

MEETING MINUTES

I2S Inland Rail Illabo to Stockinbingal Community Consultative Committee

DATE / TIME

27 August 2020
1pm

LOCATION

Junee Ex-Services Memorial Club
75 Broadway Street, Junee

FACILITATOR

Garry West

MINUTE TAKER

Garry West

DISTRIBUTION

Illabo to Stockinbingal CCC

ATTENDEES (SHOW ORGANISATION IF NOT ARTC)

- ▶ Garry West (Independent Chair)
- ▶ David Carr (Community Member)
- ▶ David Carter (NSW Farmers)
- ▶ Grant Johnson (Junee Shire Council)
- ▶ Melvyn Matlin (I2S Project Director)
- ▶ Heath Martin (Stakeholder Engagement Manager, Southern NSW)
- ▶ Geoffrey Larsen (Community Member)
- ▶ Laura Schweiger (Cootamundra-Gundagai Regional Council) **By video**
- ▶ James Coleborne (Community Member) **By video**
- ▶ James Pederick (I2S Environmental Advisor)
- ▶ Rene Provis (Stakeholder Engagement Advisor)

APOLOGIES (SHOW ORGANISATION IF NOT ARTC)

- ▶ Martin Honner (NSW Farmers)
- ▶ Cr Pam Halliburton (Junee Shire Council)
- ▶ Sharon Langham (Cootamundra-Gundagai Regional Council)

GUESTS (SHOW ORGANISATION IF NOT ARTC)

- ▶ John Zannes (Project Manager, Inland Rail, Transport for NSW)
- ▶ Shane Sykes (Inland Rail Regional Liaison Officer, Department of Infrastructure, regional development and Cities) **By video**

