

# Meeting minutes

## Inner Darling Downs Consultative Committee Meeting

### Date / Time

4 September 2021  
1.30pm to 2.30pm

### Location

Gowrie Junction Progress Association and Community Hall  
Old Homebush Road, Gowrie Junction

### Facilitator

Mr Bill Armagnacq (Chair) (BA)

### Minute taker

Katie Unipan – (ARTC Inland Rail) (KU)

### Distribution

All

### Attendees (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Clinton Weber, Individual (CW)
- ▶ Vicki Battaglia, Individual, (VB)
- ▶ Ken Murphy, Individual (KM)
- ▶ Phoebe Mitchell, Individual (PM)

### Apologies (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- |                 |                     |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| ▶ Paul McDonald | ▶ Larry Pappin      |
| ▶ Gary Garland  | ▶ Lance MacManus    |
| ▶ Kylie Schultz | ▶ Paul Hanlon       |
| ▶ Rob Loch      | ▶ Rich Pidgeon (RP) |

### ARTC

- |                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| ▶ Elysha Loiterton (EL) | ▶ Sarah Delahunty (Manager Stakeholder Engagement QLD) (SD) |
| ▶ Linda Lam (LL)        | ▶ Giano Terzic (Stakeholder Engagement Lead G2H) (GT)       |
| ▶ Ashley Williams (AW)  | ▶ Shane Harris (SH)   |
| ▶ Trinity Graham (TG)   | ▶ Diane Mather (DM)   |
| ▶ Reggie Dutt (RD)      | ▶ Robert Kampe (RK)   |
| ▶ Max Nichols (MN)      | ▶ Chris Schell (CS)   |
| ▶ Nawar Spear (NS)      | ▶ Albert Kwong (AK)   |
| ▶ Timothy Trewin (TT)   | ▶ Krystle Nichols (KN)                                      |
| ▶ Linda Lam (LL)        | ▶ Mel Brown (MB)  |

### 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"> <li>▶ AW delivered an Acknowledgement of Country.</li> <li>▶ Chair welcomed the committee and stated that the meeting’s purpose was to discuss the Gowrie to Helidon (G2H) draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Summary of Findings (SoF) released by the Office of the Coordinator-General (OCG).</li> <li>▶ Chair noted that anyone asking questions should wait until a microphone is handed to them and mention their name.</li> <li>▶ Chair noted the meeting was recorded for meeting minute purposes.</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Project presentation – G2H Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Chair noted that MN, G2H Senior Project Manager, will facilitate the meeting to deliver the draft EIS presentation.</li> <li>▶ Chair commented that the meeting’s agenda and presentation content was quite lengthy, and the allocated time would not allow the presentation to cover all topics from the EIS but would focus on the topics that the Committee request.</li> <li>▶ MN stated the intent of the meeting was to introduce the G2H draft EIS to the Committee and to receive community feedback, which will be ongoing throughout the draft EIS consultation period (to 25 October 2021).</li> <li>▶ MN noted that Committee Members had sent EIS questions to the G2H Project Team, and the presentation will focus on answering those and any other questions or EIS topic requests made today from the meeting attendees.</li> <li>▶ MN stated that the three questions received from the Committee related to spoil, construction water and train operations.</li> <li>▶ <b>Questions from the committee:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>What is the projected amount of material that will be moved during construction earthworks.</b></li> </ol> <p>MN responded there is approximately two million cubic metres of material to be removed from one section of the rail alignment and placed as fill in another. The 6.2km tunnel will be a large excavation process with approximately 700,000 cubic metres of material to be removed during construction. The plan for that material is to stockpile tunnel spoil on nearby land. This solution has been assessed within the draft EIS (Chapter 6: Project Description (Section 6.6.7) and Appendix T: Spoil Management Strategy). Other options are being explored such as moving the spoil to assist local construction projects and to fill unused quarries. Approximately 230,000 cubic metres of spoil will be moved from the Lockyer Valley section of the G2H project. This spoil will likely be reused during construction, e.g., to build access tracks, and will be determined during the project’s Detailed Design Phase. MN further noted that concerns regarding the spoil stockpile at the Western Portal should be directed to the OCG via a submission.</p> <p>VB requested the weight of a cubic metre of spoil. MN took this question on notice.</p> <p>KL asked who is responsible, the contractor or ARTC, for seeking to disperse the spoil stockpile. MN responded that the contractor would need to achieve a certain sustainability ISCA rating.</p> <p>VB stated that she had received community concerns about the western portal stockpile and asked how the stockpile will control air borne displacement of spoil, excessive weed growth on the spoil stockpile and erosion causing deposits in other areas. MN responded that the engineering construction of the stockpile is the responsibility of the contractor, e.g., to compact the material, ensure dust suppression and rehabilitation of the land, to ARTC’s satisfaction.</p> <p>VB asked how ARTC will ensure that the stockpile does not become a large community problem when ARTC exit the area. SH responded that depending on the property arrangement in place, ARTC hands the land over to the landowner with compliances in place, such as rehabilitation. SH reiterated to the Committee to contact the OCG via a submission regarding concerns surrounding the management of the stockpile.</p> </li> </ul>

