerns</li> <li>▶ Provide support to stakeholders and communities facing change due to Inland Rail</li> <li>▶ Engage with Government agencies to confirm detail of mitigations for impacts on social infrastructure</li> <li>▶ Work with affected property owners to mitigate specific concerns, and refine mitigation and offset strategies</li> <li>▶ Engage with adjacent landowners to ensure mitigation of potential amenity impacts is effective</li> <li>▶ Regular communication throughout the approval, pre-construction and construction phases.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Workforce               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Working with Indigenous communities, schools, local training providers, industry and government agencies to support the design and delivery of training and development programs</li> <li>▶ Contractors and operators required to seek local workers</li> <li>▶ Clear, efficient process for people to seek information and register interest in employment</li> <li>▶ Workforce Code of Conduct which considers local values.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Housing and accommodation               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Two or three construction workforce accommodation camps</li> <li>▶ Workforce accommodation plan indicating how non-local personnel will be accommodated and specifying how the contractor will avoid impacts on low income households' rental availability</li> <li>▶ Consultation with TRC, GRC and the Queensland Police to identify issues to be addressed in workforce accommodation plan.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Health and wellbeing               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Early advice and ongoing engagement with QPS, QAS and QFES</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Locally-based community development programmes funded to work with residents</li> <li>▶ Ongoing engagement to identify impacts and opportunities that have potential to impact on wellbeing</li> <li>▶ In consultation with communities, development of appropriate mitigation/enhancement programs or initiatives</li> <li>▶ Identify opportunities and develop programs to improve safety outcomes for local communities</li> <li>▶ Mental health partnership which includes a focus on local communities (initiated)</li> <li>▶ Partner with Councils, Government agencies and community organisations to implement effective mitigations for impacts on community facilities and amenity.</li> <li>▶ Local business and industry <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Work with property owners to identify potential impacts and develop cooperative strategies to reduce impacts</li> <li>▶ Implement Inland Rail's Sustainable Procurement Policy, including local and Indigenous participation</li> <li>▶ Work with government stakeholders to build businesses' capacity</li> <li>▶ Support Indigenous businesses to ensure they are prepared for and provided with opportunities to participate</li> <li>▶ Communicate pre-qualification requirements to businesses in the Goondiwindi and Toowoomba LGAs</li> <li>▶ Consult with Councils, Chambers of Commerce and tourism associations to identify any additional, feasible strategies to reduce or offset impacts on connectivity or businesses' amenity.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Next steps <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completion of draft SIA</li> <li>2. Submission of draft EIS in Q4 2019 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ OCG conducts adequacy assessment</li> <li>▶ ARTC responds to any revisions required</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. OCG puts draft EIS on public exhibition and seeks agency comments</li> <li>4. OCG and ARTC consider public and agency submissions</li> <li>5. ARTC supply further information/clarification</li> <li>6. Consideration by Queensland Government (OCG) and Commonwealth Government (Minister for Environment)</li> <li>7. State and Commonwealth assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Approval with conditions</li> <li>▶ Refusal</li> </ul> </li> </ol> </li> </ul> <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ NC noted that the Millmerran population catchment is larger than what the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) states. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ DE advised the SIA needs to use the "state suburbs" for general population, but acknowledged that in rural communities, some larger towns may be seen as a hub for landowners.</li> <li>▶ RB noted that the population for Goondiwindi is also higher than stated.</li> <li>▶ DE acknowledged and advised that often estimates are also used if the data is old.</li> <li>▶ HW noted that ARTC talks to councils and local stakeholders to gain insights into catchment and service area considerations and to consult on the design of the programs.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ MO asked whether a SIA workshop was conducted in Millmerran. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ DE advised one was done in Pittsworth, and representatives from Millmerran were invited.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ MO noted that a construction camp within walking distance of Millmerran would provide a benefit to the town, and it should be taken into account in the assessment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ DE agreed and advised that ARTC looks at a range of criteria to locate camps, and that while it would provide a benefit to the town, that needs to be balanced with the potential impact to neighbours.</li> <li>▶ MO commented that during a coal seam gas project, the camps were out of town and provided no benefit. It is hoped that that wouldn't happen with Inland Rail.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair asked whether the SIA presentation would be available on the ARTC Inland Rail website. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW advised the points would be available in the minutes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
