

Meeting minutes

Inner Darling Downs and Southern Darling Downs Consultative Committee Meeting

Special meeting with the independent panel of experts for flood studies in Queensland

Date / Time

18 November 2021
6.00pm to 8pm

Location

Millmerran Cultural Centre
45 Walpole Street, Millmerran

Facilitators

Graham Clapham, Southern
Darling Downs CCC (GC)
Bill Armagnacq, Inner Darling
Downs CCC (BA)

Minute taker

Katie Unipan – (ARTC Inland
Rail) (KU)

Distribution

All

Attendees (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Gary Garland, Individual (GG)
- ▶ Ken Murphy, Individual (KM)
- ▶ Brett Kelly, Central Downs Irrigators Ltd (BK)
- ▶ Vicki Battaglia, Individual (VB)
- ▶ Paul Hanlon, Individual (PH)
- ▶ Maria Oliver, Individual (MO) online
- ▶ Kev Loveday (KL)
- ▶ Rob Loch, Pittsworth District Landcare Association (RL)
- ▶

Apologies (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Garth Hamilton MP, Member for Groom
- ▶ Todd Rohl, Toowoomba Chamber of Commerce
- ▶ Kylie Schultz, Individual
- ▶ Paul McDonald, Southern Queensland Landscapes
- ▶ Chris Joseph, Individual
- ▶ Robert Earixson, Gowrie Junction Progress Association
- ▶ Larry Pappin, Inner Downs Inland Rail Action Group
- ▶ Jeffrey Chandler, Individual
- ▶ Georgina Krieg, Individual
- ▶ Norm Chapman, Individual
- ▶ Lance MacManus, TSBE
- ▶ Clinton Weber, Individual
- ▶ Thomas Draper, Indigenous representative
- ▶ Phoebe Mitchell, Individual
- ▶ Robert Barrett, Individual
- ▶ Rick McDougall, Inglewood Community Advisory Network; MacIntyre Brook Irrigators Association
- ▶ Andrew McCarney, Southern Queensland Landscapes
- ▶ Justin Saunders, Bigambul Native Title Aboriginal Corporation
- ▶ Rosalie Millar, Individual
- ▶ Robert Webb, Goondiwindi Chamber of Commerce

Guests (Show organisation if not ARTC)

MEETING MINUTES

Inner Darling Downs and Southern Darling Downs Consultative Committee Meeting

- ▶ Martin Giles, Senior Principal BMT, Independent International Panel of Experts for Flood Studies (MG)
- ▶ Tina O'Connell, Independent International Panel of Experts for Flood Studies (TO)
- ▶ Steve Clark, Managing Director, Water Technologies, Independent International Panel of Experts for Flood Studies (SC)
- ▶ Craig Sleeman, Toowoomba Regional Council
- ▶ Trevor Mitchell, Toowoomba Regional Council
- ▶ Bec Abraham, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications
- ▶ Drue Edwards, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications (virtual)

ARTC

- ▶ Sarah Delahunty (Manager Stakeholder Engagement QLD) (SD)
- ▶ Katie Unipan, Stakeholder Engagement Lead Northern (KU)
- ▶ Belinda Scott-Toms, Stakeholder Engagement Advisor Northern (BST)
- ▶ Phoebe Moore, (PM) (online)
- ▶ Michael Price (MP) online
- ▶ Rob Smith (RS) online

Members of the public

A number of members of the public were in attendance

Discussions

NO.	ACTIONS
1	<p>Welcome, introductions and conflicts of interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ BA delivered an acknowledgement of Traditional Owners.▶ GC welcomed the committees.▶ GC noted observers both those in the room and those online.▶ GC noted that anyone asking questions should wait till a microphone is handed to them and mention their name.▶ GC noted the meeting was recorded for meeting minute purposes.▶ GC noted the conflicts of interest register and committee to inform Chair of any changes or updates. <p>No changes were advised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ GC welcomed Members of the International Panel of Experts for Flood Studies (the Independent Panel).▶ GC informed meeting attendees that an hour had been allocated for the Flood Panel's presentation and attendees will have the opportunity to ask questions at the end of the presentation (both by committee members and members of the public). <p>GC handed meeting proceedings to the Flood Panel</p>
2	<p>Independent International Panel of Experts for Flood Studies presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ MG introduced the Independent Panel attending the meeting as himself, OG and SC. Two further Independent Panel members, Mark Babister and Ferdinand Diermanse, were unable to attend today's field visit and this evening's meeting due to Covid-19 travel restrictions.▶ MG provided the weblink to the independent panel's draft report: tmr.qld.gov.au/projects/inland-rail/independent-panel-of-experts-for-flood-studies-in-queensland▶ MG provided a recap on the independent panel:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ In June 2020, the Australian and Queensland Governments established the independent panel under a Terms of Reference, to complete an independent assessment of the flood

