

MEETING MINUTES

Scenic Rim Community Consultative Committee

DATE / TIME14 January 2021
5:30pm – 9:00pm**LOCATION**

Peak Crossing Community Hall

MINUTE TAKER

Amanda Quayle

ATTENDEES (SHOW ORGANISATION IF NOT ARTC)

Ms Kathy Baburin - Chair	▶ SRCCC
Mr Simon Birrell	▶ SRCCC
Mr Dennis Dwyer	▶ SRCCC
Ms Angela Collyer	▶ SRCCC
Mr Robert Collett	▶ SRCCC
Ms Jan McGregor	▶ SRCCC
Mr Mike Townsend	▶ SRCCC
Ms Rosemaree Thomasson	▶ SRCCC
Ms Alison Duke-Gibb	▶ SRCCC
Ms Robyn Keenan	▶ SRCCC
Mr Bruce Trevena	▶ SRCCC

Apologies

Ms Narrella Simpson	▶ SRCCC
Mr Adrian Stephan	▶ SRCCC
Mr Phillip Bell	▶ SRCCC

ARTC INLAND RAIL

Ms Sarah Delahunty	▶ ARTC Inland Rail
Mr Chris Matthews	▶ ARTC Inland Rail
Mr Shane Harris	▶ ARTC Inland Rail
Ms Amanda Quayle	▶ ARTC Inland Rail
Ms Belinda Scott-Toms	▶ ARTC Inland Rail
Mr Rhys Carey	▶ ARTC Inland Rail
Mr Adam Marks	▶ ARTC Inland Rail
Mr Matvey Klopov	▶ ARTC Inland Rail
Mr Rich Pidgeon	▶ FFJV
Ms Trinity Graham	▶ FFJV
Dr Chris Schell	▶ FFJV

DISCUSSIONS

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
1	<p>Introduction and Acknowledgement of Country.</p> <p>KB requested everyone adhere to COVID19 distancing measures. Hand sanitizer is available throughout the room.</p> <p>KB stated that the meeting's purpose was to discuss the Calvert to Kagaru (C2K) draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Summary of Findings (SoF) released by the Office of the Coordinator-General (OCG).</p> <p>KB stated that the meeting may go overtime due to the amount of content. Those able to stay longer are welcome to.</p> <p>KB reminded committee members of the SRCCC Charter that they have agreed to abide to.</p> <p>The C2K draft EIS is open to public consultation until 8 March 2021.</p> <p>Inland Rail will hold further Community Information sessions on the C2K Draft EIS at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Purga, Saturday 16 January 2021, 9am – 12pm at Purga Community Hall ○ Rosewood, Thursday 28 January 2021, 4pm – 7pm at Rosewood Uniting Church Hall ○ Beaudesert, Saturday 6 February 2021, 9am – 12pm at the Centre Beaudesert ○ Ipswich, Thursday 11 February 2021, 4pm – 7pm at the North Ipswich Reserve Corporate Centre <p>A meeting has been scheduled between the SR CCC and the OCG to learn how to make a submission.</p>
2	<p>Conflict of interest</p> <p>No conflicts raised in the meeting.</p>
3	<p>Meeting Overview – Chris Mathews (CM)</p> <p>CM introduced the C2K draft EIS and provided an overview of the Summary of Findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link to C2K draft EIS: www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/coordinator-general/assessments-and-approvals/coordinated-projects/current-projects/inland-rail-calvert-to-kagaru • Link to C2K draft EIS Summary of Findings: https://inlandrail.artc.com.au/calvert-to-kagaru-eis-summary-of-findings/
4	<p>Environmental Impact Statement Overview – Rich Pidgeon (RP)</p> <p>RP provided an overview of the C2K draft EIS.</p> <p>The blue box to the right of each PowerPoint slide provides the corresponding C2K draft EIS Chapter for further information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alison Duke-Gibb (AD-G) requested a PDF version of the PowerPoint slides be provided to the CCC members. Amanda Quayle (AQ) responded that she will send the pdf to all members. • Landscape and Visual – AD-G asked whether Before and After images of the landscape are available on the Inland Rail Website. Amanda Quayle (AQ) Responded yes, before and after images are available on the C2K page of the Inland Rail Website. AQ will send AD-G the link. • AD-G asked what the criteria was for visual impact to be deemed low. RP responded that this is available in the technical report at Appendix I of the draft EIS. • Simon Birrell (SB) asked whether images were available of the visual impact for people driving to Boonah or towards Ipswich and looking across to the range. RP responded that this area was part of the assessment and there are 12 before and after images within the EIS. If there is not one for that viewpoint, RP can source this.

