

# Meeting minutes

## Southern Darling Downs Consultative Committee Meeting

### Date / Time

28 January 2021  
6.00pm to 8.05pm

### Location

Millmerran Cultural Centre  
Walpole Street, Millmerran

### Facilitator

Graham Clapham (Chair)

### Minute taker

Naomi Tonscheck – (ARTC  
Inland Rail)

### Distribution

All

### Attendees (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Graham Clapham, SDD Chair (Chair)
- ▶ Norm Chapman, SDD member (NC)
- ▶ Robert Barrett, SDD member (RB)
- ▶ Rick McDougall SDD member (RM)
- ▶ Rosalie Millar, SDD member (RM)
- ▶ Georgina Krieg, SDD member (GK)
- ▶ Naomi Tonscheck (NT)
- ▶ Katie Unipan (KU)
- ▶ Andrew Roberts (JR)
- ▶ Jeff Chandler, SDD member (JC)
- ▶ Maria Oliver, SDD member (MO)
- ▶ Robert Webb, SDD member (RW)
- ▶ Brett Kelly, SDD member (BK)
- ▶ Kev Loveday, SDD member (KL)
- ▶ Robert Smith (RS)
- ▶ Fiona Kennedy (FK)
- ▶ Bree Jeffrey (BF)
- ▶ Ash Williams (AW)

### Apologies (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Justin Saunders, SDD member (JS)
- ▶ Andrew McCartney, SDD member (AM)

### Guests (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Kathryn Chaffey, (Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications)

### Discussions

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p><b>Safety share</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ NT presented a safety share on being aware of snakes.</li> </ul>
1	<p><b>Welcome, Actions and Conflict of Interest</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ AW delivered an acknowledgement of country</li> <li>▶ The Chair welcomed the committee, ARTC staff and observers to the meeting.</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Actions arising from previous meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Noise presentation and analogies - <b>complete</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ <i>Presentation and analogies were provided to the CCC members</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Landowner meetings – <b>ongoing</b></li> <li>▶ ARTC to provide the link to the P2N construction video – <b>complete</b></li> <li>▶ Chair to approach a legal firm asking them present at the next CCC meeting – <b>complete</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Update included in General Business</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
3	<p><b>Proponent's presentation – B2G Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)</b></p>

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Chair commented that this meeting's agenda is quite short and does not get into the content of the EIS but focuses on the EIS process and how to make a submission which is appropriate for this stage of the project.</li> <li>▶ RS stated the intent of tonight's meeting is to recap on the EIS process and status and the next steps.</li> <li>▶ FK provided an overview of the B2G EIS process. She explained that the EIS approval process is administered by the Office of the Coordinator General (OCG) and not an ARTC created process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Coordinated Project declaration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ FK commented we received 'Coordinated project' status under the <i>State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 (SDPWO Act)</i>, triggering the requirement for an EIS document.</li> <li>▶ FK stated the Coordinator General (CG) coordinate the EIS approval. The CG works with advisory agencies, local government and other organisations to seek input into the EIS and post-EIS approvals, coordinates public submissions, prepares the final EIS evaluation report – rejecting or approving the project.</li> <li>▶ FK noted that the 'Coordinated Project' declaration does not imply government approval of, support for or commitment to a project.</li> </ul> <p><b>Approval process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ FK commented that the EIS approval process is a 12-step process. This process is publicly available on the OCG's website at <a href="https://www.dsdmip.qld.gov.au/coordinator-general/assessments-and-approvals/coordinated-projects/the-coordinated-project-process">https://www.dsdmip.qld.gov.au/coordinator-general/assessments-and-approvals/coordinated-projects/the-coordinated-project-process</a>.</li> <li>▶ FK stated that steps 1&amp;2 included the project declaration stage and involved a pre-lodgement meeting and an application for declaration. The information submitted included an Initial Advice Statement (IAS) (specifying the high-level description of the proposed development and the environmental effects of the project), Project pre-feasibility and an overview of ARTC's capability to complete an EIS. She commented the IAS was accepted by the CG 2 March 2018.</li> <li>▶ FK said step 3 involves the CG declaring the project to be a Coordinated Project via notification in the QLD Government Gazette and local newspapers, confirming the B2G project would require an EIS.</li> <li>▶ FK continued stating Step 4 involved ARTC preparing the draft Terms of Reference (ToR) that sets out matters that must be addressed in preparing the EIS. She commented the CG seeks feedback on the ToR from government agencies and the community between 7 May to 18 June 2018.</li> <li>▶ FK commented step 5 of the approval process involved the CG considering submissions from affected stakeholders. The final B2G EIS ToR was issued by CG 16 November 2018.</li> <li>▶ FK continued stating step 6 involved the preparation of the B2G EIS which took place between Nov 2018 to Dec 2020. She commented the draft EIS complies with the final ToR, CG's guidelines for preparing an EIS, CG's social impact assessment guidelines, the economic impact assessment guideline, and the guidelines/policies specified in Appendix 1 of the B2G ToR. FK continued stating the draft EIS was submitted to the OCG in Dec 2019 and the CG sought feedback from state and federal agencies on matters of interest or concern during 2020. ARTC received this feedback from OCG and updated the draft EIS as required.</li> <li>▶ FK continued stating we are now at step 7, the public release of the draft EIS document. She said the CG is satisfied the draft EIS meets the requirements of the ToR, CG guideline for an EIS and the draft EIS addresses the principle areas of advisory agency feedback. She continued stating the CG sets the EIS notification period and the CG has determined a period of 12 weeks from 23 January to 19 April 2021.</li> </ul> <p><b>Questions from the committee:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ KL questioned how the draft EIS has met advisory agency feedback when the Senate Inquiry has not completed, and the Independent Panel of Expert's report has not been issued? FK confirmed that the advisory agencies were satisfied ARTC has met the initial step enabling the CG to release the draft EIS for public notification. During the notification period, there is a</li> </ul>

