

# Meeting minutes

## Scenic Rim Community Consultative Committee

**Date / Time**  
17 February 2022  
5.30 – 8pm

**Location**  
Online

**Facilitator**

Ms Kathy Baburin (KB) – Chair

**Minute taker**

Ms Karen Hillery (KH)

**Attendees** (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Mr Robert Collett (RC) - SRICCC
- ▶ Ms Angela Collyer (AC) – SRICCC
- ▶ Ms Alison Duke-Gibb (AD-G) – SRICCC
- ▶ Ms Robyn Keenan (RK) – SRICCC
- ▶ Ms Jan McGregor (JM) – SRICCC
- ▶ Ms Narrella Simpson (NS) – SRICCC
- ▶ Mr Adrian Stephan (AS) – SRICCC
- ▶ Ms Rosemaree Thomasson (RT) – SRICCC
- ▶ Mr Mike Townsend (MT) – SRICCC
- ▶ Mr Mike Townsend (MT) - SRICCC
- ▶ Mr Don Piggott-McKellar (DPM) – ARTC Inland Rail
- ▶ Ms Amanda Quayle (AQ) – ARTC Inland Rail
- ▶ Ms Helen Wood (HW) – ARTC Inland Rail
- ▶ Ms Rosemary Judd (RJ) – ARTC Inland Rail
- ▶ Mr Giano Terzic (GH) – ARTC Inland Rail
- ▶ Ms Selina Nalatu (SN) – ARTC Inland Rail
- ▶ Mr Alex Ormrod (AO) – ARTC Inland Rail

**Apologies**

- ▶ Mr Phillip Bell - SRICCC
- ▶ Mr Robert Collett - SRICCC

**Guests** (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- ▶ Mr Mark Babister – Chair, International Flood Panel
- ▶ Mr Stephen Sorbello – Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications
- ▶ Mr Martin Giles – Senior Principal, International Flood Panel