models completed for the ARTC Inland Rail Border to Gowrie (B2G) draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). This differs to the EIS Terms of Reference.

- ▶ In Queensland there are 21 flood models.
- ▶ Although ARTC's flood models had been well constructed, there were some concerns identified in relation to the modelling approach and how hydrology (the conversion of rainfall to run off) and hydraulics (calculate flood levels and flows) was addressed.
- ▶ For each of the 13 catchments, the independent panel had produced a list of issues for further consideration. These issues are categorised from high to low level issues in the draft report.
- ▶ ARTC had reviewed all issues raised in the draft report and are in the process of responding to them. The independent panel's role is to assess each of ARTC's responses for adequacy.
- ▶ A final report will be produced to document the final resolutions and any ongoing issues that need to be analysed, monitored and resolved.
- ▶ The final flood panel report will state whether the independent panel agree the model is fit for purpose for use in B2G's Detail Design and to provide recommendations for improvements.
- ▶ ARTC and the independent panel agree they are to adopt modified Flood Impact Objectives. These objectives will be part of the final flood panel report – with guidance from the independent panel on how to address the objectives.
- ▶ ARTC is undertaking a geomorphologic assessment, to complete more desktop analysis and to look at further during B2G's Detailed Design.
- ▶ Any feedback throughout this process can be provided directly to the independent flood panel via a submission available on the website link provided above.

Questions from the committee

- ▶ RL asked for clarity on when the final report will be released.
 - ▶ MG replied that it as it is an iterative process, an exact timeframe for producing a final report is unable to be predicted. However, depending on the amount of clarification required between the independent flood panel and ARTC, the report will likely be released in a couple of months' time.
- ▶ RL asked when the independent panel speaks about quantitative change, are they taking into consideration that the system is already stressed with cumulative impacts, that even a minor change can push it in to an unstable state.
 - ▶ SC responded that there are two aspects to the answer:
 - ▶ 1. The work completed to date has been done to a set of flood impact objectives which have criteria such as depth increase, level increase, impact on velocity, increase on flow paths etc. Part of the independent panel's work has been to recommend quantitative limits around characterising those things that have not been quantified to date.
 - ▶ 2. There will be a risk management approach to areas already stressed.
- ▶ RL said several of the flood plains are stressed and have cumulative impacts on their stability due to developing agricultural areas. When looking at risk management and scour risk, has there been thought of looking at dedicated onsite measured critical flow and shear stress for scour to happen.
 - ▶ SC responded that the independent panel has recommended a geomorphological assessment conducted for potentially exposed areas that are fragile.
- ▶ RL asked how the two-flow modelling influences culvert design and impacts, specifically, is it being run with a grid cell small enough to genuinely pick up velocity profiles through a culvert.
 - ▶ SC said the proposal is currently in concept design phase. The culverts being considered have one dimensional elements. Moderate to large scale structures are at a resolution large

enough to identify areas of concern. More investigations will be undertaken as the project moves into detailed design and the panel's comments have been provided to ARTC.