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dennis Dwyer (DD) (26:30) stated that there is a viewpoint within the draft EIS from the Flinders Peak Winery looking across Dwyers Road and asked how landscaping will be done along this corridor. RP responded that the landscape management plan will be further developed as part of the detailed design. • AD-G asked how the community can have input to visual amenity for the detailed design. RP responded that the community could comment within the current consultation process with the OCG. This feedback will then be passed on to the detailed design phase via the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) which will have the landscape and visual amenity conditions for mitigation measures that Inland Rail must implement. • AD-G asked whether there was a guarantee that visual amenity will be mitigated as per public consultation. RP responded no, the existing landscape will be kept as much as possible however there were considerations such as ongoing management of the landscape, the viability of growing trees in particular areas, the suitability of the soil and rainfall. <p>Link to Before and After landscape images: https://inlandrail.artc.com.au/where-we-go/projects/calvert-to-kagaru/works-and-planning/</p>
5	<p>Flora and Fauna – Dr Chris Schell (CS) CS provided an overview of Flora and Fauna within the C2K draft EIS. Flora and Fauna can be found at Chapter 11 of the EIS, with detailed investigations available within Appendix J for the terrestrial ecology and Appendix K for the matters of national environmental significance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jan McGregor (JM) asked which species were covered under ‘Essential Habitat’. CS responded that Essential Habitat mapping is non defined and encompasses several flora and fauna species. • JM asked if the location where the proposed train line crosses into the Queensland State Government Koala habitat mapping would be defined as a ‘Essential Habitat’. CS responded that there would be overlapping and will be covered under the essential habitat as regulated under the <i>Vegetation Management Act 1999</i>. • JM asked how kangaroos are classed and will they be protected. CS responded that all native species within Queensland are protected under the <i>Nature Conservation Act 1992</i>, however kangaroos are listed as least concerned species under this Act. Least concerned species were assessed as part of the EIS investigations in accordance with the ToR. • JM stated there were weed management control concerns on acquired land and held further weed management concerns if there were more delays to the rail line being built. CS responded that there were legal obligations for the property owner, under the <i>Biosecurity Act 2015</i>. Inland Rail will work within those legal requirements. KB further clarified that the community can refer to weed control on land already acquired by making a submission to the OCG. KB said DTMR had been contacted and invited to previous CCC Meetings with regards to this issue. • JM asked whether there were offsets work to protect threatened species. CS responded that offsets are a last resort mitigation measure that are governed by State and Federal Government regulators. Measures will be undertaken to protect biodiversity and natural habitat as much as possible before offsets will be considered. The offsets required for the C2K section of Inland Rail will be considered as part of the detailed design. • AD-G asked who determines what offset measures will be considered. CS responded that potential impacts are contained within the draft EIS. There are offset mechanisms at both a State and Federal level which have specific requirements, e.g. at a Federal level, offsets must be 90% direct, state-based offsets are more diverse in their delivery options.
5	<p>Offsets - Adam Marks AM provided an overview of Offsets contained within the C2K draft EIS. Offsets can be located at Appendix J of the C2K draft EIS technical report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DD asked for clarification of an offset. AM responded with an example - if Inland Rail impacts on one hectare of koala habitat, Inland Rail needs to compensate for that impact.