KL queried the water absorption of volcanic rock spoil which may swell in size and water displacement during construction may bring additional materials into the tunnel leading to a higher amount of spoil than anticipated. MN responded that there is always a risk of material spilling into the tunnel during the tunnel boring process. MN further explained that the potential for extra spoil had been catered for in the stockpile scenario. The swell factor is also assessed as part of the EIS.

PM asked how much of the two million cubic metre material will be reused during construction. MN responded that extra spoil will be used to build embankments. SH further noted that the Inland Rail project will actively investigate the reuse all materials before placing it in a stockpile. VB asked how many truck movements would be involved in moving spoil and what haulage routes would be used. MN replied that there would be no truck movements on local roads for the removal of spoil from the tunnel. Most of this spoil would be moved from the tunnel on a conveyor belt and placed on a temporary stockpile area before it is moved to the permanent stockpile within the western portal area. Truck movements will be necessary for spoil that is moved to other construction activities and that would be negotiated on an as needs basis.

VB asked why the carbon footprint of diesel truck movements had not been factored into the EIS. MN responded that the way the impacts were investigated in the EIS were per truck movements on local roads and the impacts on other road users and the local community rather than the amount of truck movements within the work site. The Project's Business case is based on future increase in freight movement requirements and Inland Rail is answering that freight movement challenge. An increase in freight movement can either be addressed by upgrading roads or rail. The decision to deliver a rail project was determined to be more efficient. SH responded that the greenhouse emissions had not been presented in the EIS and suggested making this enquiry as a submission to the OCG.

**2. How much construction water will be used on the G2H project.**

MN responded approximately 700 megalitres of water would be required during construction. Use of a recycled water pipeline and using water from the Withcott Seedlings' evaporation basin is under investigation. A large amount of water will also be exhumed during the excavation of the tunnel which will be put through a water treatment plant and reused on the project. Use of landowner and regional council water sources will also be investigated however only after alternative water use options are exhausted.

**3. Train operations: On other parts of the Inland Rail project there is a requirement for crossing loops to be on a 1 in 200 grade, however on G2H project, crossing loops are at 1 in 64 grade. Can this be explained.**

MN explained that this is for operational efficiency for a flat as practicable loop grade traversing the Toowoomba Range, to assist trains to run again (after stopping at an uphill crossing loop) in a short timeframe.