- ▶ RL commented that the committee were hoping modelling would be prescribed at this stage.
- ▶ KL asked the independent panel to describe the term 'geomorphologic assessment.'
 - ▶ SC said for the purposes of this meeting, this term refers to the adjustment of creeks/ floodplains flow. That may be in channel (widening of channels) or works that may introduce erosion/ scouring in floodplains.
- ▶ KL clarified with the independent panel that the draft report had been published. KL further asked if the information collected in the recent floodplain tour means a total review of the published report or the preliminary findings.
 - ▶ TO responded that the draft report reviewed ARTC flood models. With the added data, the independent panel will verify that the calibrated data in the draft report is accurate.
- ▶ KL asked if the independent panel found any variations during today's field visits.
 - ▶ TO responded that what has been physically shown by landholders today has put the model in perspective. Eg. how high the flood waters go – and this will be taken into consideration when reviewing the data in the draft report to ensure previous findings are valid.
 - ▶ MB further responded that in the initial review there were several issues identified in the calibration of the model and the agreement of the flood models to the recorded models. As a result, ARTC is in the process of reviewing its data; today it was good to reinforce this data with what the independent flood panel observed from being in the field.
- ▶ KL said the initial report covered 12 catchments; however, the independent panel is reviewing 13 catchments and there is a subsequent report covering the McIntyre River. Where is this report located?
 - ▶ TO responded that all five reports are available on the on the flood panel review website (previously provided in Minutes).
- ▶ VB asked if there was anything further in the PowerPoint presentation which talks to the independent panel's issues and ARTC's resolutions to those issues.
 - ▶ MB responded that as this is a work in progress, it was not included in the PowerPoint presentation.
- ▶ VB asked for clarification on whether, when the final report is available, it will be for public comment or for ARTC response.
 - ▶ MB responded the final report will be provided, for consideration and review, to both the Federal and State Governments before it becomes a public document.
- ▶ VB asked whether the updated flooding information provided by the Toowoomba Regional Council (TRC) and requests provided by community members will be added to the draft report, such as the infrastructure at Wellcamp Airport, that the independent flood panel is currently assessing.
 - ▶ TO said ARTC will need to consider this when they are in the project's design phase. This can also be a Panel recommendation.
- ▶ VB asked if there had been any additional information found that will be included in the final report.
 - ▶ TO responded that the final report will discuss the draft report submissions, draft EIS submissions and submissions provided to the independent panel. It will also cover all interactions and discussions that the independent panel has had with ARTC post review and will draw conclusions and recommendations.