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>further round of agency feedback that needs to be satisfied, however we have passed the initial step allowing EIS release for public comment. ARTC will still need to address community and advisory agency concerns raised during the EIS public notification period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ KL asked what happens if we go through the public notification stage and the Independent Panel of Experts find there is an error with the model? The Chair commented that he asked the OCG the same question and the OCG responded that the input from the panel would be used to apply conditions to the project. He continued the final conditions of the EIS will include input from advisory groups including the Independent International Panel for Flood Studies Queensland (the Panel). FK said the Panel has reviewed the EIS and determined the EIS meets the ToR. The final report from the panel will be considered by the CG.</li> <li>▶ KL asked what happens if the report finds the proposal is not fit for purpose? Chair commented that the CG will use the findings from the Panel to make its final determination.</li> <li>▶ BK said there is very little detail about the design and asked if it was true that the design at Pampas has not been finalised? RS commented ARTC has been working closely with TMR and is still negotiating the final design. It could be that TMR may comment on our EIS and put forward their preferred option, however at this stage it is not yet agreed what the treatment will be at the road/rail interfaces. It is subject to ongoing conversations and EIS submission response process.</li> <li>▶ BK asked if the design changes through the EIS process or through your conversations with TMR, do we get the opportunity to comment? FK commented that it is at the CG's discretion as to whether there is an additional public notification period. FK said there is a detailed traffic assessment report and alignment design drawings as part of the EIS.</li> <li>▶ KL what is a high-level assessment of the environmental affects? FK stated that at the application stage we provide the CG with a broad description of the project and the environmental issues. FK continued stating the CG used this initial information to determine whether it required an EIS. It is a very early part of the process. FK commented high-level means a strategic level assessment.</li> <li>▶ GK where are the maps? FK confirmed the alignment drawings are provided as volume three of the EIS.</li> <li>▶ The Chair commented that he spoke to the OCG about detail in the EIS and the fact the community as laypeople are responding to the technical information. The Chair said OCG wants to hear from you in your words raising the issues as you see them. The Chair stated the OCG will appoint technical experts to review.</li> <li>▶ BK commented we still do not have the detail we are looking for. We would like the final design.</li> <li>▶ KL commented this section of the project has been on the table for 10 year and we still do not have a final design.</li> </ul> <p><b>What is an EIS and the timeline?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ FK provided an overview of the EIS. FK commented it is the highest form of environmental assessment in QLD. She said it provides a comprehensive description of the current environment, potential environmental, social and economic impacts of the project and ARTC's proposal to avoid, minimise and/or offset those potential impacts. She commented it included direct, indirect and cumulative impacts resulting from the different stages of the project.</li> <li>▶ FK commented the timeline is subject to the complexity of the project. She said the CG may ask for additional information, correction or clarifications, request ARTC complete additional studies and may request information on refinements of the project since the release of the draft EIS.</li> <li>▶ FK stated that once the EIS is accepted as final, the evaluation report on the project's EIS is released by OCG             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair asked about the federal approval EPBC act and whether there will be conditions on the EIS? FK confirmed the project is subject to EPBC Act approval.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair asked if the federal minister would take submissions? FK commented there is a bilateral agreement between the state and federal governments, both parties must be satisfied the EIS meets both levels of government’s legislation. The state will coordinate the submissions.</li> <li>▶ MO wanted to know about how to navigate the EIS? FK recommended the Summary of Findings document as a navigation tool. She commented it provides an overview of the topics and where you can find more information. NT commented using the ‘Control F’ function will help navigate the EIS when searching for specific words like non-resident workforce accommodation for example.</li> <li>▶ KL asked who will conduct the community information sessions and why are they being held three weeks into the public exhibition period? NT commented that ARTC will be hosting the information sessions. FK commented that we wanted to allow people enough time to view the EIS so they could come to us with their questions.</li> <li>▶ MO asked if the location of the EIS in Millmerran could be changed due to the library only being opened 3 days a week. FK commented that we will follow up with the CG and request they approve that change. <b>ACTION</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Overview of public exhibition consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ NT provided an overview of the responsibilities during the EIS approval process for the OCG and ARTC. FK commented the OCG are responsible for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ selecting the locations of the EIS displays,</li> <li>▶ where the public exhibition is advertised,</li> <li>▶ determining number of EIS copies that are required to be printed,</li> <li>▶ providing guidance on how to make comment on the EIS,</li> <li>▶ reviewing the submissions,</li> <li>▶ requesting ARTC response to submissions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>FK said ARTC support this process by hosting information sessions, engaging with the community and developing collateral to support EIS public notification. FK said all of these activities must be accepted by the OCG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ NT commented that the team have been contacting directly affected landowners to inform them of the EIS public notification period, that we have sent letters to the landowners in the study corridor and held meetings as required. ARTC is planning eight community information sessions, advertising on social media, continuing the community outreach program each week either in Pittsworth or Millmerran, planning to attend local shows, distributing the USBs to libraries and has developed the summary of findings to support the EIS public notification period. NT continued stating the directly affected landowners were sent a copy of the OCG’s ‘Have your say’ factsheet and a reply-paid envelope to help them place a submission. She said ARTC have also catered for low literacy and translation requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ KL asked when the Toowoomba show was being held? NT commented mid-April 21. KL commented it was very close to the end of the exhibition period.</li> <li>▶ GK asked if visualisations could be taken to the shows and whether one could be created for the Pampas and the Pittsworth communities. NT commented we will be taking the visualisations to the shows however there currently isn’t one for Pampas. NT committed to following up on the visualisation for Pampas and Pittsworth community. <b>ACTION</b></li> <li>▶ BK commented that registered post will not deliver to regional areas. BK also asked why the OCG was not attending the EIS community information sessions. The Chair responded that the OCG would like to meet with the IDD and SDD for a combined meeting with the committees to discuss the EIS process. He continued that they would not be discussing the issues of the EIS but the approval process. The committee discussed the OCG meeting in general business.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ NT spoke about the EIS community information sessions and asked the committee members to put the posters up in their local communities.</li> </ul>