6	<p data-bbox="293 275 646 300"><b>Independent review of hydrology</b></p> <ul data-bbox="293 310 1386 527" style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ The Chair provided an update on the review of the hydrology on the Condamine floodplain on behalf of independent reviewer Dr John Macintosh, who was unable to attend the meeting.</li><li>▶ John undertook a workshop in Brookstead, specifically about his work in assessing the suitability of the modelling that's been carried out; and did some explanation of the modelling, how it works and the terminology used. That workshop was well-attended by approximately 20 people.</li><li>▶ Ongoing advice is being provided on areas of concern pertaining to individual properties.</li><li>▶ Upon the completion of that process, Dr Macintosh will prepare a report for the CCC who engaged him.</li><li>▶ The Chair committed to sharing the report with the Committee when it becomes available.</li></ul> <p data-bbox="293 573 548 598"><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul data-bbox="293 604 1393 821" style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ LK gave a statement on behalf of BK and provided a handout to Committee members. "At the SDCCC Inglewood meeting held on 21 March, Dr John McIntosh [sic] provided us with floodplain maps. I immediately noticed that there appeared to be some missing water from the flood map. At a follow-up meeting for floodplain residents at Brookstead on 9 April, John presented further flood inundation maps. A concerned landholder on the floodplain asked John to show the water that was coming into the catchment from the west of the Grasstree Creek. John had no images of this part of the floodwater; so I have sourced and attached two photographs taken from 4-wheel drive vehicles passing along the Gore Highway during the 2010 flood.</li></ul> <p data-bbox="334 856 1393 1024">The first photo is taken from a vehicle travelling west of Millmerran, a few hundred metres over the current railway crossing at the S-bend. In the centre of the photograph, to the left of the light pole, you can see the residents of Paul and Kelly Curtis in the distance, just to the right of the tree line. The depth of the water is to the top of the vehicle wheels on the built-up road, with little of the fence post showing above the water. From this photo, you can see that this body of flowing water is several kilometres wide upstream of the existing QR line.</p> <p data-bbox="334 1056 1393 1167">The second photo is taken in a similar place from a different vehicle heading eastwards from Millmerran towards Brookstead. In the left-hand side of this photo, you can see water making its way to cross the existing QR line. The water in front of this vehicle extends all the way to the other edge of the floodplain near Brookstead, which is approximately 16-17 kilometres from this point.</p> <p data-bbox="334 1199 1393 1367">The water in these photos is over-flowing out of Back Creek and is making its way towards Grasstree Creek, and the Condamine River. Some of this water flows over the existing QR railway line while the other is channelled along the upstream side of the existing rail line to Grasstree Creek. This is one of four water courses between Millmerran and Grasstree Creek that channel into the Condamine, with this being the western-most stream. The other three build up additional water between Millmerran and Grasstree Creek. All four of these streams seem to be unaccounted for in the current flood model.</p> <p data-bbox="334 1398 1393 1587">Firstly, ARTC have proposed that the Condamine floodplain is 12 kilometres wide with the western most point ending at the west bank of Grasstree Creek. I have asked John McIntosh [sic] to confirm the extent of the floodplain modelling and am waiting for his response to this question. It would appear from the map presented at the last SDCCC [sic] meeting, together with his presentation at the Brookstead Hall, that this water is not included in the current flood model. If this is the case, the flood model would grossly underestimate the inflows into the Condamine River and hence predicted heights and velocities from the model would be incorrect.</p> <p data-bbox="334 1619 1393 1766">Secondly, the variation in the predicted flood heights from the current model are unacceptable. There are errors in the model calibration of up to 0.2 to 0.5 metres at a large number of measured stations. In addition, there are errors in predictions for future flood events both with and without the proposed rail line of similar magnitude. I am waiting for John McIntosh to return from leave to provide me with these exact details. There is supporting photographic evidence from flood events to substantiate these errors.</p> <p data-bbox="334 1797 1393 1904">Finally, the floodplain residents do not accept that the modifications to the rail design proposed in the November meeting are adequate. Evidence for this concern was confirmed in the flood model demonstration by John McIntosh [sic] at the Brookstead meeting. The graphical outputs of the increased flood heights upstream from the rail, and increased velocities downstream from the rail, are especially</p>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>evident around Pampas, and extend from where the bridge coming from the North Branch crossing is terminated. It is clear from these timeline displays of a flood event that the proposed culvert system causes water build-up and increased flood heights at Pampas, a concentrated area of housing. These changes in flood parameters are deemed unacceptable by the floodplain community; and this view was expressed at the second SDCCC [sic] meeting held in Brookstead.</p> <p>In summary, floodplain residents request a design modification for a bridge to extend the full width of the floodplain from Millmerran to Brookstead, as we have asked since the start of the consultation process."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair thanked LK and confirmed he has witnessed correspondence between BK and Dr Macintosh, and Dr Macintosh and FFJV regarding the missing flood flows in BK's statement. The issue is ongoing.</li> <li>▶ GK and KS agreed with the description of the floodwater mentioned in the statement. The deepest water was between Pittsworth and Millmerran. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ LK also stated that a huge amount of water comes down Grasstree Creek, and not all of it comes from Grasstree Creek</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair advised another independent process was looking at the same flooding issues for another landowner in the region. The CEO of Inland Rail has also stated he is aware of the issue and he is taking a personal interest in the results.</li> </ul>