- ▶ RL asked if the community can still make a submission to the independent panel, and if so, when do submissions close.
 - ▶ TO responded that submissions will be accepted until the draft report is made final. Although there is no time limit at present, the community is encouraged to put in a submission asap, to ensure feedback is captured in the final report.
- ▶ KL asked for a definition of 'baseline numbers' and how this affects the report's calculations.
 - ▶ MB said that the definition can depend on the context. The most common definition in terms of flood modelling is when you model the existing case without Inland Rail impacts, and these flows and velocities would be the baseline. Then you add the railway, and its associated drainage works and compare this to the base case, and this shows the impact.
- ▶ KL asked if there are changes in the alignment, will the flood report be updated simultaneously.
 - ▶ MB responded that there will be changes between now and Inland Rail B2G's Detailed Design. It will evolve over time and there will be a flood model that will be vetted and approved with parameters. If something changes, it will need to be reflected in the model.
- ▶ KL asked if this is reflected in the Terms of Reference.
 - ▶ MB responded it is not in the Terms of the Reference, however the model would become the reference to use during the Detailed Design project phase.
- ▶ BK asked if there was significant rail design alteration that will have a negative impact on a landholder, what guarantee have they got that this will be correctly addressed, if it is not in the Terms of Reference.
 - ▶ TO responded that ARTC will be required to address this, however this is an overarching process of the Coordinator General (CG) who will put conditions on the EIS approval, and those conditions are to be met by ARTC. The final report will have recommendations from the independent panel to the CG via the EIS and for the Detailed Design.
- ▶ KL asked if the section with recommendations were in the draft flood independent panel report as the committee would like to comment on the recommendations.
 - ▶ TO responded that no, the section with the independent panel's recommendations will only be in the final report. The draft report includes the technical aspects of the model and the issues identified by the independent panel.
 - ▶ TO noted KL's comment and will write to the Federal and State Governments that the community would like to make comment on the Final Report's recommendations.
- ▶ KL asked if there a formal process where the independent panel will be advising the CG or is the independent flood panel's role only to advise government.
 - ▶ TO replied that the independent panel role is to provide their advice to the Federal and State Governments only.
- ▶ VB asked if there is a recommendation in the Report that states significant infrastructure changes that would impact flooding, and if these changes will be available for public comment.
 - ▶ TO responded that the recommendation will be that the model and outcomes of the model need to be kept up to date with the current alignment design. Further, the Contractor will be required to ensure that they still meet the flood impact objectives at every step of the project.
- ▶ KL said Doug Hall Poultry Business is genuinely concerned about the impact of flooding from a combination of local creeks and back up water from the river. KL asked if the independent panel visited the business today and if they have a better understanding of their impacts.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ MB said the independent panel met with the business today. It was beneficial for the independent panel to see potential impacts firsthand and reinforced the data in the report. ▶ KL asked, with the added information the independent panel collected today, is there a consideration that there is an even bigger risk than initially reported. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ MB said as the report is still a work in progress, today really helped to verify the initial data. ▶ TO also confirmed that today put the business at 'front of mind' which will assist with the final report and negotiating changes to the model in that area. ▶ SC added that meeting the business owners and hearing their stories, such as the use of sandbagging etc has helped the independent panel better understand the waterflow impacts and appreciates the time spent with the independent panel today. ▶ KL asked if the impact objectives are listed in the draft report and whether the public can view these. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ TO said that ARTC's B2G draft EIS lists their design and flood objectives which have not been updated since the flood panel report. Negotiations are underway between ARTC and the Flood Panel for ARTC to provide updated tables with the requested information. These are not for public consumption at present. ▶ A member of the public asked who is responsible for updating the models. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ MB said that after the independent panel's review and recommendations, ARTC contractors will be responsible for updating the models (after CG approval). ▶ A member of the public asked if the independent panel would make any further updates after the report is final. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ MB said the independent panel's responsibility ends after the final report is submitted and the Federal and State Governments are satisfied with it. However, if ARTC raise an issue in the report, the independent panel will respond to this prior to delivering the final report. ▶ GC asked the Committee if there were any further comments for the independent panel. ▶ No further questions were asked. ▶ GC thanked the independent flood panel for taking the time to speak to the CCC members and community. ▶ MB thanked the Chairs and committee for the opportunity to present and the community for taking the time to speak with them throughout the day.
<p>3</p>	<p>Project update Sarah Delahunty, Qld Stakeholder Engagement Manager Rob Smith, B2G Senior Project Manager (online) Jane Roberts, Qld and Central Social Performance Manager (online)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SD said one-on-one landholder meetings with TMR, the project and directly impacted landowners were continuing throughout the B2G Northern area. Currently the Team is working on the final package from Whetstone to Inglewood and closing out any landowners unable to make earlier meetings. ▶ SD commented that although the conversations are at times difficult, the one-on-one landholder meetings were being well received and feedback from landowners had been positive toward receiving the steps of the land acquisition process. ▶ SD said soil surveys would be ongoing with final investigations scheduled for completion in December 2021, weather dependent. ▶ SD said the Terms of Reference for the EIS state that Inland Rail need to complete access requests for field investigations every 200m. At present, the Team are closing out any gaps in information in the draft EIS where ARTC did not previously have land access granted, which has been challenging. This work has been requested by the CG to complete the EIS.

- ▶ SD commented that preferably access to land is a voluntary agreement between the landholder and ARTC, however in some instances this is not possible. The Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) has issued statutory notices to allow ARTC to investigate land for potential rail corridor, which is not ARTC's preference but necessary to complete CG requirements for the EIS.
- ▶ SD announced Katie Unipan as the Stakeholder Engagement Lead and Belinda Scott-Toms as the Stakeholder Engagement Advisor for the B2G (Northern) Team.
- ▶ SD commented that Naomi Tonscheck had moved to the Central Project Team as the Stakeholder Engagement Manager.

Questions from the committee:

