

# Meeting minutes

## Calvert to Kagaru

### Community Consultative Committee

#### Date / Time

4 August 2022

5.30 – 8pm

#### Location

The Centre, Beaudesert and online

#### Facilitator

Ms Kathy Baburin (KB) – Chair

#### Minute taker

Ms Karen Hillery (KH)

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

- Ms Angela Collyer (AC) – SRICCC
- Mr Phillip Bell (PB) – SRCC (online)
- Mr Simon Birrell (SB) – SRICCC (online)
- Ms Robyn Keenan (RK) – SRICCC
- Ms Jan McGregor (JM) – SRICCC
- Mr Mike Townsend (MT) – SRICCC
- Mr Don Piggott-McKellar (DPM) – ARTC Inland Rail
- Ms Amanda Reed (AR) – ARTC Inland Rail
- Ms Fleur McPherson (FM) - ARTC Inland Rail
- Ms Myf Jagger (MJ) – ARTC Inland Rail
- Mr Giano Terzic (GT) – ARTC Inland Rail
- Ms Karen Hillery (KH) – ARTC Inland Rail
- Ms Amy Stewart (AS) – ARTC Inland Rail
- Ms Janeen Bulsey (JB) – ARTC Inland Rail

#### Apologies

- Ms Alison Duke-Gibb – SRICCC
- Ms Narrella Simpson – SRICCC
- Mr Adrian Stephan – SRICCC
- Mr Robert Collett – SRCC
- Ms Rosemaree Thomasson – SRICCC

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
1	<p><b>Introduction and Acknowledgement of Country</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>KB</b> raised that coal queries are sometimes raised and that Inland Rail is being constructed to be an open access freight network.</li> <li>- <b>KH</b> noted that the Intergovernmental Agreement between the State and Federal Governments states that no coal will be transported on the Inland Rail line between Kagaru and Acacia Ridge until the construction of the Salisbury to Beaudesert passenger rail starts, or another time as agreed by governments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>JM</b> queried if this is a new or pre-existing agreement.</li> <li>o <b>KH</b> replied that it is a couple of years old.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>JM</b> commented that the new government may decide to review Inland Rail, which may or may not lead to changes in the project.</li> <li>- <b>DPM</b> added that the Inland Rail is not in construction yet and that the project team is still working through the project approvals.</li> <li>- <b>AC</b> asked if any more information was available regarding the Salisbury to Beaudesert passenger rail project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>KH</b> replied that this was a State Government, Department of Main Roads project so Inland Rail could not comment further about this project.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> noted that the planning and impact assessment undertaken for Inland Rail assumes that there is coal on the C2K line. However we also think it is important for stakeholders to have the context of all of the moving parts associated with the project.</li> <li>- <b>Action:</b> Provide further information available about the Intergovernmental Agreement.</li> <li>- <b>KB</b> discussed the meeting protocols</li> <li>- <b>KB</b> requested introductions be made by the SRICCC members and ARTC staff</li> <li>- <b>KB</b> provided an Acknowledgement of Country</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Conflict of interest</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No conflicts raised in the meeting</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Update on previous actions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Presentation/updated at the next SRICCC meeting re land parcel information – property team will provide a presentation tonight.</li> <li>○ Provide a summary of the mental health presentation for SRICCC members – <b>ACTIONED AND CLOSED BY ARTC</b></li> <li>○ Share the K2ARB Public Health Network information with SRICCC members - <b>ACTIONED AND CLOSED BY ARTC</b></li> <li>○ Re-visit promotional messaging for the C2K EIS interactive workshop – Social Performance and Business Opportunities to clarify what Social Performance includes e.g. in e-DM and online materials - <b>ACTIONED AND CLOSED BY ARTC</b></li> <li>○ Provide more information regarding what the 5% enhancement of ecological values means for the C2K project - <b>ACTIONED AND CLOSED BY ARTC</b></li> <li>○ Undertake a koala management plan meeting with SRICCC/community member input - <b>ACTIONED AND CLOSED BY ARTC</b></li> <li>○ Undertake a follow-up online Flora and Fauna, Sustainability and Offsets meeting - <b>ACTIONED AND CLOSED BY ARTC</b></li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Cultural Heritage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>KH</b> noted that the Cultural Heritage team will be out in the field, undertaking further work to inform our revised draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<p><b>Property presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>AR</b> introduced herself as the manager of property access and acquisition for the Queensland projects.</li> <li>- <b>AR</b> started by outlining the land acquisition process for Inland Rail: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ARTC Inland Rail has an arrangement with the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR). They are the acquiring authority for the Queensland section of Inland Rail. TMR will manage the compulsory land acquisition process.</li> <li>○ The process for land acquisition is via the Acquisition of Land Act, which TMR will adhere to when they carry out any compulsory land acquisitions. Compulsory land acquisitions will only happen after the government has approved the EIS and the Coordinator-General has provided their evaluation report.</li> <li>○ ARTC and TMR have acquired some land already with some landowners on a voluntary basis, should directly impacted landowners wish to come forward and discuss acquisition of their land now, rather than wait for compulsory acquisition to happen in the future, after EIS approval is received. This is called an ‘early acquisition’ of land. This has been undertaken in various parts of the alignment in Queensland, particularly if landowners are suffering some form of hardship situation and need to sell their property now but are unable to do so because of the planning around the Inland Rail project.</li> <li>○ Prior to the compulsory land acquisition process, every impacted landowner will be consulted and made aware of the land requirements and their rights and entitlements under the process. Usually this engagement will happen with both</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