7	<p><b>General business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair advised of reports that vehicles associated with contractors to ARTC were not displaying identification. The Chair reiterated the importance of having marked vehicles so that everyone who sees them knows who they are. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RS advised it is a condition of all contractors and the issue has been raised. RS thanked the Committee for reporting the issue to the Chair and ARTC.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ MO raised that finding information on doing business with Inland Rail was not easy. The information raised at the last meeting about public reporting on the Parkes to Narromine (P2N) project was not easy to find. MO asked if a link could be provided with some frequently asked questions (FAQs) for circulation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW advised the P2N information was on the ARTC Inland Rail website but that it could be sent to the Committee and that she would investigate how hard it is to find.</li> <li>▶ HW advised ARTC would compile some FAQs for doing business with Inland Rail. The general process for working with contractors can be discussed however it may be different depending on who the contractors are.</li> <li>▶ HW agreed to present the doing business with Inland Rail slides from the previous CCC meeting again at the next meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair advised Jo Tait is now looking at business opportunities and how to connect opportunities to communities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ HW noted that short-term construction opportunities are managed by herself and Social Performance, and Jo Tait manages long-term utilisation of the rail once it is built.</li> <li>▶ MO requested a presentation on both aspects at the next meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair advised the next meeting would be in August – date TBC.</li> <li>▶ RM raised LJ's email regarding consultation during the school holidays. LJ advised the email was to ask the Committee from feedback on holding consultation during school holidays. She noted that she only heard back from a few people. As the design review is ongoing, planned consultation is no longer coinciding with school holidays; however, feedback from the committee will be considered depending on the timing for the release.</li> <li>▶ RM noted she received a call to follow up on her RSVP for the meeting. RM's perspective is that unless she says otherwise, she will be attending the meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair acknowledged that at the joint CCC meeting in Brookstead, RSVPs weren't received and therefore the room was not laid out to accommodate everyone who attended.</li> <li>▶ All agreed that for future meetings, members need only respond if they would not attend the meeting.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
8	<p><b>Conclusion and confirmation of actions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chair to forward committee email update from Dr John Macintosh.</li> <li>2. ARTC to distribute the link for the Parkes to Narromine social performance information.</li> <li>3. ARTC to develop and distribute frequently asked questions/a fact sheet about social performance and doing business with Inland Rail.</li> <li>4. Helen Williams and Jo Tait to present at the next meeting regarding opportunities for business.</li> <li>5. ARTC to distribute the revised land acquisition factsheet when it is finalised.</li> </ol> <p>▶ The Chair asked that ARTC respond to the Committee if the requested information cannot be provided, stating why it cannot be provided and when it will be available.</p>
9	<p><b>Questions from observers</b></p> <p>▶ Observer 1 asked why Dr Rob Loch could be considered as not being independent or qualified. He is highly qualified in soil erosion and has addressed the Deputy Prime Minister of Australia. The fact he lives in the area has nothing to do with the Condamine floodplain.</p> <p>▶ The Chair noted Dr Rob Loch's professional capabilities were not degraded. When the Committee gets to the stage on considering independent advice on erosion, independence will need to be considered.</p> <p>▶ Observer 1 asked why individuals on the Committee could not appoint proxies.</p> <p>▶ The Chair advised it was in the Charter which had been agreed to by the Committee. The matter will have to be put to the Committee if it needs to be discussed further.</p> <p>▶ Observer 1 advised he would ask one of the members to raise it.</p> <p>▶ Observer 1 asked whether a public meeting would be held in Pittsworth to explain impacts of the proposed rail.</p> <p>▶ RS advised that the process would be similar to when the focused area of investigation was released, and public information sessions would be held at various spots along the alignment. Pittsworth is one of those places. Information will be available for people to come and comment on, ask questions and give feedback. All of that will be captured, taken on board and fed into design development and the EIS submission.</p> <p>▶ Observer 1 asked why a public forum wouldn't be held so that the community can ask questions from the floor. One thousand people have signed a petition, so that needs to be addressed.</p> <p>▶ RS noted early on in the project, the communities' engagement preference was for information sessions rather than town halls.</p> <p>▶ Observer 1 asked whether ARTC staff present attended the Inland Rail Summit in Sydney on 1 May 2019.</p> <p>▶ AR and RS stated they did not attend.</p> <p>▶ Observer 1 noted that the Infrastructure General Manager of Toowoomba Regional Council was quoted saying "In respect to the preliminary conservative mine crossing solution, that there would be no worsening; and if possible, improved flooding outcomes upstream and downstream on the Condamine River."</p> <p>▶ Observer 1 continued that ARTC and TRC are on record saying they work closely together, and asked why TRC would make this statement.</p> <p>▶ The Chair acknowledged that the statement likely pertained to the existing infrastructure on the current corridor. The Chair noted Dr John Macintosh had drawn similar conclusions that removal of the existing infrastructure will have an impact on how and where water flows.</p> <p>▶ Observer 1 disagreed with the Chair.</p> <p>▶ JC asked that observers identify themselves in the future, prior to asking questions.</p> <p>▶ Observer 1 noted his name, location and reason for interest.</p> <p><i>Meeting concluded at 8.30pm.</i></p>