

Meeting minutes - unconfirmed

Lockyer Valley Community Consultative Committee

Date / Time

7 December 2021
5:00pm – 7:00pm

Location

Forest Hill School of Arts Hall, Forest Hill

Facilitator

Simon Warner

Minute taker

Secretariat

Attendees (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Gordon van der Est
- ▶ Margaret McCarthy
- ▶ Darryl Green
- ▶ Maurice Hennessy
- ▶ Michael Keene
- ▶ Gavin Simpson
- ▶ Gary Stark
- ▶ Neil Cook

Apologies

- ▶ Jason Chavasse
- ▶ Doug Lyons
- ▶ Maree Rosier
- ▶ Daniel McNamara
- ▶ John Schollick

Guests (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Bec Abraham, DITRDC

ARTC project team

- ▶ Tony Lubofsky (via Teams), Director PPP
- ▶ Nawar Spear (via Teams), Project Manager G2H
- ▶ Jacqui Neill (via Teams), Government Relations
- ▶ Rob Walker, Project Manager H2C
- ▶ Chris Matthews, Senior Project Manager
- ▶ Stephen Brierley, Design Manager H2C
- ▶ Michael Price, Environment Lead G2H
- ▶ Tessa Drayson, Environment Lead H2C
- ▶ Giano Terzic, Stakeholder Engagement G2H
- ▶ Kylie Wendell, Stakeholder Engagement H2C
- ▶ Corey Doran, Stakeholder Engagement G2H & H2C
- ▶ Brodie Hartfiel, Cultural Heritage

Discussions

NO.	ACTIONS
1	<p>Introductions and Welcome to Country – 5:10pm – Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome to committee and observers • Chair welcomed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Representative from the Office of Scott Buchholz MP, Patrick Murphy ○ Lockyer Valley Regional Council councillors ○ Bec Abraham, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications ○ Jim McDonald MP, Member for Lockyer ○ Observers ○ Apology from Tanya Milligan, Mayor Lockyer Valley Regional Council

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Five apologies from committee members: Jason Chavasse, Daniel McNamara, Doug Lyons, John Schollick, Maree Rosier● Margaret McCarthy delivered the Welcome to Country● Nil conflicts of interest
2	<p>PPP update – 5:20pm – Tony Lubofsky provided a brief, high level overview of Inland Rail:</p> <p>Presentation key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 1,700km railway line between Melbourne and Brisbane○ Freight logistics and provide a more efficient supply chain with the aim to improve competitiveness on a global scale○ 21,500 direct and indirect jobs at the peak of construction, 11,800 of those jobs will be in Queensland○ No construction has commenced in Queensland yet, however approx. 500 contracts have already been awarded with a value of \$1.3 billion. The larger contracts are yet to be awarded○ The section of Inland Rail being delivered between Gowrie to Kagaru is 128km long and will be delivered through a Public Private Partnership (PPP)○ The Gowrie to Helidon draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) public exhibition concluded on 25 October 2021○ The Coordinator-General has decided not to declare the Kagaru to Acacia Ridge project a 'coordinated project'○ Recently announced the preferred proponent for the Border to Gowrie Civil Works program – BHQ joint venture○ Across the entire Inland Rail program from Melbourne to Brisbane, the Parkes to Narromine section has already been completed, Narromine to North Star has just commenced construction and the vast majority of the greenfield sections are in the procurement stages.● The Gowrie to Kagaru section is the most technically complex section of Inland Rail and the most expensive. Three multi-national consortia have been shortlisted will provide their final submissions for consideration in the coming weeks. The aim is to appoint the winning consortium in the first quarter of 2022.● The bidders have generally followed the Reference Design in most sections which is reflected in our EISs but with some refinements.● We are pleased to be nearing the end of the procurement process although there is still likely to be a lengthy period between the date we appoint the Preferred Proponent and the date that contracts are signed, and construction commences. This will need to be until after the EIS process is completed and the Coordinator-General has issued its approval conditions. Land resumption can also only commence once the EISs have been approved. That is what is driving the critical path for the overall project.● By first quarter 2022, we will have a clearer idea of who the partners will be and we will endeavour to update the committee on the process and timelines moving forward. <p>Question from Gary Stark</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● What is the delay on the EIS program?● Tony Lubofsky – we are working on what the program is going to look like together with the Office of the Coordinator-General. We cannot be certain regarding the program impacts until we have the preferred proponent on board. The reason for that is that the proponents' proposals are bespoke, they all contain unique elements and therefore may potentially impact the EIS in different ways. We won't know what those impacts will be and therefore the impact on our schedule until we have made the selection regarding our preferred proponent.