ARTC and TMR property representatives, and TMR would explain the Acquisition of Land Act process in detail.

- When compulsory acquisition occurs, there is a Notice of Intent to Resume that is provided to landowners. This describes the formal objection rights that landowners have, and generally how the process will work. Landowners would receive the Notice of Intent to Resume along with a plan eg a survey plan that shows the area of land that is proposed to be acquired and the purpose for which it is being acquired, whether it's for the permanent rail corridor or for some other purpose related to the corridor.
- The correspondence provided also provides some information about landowners' objection rights. Every landowner is able to lodge a formal objection to the taking of the land if they wish to. TMR have an independent, appointed delegate that must consider all objections received.
- A decision is then made by the TMR delegate as to whether they recommend that the land acquisition process proceed or not. If it is decided to proceed, the Transport Minister formally approves the taking of the land, which turns into a Taking of Land Notice that is gazetted in the Queensland government gazette. It is at that stage that the land is said to be formally taken and it vests in the name of the State ie TMR and this is when it converts into a landowner's rights to put forward a claim for compensation.
- This is generally how the process works, however there are a lot of fact sheets and information available at: <https://www.tmr.qld.gov.au/Community-and-environment/Property-information>
- In terms of parcel severance, this occurs if there's a strip of land taken from a property. There may only be part of the property required for the rail corridor. This could result in severed or balance areas. The project designers will try to avoid severance where possible, but unfortunately if there is a large property, where the rail corridor is only going through a corner of or through the middle of the property, there may be a severance of land.
- If there are severed or balance areas left over, and if the area of the land that is severed is a lower amount than you would normally see in a council planning scheme, there are exemptions under the Planning Act. Properties may be severed and created that happen to be a smaller lot size than you would normally find that council would approve. These are the types of exemptions that apply when land is acquired under the Acquisition of Land Act.
- There may be situations where the land that's acquired creates a severed area that may end up being of no practical use or value to the landowner. If so, the landowner can ask for that land to be acquired as well, and they would be compensated for the additional land taken. The project designers will try to avoid the situation of leaving small amounts of land or severed areas.
- Following establishment of the rail corridor, after construction, there will be a review of what land has been acquired. If it happened to be surplus to the actual corridor requirements, ARTC, in conjunction with TMR would look at any remaining surplus land and undertake a strategy for the land.
- If land has been acquired from a landowner under the Acquisition of Land Act but then proves not to be required, the legislation requires that TMR offer the land back to the landowner from whom it was resumed. A landowner doesn't necessarily have to take the land. ARTC in conjunction with TMR would determine the most appropriate way for the land to be dealt with.
- The land could be offered to adjoining landowners for amalgamating into their block, or TMR's preferred method is to offer it to the market. However there may be some obvious users of the land, for example if the land happened to be landlocked or there were adjoining landowners with interests in the property, then it could be offered to adjoining owners for amalgamation into their existing blocks.