- ▶ KL commented on the site investigation access requested by the CG, such as Geotech and ecology. Some landholders were receiving persistent phone calls requesting access and landholders have denied access. KL reported landholders are under stress due to the current land access process and feel threatened and intimidated by the invasive S109a process. KL asked why intimidation was being used for forced entry, and why is ARTC in such a hurry to get the investigations completed.
 - ▶ SD Appreciated the question and said ARTC's preference is to have voluntary access. This assists ARTC to work with landholders to understand specific entry requests, or understand what is happening on property at the time of access, e.g. ARTC do not want to interrupt harvesting activities. ARTC has been receiving voluntary access and have completed studies; however, the Project is now at a point where it needs to complete information gaps. The CG has requested this. The Team want to work with the landholders on this, that is why we are phoning, texting, and emailing – to try our best to gain voluntary access. The window of opportunity to gain access to update the findings for the draft EIS is closing. Weekly separate meetings are occurring with TMR and the Office of the Coordinator General (OCG) to inform how the project is progressing with gaining access for field studies. This is occurring across the proposed Queensland alignment. The decision to make a S109a request is not taken lightly. Hearing from the committee that landholders are experiencing threats and intimidation is unfortunate, this is not the way we operate, and I would like to speak with those landholders directly to talk through the process.
- ▶ KL said that SD's response was reassuring and asked for clarification that a test is required every 200m
 - ▶ SD responded yes.
- ▶ KL feels that so many tests is incredible, as the land from Yarranlea to Gowrie is the same. There are also bore logs all over this country every metre – all this information is available from the Department of Resources. Why not consult with them and not force entry to landholders? Or why do you need to test within properties, rather than gaining access.
 - ▶ SD explained that each property will have different requirements that land access is needed to fill gaps in information. The information collected is not only from the properties, but also an accumulated investigation and not just soil samples. E.g., cultural heritage, flora and fauna and ecology.
- ▶ A community member commented that his property was one that had been given an S109a notice and that he had felt bullied and harassed by TMR officers. Re: cultural heritage access, He had allowed Inland Rail to see a Pioneer Grave site and is not against Inland Rail access. However, Inland Rail own the land next to the property and feels investigations could be undertaken there instead. He said TMR threatened court action. This would cost the landholder \$200,000 in the Supreme Court to query the bullying tactics. Thoroughbred horses worth 100s of thousands of dollars are on the property. He does not want Inland Rail coming onto the property unsupervised and considers the actions to gain access immoral.

- ▶ SD apologised that this has been an upsetting process for the landholder and offered to talk through the process to find a resolution outside of this meeting.
- ▶ SD continued, with a valid Land Access Agreement, access can be done under terms appropriate to each landholder's specific circumstances – such as under supervision, ensuring stock and horses are not impacted and we can have all that recorded on the land access agreement. An S109 allows a small window of opportunity to access the land. There is no court involved in this. We still must let landholders know dates and times.
- ▶ RS further noted that ARTC has worked hard to move all investigation sites into public land or state roads wherever possible and had relocated sites to properties outside of cropping areas to minimise landholder disturbances. ARTC has made a commitment to the CG to include one in ten thousand soils mapping for the updated EIS. This is in line with a specific standard that ARTC is undertaking soil sampling against. With regards to issuing S109s, Inland Rail does not condone bullying. Even with an S109, we still work with the landholder as much as we can to listen to their requirements. An S109 is actioned as a last resort and one that ARTC does not want to undertake. Any specific examples of inappropriate behaviours will be taken seriously, and appropriate action undertaken, that includes any ARTC staff, contractors or TMR representatives.
- ▶ KL asked if biosecurity would be considered, i.e., clean vehicles and workwear, while Inland Rail are gaining access to properties.
 - ▶ SD said that with voluntary access, biosecurity measures can be requested and ARTC contractors accessing properties must abide by those rules when accessing properties.
- ▶ KL commented that this should be mandatory, not requested.
 - ▶ SD said that each landholder has different requirements, that's why ARTC want to talk to each landholder and come to an agreement prior to access.
- ▶ VB said she had not met one landholder who is appreciative of land access. It is considered bullying. Her understanding is the Form S109a is not compliant with the legislation as it states the organisation must discuss compensation, make good, biosecurity issues and other things before the form is issued. A landholder informed her recently that they received the S109 in the mail without any previous discussions. There has been refusal by Inland Rail to attend meetings with the landholder's solicitors. This is not considered good social performance. These people are having their livelihoods destroyed by a train line that is bringing them no benefits.
 - ▶ SD said there are thousands of voluntary land access approvals, and the process is explained to each landholder. Inland Rail only have a small minority of S109s along the proposed alignment. The process of one-on-one landholder meetings that are occurring simultaneously are about the land acquisition process. We are not refusing meetings with landholders.
- ▶ VB said that is not true.
 - ▶ SD Where landholders are saying that they cannot meet until next year, we are trying to bring those meetings forward. We are not refusing to meet with landholders. We are trying our best to get the meetings sooner.
- ▶ BK said that if Inland Rail would like to know who has been intimidated, check the list of who received a S109 from TMR.
- ▶ KL has a copy of a S109 which has the signature of a director. KL's said his understanding is only the Minister had authority over S109.
 - ▶ SD replied the Director of TMR acts as the Minister's Delegate and has authority to sign for and action a S109.