Comment from Chair:

- One of the issues that has been brought up with the Coordinator-General is that both the G2H and H2C EISs are so high level which makes them difficult to interpret and respond to, therefore looking highly likely the EIS won't be completed while it is still in that reference design stage and will need to have a much more detailed design before the EIS can be completed.

Comment from Tony Lubofsky: I agree. In updating our EISs, we will need to take account of all the dEIS submissions as well as feedback from the Coordinator-General. Where we have not provided the level of detail people need, we will address in what is likely to be a second round of public exhibitions for the EISs. We are very eager to get the preferred proponent on board and then we will provide greater clarity regarding the final design.

Question from Michael Keene:

- Once the preferred proponent is selected, as part of their submission they have put forward innovation that may or may not have altered the alignment or design, will the EIS need to be recast and republished in order to reflect innovation or changes proposed?
- Tony Lubofsky – it will depend on which proponent is selected but yes, there will almost inevitably be elements that will need to be recast or updated. I should emphasise that those changes to the alignment are generally minor refinements, not massive changes. No one is going propose changes that are too radical. There will be a process where we will update the EIS and more than likely have another round of public exhibition.

Question from Gary Stark:

- If the Coordinator-General knocks the EIS on the head, what is 'plan b' and also, would you be looking at single deck rather than double deck using the existing line and infrastructure?
- Tony Lubofsky – it is unlikely that the Coordinator-General will knock the whole project on the head. We liaise very closely with the Office of the Coordinator-General and we know the main issues of concern to the Coordinator-General and we will make sure we address them the next time around.

Question from Gordon van der Est:

- In the Lockyer Valley we have recently just had medium level flood events, one of the key issues again was the pinch point at Warrego Highway and Forest Hill-Fernvale Road, could you please tell us what liaisons you are having with the Department of Transport and Main Roads to ensure when you increase the water flows in Forest Hill that that situation isn't exacerbated? Also, you implied there may be other route / alignment considerations, could you please share with us what they are?
- Tony Lubofsky – with regards the flooding issue, I can assure you we have done extensive modelling. The independent flood panel has looked at our modelling and generally supports it. Additionally, we have received data from the recent flood events so we can also take that into account in our modelling.

Question from Darryl Green:

- How long will the 11,800 odd jobs last for?
- Tony Lubofsky – we are anticipating the construction phase to be between four and five years. Job numbers will peak at different stages of construction and then decrease as construction concludes.

Question from Chair:

- What about job numbers post construction phase?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tony Lubofsky – across the Gowrie to Kagaru projects we anticipate approximately 60 jobs post construction. Approximately 40 of those will be in the Toowoomba and Lockyer Valley regions.
3	<p>Gowrie to Helidon Project Manager introduction – 5:40pm – Nawar Spear</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Career expands more than 20 years where I have acquired local and international program and project management skills and I have delivered large infrastructure programs and major construction projects for federal and state government agencies. • Joined the Gowrie to Helidon team earlier in the year and am very excited to be a part of a very important project. • Anticipate being able to discuss the key findings of the dEIS for G2H at the next CCC meeting. • Look forward to working with the committee in the future.
4	<p>Helidon to Calvert Project Manager introduction – 5:45pm – Robert Walker</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joined ARTC in 2016 and prior to this, I worked for Queensland Rail. When I first joined ARTC I commenced working on the C2K project before moving on to some of the projects in NSW. I was on those projects for about 3 years and have recently moved back to Queensland and have been on the H2C project for about a month now. • Looking forward to getting out on to the alignment and getting up to speed with all the issues, moving forward with the dEIS and engaging with the committee.
5	<p>Cultural Heritage – 5:50pm – Brodie Hartfiel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural Heritage management and Native Title are different but integral to each other. • Cultural Heritage management refers to the recognition, protection and conservation of Cultural Heritage sites, places, and items. • Native Title is the recognition and protection of Native Title rights and interests for the benefit of Traditional Owners across Australia. • Cultural Heritage (Aboriginal and non-Indigenous) is protected at the Commonwealth, state, and local level. • The pedestrian Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Surveys have been underway since mid-2016 and are ongoing. • Recently met with Yuggera Ugarapul to discuss and agree on findings and management provisions of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Surveys thus far. • Stone artefact scatters and isolated artefacts were the most common Aboriginal heritage sites that were identified during the surveys, followed by scarred trees. • The assessments identified a number of highly sensitive areas and site provinces where certain landscape features such as ridgelines that provide access between river catchments and alluvial flats with sandy deposits showed evidence of Aboriginal Cultural Heritage. • These sites, items and places will be managed under the measures set out in the approved Cultural Heritage Management Plan that Yuggera Ugarapul have with Inland Rail. • Some of these management activities will include avoidance, salvaging of surface artefact scatters and archaeological test-pitting to determine site extents and deposit depth. <p>Comment from Margaret McCarthy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very pleased with the information shared with everyone tonight and the work that has done to date. Thank you for sharing it with us all. <p>Question from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I understand there are only two tribes in South-East Queensland that have Native Title at this point in time (Yuggera Ugarapul have not had Native Title declared yet) and I am aware there have been some very significant artefacts identified, how does the <i>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act</i> protect the Cultural Heritage finds in this area?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brodie Hartfiel - the <i>Native Title Act</i> provides a mechanism to identify the Aboriginal parties and while Yuggera Ugarapul do not have a determined Native Title claim, they have passed the registration test which is a really fundamental and important part of that process. Yuggera Ugarapul have submitted their claim to the Native Title Tribunal and have provided enough information for the government body to say they have passed that registration test, making them the registered Native Title claimants for this area. This gives them legal standing under the <i>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act</i> as the only party that we can approach and deal with Cultural Heritage.
6	<p>Listening examples – 6:05pm – Corey Doran and Giano Terzic</p> <p>Corey Doran – two examples for H2C</p> <p>Airforce Road, Helidon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local council and Helidon community were concerned about public safety impacts of closing Airforce Road and diverting heavy traffic (including trucks carrying explosives) to / from the nearby Helidon Explosives Reserve, through the town • The Project team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ reassessed options and proposed a grade separated crossing at Airforce Road ○ proposal also involved diverting Seventeen Mile Road to Airforce Road ○ benefit for the community resulted in keeping heavy truck traffic, including explosives, away from town ○ additionally, public safety benefit that the grade separated road ensures trucks carrying explosives avoid interaction with the railway line. <p>Road / rail interface, Forest Hill</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest Hill community were concerned it may lose connectivity if the existing Hunt Street level crossing was closed and replaced by a road-over-rail bridge and additionally, eliminating passing traffic on the main street (Victoria Street) would reduce business patronage • The Project team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ investigated multiple options including a re-designed, safe level crossing at the end of Glenore Grove Road, and two road-over-rail bridge options (to the east and west of the town) ○ workshopped and collected community feedback on the three options ○ community feedback proposed that we close the existing level crossing to road traffic (remain open to pedestrians) and re-design a safe level crossing at the end of Glenore Grove Road ○ this option maintains passing traffic for businesses on Victoria Street. <p>Giano Terzic – two examples for G2H</p> <p>Toowoomba tunnel, western portal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The initial design of the Toowoomba tunnel western portal was susceptible to flooding impacts in a significant flooding event. Community also identified similar concerns • The Project team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ revisited the initial proposed alignment to comply with flood immunity requirements for the tunnel ○ investigated options for a new alignment for the tunnel while minimising the impacts on properties around the area ○ selected a new proposed alignment that did not impact any additional properties. <p>Road / rail interface, Gowrie Junction</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The initial design proposed the continuation of the existing level crossing at Gowrie Junction. The existing level crossing was acknowledged as unsafe for the community. • The Project team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ identified the existing Gowrie Junction Road level crossing will be replaced with a road-over-rail bridge ○ the new line will run parallel to the existing railway line with a crossing loop to manage train movements through the Toowoomba tunnel ○ the road-over-rail bridge will improve safety and connectivity by removing the danger of trains sharing a crossing with vehicles and other users. Road users will be able to move freely without having to wait at the railway crossing signals and boom gates. <p>Question from Gary Stark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the pedestrian walkway at the level crossing in Forest Hill going to be closed? • Corey Doran – the Reference Design describes that the pedestrian crossing will be preserved as it is, where it is. It will be upgraded to allow for the third track and it will be an active level crossing for pedestrians. It is only the vehicle level crossing that will be relocated to Glenore Grove Road.
7	<p>G2H dEIS update, summary of topics of concern – 6:15pm – Michael Price</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gowrie to Helidon public exhibition concluded on 25 October 2021. • The submissions are being processed by the OCG and input from advisory agencies is being compiled. Following this, the Coordinator-General will determine whether a request for additional information is required (highly likely). ARTC is awaiting formal request from the Coordinator-General which is expected in Quarter 2, 2022. • 60 submissions have been received by the OCG. The submissions were dominated by private submissions followed by State Government and Commonwealth agencies, then councils. • Early feedback from the OCG regarding the submissions focusses on these five topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Property value ○ Lifestyle and wellbeing ○ Noise and vibration ○ Construction haulage routes ○ Design changes. <p>H2C dEIS, summary of enquiries – Tessa Drayson</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helidon to Calvert public exhibition concluded 23 June 2021. • H2C is also waiting on the request for additional information from the OCG. • Reflecting back to the H2C dEIS exhibition, the Project team engaged with 174 stakeholders throughout the public notification period either via phone, email, Gatton office drop-ins, community events, CCC meetings and community information sessions. • Stakeholder groups consisted largely of local residents with an even distribution of state and local government representatives, community groups and local businesses. • Similar to G2H, the H2C project is still waiting for the OCG to provide a breakdown of the submissions however early advice is that 233 submissions were received by the OCG, and the submissions were predominantly private submissions. • The key issues raised included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Property values ○ Noise and vibration ○ Visual amenity (including noise barriers) ○ Air quality ○ Flooding concerns ○ Level crossings.