- TMR have some policies that they must comply with. There is a Queensland Government Land Transaction Policy. Whenever they are dealing with the disposal of State-owned land, TMR is also required to comply with the obligations under that policy.
- When the review of any surplus land occurs, ARTC in conjunction with TMR will look at how the land was initially acquired, what kind of legal/practical access it has, what the size of the parcel/s are and what the potential uses would be. In the first instance the land would be offered back to the landowner from whom it was resumed.

#### Questions and discussion

- **KB** queried if the rail corridor was completely owned by TMR or was some land owned by Queensland Rail?
  - o **AR** remarked that ARTC has acquired some land, some of which is in ARTC's name and some is in TMR's name. The operating rail corridor ie the actual, eventual land tenure will be a perpetual lease from TMR to ARTC and will form part of the ARTC network. So we might acquire land now through early acquisition and it's held in a freehold title. Before any construction works commence, there will be a construction lease from TMR to ARTC. After construction, an operational leasehold tenure will be created, which turns into the perpetual lease. Existing rail corridors or the Queensland Rail network usually have the same type of leasehold land tenure.
  - o **DPM** noted that part of our project is also offsetting the impact we have by building the railway line. So ARTC also has an offsets program. There's a requirement for ARTC to offset the impacts we are having by purchasing properties. The plan is to buy them as close to the railway line as possible or in the same bioregion, so we are offsetting our impact as close to possible to where we are having that impact. This is another scenario where there are some properties that sit in ARTC's name.
  - o **KB** commented that this is reminiscent of Wyaralong Dam, where every tree that was taken out for the dam had to be re-planted elsewhere.
    - **DPM** agreed that this is a similar principle.
- **AC** queried if there is a large block and the railway line goes through the middle so there's two parts on either side, do they become two separate lots with their own title or do they remain as one lot with a railway line through the middle?
  - o **AR** commented that she thinks there may be two lots but they will be on the one title to that landowner and the corridor through the middle is the leasehold tenure. There have been instances previously where there is one land parcel which is split by vinculum. However this is probably more of a question for ARTC's survey team.
- **AC** remarked that she had concerns that the landowner had a railway line through the middle of the property. They can't run the two pieces of land together which makes it uneconomical and can't sell one lot to someone else. If they could sell the farther lot to the neighbour, this may assist the issue. However it seems that the two pieces can't be sold but rather the entire lot, which means the next owner would have exactly the same issue.
  - o **AR** replied that this would be worked through when the resumption survey plans are drawn up. These types of matters would be considered through the consultation process with the landowner prior to the resumption plans being drafted. If the landowner preferred this, you could have for example 'lot 1, corridor, lot 2 down the bottom'. However **AR** needs to check this with TMR.
  - o **AC** queried if ARTC or TMR would be subdividing the land. They would pay for the survey and the production of two new titles from that one original title?
    - **AR** responded that there will be a whole titling correction piece of work that happens following the taking of the land. All of the survey plans are registered by TMR with the Titles Office at no cost to the landowner.