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
1	<p><b>Introduction and Acknowledgement of Country</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>KB</b> requested introductions be made by the SRICCC members</li> <li>- <b>KB</b> asked <b>NS</b> to please provide the Welcome to Country</li> <li>- Note: technical difficulties prevented <b>NS</b> from providing the usual Welcome to Country.</li> <li>- <b>SN</b> provided an Acknowledgement of Country</li> <li>- <b>KB</b> discussed the meeting protocols</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Conflict of interest</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No conflicts raised in the meeting</li> </ul>
3	<p><b>Update on previous actions</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>KB</b> advised that most of the actions from the last meeting have been closed</li> <li>- <b>KH</b> discussed the open actions from the last meeting:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Project team to invite the Inland Rail Sustainability Manager to present at a CCC meeting – in plan for the May meeting</li> <li>o Distribute the interactive sessions list, including proposed dates and locations – ongoing with continued updates to members</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>AD-G</b> asked if the mental health information was available in areas such as doctors' surgeries, corner stores etc about accessing support.</li> <li>- <b>DPM</b> added that a response was provided at the last CCC meeting, so the action had been marked as closed. A mail-out had been completed and some flyers had been dropped off at the Flinders Medical Centre.</li> <li>- <b>AD-G</b> said that there's also the local Salvation Army and other community venues including the local pub where information could be put on walls.</li> <li>- <b>KB</b> commented that doctor's surgeries had been discussed last time but it could be broadened to other venues now.</li> <li>- <b>AD-G</b> noted that it only needs to happen at high stress times eg when the EIS came out, or in any meetings with TMR, ie ARTC should be distributing this information. It could happen intermittently in venues along the alignment, not just in public health venues.</li> <li>- <b>KB</b> remarked that SRICCC members can input into where the information should be distributed to.</li> <li>- <b>DPM</b> added that the social performance team usually present at these meetings but due to the high number of presentations this time they didn't, however the work is continuing outside of the meeting.</li> <li>- <b>ACTION ITEM</b> – Ongoing mental health updates in SRICCC meetings.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>Cultural Heritage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>SN</b> discussed that Native Title legislation informs ARTC of who to speak to and who ARTC needs to have a Cultural Heritage Management Plan with.</li> <li>- Cultural Heritage Management refers to the recognition, protection and conservation of Cultural Heritage sites, places and items, managed under the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003.</li> <li>- Native Title is the recognition and protection of Native Title rights and interests for the benefit of the Traditional Owners across Australia, managed under the Native Title Act.</li> <li>- ARTC have been working with the Jagera/Turrbal people since mid-2016, from early works up to pedestrian surveys. They have representatives that come out on country with and walk the alignment with ARTC, from early geotechnical works to construction.</li> <li>- The predominant items found along the alignment are stone artefact scatters and isolated artefacts, closely followed by scar trees.</li> <li>- All of the sites, items and places found are managed under the Cultural Heritage Management Plan that Jagera/Turrbal have agreed with Inland Rail. Some of the management arrangements can include avoidance eg fencing a scar tree off and protecting it. Stone tools found in the alignment are salvaged and put in a safe place. Archaeological testing can also be done to in consultation with the appropriate group.</li> <li>- During detailed design, more pedestrian surveys will be undertaken in areas where ARTC hasn't had access to land, or where design changes may result in changes to the impact zone. Any Cultural Heritage finds can start to be mitigated.</li> <li>- An 'unexpected finds' procedure also exists where ARTC will stop work and assess the item.</li> </ul> <p>Questions and discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>AC</b> asked where the safe place was located if artefacts were found and if the research and findings were documented.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>SN</b> remarked that the Traditional Owners generally like to keep the artefact on country, so a safe place is found outside of the impact zone where they are happy to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>relocate it. The Cultural Heritage assessment reports are confidential documents which are owned by the Traditional Owner group, so ARTC would need their permission to distribute it further.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>AC</b> queried if any studies are undertaken of European heritage eg comparing early survey maps with ARTC's findings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>SN</b> replied that ARTC's survey findings are available in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) documentation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>AS</b> asked if ARTC had thought about if an artefact was there but is not known about and therefore not seen. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>SN</b> remarked that ARTC's assessments include the 'unexpected finds' procedure for this sort of find. Inducting staff and contractors can also assist in being more aware of what to look for.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>International Flood Panel</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>MB</b> outlined that there were five people on the International Flood Panel who have been tasked with independently reviewing all of the flood modelling and ensuring it's in accordance with the relevant Australian standards and best practice.</li> <li>- A series of draft reports on the Inland Rail projects were undertaken and they are in the process of finalising their report.</li> <li>- Most of the flood modelling was in accordance with the relevant standards and the panel made suggestions for some sensitivity testing and minor changes, which ARTC's consultants incorporated.</li> <li>- All of the draft reports and the terms of reference are available online, as well as the final report, when completed.</li> <li>- <b>MG</b> commented that the Panel has recommended the adoption of a set of quantitative flood impact objectives to provide a high level of control over what impacts are permissible for flooding.</li> <li>- The original objectives were initially not so well defined, being qualitative in a number of instances. After engagement with ARTC, ARTC developed a set of objectives which has been reviewed in consultation with the Panel regarding a number of parameters including flood level increases, times of flooding and velocities, once thresholds are exceeded. This gives more certainty and confidence for ARTC's further design stages.</li> <li>- The prioritisation of a geomorphological investigation has also been agreed upon ie looking at soil types in the area, so the design of embankments and drainage openings takes that into account at an early stage.</li> </ul> <p>Questions and discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>RK</b> queried if the final report would be used as part of the C2K EIS ie the EIS wouldn't be completed until the final report was presented. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>MB</b> advised that they will be making some recommendations, some of which should be done before the EIS is finalised and some before the detailed design stage, which is the next step.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>RK</b> asked if recommendations will be made before the EIS is completed, whether these will be made available to the SRICCC members and the wider public. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>MB</b> noted that their draft recommendations were published online as well as the final report when available. It should be completed in around a month and will go to government.</li> <li>o <b>DPM</b> added that ARTC will commit to ensuring the SRICCC is kept updated as the report progresses.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>KB</b> asked if the major focus of the report was the first section coming into Queensland. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>MB</b> confirmed that they have looked at all of the Inland Rail route from the border and covers the Toowoomba, Lockyer, Scenic Rim and Ipswich council areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>KB</b> queried if community concerns were incorporated in the document.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>MB</b> advised that they have looked at all of the submissions to the EIS process about flooding, which will probably be released in around two months.</li> <li>- <b>DPM</b> remarked that the Flood Panel has been set up as an independent body by the Queensland government to hold Inland Rail to account. The Coordinator General has advised that the Flood Panel's recommendations need to be adopted by Inland Rail.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>South East Queensland Inland Rail Intermodal Business Case</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>DPM</b> introduced <b>SS</b> and outlined that the key outcomes from the upcoming presentation will be captured in the minutes but that the slides won't be able to be shared outside of this meeting.</li> <li>- <b>SS</b> outlined that his team is responsible for a range of large business case projects, including the work that the Federal Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications and the Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads are jointly delivering on the intermodal terminals business case study.</li> <li>- <b>SS</b> noted that they provided a similar update to the Kagaru to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton CCC in the second half of 2021.</li> <li>- <b>SS</b> provided some background to the intermodal terminals business case, noting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Intermodal terminals are critical enablers to realise the full benefits of Inland Rail and to maximise productivity in the freight network.</li> <li>○ Currently there is insufficient capacity at both the Brisbane and Melbourne ends to support the forecast freight volumes that Inland Rail will provide, so they are looking at solutions to increase the capacity.</li> <li>○ There are a number of constraints around existing infrastructure, particularly at Acacia Ridge. There's some network issues also.</li> <li>○ The Commonwealth provided \$10m through the Major Project Business Case fund and the Queensland government is providing an in-kind contribution to deliver the work.</li> <li>○ The business case is due for completion in mid-2022.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>SS</b> noted that the Department is also working on four other business cases with the Queensland government: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Planning regarding freight connectivity from Inland Rail to the Port of Brisbane</li> <li>▪ Exploring the extension of Inland Rail from Toowoomba to Gladstone</li> <li>▪ Salisbury to Beaudesert passenger rail</li> <li>▪ Brisbane to Toowoomba passenger rail</li> </ul> </li> <li>- The Department are looking at the South East Queensland network as a whole; how freight impacts on the broader freight network and how it impacts the passenger rail networks. They also review the road networks regarding alleviating congestion and potential road upgrades where new facilities are built.</li> <li>- The business cases follow the Queensland Government and Infrastructure Australia frameworks. There are three stages and they have almost completed stage two, with preliminary work started on stage three.</li> <li>- The business case is looking at locations that are able to accommodate current and future demand for Inland Rail eg planning for the next 30 – 40 years. It looks at facilities which can drive competition, multiple users and open access arrangements. It will look at a recommended site and structure and other assessments, as well as other connecting/enabling infrastructure.</li> <li>- <b>SS</b> outlined that they started with seven locations: Acacia Ridge, Bromelton, Charlton, Toowoomba, Wellcamp, Ebenezer and Greenbank. This includes existing facilities and future intermodal terminals.</li> <li>- The locations were looked at regarding their suitability for long-term requirements, including their proximity to distribution centres and whether they can meet Inland Rail's service requirements.</li> </ul>