Question from Chair:

- Understand that the EIS that we recently responded to for all the projects is not the final EIS and that given the potential for the PPP to change some of the Reference Design issues, it will be highly likely that the community will be asked to make contributions again in public submissions. How will that be timed and what is the process for keeping the community informed?
- Michael Price – the timing is hard to determine at this current stage. We must wait for the formal Request for Information from the OCG and additionally, the proponent's bids. Hopefully the Request for Information and proponent announcement is close in timing so we can present that information to the CCC and the community at the same time and how we are moving forward. We are anticipating this information Quarter 2, 2022.
- Once we have addressed the deficiencies in the dEIS and the proponent's bids, the dEIS will go back out to the community for another round of public exhibition.

Comment from Gordon van der Est:

- Disappointed with the content of the tonight's CCC EIS presentation by ARTC, we are being presented with the same EIS information and process, yet again. With regards to the 5 key theme issues, rather than tell us the key theme points again, it would be really helpful to provide the committee with an overview of the considerations and the solutions that are being discussed to resolve the issues.
- Secondly, I understand ARTC is currently assessing proponents.....we were assured the whole way through this process that we raise matters that were missed and not included in the EIS that they would be put in the scope. It almost seems like the scope is moving forward and the EIS is still hanging back.
- Chair – I understand your frustration with the EIS process and you are not alone. The key issue is that ARTC has not received the response back from the OCG yet so they cannot give you that data at this current point in time. The question is more around when ARTC actually get that data, will they share it with us and tell us what they are working on to respond to the submissions.
- Michael Price – the Chair is correct, we cannot progress too far ahead of what the OCG is saying at the moment. The OCG are handling the process and the submissions and are currently moderating them. Once we have the Request for Information from the OCG, we will be able to share new information and advice how we are going to handle them.

7 Alignment and passenger rail – 6:30pm – Simon Warner

Alignment discussion

- The Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) has information on their website with regards to the alignment that ARTC was required to use for Gowrie to Helidon and Helidon to Calvert projects (IE the Gowrie to Grandchester rail corridor) which was decided by TMR in 2003.
- Please refer to the TMR's website for further information:
<https://www.tmr.qld.gov.au/projects/gowrie-to-grandchester-rail-corridor-study>
- For landowners who have raised issues with the alignment have either come to the region after 2003 or are asking ARTC to move the alignment, to which they do not have the powers to do so. ARTC has been told that the Gowrie to Grandchester rail corridor is the alignment that they must follow.
- ARTC has not been straight forward enough with that statement (that they have been given an alignment that they must work with) and rather than taking it on the chin, should have been informing stakeholders to take their matter up with the State Government.