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ NT spoke about the EIS document stating there are 25 chapters, 26 appendices totalling approximately 14,000 pages. She provided an overview on anticipated EIS submission topics including hydrology, alignment selection etc.</li> <li>▶ NT provided an overview on how to submit a 'properly made' submission and spoke to the OCG's 'Have your say' factsheet.</li> </ul>
4	<p><b>General Business</b></p> <p><b>OCG presentation to the CCCs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair spoke to the committee and sought feedback on holding a closed meeting with the Inner Darling Downs (IDD) CCC members to discuss the EIS approval process on the 25 February 2021. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ KL asked why it is a closed meeting. The Chair commented they would need to ask the OCG however they have indicated it will be a closed meeting or they will not attend. RM commented that the committee represent their communities and the committee should share the information received.</li> <li>▶ JC asked will the OCG share any additional information? The Chair said you will hear about the process directly from the OCG.</li> <li>▶ Committee agreed to holding a closed meeting with the OCG, if possible, on 24 February 2021 in Millmerran.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Proposed seminar on land acquisition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair provided an update on the SDD and IDD Chairs' conversation with the proposed specialists who would provide taxation, accounting, legal and property valuation advice to the landowners, and sought feedback from the committee. The Chair stated the proposed specialists would be prepared to speak to the directly affected landowners in detail about the compulsory acquisition process. The Chair recommended that this seminar be held after the EIS public notification period. The Chair commented it will be invite only open to directly affected landowners only. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ BK asked whether people who were impacted by hydrological changes but not necessarily land take would be included? Chair confirmed it would only be for landowners whose properties were directly affected by the alignment.</li> <li>▶ BK commented people may want to research the specialists prior to coming to the seminar. The Chair commented confirmed the legal representative was Adair Donaldson.</li> <li>▶ JC asked when ARTC would be commencing land acquisition. The Chair commented it is not a project until it is approved.</li> <li>▶ BK commented the New Acland EIS is still not approved. He commented that if this project is subject to other legal action, that could also hold the project up.</li> <li>▶ The Chair commented this is your opportunity to have your say. Use it.</li> <li>▶ GK supported the Chair's comments and stated the EIS process seems overwhelming however look for the areas that are important to you and submit a comment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ The Chair commented that ARTC would support the logistics of the meeting but not participate.</li> <li>▶ KL raised his concerns about the size of the EIS and the timeframe allocated to responding to the EIS. He sought feedback from the committee as to whether they would support requesting an extension to the public notification period timeframes. The committee agreed that they would wait until the meeting with the OCG and if the community felt that they needed an extension, the committee would ask the OCG in that forum for an extension.</li> <li>▶ BK raised concerns about culvert erosion and requested ARTC enter a formal agreement with each landowner along the floodplain, for the life of the project including decommissioning, to make good for any erosion caused by the culverts and structures. The Chair commented that that should be put into a submission to the OCG and to also formally write to ARTC requesting make good agreements be offered to all floodplain landowners.</li> </ul>