    - **AC** remarked that she would like to see some sort of policy in place before this process starts, so the landowner has the option to potentially have two titles issued if they preferred this, rather than TMR making the decision.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>AR</b> replied that ARTC will get some clarity on this from TMR.</li> <li>- <b>Action:</b> ARTC to talk to TMR regarding lot parcel options available to landowners.</li> <li>- <b>AC</b> raised that land that has already be acquired by TMR/ARTC, particularly around Peak Crossing has had complaints that it's been allowed to become infested with weeds. Landowners have had to observe the regulations about clearing noxious weeds – does TMR/ARTC have to also?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>AR</b> replied that any land owned by ARTC or TMR will need to be property managed for weed control.</li> <li>○ <b>AC</b> commented that she has heard that the land is outside the regulations because the State legislation doesn't apply to that.</li> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> noted that there are some examples of these properties. Two have been flagged with ARTC previously and are in Peak Crossing, which he has personally raised with TMR. These are the properties that were acquired by TMR as part of the gazettal of the Southern Freight Rail Corridor around 2010/11. ARTC works with TMR so we are happy to continue to follow this up.</li> <li>○ <b>AC</b> remarked that she would like to have this followed up as there have been complaints about this for the last couple of years regarding there being no control of the noxious weeds on those blocks.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>Action:</b> ARTC to talk to TMR regarding noxious weeds on TMR-owned properties</li> <li>- <b>RK</b> asked if this also applied to the actual rain corridor and who was responsible for the maintenance of this regarding weeds and fencing etc, TMR as the owners or ARTC as the lessee?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>AR</b> replied that it will ultimately be ARTC because they will be the lessee.</li> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> added that in the same way that Queensland Rail manages these things for the Queensland Rail network, there may be some examples of lots that cross over, where TMR will still own a section of land at some point. However for the most part the rail infrastructure managers are responsible for operating the rail line.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>RK</b> added that the area around Kagaru on the current interstate line that is leased by ARTC but owned by TMR, is very overgrown with weeds along the side of the track. There is no fencing and you can walk less than 10 metres off a fairly major road now to the railway line. So as an example of what current maintenance is, if this is going to be an example of what future maintenance is going to be like, it's not a particularly good one.</li> <li>- <b>AC</b> remarked that there's a serious fire ant issue around Peak Crossing. If ARTC are going to be digging and moving soil to construct the railway line, that's in breach of all the current fire ant regulations in place. Can somebody be appointed to look after the maintenance of this now and in the future, so there is one person to complain to?</li> <li>- <b>Action:</b> ARTC to confirm if a centralised contact point for maintenance queries can be established.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Social Performance presentation and Community Wellbeing activity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>MJ</b> noted that in May 2022 a C2K Social Performance and Business Opportunities workshop was held which included a community wellbeing plan and a legacy scoping activity. Tonight's presentation will re-visit some of the information presented at the workshop, along with making the activities available for CCC members to undertake. The workshop activities will also be undertaken with the Peak Crossing community.</li> <li>- In a lot of the CCC meetings some of the Social Performance partnerships and initiatives have been discussed, particularly ARTC's work on the mental health partnership. In the last CCC meeting an overview of the breadth of the Social Performance program was provided, regarding ARTC Inland Rail's responsibilities relating to the management of social impacts and potential negative impacts in local areas. ARTC is also looking at where the benefits and opportunities can be enhanced with each of the projects that make up the Inland Rail program.</li> <li>- One of the areas of focus within the Social Performance program is workforce management, which includes workforce development, workforce diversity, skills and training opportunities, contractor management, workforce code of conduct and working with our contractors, so they understand what their responsibilities are in relation to social performance upon project</li> </ul>