Discussions

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
1. Welcome	The Chair welcomed all to the meeting and introduced those attending by video and reported the resignation of Roderick Chalmers (Community Member) from the CCC.
Declarations of Interest	No new declarations
2. Minutes of Previous Meeting	It was noted and agreed that the minutes of the meeting on 28 May 2020 had been approved on 2 June 2020 and placed on the proponent's website.
3. Business Arising	<p>Melvyn Maylin addressed the actions listed in the previous minutes.</p> <p>Action 1: Details of signalling that is to be installed for the projects through properties? Signalling will be in accordance with standard level crossing signals as set out in the ALCAM (Australian Level Crossing Assessment Model) methodology. This question is primarily about impacts on private landholders and their ability to move livestock across the alignment. The current procedures are to call the Junee Control Centre to establish the current train timetable and determine when it is safe to cross. Q: Will a private level crossing have flashing lights? A: Whatever the methodology determines and that could be flashing lights in some cases.</p> <p>Action 2: What water and drainage issues have been identified with the potential for the new line to act as a buffer dam? The answer will be provided with the flood modelling. The project's technical adviser has an obligation to produce a hydrological model, which models the existing ground conditions and existing drainage paths. This will then be 'ground truthed' to ensure the model reflects what really happens. This will be done by talking to councils and landowners. Then we overlay the design to understand the water paths as a result of the alignment. No major drainage issues have been flagged at this stage. An important outcome will be to ensure the alignment does not result in the</p>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>movement of water from one catchment to another. This documentation will be part of the EIS and will have to be independently peer reviewed. Q: How much emphasis will be placed on local knowledge? A: The 'ground truthing' is about incorporating local knowledge. Every impacted landowner will be contacted in this process.</p>
<p>4. Correspondence</p>	<p>Nil</p>
<p>5. Proponent's Reports</p>	<p>Melvyn Maylin (I2S Project Director) Today is sharing the results of the optimisation exercise which was flagged at the previous meeting. There has been limited exposure of this information to date. The optimisation was undertaken to consider improved value for money, without compromising service levels, environmental impacts, and stakeholder impacts. The optimisation focussed on a review of the grade of the alignment, road/rail interfaces (bridges and level crossings), and the connections at each end. Primarily the focus was to keep the review inside the FAI but going outside was not precluded. This has resulted in a small number of areas where the new alignment goes outside the FAI but on average no more than 200 metres.</p> <p>The high-level work is now complete and the Inland Rail Design Joint Venture (IRDJV) are being briefed to recommence updating the preferred refined design to a reference design standard (i.e. a more detailed level of design) and the Inland Rail team have spoken to the five most affected landowners, and are arranging to meet all landowners as we speak. Community consultation will then commence to gain feedback on the updated reference design. Stakeholder feedback will be fed back to the design team for an updated reference design, which then feeds into the EIS which is planned for lodgement mid 2021.</p> <p>To understand the opportunities across the project it was divided into 5 sections (see presentation slide – Optimisation Findings Summary).</p> <p>Moving outside the FAI in some places demonstrated significant earthworks savings were found by moving the alignment further from the significant ridge lines.</p> <p>Q: Why didn't the earlier design work pick up on this saving in the original review? A: On major infrastructure projects designs are likely to change at different stages of the cycle. Looking at the design holistically you have to ask the question, 'what could we do better?'</p> <p>Q: The impact on a landowner moving the alignment up to 100-200 metres could have a significant impact to their farming operations. A: Accept that these changes will have different impact on landowners and have to engage with each one to assess that impact. It will have a more adverse impact on some but a lesser impact on others. For example, if the alignment is too far up a hill, landowner would have difficulty with access but moving it to flatter terrain can improve access.</p> <p>Q: So, the 5 landowners already spoken to, were they the most adversely affected? A: No, they were the ones where the movement of the alignment was outside the FAI, which is only an indicative area and not an obligatory area. It was only an area designated so people could have some degree of certainty. The impact varies. All landowners will be spoken to in the near future. Any changes to these people are likely to be only minor. The process of landowner engagement will entail providing individual property maps showing the changes and the alignment. Landowner feedback will be taken into account in the final decision but not necessarily adopting everyone's views.</p> <p>Q: By keeping the alignment where there is more dirt to be moved, couldn't that help by now having to take it from somewhere else? A: The project team haven't yet finalised what is called the 'cut/fill balance' but believe the alignment as changed does provide this balance but that will be further tested going into the reference design.</p> <p><u>Southern Connection</u> – shifts take-off location further along the existing Main South line; reduces property impacts; reduces impacts on native vegetation and reduces earthworks volumes. This still needs to go to reference design.</p> <p>Q: How many landholders and how many hectares are affected through the whole corridor?</p>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>A: 22 landholders, not sure about actual hectares, the final detail design may show 2 less landholders are impacted.</p> <p>Q: How many of the 22 have a major impact on their property and therefore their operations?</p> <p>A: 4 is the estimate at this stage.</p> <p><u>Ironbong Road</u> – the horizontal alignment has not changed much; the biggest change is that it was to be an overbridge, now it is to be a level crossing, resulting in a significant reduction in earthworks volume. The initial feedback from landholders is they prefer a level crossing as they can get bigger machinery across. The crossing loop (passing loop) added to this section has been moved south from the Dirnaseer Road section, which is better for engineering and design related reasons and gives better flexibility further north. Need passing loops about every 50 kilometres.</p> <p>Several members of the CCC questioned the statement about the level crossing being better from landholders’ operational aspects. The project team will discuss this further with landholders during the ongoing stakeholder consultation.