

# EUROA WORKING GROUP

## Minutes

### DATE / TIME

19 August 2019  
6:00pm to 8:00pm

### LOCATION

Temple Kitchen  
10-12 Tarcombe St, Euroa

### FACILITATOR

Todd Beavis

### MINUTE TAKER

Mark Blackman

### ATTENDEES

- |                        |                           |                  |  |
|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|--|
| ▶ Cr. Alistair Thomson | Strathbogie Shire Council | ▶ Ed Walker      | ARTC, General Manager Victoria Projects  |
| ▶ Cr. Mick Williams    | Strathbogie Shire Council | ▶ Dinesh Batra   | ARTC, Senior Project Manager Inland Rail |
| ▶ Edwina Thompson      | DESIGN Euroa              | ▶ Renee Preece   | ARTC, Stakeholder Engagement Lead        |
| ▶ Justine Collins      |                           | ▶ Mark Blackman  | ARTC, Stakeholder Engagement Advisor     |
| ▶ Nola Dudley          |                           | ▶ Simon De Lisle | SLR, Acoustics Specialist                |
| ▶ Tom Maher            |                           |                  |  |
| ▶ Ann Mahon            |                           |                  |  |
| ▶ Des Ryan             |                           |                  |  |
| ▶ Shirley Saywell      |                           |                  |  |
| ▶ Michael Tehan        |                           |                  |  |
| ▶ Sarah Treloar        |                           |                  |  |
| ▶ Bernard Walker       |                           |                  |  |