approval being received. ARTC is also looking at ways to maximise access and opportunities for local and Indigenous businesses to participate in each of the projects.

- Another focus is to monitor local housing conditions and to work with our contractors on the workforce accommodation arrangements that they have, to ensure we are looking at ways to avoid or mitigate any impacts our workers will have in local areas as the projects are constructed.
  - There is also a focus on health and community wellbeing. ARTC have developed a number of partnerships which are continued to be worked through, which focus on opportunities to contribute positively to community wellbeing or opportunities to increase available support eg the mental health program (New Access), for landholders and community members and businesses impacted by the project.
  - The last pillar is around community and stakeholder engagement, which encompasses the work the team dedicated to this function does, as well as the work the Social Performance team need to do across all of the focus areas.
  - ARTC is about to roll out a series of workforce development events. One was held previously in Goondiwindi which was part of the Border to Gowrie project. The current series are as follows:
    - o Ipswich, 25 August, 4 – 6pm, North Ipswich Reserve Corporate Centre
    - o Beaudesert, 1 September, 4 – 6pm, The Centre, Beaudesert
    - o Toowoomba, 8 September, 4 – 6pm, Empire Theatre
    - o Gatton, 15 September, 4 – 6pm, Lockyer Valley Cultural Centre
- Note:** Additional event details added after the meeting
- ARTC is currently in the process of revising the social impact assessment, which forms part of the EIS, which will involve a process of further consultation. A Social Impact Management Plan (SIMP) will also be developed specifically for the Calvert to Kagaru (C2K) project. This will be implemented upon the revised EIS being approved.
  - ARTC is also working with Regionerate Rail to ensure they are across their responsibilities, as it relates to the social impact assessment findings.
  - Within the draft SIMP, is a community wellbeing plan. This has a series of objectives for each of ARTC's Queensland projects to identify strategies that:
    - o will avoid and minimise impacts that may affect community wellbeing, including impacts on community mental health
    - o identify strategies that maximise communication and cooperation between local stakeholders to address social impacts, including a focus on vulnerable groups
    - o mitigate the impacts on local amenity eg schools/school facilities, parks, people's enjoyment of public space or people's enjoyment of their own private property.
  - Through the community plan, ARTC is looking at the things that we could do that might help to offset some of the amenity impacts and contribute positively to community or local area amenity such as public spaces and facilities.
  - **JM** queried if there was actually a proposed community wellbeing plan in the first draft EIS?
    - o **MJ** confirmed that there was.
    - o **JM** asked if ARTC was re-visiting that whole plan?
    - o **MJ** replied that there is a secondary level of detail that is required upon receiving project approval, related to initiatives that will contribute positively to community wellbeing as the project is being constructed.
    - o **JM** queried if ARTC was undertaking this work in response to the request for more detailed information from the Office of the Coordinator General (OCG)?
    - o **MJ** responded that the OCG has sought additional information asking ARTC to provide more detail about what the scope of the plan would look like. ARTC have been engaging with councils around potential initiatives and mining some survey data undertaken recently, as well as undertaking an activity with the CCC members tonight and with the Peak Crossing community in the near future for any additional ideas they may have.

- **RK** commented that she is aware that ARTC have set up the mental health program for people to access if they choose to. However she wonders how many people in the Kagaru/Beaudesert area know about this service as it is a separate group to those who are doing it to the rest of the corridor. People are being affected right now by the unknown.
  - o **MJ** responded that we absolutely acknowledge impacts are being experienced now and the uncertainty is creating heightened levels of anxiety and may adversely impact some people's mental health. This is why ARTC created this partnership in 2019 and ahead of project approvals.
- **KB** queried what a PHN was?
- **MJ** confirmed that this is a Primary Health Network. It is a largely federally funded entity, responsible for assessing and commissioning services based on population need and helping to coordinate the health system more broadly. ARTC have established a partnership with the Darling Downs/West Moreton PHN, which is funding and trying to increase the promotion of those services for residents within the PHN catchment area. We have tried to do the same thing with the Brisbane South PHN, however a formal partnership has not yet been established with them.
- **MJ** reiterated that we will be running an activity tonight, and at an upcoming event in Peak Crossing, regarding ideas of where we can contribute positively to and enhance the amenity, character and connectivity of this local area.
- **KB** asked if any solid examples could be provided?
- **AS** noted some examples of ideas submitted previously from local stakeholders relevant to the C2K project area included:
  - o Rosewood Community Hub – planning or program support
  - o Support for local community or tourism events
  - o Art installations or signage reflecting local/Aboriginal heritage
- **KB** invited **KH** to talk more about the community grants process.
  - o **KH** noted that there are four rounds per year within the ARTC Inland Rail sponsorship and donations process. Up to \$4,000 is the maximum amount that one organisation can receive.
  - o **MJ** added that the sponsorship and donations process is administered through the Social Performance program and will continue to be available while project approvals are being sought, and some of these additional project-specific initiatives can be progressed.
- **KB** asked for some examples of where the money has been awarded in C2K
  - o **MJ** noted some examples in C2K are:
    - The Peak Crossing hall
    - Beaudesert State High School
    - Peak Crossing State School
    - Ipswich State School
    - The Ipswich Table Tennis Association
    - Queensland Pioneer Steam Railway
- Overall, the sponsorships and donations program has supported projects and initiatives totalling \$19k within the C2K area, not including the additional funding for this last round.
- **MJ** advised that, as part of the CCC activity, there is a poster in the room which lists some initiatives previously suggested by community members, and another poster which asks for ideas and suggestions.
- There is a third poster which asks for what a positive legacy would look like from Inland Rail, in the context of the Social Performance program.
- **JB** shared some examples of a legacy benefit may be:
  - o enhance public spaces, such as parks or streetscapes
  - o better physical or digital connectivity
  - o an increase in industry experience or skills
  - o stronger community organisations or networks