- ▶ BK asked if the CG had given indication why she wants the investigations.
 - ▶ RS explained the reason for the soil tests was linked to geomorphology and that erosion is a sensitive and prominent issue along the alignment. To understand and address and minimise erosion, we are required to undertake intense soil sampling.
- ▶ A member of the community asked if the sampling is done every 200m, the total from the actual rail/ road reserve to the centre of where the rail is approx. 40m. If there is a test every 200m, what's 50m out of that. Why do you need to enter a property when you can get the same result from sampling on a road reserve.
 - ▶ RS reiterated that ARTC has tried to move the testing to the road reserves as best they can, while maintaining the required sampling resolution. Unfortunately, there are instances where ARTC has been unable to avoid accessing certain properties.
 - ▶ PM added that an adequate baseline assessment is essential to assess the impacts and mitigate appropriately for what the guidelines and regulators require. Effort is taken to gather and incorporate publicly available information and mapping, and where it is not available (within the one in 10,000 soil mapping samples) ARTC need to sample those areas. This allows ARTC to identify the higher risk soils and adjust the reference design for things like scour protection and ensures the design environmental impacts are managed appropriately and mitigated.
- ▶ RL enquired about how soil surveys are done across the eastern downs with a lot of rocky ridges. If somebody is doing a soil survey and they are winging down a hole every 200m they will end up with blunt augers.
 - ▶ PM responded that the ARTC sampling plan was designed in accordance with the guidelines and reviewed by the Department of Resources, Mines and Energy before being implemented. Any opportunity to adjust, reduce or change to meet the standards was provided by ARTC prior to the commencing the soil surveys.
- ▶ VB asked how ARTC has progressed on securing the water required for this project.
 - ▶ PM said ARTC has done a preliminary assessment of determining available water sources. The project has a hierarchy of preferences that have been communicated to the OCG. At this stage of the project, it is difficult to determine reuse opportunities in detail. The contractor will drive this. The project has done investigations to determine available water sources and quantify the projects requirements. The project is consulting with the Department of Regional Development, Manufacturing and Water this will be updated closer to the construction commencement date.
- ▶ VB asked if the public would be given the opportunity to view this in the next iteration of the EIS and will it specifically state where the water is coming from.
 - ▶ PM responded yes. The draft EIS has information that will be updated in the next EIS. However, there are some confidentiality issues where only some information can be released publicly.
- ▶ VB asked what strategies ARTC is planning to use to address the issues raised by the TRC with respect to dissecting the water table and threatening the water security for Toowoomba.
 - ▶ SD responded that this was part of the TRC response to the Gowrie to Helidon (G2H) draft EIS.
- ▶ VB responded that her understanding was the Inner Darling Downs (IDD) CCC covered the Toowoomba area as well and her question covers the Gowrie section of the Gowrie to Helidon (G2H) project, and the concerns raised by the TRC Mayor.
 - ▶ SD informed that that the Lockyer Valley (LV) CCC covers Toowoomba as well.

- ▶ MP clarified that the G2H team is reviewing the 60 submissions received by the G2H draft EIS which closed on 25 October 2021 and thanked any committee or public members present who had made a submission. The G2H project team has provided a response to TRC. There are two separate responses to VB's query, depending on where the construction is when most of the groundwater drawdown occurs. MP said he will provide VB information on the groundwater management (during construction) via SD and KU.
- ▶ MP further clarified that during operation, the tunnel has an undrained design and water will not be able to enter the tunnel and water levels are expected to rise again and not have significant drawdown on the aquifers.
- ▶ MP said of the three aquifers impacted during construction of the tunnel, one is used by TRC for the main range volcanics. Only one aquifer will be impacted during operation, which is not where the TRC source its water from.

Contractor announcement

- ▶ RS: BHQ Joint Venture (JV) has entered into a collaborative framework agreement with ARTC for the Northern Civil Works Program, which runs from Whetstone to Gowrie.
- ▶ RS: BHQ comprises of Bielby Holdings Pty Ltd, JF Hull Holdings Pty Ltd, and QH&M Birt Pty Ltd. These are all Queensland based companies.
- ▶ RS: As the BHQ JV is formed, several "Meet the contractor" events will be planned for early in the new year
- ▶ RS: BHQ will attend CCC meetings in the new year.
- ▶ RS: Will be two contractors split across the B2G project. There will be the Southern works program (Border to Whetstone) and the Northern works program (Whetstone to Gowrie).