- A multi-criteria analysis was undertaken, which narrowed the seven locations to Ebenezer, Bromelton and Acacia Ridge (current terminal).

#### Questions and discussion

- **RK** queried who would be responsible for any land purchases and associated infrastructure to develop the intermodal terminals?
  - o **SS** advised that any additional infrastructure requirements are being looked at in the business case.
- **AS** asked if Inland Rail is building a rail system to support national operational requirements where needed.
  - o **KB** replied that this will be taken on notice.
- **AD-G** asked what industry groups were consulted and if the community was consulted, when looking at which intermodal terminal has the best capacity and associated logistics.
  - o **SS** commented that an initial industry consultation was conducted with logistics companies and similar firms. They are looking at how to best support and improve efficiencies for industry as well as understanding what the community impacts are. A technical working group will also consult with councils and other parties, to be developed over the coming months in consultation with the Queensland government.
- **JM** asked if they were looking at ramping up the intermodal terminals and if the business case assumes Inland Rail still goes to Acacia Ridge and the Port of Brisbane.
  - o **SS** noted that the Government's policy is for Inland Rail to connect through to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton and then to the Port of Brisbane via the existing rail line.
- **JM** queried if Inland Rail was taken to Gladstone, would they review the South East Queensland requirements.
  - o **SS** remarked that Gladstone was being accounted for in the business case, as well as in the Toowoomba to Gladstone business case.
- **SS** re-commenced the presentation and advised that some discussions have occurred with local councils and the stakeholder engagement activity was being developed, which may include landholders, as well as technical assessments.
- The email address for those wanting to receive updates is: [seqintermodal@tmr.qld.gov.au](mailto:seqintermodal@tmr.qld.gov.au).
- **ACTION ITEM** – ARTC to distribute email address for intermodal terminal updates.