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ lasting projects that support local industry strengths eg tourism or logistics</li> <li>○ project facilities or infrastructure, that's left for the community to be used once ARTC have finished with those.</li> <li>- <b>MJ</b> noted that she has heard some of the suggestions around fencing and maintenance at Peak Crossing and at Kagaru. There may be something there in terms of a partnership that can be done in land management; ARTC could look at doing something in skills and training to assist with land care.</li> <li>- <b>MJ</b> invited anyone joining online to also participate in the activity via the survey link provided which outlines the same activities discussed tonight.</li> <li>- <b>KB</b> invited any community members observing the meeting to also participate in the activity.</li> <li>- <b>KB</b> called for any questions from observers.</li> <li>- <b>KH</b> read a question on behalf of <b>PB</b>: “Can I please suggest workshops for businesses, to leverage benefits from large infrastructure programs/projects?” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>MJ</b> replied that she will send <b>PB</b> the details for a workshop which is about engaging businesses and helping business development and growth ahead of Inland Rail.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>7</b></p>	<p><b>Project update and Engagement update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>DPM</b> noted that the EIS and the revised draft EIS continue to be one of the main focuses for the C2K project team. This is linked to the request for additional information from the Office of the Coordinator-General (OCG).</li> <li>- Ongoing engagement with the community and all three levels of government continues. Some of this is responding to questions from the OCG, and some is just best practice to maintain our relationships and presence in the community. We are very conscious that this project has been in the public realm for a long time. The recent workshops held on EIS topics and meetings held with all levels of Government, this engagement is ongoing as the project is ongoing.</li> <li>- We are still in the process of finalising when the second round of public consultation will occur, which is part of the OCG process. It will be in the next calendar year and we will give community members plenty of notice when the dates are confirmed.</li> <li>- <b>JM</b> asked if the process could be explained? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> replied that the draft EIS was the first version and the revised draft EIS is the second round. ARTC will develop that and send it to the OCG for review. If they deem it to be adequate enough it will go back out for the formal second round of public consultation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>JM</b> asked if ARTC has a good relationship with the OCG ie does ARTC receive guidance as to what they are looking for? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> responded that ARTC work closely with the OCG’s office and attend fortnightly meetings with them at different levels within our organisation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Construction can’t commence until EIS approval has been received. On the whole, land resumption occurs after EIS approval and then construction commences.</li> <li>- ARTC is undertaking ongoing interaction with Regionerate Rail as the preferred proponent to revise the draft EIS. A final contract hasn’t been signed with them yet. The conditions that come back from the EIS form part of ARTC’s relationship with Regionerate Rail.</li> <li>- ARTC are still leading the project but Regionerate Rail are playing an important role and we understand there is some interest from the community to meet them. They will be the ones that have the enduring relationship in the community, and who will be offering business opportunities as the project progresses. There is no date in plan for this meeting but a future CCC is also a good opportunity for this to occur.</li> <li>- <b>RK</b> asked if Regionerate Rail will be coming to an upcoming future CCC meeting?</li> <li>- <b>DPM</b> said that a CCC meeting makes sense as part of a formal introduction to the community.</li> <li>- <b>JM</b> commented that she would like to see attendance figures at the C2K EIS workshops. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>KH</b> replied that the numbers were available in an upcoming slide.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