</p> <p>Q: In this day & age can’t understand why level crossings are proposed instead of bridges from a safety point of view.</p> <p>A: Accept there are divergent views about level crossings. The ALCAM referred to earlier tries to weight up risk verses cost and sometimes we can’t have everything we want. The test is to mitigate risk as far as is reasonably practical.</p> <p>Concern was expressed that the Inland Rail Project is about building for the future but only putting in infrastructure that suits today. Discussion occurred. Concern expressed about impact on firefighting issues. It was noted the boom gates are only down 2 -2.5 minutes.</p> <p><u>Dirnaseer Road</u> – The alignment has moved in a couple of places outside the FAI that avoids hilly terrain and reduces earthworks and the previously proposed passing loop has been moved south, which allows greater flexibility in optimising vertical geometry significantly reducing earthwork volumes. Moving to the west reduces the environment impacts, however, it does move further into landholder space. Some conversations have already occurred and will be ongoing. This is the area where the most significant changes have been made.</p> <p>Q: How close is it to a farmhouse?</p> <p>A: Unable to give a specific answer at this stage. Individual property maps when produced will give a more definitive answer. Discussions with private landholders has to be respected as there are privacy issues to respect. Individual landholder discussions will commence within the next couple of weeks.</p> <p>Concern was expressed that the information being provided is too general and not of sufficient detail to be considered consultative which is the purpose of the committee. Concern was also expressed that the budget for the project seems to be now taking greater prominence than previously submitted. The Project team indicated they believed the feedback at the committee meeting is very valuable. The Chair indicated there was always a balance and when the CCC is advised of detailed information at the same time discussions need to be held with relevant stakeholders.</p> <p><u>Dudauman Road</u> – Little change in alignment of this section over the previous design. The natural topography indicates a grade separation (ie road under rail) is more suitable at Old Cootamundra Road.</p> <p><u>Stockinbingal</u> - Quite a bit of feedback is expected to the changes outlined. Stayed within the FAI which was originally quite wide. There are several stakeholders that will need to be engaged. There is a significant reduction in earthwork volumes; the grade separation (overbridge) at Burley Griffin Way is maintained; removes an underbridge at Dudauman Creek by shifting the alignment east and brings it all closer to Stockinbingal about 200 metres.</p> <p><u>Stockinbingal Connection</u> – Brings the line closer to Stockinbingal, with potential for noise and vibration impacts during construction and operation, which will be addressed in detail in the EIS; reduces property impacts by hugging existing rail corridor; reduces visual amenity impacts of deep hill cutting. There will be stakeholder engagement on this design during September.</p>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>Comment and discussion about the Government’s intention to accelerate infrastructure works. There are elements of the Inland Rail Project that may be able to be brought online quicker, but it doesn’t circumvent the environmental planning requirements of the project. The projected timing of the I2S section will remain as it is at the moment which is about 18 months before construction.</p> <p>Heath Martin (Stakeholder Engagement) outlined landowner consultation program. The five most affected landowners were consulted during July and there was majority acceptance of the proposed changes outside the FAI. The main feedback has been that access and compensation are the primary concerns when selecting between alternate alignment options. During September all impacted landholders will be provided with updated alignment map by property and consultation will occur.</p> <p>Late 2020, more work will be done on the level crossings and hydrology impacts and ground truthing which will be feed into the next stage of the reference design. Early 2021 the reference design will be updated which will lead to a further round of consultations with all stakeholders.</p> <p>Previously it has been raised about mental health and it has been advised the project has partnered with the primary health care network and the question was raised whether CCC members would be interested in online training? It is just about upskilling community about mental health issues. Members can think about it and let Heath know.</p> <p>James Pederick (Environmental Advisor) The draft EIS is planned for submission to the ARTC early 2021 and is planned for lodgement with the Department of Planning, Infrastructure and Environment (DPIE) for adequacy review about mid 2021 and Public exhibition planned for late 2021. The public exhibition would be a minimum of 28 days with everyone being able to make submissions to DPIE. There will be ongoing workshops and community meetings next year as the EIS is developed.</p> <p>Hydrological Modelling. The hydrology model is being developed to understand different flood scenarios. A two-stage consultation process will be undertaken with councils and impacted landowners. The stage one consultation will involve consultation to ground truth the base model. The draft reference design will then be incorporated to understand the hydrological impacts of the new alignment. Stage two will then involve consultation on the impacts identified.</p> <p>Q: Has there been a review of the hydrology model since the recent rain which has been significant? A: Historical records are considered and ground truthing then updates. Regulator consultation will occur with relevant government agencies by way of a series of workshops. Q: Will the CCC get a chance to look at the draft EIS before it goes to DPIE for exhibition? A: The CCC will be given the opportunity to have a briefing on the draft EIS during 2021. [Action: Program for CCC workshops on the EIS]</p>
<p>6. General Business</p>	<p>Q: Concerned the question of the land acquisition process is still not clearly understood in the general community. A: Yes, is this something we have to do more on. The Chair indicated he would have discussions with the project team to further advance the issue at an appropriate time. The timing of these discussions is important. [Action: Advise process for briefing on compensation and acquisition at next meeting]</p> <p>Concern was expressed about the lack of attendance of an elected representative of the Cootamundra-Gundagai Regional Council at these meetings. Laura is in the meeting by video and has indicated she will take that message back to Council. The Chair will discuss with Council as well.</p>

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	Advise process and timing for briefing on compensation and acquisition.	GW; MM; & HM	26 November 2020
2	Advise program for workshops for the CCC on the draft EIS.	MM & JP	26 November 2020

Next Meeting

1pm Thursday 26 November 2020. Location to be advised.