#### Questions and discussion

- **RK** remarked that it appears that decisions are being made with little community consultation and she hopes that there is more opportunity for community interaction via open meetings etc. **RK** asked if complementary business cases eg the Salisbury to Beaudesert alignment were looked at in combination regarding any issues.
  - o **SS** stated that the business cases are being run as one larger program with collaboration from the Queensland government to look at any associated issues. The engagement plan is currently being developed with the Queensland government and they will endeavour to provide an update regarding the consultation process.
- **JM** asked if the environmental impacts only related to the Ebenezer/Bromelton area or wider eg reduction in koala impacts by having more freight unloaded prior to the Calvert to Kagaru (C2K) alignment, such as at Toowoomba.
  - o **SS** replied that they are looking at the environmental impacts of the terminals and Inland Rail looks at the environmental impacts of the alignment through the EIS.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> added that the EIS captures the maximum number of trains running on the line and the Department would capture the additional footprint from the intermodal terminal.</li> <li>○ <b>JM</b> commented that the community is commenting on the EIS parameters and there are business cases occurring which could change that data.</li> <li>- <b>AD-G</b> remarked that the Inland Rail business case is from 2015 and won't be updated and asked how coal will be factored into their planning.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>SS</b> answered that the Inland Rail business case is a key input, as well as broader South East Queensland issues also and how they may impact demand forecasts.</li> <li>○ <b>AD-G</b> asked if terminating at other locations eg Ebenezer was possible or does Inland Rail have to go to Acacia Ridge.                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>SS</b> advised that consistent with Government's policy Inland Rail will go to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>KB</b> asked if the Intermodal Terminal business case will be a public document.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>SS</b> advised that their intention is to have a public business case available to view, however this will also require the Queensland government's agreement.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Questions and discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An observer asked - Are any of the expert opinions and evidence from the Inland Rail Senate Inquiry being considered when determining development and location of intermodal terminals.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>SS</b> <b>replied</b> that they will be looking at this as part of the detailed business case process.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>KB</b> asked if the Department would be able to speak to the committee again if further information was needed in the future.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>SS</b> advised that the Department would be happy to present again and suggested another presentation once the detailed business case work was further progressed in mid-2022.</li> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> commented that Inland Rail can also provide key information that may be available.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
7	<p><b>Operational train modelling</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>AO</b> noted that he will address some previous questions raised by the SRICCC members, namely:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How the number and location of crossing loops is determined on Inland Rail and</li> <li>○ How do we demonstrate that Inland Rail can actually accommodate the expected future train volumes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- From a freight customer's perspective, the fundamental benefits of Inland Rail are faster transit times, reliability, lower price and availability of freight.</li> <li>- To test whether Inland Rail will meet the transit times and capacity requirements, ARTC needs to understand how the future trains are actually going to perform on the network.</li> <li>- As Inland Rail is still in design or under construction in some areas, ARTC run simulations using operational modelling software, an approach applied across the world in the planning of freight and passenger rail networks.</li> <li>- ARTC has developed a model of the whole Inland Rail network from Melbourne to Brisbane, based on the latest designs from each of the individual projects. The model reflects all of the latest assumptions around the types of train that we expect to run on the network in the future.</li> <li>- The inputs also include the number of trains ARTC expects to run, as well as the gradient (ie vertical alignment), any track curvature and any speed restrictions expected to apply.</li> <li>- The model has been fully calibrated against the existing ARTC network, so ARTC know within a very close margin that the model is going to accurately reflect how trains run across the network.</li> </ul>