- **JM** noted that there was a low attendance at the Social Performance and business opportunities workshop she attended.
- **DPM** said that this is a good topic for all of us to be conscious of. Part of this is that the project has already been quite a long time in the community. Observer numbers at CCC meetings also fluctuate. We are trying to keep community members' interest in the project. Although there wasn't a huge turn out at that session, there was some good attendance at other workshops. It is dependent on the topic, the time of day and the weather etc. We have a real interest in trying to do things differently.
- **KB** highlighted on behalf of **MJ** that there was a Social Performance community wellbeing activity on Saturday 10 September, as well as a sausage sizzle, thanks to **JM**'s suggestion.
- The C2K EIS workshops held to date have been water, flora & fauna and sustainability & offsets, Social Performance & business opportunities and ecology, with a specific koala workshop planned for 18 August.
  - **KH** noted that this is a targeted invitation list to groups and individuals with a specialist knowledge in koalas, so we are hoping for a good attendance at this workshop. We are also interested in testing attendance at different locations and different times of day to see how they go.
- **RK** queried if the koala workshop invitee list will be published before the meeting, including the expert groups who have been invited?
  - **KH** said she will follow this up further but imagines it will probably be a similar format to what was done previously for the B2G workshop.
- **ACTION ITEM** – ARTC to look into distributing the C2K koala workshop invitation list to the invitees in advance.
- Upcoming C2K EIS workshops include traffic & level crossings and noise & vibration, followed by the introduction of Regionerate Rail to the CCC and community members. We are still looking to lock dates in for these activities.
- **AC** asked if a workshop could be included on the land ownership that we were discussing earlier eg if people's land is going to be resumed, they may want to talk to surveyors.
  - **AR** replied that she will discuss this with TMR.
- **DPM** commented that the consultation associated with the property impacts is one of the most extensive ones because ARTC has to have these meetings. The impact assessment and cost reimbursement process needs to be clearly understood. The residents who have impacts will receive very high levels of consultation for the project and there are very formal processes established. However we will look into this further with TMR.
- **ACTION ITEM** – ARTC to talk to TMR whether a property-focused workshop could be held, where interested stakeholders could hear from and ask questions of subject-matter experts.
- **MJ** discussed the Social Performance workshop and agreed that fewer community members attended this one. A question was raised around noise mitigation at Peak Crossing, which is something that ARTC will continue to work through with Regionerate Rail. Noise mitigations would be offered on a case by case basis where exceedances apply, which would include residents in Peak Crossing.
- A question was also raised around the 'living in place' survey which was an independent survey that has been led to measure community values around a number of liveability factors and community wellbeing. We have made a commitment to share the results of this at a future CCC meeting.
- **FM** discussed the Ecology workshop recently held in Peak Crossing on Saturday 30<sup>th</sup> July. There were 11 people attending in person and 2 online and was a follow-up to the previous flora & fauna, sustainability & offsets session held in April this year. We wanted to give more time in this session to community members to provide their knowledge and data that they had about ecology near the alignment. Dr Vanessa Gorecki provided an overview of all of the survey work that's been done in the past, back to 2013 or so, and we asked participants to provide some information and to provide some feedback to us regarding flora and fauna seen near the alignment.