KL noted that on Page 36 of the G2H draft EIS Project Description, the phrase 'non curve' was used and asked for clarification as there are many curves along the proposed G2H alignment and at the current calculation, it appears trains will take more than an hour to climb the range. MN responded that when there is a "curve compensation" in the rail line, curves are constructed slightly flatter, so the train "feels" 1 in 64 grades. This flattening is different for each curve. KL asked how loaded trains are expected to climb uphill when stopping and starting at the 1 in 64 grade and will this impact on the ARTC Inland Rail service offering. MN responded that simulation software calculates the grade that trains can start and stop which is validated through the rolling stock operators. This power to weight ratio is one of the driving factors and is consistent with the current operators use throughout Australia. MN further noted that not every train will be 1.8 km long and that there will be a list of priority for which trains will get right of way (up or down the range), e.g., coal trains returning from Brisbane will be empty and able to idle at a passing loop to allow for a loaded train to pass.

MN asked the committee which EIS topics they would like to cover for the remaining meeting time. Committee members requested Noise and vibration be discussed.

<b>3</b>	<p><b>Noise and Vibration</b></p> <p>Timothy Trewin (TT) provided an overview of Noise and Vibration, which can be found at Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration and Appendix P: Operational Railway Noise and Vibration of the draft EIS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ TT Explained the different assessment criteria for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction noise (temporary element of the project)</li> <li>• Road traffic movements</li> <li>• Operational noise</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ <b>Questions from the committee:</b></li> </ul> <p>VB asked whether the vibration assessment criteria for tunnelling pertained to working with volcanic rock. TT said the vibration assessment considers the local soil types.</p> <p>MN explained the difference between vibration and ground borne noise. The vibration is not exceeded however there are trigger levels for ground borne noise.</p> <p>VB clarified that she was asking about tunnelling and blasting during construction and asked if a landholder's property is not identified as having an exceedance, but later becomes an impacted property, what provisions is Inland Rail taking to assist those landholders? TT explained that if a noise trigger level is later exceeded, the process of the noise assessment will be undertaken, and that property will be added so that mitigation options can be discussed.</p> <p>KL noted the closeness of the eastern portal to Harlaxton Quarry and asked if noise will travel up to high density living in Toowoomba suburbs such as Prince Henry Heights, Harlaxton and Katoomba Point. KL asked whether those suburbs would experience an increase in noise from trains travelling up the Toowoomba Range before the train enters the tunnel. TT responded that noise could travel in all directions and the modelling undertaken as part of the Inland Rail G2H EIS is three-dimensional modelling has been captured and reflected in the EIS noise contours.</p> <p>KL asked, in relation to the plans to build a new Toowoomba Base Hospital at the Baillie Henderson Hospital site in Cranley, whether sensitive medical equipment would be impacted by vibration of passing trains in the tunnel. GT responded that Baillie Henderson Hospital had been consulted with and are aware and considering any potential impacts vibration may have on sensitive medical equipment. This engagement will be ongoing.</p> <p>VB asked where the investigations for the Helidon explosives reserve area was in the EIS. SH responded that these investigations could be found throughout the EIS and in the Hazard and Waste section and took this question on notice to respond with a more specific answer.</p>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>General Business</b></p> <p><b>Possible upcoming Meeting topics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Flood Panel meeting – subject to covid-19 restrictions and the team's ability to travel into Qld.</li> <li>▶ B2G draft EIS update tba</li> <li>▶ Koalas and soil – presentation at the next meeting.</li> <li>▶ Representatives of the appointed contractors</li> <li>▶ Next G2H draft EIS Information Session will be held at the Toowoomba Empire Theatre on Wednesday 8 September from 4pm - 7pm</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<p>Conclusion and confirmation of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Next meeting will be held in October 2021, pending feedback from the OCG on the B2G EIS submissions.</li> </ul> <p>Meeting closed 2.35pm</p>

## Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY
1	ARTC to confirm the weight of a cubic metre of spoil.	ARTC Inland Rail

2	ARTC to confirm where the investigations on the Helidon explosives reserve area is in the EIS – Hazards and waste	ARTC Inland Rail
---	---	------------------

**Next meeting**

To be advised