- Once ARTC have run the simulations, outputs from the model indicate how long a train takes to travel from A to B and can be used to demonstrate that Inland Rail meets the service requirements.
- Regarding capacity requirements for some of the numbers indicated in the Inland Rail business case and the draft C2K EIS.
- A train plan has been developed using the train numbers and tonnage requirements in the Inland Rail business case.
- ARTC does not currently have a timetable in the format that most people would understand a timetable to be in. A detailed timetable is normally the final output that would come from a long timetable development process, which won't be prepared for Inland Rail until closer to operations.
- The important thing for now is the capacity assessment and forecasts of utilisation ie to forecast how busy the different sections of Inland Rail will be across the day.
- Inland Rail will be a single track with some crossing loops so trains can pass each other. The number and location of crossing loops directly affects how many trains you can run on the network. More crossing loops means more capacity on the network.
- When ARTC is planning its train schedules, it is not feasible to plan for every section of track to be in use a hundred per cent across 24 hours. ARTC has a target of 65 per cent or lower for every section of track ie 65 per cent of that time at most you might expect to have a train running through that section across 24 hours. This accommodates maintenance activities and provides some resilience if there are delays or incidents.
- Example one: there are 65 minutes between two crossing loops, so every time one train goes through there, you can't use that section for any other trains for one hour. Based on the 65 per cent target, there is capacity for around 15 services per day.
- Example two: the crossing loops are 30 minutes apart, which can provide the capacity for around 30 services per day. If the number of crossing loops are doubled, the capacity is broadly doubled.
- Between Gowrie and Kagaru, the distances between loops are much shorter than 30 minutes, which provides greater capacity to accommodate the trains we are expecting.
- ARTC identifies how many crossing loops are needed to meet the 65 per cent utilisation target.
- The specific locations of the crossing loops is an iterative process between ARTC operations teams and project design teams.
- Regarding the Calvert to Kagaru project, there are sections of the network where more services are expected to run so there are more crossing loops, and other sections have less.

#### Questions and discussion

- **JM** asked what the estimated time of a train to travel from Toowoomba to Kagaru and then Kagaru to Acacia Ridge is. An additional critical question that has been asked previously is what is the time that the train will take to travel on those different segments ie Gowrie to Helidon/Calvert due to the speed of the trains coming down The Range, as well as the time taken from Calvert to Kagaru. These may only be estimates at this point. Based on topography conditions and the issues of The Range, how long does it take, the train to go from Gowrie to Kagaru; and how long does it take the train to go from Kagaru to Gowrie.
  - o **DPM** replied that from:
    - Toowoomba (Gowrie Junction) to Acacia Ridge: 1 hour 55 mins
    - Toowoomba (Gowrie Junction) to Bromelton: 1 hour 40 mins
    - Toowoomba (Gowrie Junction) to Ebenezer/Calvert: 56 mins
- **AD-G** queried what the reverse timings were from the same points
  - o **DPM** remarked that this information isn't currently shown but can be provided to the committee at a later date.
- **ACTION ITEM** – ARTC to share the reverse timing information from Toowoomba (Gowrie Junction to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> offered to call AD-G to establish a follow up meeting regarding this information.</li> <li>- <b>ACTION ITEM</b> – ARTC to have a follow up meeting regarding the train timing information, coordinated via <b>AD-G</b>.</li> <li>- <b>RT</b> asked whether a train travelling from Brisbane to Melbourne can do it within 24 hours.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>AO</b> remarked that ARTC’s modelling indicates this is correct.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>RK</b> remarked that the road vehicle times indicated are slower than what the transport providers publish on their websites to Acacia Ridge.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>AQ</b> replied that ARTC will check the timings. The difference may be felt regarding the volume of freight which can be moved. One train averages 110 B-double trucks.</li> <li>○ <b>RK</b> noted that a truck can take freight straight to where it’s being delivered. Her concern is regarding the intermodal terminals.</li> <li>○ <b>AQ</b> added that the difference is 1,818 trains a year or 90,000 trucks.</li> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> remarked that Inland Rail goes from Brisbane to Melbourne; there are different scenarios over longer distances.</li> <li>○ <b>RK</b> noted her concerns for the general public who have to put up with the traffic associated with transport from the intermodal terminals. She has concerns that no-one is taking responsibility for this as it’s not directly Inland Rail.</li> <li>○ <b>AD-G</b> commented that she thinks an intermodal terminal should be located at Toowoomba for off-loading to south-east Queensland destinations, rather than clogging up local roads to get to the destination.                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>DPM</b> remarked that this can be discussed further in the follow-up meeting.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>8</b></p>	<p><b>Project update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The procurement is still progressing, with a preferred proponent anticipated in the next couple of months. There may be some media around this. There will be ongoing engagement and working with them to incorporate any innovations they may have into the C2K EIS, and there will be further community consultation after this.</li> <li>- The EIS is also progressing. The timings for the second round of public consultation haven’t been confirmed yet. ARTC would like it to be this year and is working with the Office of the Coordinator General (OCG) to finalise this.</li> <li>- ARTC will keep this as a recurring topic to keep CCC members and the general community updated.</li> </ul>
<p><b>9</b></p>	<p><b>Engagement update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ARTC will be holding six C2K EIS interactive workshops in the coming months. The first session will be on surface water, hydrology, flooding and groundwater. The second session will be on flora and fauna, sustainability and offsets. A follow-up online only session after the second workshop will also be offered if there are any outstanding questions that weren’t answered in the first session.</li> <li>- The sessions will be held face to face with an online option. They will be advertised and ARTC is seeking some information to be provided in the workshops, which will be outlined in the advertising.</li> <li>- <b>AD-G</b> remarked that she thought one session per topic was too limited and wanted some clarification around whether ARTC had the contact details of the submitters so they could be contacted about their concerns.</li> <li>- <b>DPM</b> replied that this was a good idea and that ARTC will contact the OCG about this as there may be sensitivities around using people’s information when it has been provided by the government.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>AD-G</b> queried whether the OCG would be able to send information to the submitters regarding the upcoming workshops.</li> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> advised that the second round of public consultation referred to in the project update is the standard process for closing the loop for updates that are required. ARTC will check if the OCG contacts the submitters directly about the consultation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