Questions from the committee:

- ▶ KL asked what ARTC meant by 'experienced' contractor in terms of the BHQ JV and if they have experience in placing a 18KL rail line across a flood plain.
 - ▶ RS: BHQ JV has experience in constructing long linear infrastructure in flood plains, e.g., the Horton Flood Plain (North Qld) and building bridges in that region.

EIS update

- ▶ RS: CG had received 566 submissions and had forwarded these to ARTC.
- ▶ RS: Submissions covered all EIS chapters and was a good community representation.
- ▶ RS: focus submission areas are flooding, noise and social impact.
- ▶ RS: CG was evaluating all submissions. If required, the CG will send a formal request to ARTC for additional information, which ARTC may receive by the end of the year.
- ▶ RS: ARTC are also working on responses to submissions that the CG had requested visibility on and is working on any required EIS updates required due to these submissions.
- ▶ SD: Provided an update on the Calvert to Kagaru (C2K) project EIS. The CG has given indication that C2K may need to go back to public consultation with their EIS changes.

Questions from the committee:

- ▶ KL If there is a second public notification period for the B2G EIS, can the public have their say on the changes?
 - ▶ SD said that if there is another public notification period, it will be to provide the updated EIS with the submissions already received. However, as this is the CG's process, they make the final decision re: public notification with submissions on the updated material (subject to OCG advice).
 - ▶ PM further clarified that the project is updating the current draft EIS and, if requested by the CG, there will be a revised draft EIS public consultation period in early 2022 for public review and comment. After this process, it will go to final EIS.
- ▶ GC offered for he and BA to write to the GC and request that public comment be allowed if there is a second public notification period on the updated EIS.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Committee agreed. ▶ GC said there had been some valuable feedback and assurance provided and urged the committee to discuss those issues with SD after the meeting. ▶ GC introduced the Social Performance Update. <p>Social Performance update</p> <p>Jane Roberts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ JR announced five new Inland Rail Skills Academy initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Millmerran State School Try a Trade Day, hosted by CSQ in early October (Grade 9 and 10) where young people were provided with an opportunity to try different trades. ▶ Partnerships with Clontarf Foundation, supporting young Indigenous men remain at school, gain an education and career, and Mates in Construction, an NGO supporting the mental health of construction workers. ▶ Collaboration with USQ to provide Inland Rail geotechnical data as an educational resource ▶ Upcoming business capability development webinar for prospective subcontractors, suppliers, and equipment providers on 30 November. ▶ Sustainability mentoring for small to medium enterprises, to support any business either starting a sustainability journey or is well into it by providing an hour's mentoring session. ▶ JR provided an infographic (available on the PowerPoint presentation) which shows the Inland Rail Skills Academy initiatives developed over the past two years. ▶ JR said the team was working closely, and will continue to work closely, with the contractor to ensure they recruit and procure locally. This will be reported on monthly once the contractor is onboarded. This information will be available on the Inland Rail website. ▶ GC asked if there were any questions. <p>No questions from the committee were asked.</p>
5	<p>General Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ GC stated that Maria Oliver (online) had a question. ▶ MO noted that the recent community meeting held by ARTC regarding the Turallin Accommodation Camp was not properly conducted as the letterbox was not done correctly. Due notice was not given to all residents who live and work in the area. ARTC should hold another community meeting and all who live and work in the area should be invited, including those who use the Turallin and Western Creek sand both Stock Roads to attend work. Also, the families within Millmerran and properties surrounding the proposed accommodation site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KU stated that the letterbox drop was done through Australia Post and unfortunately not all received the meeting invitation. An agreed action from the Turallin Accommodation Community Meeting was for a second wider community meeting be held, however the best timing would be when the contractor can attend as they are the decision maker on the location of the workforce accommodation camp. ▶ GC asked the meeting if there were any other general business items to discuss. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KL said that recently he had spoken with an impacted landholder in the Millwood area. They had asked to have a meeting with ARTC re: shifting the route to a different alignment which suited both them and their rear neighbours. Originally the route was to go along the boundary of the two properties. They spoke to RS regarding this, and ARTC's response was that the alignment could not shift because it was outside of the rail corridor. However, part of the alignment has now changed and one of the landholders is now very

impacted, who was originally outside of the corridor. KL said he was under the impression that the corridor was changed south of Millmerran because it was going through the mine site and got moved to a private property to avoid the mine site. If that is a precedent, why couldn't ARTC work with the landholders with instead of stating that it cannot be done as it was outside of the corridor?