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>▶ BK raised there was an increase in contractor movements along the rail corridor. BK continued stating that many of the landowners' sheds and homes were within proximity of the alignment. BK raised the issue that ARTC vehicles are still traveling around unbranded and the community is concerned about property safety and requested ARTC consider cameras or the like to protect landowners. BK asked if staff were police checked. The Chair responded stating ARTC staff are police checked but not the contractors. The Chair also suggested ARTC work with the neighbourhood watch groups to brainstorm some solutions. NT committed to re-instructing all contractors to use branded vehicles when working on the project. She also committed to working with BK and the neighbourhood watch. <b>ACTION</b></p> <p><b>Next meeting</b></p> <p>▶ GK suggested Brookstead. Committee agreed the next meeting would be held in Brookstead. Date yet to be confirmed but will be prior to the end of the EIS public notification period.</p>
6	<p><b>Questions from observers</b></p> <p>▶ NA</p> <p>▶ <i>Meeting closed 8.05pm</i></p>

### Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY
1	ARTC to contact CG and ask for approval to relocate the Millmerran EIS to the Service Centre.	ARTC Inland Rail
2	Visualisations for Pampas and Pittsworth communities	ARTC Inland Rail
3	ARTC to seek feedback from the IDD in relation to the closed meeting with the OCG.	ARTC Inland Rail
4	The Chair to continue to coordinate the property acquisition seminar.	The Chair SDD CCC
5	ARTC to work with BK and meet with the neighbourhood watch groups to brainstorm some safety solutions.	ARTC Inland Rail and BK
6	ARTC to re-instruct contractors to use branded vehicles	ARTC Inland Rail

### Next meeting

To be advised