## Discussions

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
1	Open meeting, welcome
	<p>Todd welcomed the members and provided a recap of what the Group has achieved in the first two meetings, noting that the focus has been on bringing the Group up to date with the work ARTC had done in understanding the community's requirements and considering the options for Euroa. He advised that today the focus would be shifting to looking forward, working with the Group to assess and develop further options.</p> <p>It was reconfirmed that ARTC is in no hurry to get to a preferred solution and that it was committed to working with the Group, the broader Euroa community and stakeholders to get the best outcome.</p> <p>He explained the process that has been undertaken to appoint the ongoing Chair of the Group and introduced the successful candidate, Michelle Croker. He advised that Michelle was selected on the basis of her deep experience working with communities and her connection with North East Victoria.</p> <p>Michelle introduced herself and provided a brief background of her experience.</p>
2	Adoption of minutes
	No changes from last meeting. Minutes adopted.
3	Actions from last meeting
	<p>Actions from last meeting were reviewed and discussed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Action completed. The Group was advised that further communication and engagement with the Euroa community would take place in September – members raised the need for further explanation as to why a level crossing had been ruled as it was still being raised a potential option.</li> <li>2. Action completed. It was noted that Simon De Lisle from SLR Consulting would be providing an update on noise and vibration at this meeting.</li> <li>3. Action completed. Update to be provided when exploring options later in the meeting.</li> <li>4. Action completed. As above.</li> </ol>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>5. Action completed. The Group was advised that ARTC had relied on publicly available data from Goulburn Broken Catchment Management Authority (CMA). This led to further discussion around flooding, with Ed responding to questions from the Group. The following points were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 in 100 year levels are based on critical storm events and account for storm duration - including flash flooding</li> <li>• Flooding is a major consideration for all design solutions in Euroa</li> <li>• Members of the Group raised that the CMA's data had been challenged and concerns that options may be discounted on incorrect data</li> <li>• Questions were also asked if any future flood mitigation measures had been taken into consideration – ARTC advised that the detailed work around flooding would be undertaken as part of the assessment of the preferred solution.</li> </ul>
4	<p>Conversations with community</p>
	<p>The Group was advised that ARTC would like to add conversations with community as a standing agenda item, as this was an important aspect of the role of members. The following questions were posed to guide the conversation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has the community responded to your conversations around the Working Group?</li> <li>• What are you hearing?</li> <li>• What questions are people asking?</li> </ul> <p>Members reported they are hearing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some in the community are wanting more information about the project and feel they don't have the ability to have input into the project</li> <li>• There is still concern that the "Berlin Wall" images (initial concept design image of the previously preferred solution) is still what ARTC has planned</li> <li>• Station access remains a big worry – both for vehicles and pedestrians</li> <li>• There is still a lot of pushback against a roundabout on Anderson Street</li> <li>• Straightening the alignment of the road is important</li> <li>• There is a lot of concern around noise and vibration.</li> </ul> <p>It was noted that when informed about the Working Group process, community members responded well and were somewhat reassured. Community members are comforted by the broad representation on the Group.</p>
5	<p>Noise report</p>
	<p>Simon De Lisle from SLR was introduced to present more information on how baseline noise monitoring studies are undertaken</p> <p>Different noise level measurements were explained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• L90 – background noise level – the average noise level 90% of the time.</li> <li>• LEQ – rail noise.</li> <li>• L10 – road noise.</li> <li>• LMAX – The highest noise at any one time.</li> </ul> <p>Noise monitoring focuses on the average noise level, however peaks are taken into consideration at the assessment stage. The Working Group questioned the relevance of using average levels rather than peak level, and were reminded this is baseline monitoring, with the purpose of characterising noise in the area.</p> <p>Noise loggers are important to establishing the baseline monitoring, and there was one logger in Euroa, out of nineteen (19) across Victoria. This logger was located very close the Anderson Street bridge. The average noise level is then provided over a week of monitoring.</p> <p>The Inland Rail operational noise requirements take into consideration both average levels and peak levels. Factors like type of train, wind factor, speed, are all taken into account when measuring noise levels.</p>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>Noise levels is not a task that the organisation is unfamiliar with, as it manages 8500km of rail track across Australia. Studies have also shown that there is no significant increase in noise levels when running double-stacked freight trains compared to single-stacked trains. Noise peaks tend to come from the engine, rather than the carriages.</p> <p>Future modelling will be done on a preferred solution, when there is a preferred solution for the site. The methodology for predicting construction noise has been selected for its improved accuracy predicting noise at longer distances for regional areas.</p>
6	Break
7	Requirements
	<p>It was agreed the meeting would be extended to allow time to get through all options.</p> <p>It was explained that the purpose of this session was to playback to the Group ARTC’s understanding of the requirements gathered through all engagement to date for feedback and endorsement by the Group.</p> <p>ARTC presented a statement that it believes is an overarching summary of the community’s requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An opportunity to enhance Euroa – The primary requirement from the Euroa community is to make sure the opportunity afforded to this project to improve the station precinct is delivered.</li> </ul> <p>After clarifying “station precinct” as the immediate area potentially impacted by the works, including nearby residents, the Group was happy to support this as the primary requirement.</p> <p>This overarching requirement is comprised of four key requirements, capturing more specific needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community and Consultation</li> <li>• Station Precinct</li> <li>• Accessibility and Safety</li> <li>• Connectivity with Town</li> </ul> <p>These requirements came from a variety of sources, including community feedback and market research.</p> <p>Council’s requirements were also discussed, Renee advised that following further discussions with Council, the Shire was doing further work to identify what it wants out of the project, rather than specific items such as the roundabout.</p>
8	OPTIONS CONSIDERED
	<p>ARTC presented a summary of the design options that have been discussed so far, and their understanding of the status based on discussion with the Working Group at the last meeting.</p> <p>This led to a lot of discussion about the options and some disagreement amongst the Group as to whether ARTC’s summary reflected the Group’s position. In particular, Track Lowering was debated, with some group members expressing strong views that further investigation was required. It was also suggested that it could form part of a hybrid solution, with track lowering and a new bridge. Ed advised that there was no scope for ARTC to investigate the hybrid option due to the cost.</p> <p>Other members of the Group were clear that they thought that no further investigation was needed, as it meant the existing bridge would remain and this did not meet the agreed requirements and would not be accepted by the community. The Group agreed to move on to discuss other options.</p> <p>Following further discussion, there was general agreement that Road Over Rail (Skyrail), Level Crossing, and Bridge Removal did not meet requirements and therefore not acceptable.</p>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p><b>ROAD UNDER RAIL</b></p> <p>Following requests from the Working Group at the last meeting, ARTC advised they had explored the possibility of diverting large vehicles so that the road underpass would not need to be as large, thereby reducing the scale of the works. VicRoads replied by saying it would not accept a road under rail option due to flooding issues.</p> <p>The Group was advised, that as the owner of the bridge VicRoads must agree to any solution as it will continue to own the asset at the end of the project. As such, ARTC is not planning to undertake further work on this option.</p> <p><b>BRIDGE REPLACEMENT</b></p> <p>ARTC explained that the bridge replacement option did not mean building a bridge similar to the previously preferred option and that there was a lot of scope to meet the community's requirements with a bridge replacement. Several options were discussed:</p> <p><b>Bridge replacement with track reconfiguration</b></p> <p>This option was developed based on feedback from the community, including the Working Group.</p> <p>It addresses a number of the requirements, including vehicle access to the station. It also includes an underpass for pedestrians on foot, and carparks on both sides of the rail.</p> <p>The Goods Shed would be impacted because of the additional platform that would be required. A second platform would likely be a requirement of VLine. Some discussion was had as to whether a solution could be to use just one track, using the new crossovers on either side of town to re-direct freight and passenger trains as needed. Ed advised that he did not think this would be acceptable from a safety and operational perspective.</p> <p><b>Bridge replacement with reconfiguration and road connection</b></p> <p>The second option explored included a connection between Railway and Hinton Street (for small vehicles only – a height of 4.6). Other features would include a pedestrian underpass, as well as carparks on both sides.</p> <p>This option was well received by the Working Group. It was mentioned that this connection would also help open up that end of town to development, as it is largely closed off at the moment.</p> <p>ARTC understands this option ticks a lot of the community requirements, but also acknowledges it is a more expensive solution.</p>
9	<p>Future meetings</p> <p>ARTC reminded the Group that they are committed to getting to the right solution, not a quick solution. The Group was invited to provide further feedback about the options discussed at the meeting, so further consideration could be given ahead of next meeting.</p> <p>Working Group members raised serious concerns about the embankment design of the bridge options and believed that this would not be popular with the community. ARTC undertook to go away and do further work on the bridge design and to provide examples of how urban design could be used to further address the requirements.</p> <p>Ed advised that he is happy to continue to explore all options if there is general agreement in the group that is the way they wanted to spend their time. However, it had to be acknowledged that some of the options could not be pursued due to stakeholder support, impact and cost.</p> <p>An alternative solution was tabled by a Group member, with ARTC saying that it would be looked at, along with any other options the members wanted to put forward ahead of the next meeting.</p>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	Other requests for future meetings included heights of the bridge along Anderson Street (how it would impact houses) and consideration of the development of a virtual model of the existing area.  It was agreed that Temple Kitchen was the preferred venue for future meetings.
10	Close meeting

## Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	Further review of the bridge replacement options and examples of urban design options to address concerns about the earthen embankment.	ARTC	16/09
3	Consideration of option presented at the meeting, along with any others sent through	ARTC	16/09
4	Provide further information about the impact of a bridge solution on Anderson Street.	ARTC	16/09
5	Consider virtual modelling of the existing environment around station precinct.	ARTC	16/09
6	Provide peak levels of baseline noise studies.	ARTC	16/09
7	Provide VicRoads response to Road Under Rail	ARTC	16/09

## Next Meeting

16 September, 2019

6:00pm – 8:00pm

Temple Kitchen