- ▶ GC said the issue was dealt with in the previous SDD CCC meeting and there were several prevailing issues to do with the mine site and moving outside the federal government prescribed corridor.
- ▶ RS said this is a complex issue which is not taken lightly, and the team do a lot of engagement and attempt to be as flexible as possible, but it is not as easy as just moving outside the corridor. It does require an assessment of understanding of impacts to other landholders etc. Maintaining the geometries, and other design standards, noise impacts will change for other property owners who do not necessarily have a say in the decisions to change the alignment. This can change the decision on whether ARTC can make an alignment change.
- ▶ GC said he would speak with KL about recent discussions he had with federal government representative on this topic.
- ▶ A community member said that since the Millmerran Workers Accommodation meeting, they had been speaking with the Millmerran Progress Association who have been in contact with the contractor and asked if the meeting was any closer to being held.
 - ▶ KU responded that the meeting will be in the new year when the contractor is able to have a productive meeting with the community on this issue.
 - ▶ PM continued that the contractor needs to get into the detail and execution of program of works so that they can confirm for themselves the location of the accommodation sites. In the meantime, ARTC will be providing all feedback that they have so far to the contractor for their consideration.
- ▶ VB said the accommodation nominated in the EIS were provided prior to the alignment changes and whether the Wellcamp facility been considered as well?
 - ▶ RS said although ARTC had to select sites for the purposes of the EIS that demonstrate that there was a reasonable way to address accommodation areas along the alignment we fully acknowledge that as the contractor is onboarded, and we continue consultation, sites may change. The contractor would then be required to do appropriate development approvals to activate those sites. So, the sites are still up for discussion and further community consultation.
- ▶ GC asked if there were any other general business questions.
- ▶ BK said a lot of landholders who previously had land access agreements with ARTC no longer have those agreements because of the way the agreements were handled. The landholders have seen a change in attitude toward the landholders from ARTC staff.
- ▶ BK said, on another matter, he thought the IDD CCC members was up for renewal.
 - ▶ SD took this on notice and stated that it is a two-year term, or until project approval. Nominations are due March 2022. SD said she is to discuss this with the IDD and SDD Chairs before reporting back to the committee members.
- ▶ VB proposed that ARTC adds an additional CCC to cover Gowrie to Helidon section as Toowoomba is not well represented by the IDD CCC.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SD responded both the IDD and LV CCCs have Toowoomba representatives and that this covers feedback from the Toowoomba area. The Toowoomba Chamber of Commerce and Toowoomba Surat Basin Enterprise (TSBE) are also represented at the CCC.
6	<p>Questions from observers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A community member said with regards to access by ARTC for field investigations, does the ARTC have reasonable insurance to cover thoroughbreds being injured while they are on site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SD said she would talk to the landholder offline to discuss the personal circumstances. ▶ GC encouraged any other landholders with personal examples, to speak with SD after the meeting.
7	<p>Conclusion and confirmation of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Some outstanding issues with both CCCs will be held over to the new year when each CCC individually meet. ▶ Next meeting dates are to be confirmed. ▶ The Chairs will discuss with the CG’s representative exactly what the process will be going forward with any reissuing of the EIS and opportunity for public responses. <p>▶ Meeting closed 8.15pm</p>

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY
1	MP to provide VB information on G2H groundwater management (during construction) via SD and KU.	ARTC Inland Rail
2	CCC membership renewal to be discussed with chairs and communicated back to committee	ARTC Inland Rail
3	The IDD and SDD Chairs will discuss with the CG’s representative exactly what the process will be going forward with any reissuing of the EIS and opportunity for public responses.	IDD and SDD Chairs
4	Flood Panel to write to the Federal and State Governments noting that the community would like to make comment on their Final Report’s recommendations.	TO

Next meeting

To be advised