Passenger rail discussion

- The Federal Government gave the State Government \$15 million to do a study on passenger rail between Brisbane and Toowoomba.
- Only \$2.5 million of that \$15 million has been spent to date.
- There is some information online as to where they are at with that process: (<https://www.tmr.qld.gov.au/projects/toowoomba-to-brisbane-passenger-rail-strategic-business-case>).
- There are billions of dollars being spent on this freight line and there needs to be coordination from both government parties to include a passenger rail at least in the design and preferably for it to be built at the same time.
- I implore the department to ensure the business case is pushed forward at a pace that will line up with the process of what ARTC are going through, particularly in relation to the PPP and the detailed design.
- Chris Matthews – I cannot talk about the business case but I can advise you that we have been working with TMR and the State Government in order to identify a space reservation as part of our design as part of potential future rail, whether that be passenger or otherwise. We have designed Inland Rail (the tunnels etc) in such a way that we do not preclude passenger services.
- Bec Abraham – I want to assure the committee and observers here tonight that the Federal Government is working very closely with ARTC to make sure this line will accommodate passenger rail, right down to the signalling that will be used for Inland Rail will be appropriate for faster passenger trains. With regards to where the business case is up to, there is a technical working group (which includes council representatives) who have been busy shortlisting proposals (from 20 down to 10, and finally down to four). Those four different proposals are all different and some incorporate some parts of Inland Rail and parts of the existing alignment. The line needs to go close to towns so people can utilise it, however you may not want the freight trains going through town - it is about seeing where we can utilise the existing rail alignment for passenger and then in other areas we can optimise speeds by using Inland Rail. So, for a passenger rail between Toowoomba and Brisbane it isn't necessarily going to use all of Inland rail, it will be a cross between existing alignments and the Inland Rail alignment. The working group is in the process of shortlisting the proposals right now and once they have a preferred proposal, that is when they will start engaging with the community in terms of whether they want more stops. Bearing in mind that the more stops you have, the slower the trip. These are conversations that we want to involve the community in.
- Chair – I appreciate the information you have provided the committee and observers, thank you very much.

9 General business – 6:45pm – Chair

- Next CCC meeting will be in the new year, potentially after we receive a response on the dEISs or the announcement of the proponent for the PPP.
- Two-year CCC membership concludes in March 2022 however, ARTC confirmed to extend that for another 12 months or until approval of the EIS. Committee members are to consider remaining on the committee or advise of their resignation if they do not wish to stay on longer term.
- Corey Doran – we will look to recruit a community representative from the Mount Kynoch or western part of the Gowrie to Helidon area in the new year.
- Ipswich City Council has requested to be acknowledged as part of the Lockyer Valley CCC. They have two areas that fall within this committee – Calvert and Grandchester. The committee agree to consider next year.

Question from observer:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With regards to the closure of Gatton level crossing, how do people on the northern side of Gatton access town? Many Gatton residents are unsure how to access town post the closure. Corey Doran – in arriving at the closure of the Gatton level crossing (Gaul Street) to vehicles due to safety concerns, we have assessed how people will use the local road network. ARTC will look to upgrade and duplicate the Eastern Drive bridge and reengineer the underpass at Smithfield Road for trucks to offset the Gaul Street level crossing. We will maintain the pedestrian level crossing at Gaul Street. <p>Question from observer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a feasibility study underway for a route to Gladstone? Bec Abraham – the department has looked at Gladstone previously and did a prefeasibility study a few years ago. They looked at a coastal route from Brisbane to Gladstone and also an inland route that goes out following the West Moreton line, heads north at Miles through Wandoan and joins at up to an existing route at Moura. The new study that Barnaby Joyce recently mentioned only looks at the inland route. I want to make this point very clear – Gladstone is an “and”, not an “or”. It is Brisbane and Gladstone. The business case for Inland Rail is mostly domestically inter-capital freight that must go to Brisbane. Gladstone is an addition to the Brisbane option. Looking at Gladstone doesn’t mean we won’t be building the line to Brisbane.
10	Meeting close: 6:55pm

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE

Next meeting

To be determined in early 2022.