	<p>period. ARTC is filling the gap with extra engagement sessions as it is important to the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>ACTION ITEM</b> – ARTC to liaise with the OCG regarding the submitters being contacted directly about ARTC consultation activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>KB</b> added that the workshops aren't the only time that people can engage with Inland Rail. Information could be added to the website to contact ARTC if you can't make the workshops to have a one-on-one discussion.</li> <li>o <b>DPM</b> agreed with this approach.</li> <li>o <b>AD-G</b> asked if the sessions could be videoed and could be uploaded to the website.</li> <li>o <b>DPM</b> said that ARTC would discuss whether there is an opportunity to do this – technology don't always go smoothly, as experienced tonight.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>KB</b> suggested that the traffic and level crossings C2K interactive workshop be held at Peak Crossing instead of Purga. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>DPM</b> – noted.</li> <li>o <b>KB</b> requested ARTC to send the presentation to the SRICCC members as per usual process.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>10</b></p>	<p><b>General business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>KH</b> noted that there were some great Inland Rail Sponsorship and Donations program successful applicants from the last round – an Ipswich cricket team and a STEM program at Beaudesert State High School.</li> <li>- An Inland Rail business capability webinar was held in November 2021, with over 250 attendees. This can be viewed at: <a href="http://inlandrail.artc.com.au/opportunities/suppliers/">inlandrail.artc.com.au/opportunities/suppliers/</a> .</li> <li>- Fully vaccinated people to attend CCC meetings from January 2022 onwards</li> <li>- <b>UPDATE:</b> This will now be based on each venue's specific requirements and will be advertised if any restrictions apply.</li> <li>- Next SRICCC meeting scheduled for 12 May <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>AD-G</b> advised that she is unavailable on this date and would prefer an end-April date.</li> <li>o <b>KB</b> to email members re next SRICCC meeting date.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	Ongoing updates to members regarding the C2K EIS interactive workshops.	ARTC	05/05/2022
2	Ongoing mental health updates in SRICCC meetings	ARTC	05/05/2022
3	Distribute email address for intermodal terminal updates	ARTC	05/05/2022
4	Share the reverse timing information to Toowoomba (Gowrie Junction to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton	ARTC	05/05/2022
5	Follow up meeting regarding the train timing information, coordinated via <b>AD-G</b> .	ARTC	05/05/2022
6	ARTC to liaise with the OCG regarding the submitters being contacted directly about ARTC consultation activities.	ARTC	ASAP
7	Chair to email SRICCC members regarding next meeting date	KB	ASAP

## Next meeting

5 May 2022, Ipswich Civic Centre