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>IR will work at a 1:4 ratio, which is accepted under State regulations, e.g. for one hectare of impact will result in four hectares of offset.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DD asked whether private land will be bought to create the offsets. AM responded that offsets strategy will be delivered from a combination of State and privately-owned land to achieve a strategic conservation outcome. • AD-G asked whether the 19 land-based offset properties were identified within the draft EIS. DD responded that 19 land-based lot and plan descriptions of the properties have been provided to the State Government, however those details are not identified in the draft EIS. • JM asked if the offset strategy for other projects along the alignment will be used in the C2K project and how many offsets were proposed for C2K only. AM responded the strategy behind the location of the offsets will be individual project based. The offset strategies do not exist yet as this is a feasibility study. No agreements have been made with landowners to finalise offsets. • RT asked about the time lag between offsets being viable. JM responded that offsets will be built in as soon as possible, e.g. offset areas have already been located. A ratio is applied which compensates for the time lag and habitat restoration and creation in accordance with State and Federal guidelines. The offsets must be delivered, and management undertaken, prior to construction commencement. • RT asked whether properties will be compulsory acquired for the offsets. JM responded that there will be no properties under compulsory acquisition. All land will be done voluntary under negotiations. There will be no forced acquisition for the purpose of offsets. • RT asked for clarity on plans to purchase part property, and how does the ban on subdividing land below a certain land area fit with Inland Rail's strategy. JM responded that the impact on the future planning of certain land parcels may have some impact if it reduces the land down to a certain threshold that allows for subdivisions. The instruments Inland Rail will be using will be statutory binding instruments, under both State and Federal legislation.
6	<p>Air Quality – Rich Pidgeon (RP) RP provided an overview of the Air Quality section of the C2K draft EIS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JM asked for clarity on whether, during construction, materials extracted from the Purga Quarry would create dust. RP clarified that when the Quarry is operating, Inland Rail will undertake to understand what level of dust the Quarry is creating to understand the mitigation strategy for Inland Rail's dust disturbance in the area.
7	<p>Surface Water and Flooding – Rich Pidgeon (RP) and Trinity Graham (TG)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB asked why the Logan City Council model used to monitor the water in Teviot Brook as it is only in Logan for a few hundred metres with the remainder in Scenic Rim. RP said that there was a lack of available data and therefore this used. • SB asked if the Tunnel being designed so that the water drains to the West. RP responded with yes. The eastern side of the tunnel will be designed to prevent water flow into the tunnel. • DD asked whether the dry dam on Warrill Creek was under consideration as part of the draft EIS. TG responded that the dam is not being considered as part of the C2K Project. The Dam is mentioned in the EIS because it has been considered by an outside party and therefore investigated as part of the EIS but is not included as part of the Inland Rail design. • RK asked why the data used in the EIS modelling is only up to 2013 and does not include the 2017 flood events. TG responded that the Teviot Brook model was taken from work undertaken by Scenic Rim Regional Council and was already calibrated to three historical flood events. It is unlikely that adding the 2017 data would change the performance of the modelling.
8	<p>Ground Water – Rich Pidgeon (RP)</p>

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DD asked what the process is if a landowner thinks a borehole on their property is not represented in the EIS. RP responded that landowners could contact ARTC Inland Rail to state they want the bore monitored for depth and water quality. • SB asked whether the acid rock issues were for the volcanics only, or is it more widespread, e.g. is the tunnel affected. RP will take this question on notice. There is also an appendix with geotechnical advice within the C2K draft EIS. • RK mentioned that the C2K draft EIS states that there is the potential for significant change to ground water flow as a result of cuttings etc. RP responded that there is the potential for change to ground water flow. There is also a requirement that additional studies be undertaken and continue. If there are significant issues with loss of water from a bore, then we need the make plans to mitigate that.
9	<p>Noise and vibration – Shane Harris (SH)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JM asked what the normal hours for night construction were. SH responded 10pm to 7am. Those times will change on the weekend. • DD asked if relocation was an option for heavily impacted landowners during construction. SH responded that he has seen it in the past, it hasn't been identified in this EIS as we are not clear on how the construction will take place. Relocation options would be looked at on a case by case basis. • AD-G asked where noise levels per distance from the train line could be found in the draft EIS. SH responded the technical. • JM asked whether the entire alignment would be exposed to construction for four years, or certain sections at different timeframes. SH explained that works would not be consistent over the four years, the works will be transient, for example a work crew may do capping which will be followed by track works, which will be followed by the next work etc. These works will be communicated to residents during the construction phase as a notice period prior to commencing with details of timeframes. • SB said there would be simultaneous impacts over four years. Blasting would impact a lot of residents. SH said there are specific requirements for blasting and for having the correct management practices in place. There will be a certain distance from the blast that will be focussed on during construction to ensure limited impact to residents. • SB asked if the sound from blasting would be heard from several kilometres away. SH said its hard to • DD asked if the proposed C2K alignment could be changed during the construction phase. SH responded that minor changes may occur within the alignment footprint. If it is a significant change, an approval and assessment process will be undertaken. • JM asked whether train horns were considered at passing loops. SH responded that the draft EIS did not include horns in the noise investigations of passing loops. This can be investigated at a later stage. • DD asked if 60 houses will be removed for noise? SH said no, not for noise. There will be 60 houses where we need to have further conversations with them about noise impacts. You may have read about 60 houses for land acquisition. • JM said in 1.2.3 railway operations, it says it is forecast that train movements would be an average of 42 per day in 2026 and an average of 51 trains per day in 2040. SH said that is the basis of the noise modelling. JM said why does it say 33 trains. SH said this is based on breakdown of trains, could be container trains, coal trains, livestock trains and how planning works is that it looks at big numbers over a year. We divide that into trains per day. Instead of looking at a part train with a decimal point, such as 1.1 train in an hour, we round it up, to get worst case scenario, we want maximum amount of noise. • JM said if your house is not showing up on the maps and you cannot find your receptors in the draft EIS, contact ARTC directly and ask for your noise results. That there are noise figures up to 2 kilometres either side of the rail line. SH said yes that's correct. • DD sought clarification regarding train movements and sound variation. SH responded that noise depends on the gradient, type of motor, length and speed of train.

NO.	DISCUSSIONS		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SH said we built things into the design to minimise noise and make it as flat as possible, limit curve squeal, track lubricators, looked at horn options for the crossings. Mitigations for this project is at property façade. This is a case by case basis. Upgrade fencing, windows, ventilation etc. How big the building is, orientation, where the bedrooms may be, all of this is taken into consideration. RK asked where Inland Rail measures rail noise? SH said 1m from the external wall. JM stated that in the Southern Freight Rail Corridor, there were houses included in noise mitigations and she cannot see these in the draft EIS. SH responded that for the purposes of the EIS, the contour lines are for daytime/night-time/maximum, and any further mitigations can be built into the final document and planned with individual landowners as case by case. SH said works continue – its ongoing, getting a handle on number of triggers. DD asked where experience 18 decibels of railway noise could be experienced as an example. SH responded Inland Rail is looking into designing example simulations. 		
10	<p>Social Economic – Rich Pidgeon (RP)</p> <p>RP provided an overview of the Social Economic, Cultural Heritage, Traffic and Transport, Hazards and Risk and Waste and Resource Management and culminative impact sections of the C2K draft EIS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SB asked whether the social impact management plan was complete. RP will take on notice. RK says that data is from ABS, but they won't keep data on communities less than 200 people and therefore Kagaru and Allenview were not considered. RP will take on notice on smaller communities were considered. 		
11	<p>Observer questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An observer asked why there are so many level crossings in the C2K alignment. RP this question will be taken on notice. An observer asked roughly how many properties have been impacted by the alignment, why it wasn't touched on more in this meeting. RP explained the draft EIS does look at impact to properties. AQ clarified that directly impacted property owners have been notified individually. An observer asked if the noise from two 1.8km trains crossing at the same time been accounted for. SH said it's a single track, loops have been included in the noise modelling. An observer asked how the rail could be accessed for maintenance. RP responded there will be an access road. At bridges there will be a turnaround so all sections can be accessed by an access road. 		
12	<p>General business</p> <p>This is not the only opportunity to gain information on the EIS. Contact the C2K project team at anytime by phone or email to ask questions.</p> <p>Put a submission in to the OCG if there are any concerns with any aspect of the C2K Project and the draft EIS.</p>		
No.	Conclusion and confirmation of actions	Action by	Due date
1	A PDF of the presentation will be sent to SRCCC members	IR	18 Feb
2	A link of the before and after visualisations to be sent to CCC members	IR	18 Feb
3	Response on why Logan City Council data was used for the Teviot Brook	IR	18 Feb
4	Information on volcanic soils and whether it affects the tunnel	IR	18 Feb
5	Why have level crossings been introduced?	IR	18 Feb

NO.	DISCUSSIONS		
6	Shane to speak with Jan and Alison to clarify the differences in the number of train movements within the Noise and Vibration section of the draft EIS.	IR	18 Feb
7	Community members are requested to contact ARTC if there are any stock movements that will be affected by the proposed alignment.	ALL	Ongoing
8	Landowners to contact ARTC of any boreholes on property that are not listed in the EIS.	ALL	Ongoing
9	Has the Social impact management plan been completed?	IR	18 Feb
10	Members of the CCC to contact AQ if more Community Consultation Sessions are wanted.	CCC	ASAP
11	Possible webinar of the EIS topics	IR	18 Feb

Next Meeting

The next SRCCC meeting is to be confirmed.