- Healthy Land and Water provided some good information regarding their koala rehabilitation activities in the Teviot Range, which we can provide to our offsets team to understand if there's some hardships there that we can look at. Koalas were also raised as being in proximity to the alignment. We are still collating and working through the feedback we received.
- **JM** queried what the Healthy Land and Water and offsets reference meant.
  - o **FM** replied that it was a connection point between the groups so there can be more conversations going forwards.
- **RK** commented that if someone in an official capacity asks a local a question, their answer is likely to be "no", as they are afraid of what the implications for their property are. It is the same as identifying unregistered bores as people distrust bureaucracy. The fact that people say "no" doesn't mean they are not there.
- **RK** also noted regarding the information sheet that referred to endangered animals, there are quite a lot of them east of the Teviot Range. Eg she saw a regent honeyeater in the Kagaru area.
  - o **FM** noted that when we do impact assessment for ecology matters, it's predominantly around potential habitat. So even if there's only one record, all of the features that are necessary for that particular species to be able to live, breed or forage there, that's what we assess our impact on. To have community information on any sort of increase or decrease in numbers is very helpful to tell the story about the ecology.
- **RK** commented that her concern is the lack of information about observation or potential habitat area is taken as a reason not to do something. There's two major biodiversity corridors that this C2K corridor is going to totally dissect. Just because the wildlife is not sighted, it doesn't mean they are not there. The presumption should always be that they are there and every precaution needs to be taken. **RK** asked a question in the Ecology workshop regarding the underpasses being over water courses, as fauna passes under the rail. There might be 27 of them, but they will be filled when we get a storm. The answer was, "there's plenty of height above them", but koalas don't necessarily swim up to a concrete post to get through. **RK** sees fauna crossings as being separate from bridges over dry gullies.
  - o **FM** replied that **RK's** concerns are noted. There will be incidental opportunities for crossing points because of the way the infrastructure is built, being on a bridge or up on piers. That's not available at all times, particularly when there's floods so there's . times when fauna does need to be able to move. We are preparing a fauna movement connectivity strategy that specifically looks at the types of fauna that we have and how they move throughout the area. Not just along the alignment but from one section of habitat to another and how we can facilitate that movement, which wasn't in the draft EIS. It will also look at the functionality of those bridges to see if it actually achieves anything. In other cases it may be providing an effective movement corridor.
  - o **DPM** added there are an extensive amount of structures eg around 8km of bridges and the tunnel as well, which functions as a land bridge. We are maintaining that through the Teviot Range as well.
- **KH** added that there are some of the activity feedback forms from the Ecology workshop here tonight, if anyone wanted to take one home and fill it in with any information about flora or fauna they had seen locally, we would really appreciate any contribution. We were discussing emailing it to our whole database also for community members to complete.
  - o **KB** suggested that there may be some places that hard copies can be kept eg at the council chambers that people can see when they are paying their rates etc.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>JM</b> suggested other places could include the Peak Crossing store or any free newspapers eg the Moreton Border News.</li> <li>○ <b>AC</b> suggested the local schools is another idea</li> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> added that we've dropped the mental health flyers at the pub and the bakery previously so we could do something similar.</li> <li>○ <b>JM</b> suggested including it in the Gowrie to Kagaru e-newsletter             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>KH</b> thanked everyone for some excellent ideas.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>- <b>ACTION ITEM</b> – ARTC to look at ways to share the C2K Ecology workshop activity to encourage more stakeholders to identify local flora and fauna they've seen along the alignment.</p>
<p><b>8</b></p>	<p><b>General business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>KH</b> noted that the Queensland Pioneer Steam Railway was a successful applicant from the last round of the ARTC Inland Rail Sponsorship and Donations program. New applications are encouraged and the guidelines and application form can be found here: <a href="https://inlandrail.artc.com.au/opportunities/sponsorships-and-donations/">https://inlandrail.artc.com.au/opportunities/sponsorships-and-donations/</a></li> <li>- Next SRICCC meeting scheduled for 10 November             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>KH</b> added that the Cultural Awareness training for members is in plan to occur just before the CCC meeting, from 4.15 – 5.15pm.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>JM</b> asked if all of the workshops that haven't occurred yet will be scheduled prior to the next CCC meeting?</li> <li>- <b>DPM</b> replied that the formal introduction of Regionerate Rail is something we could possibly do in November, starting with the CCC, but we may have to have some flexibility around timings for this. For traffic &amp; level crossings and noise, this is probably achievable keeping in mind that we have to factor in advance time for advertising also. We will try to give as much notice as possible for the next workshops.</li> <li>- <b>JM</b> commented if ARTC is planning to resubmit the revised draft EIS before the end of the year, and if the CCC is in the second week of November, then is the purpose of the noise and vibration meeting to present information or to actually get feedback?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> noted that this is the kind of conversation ARTC has behind the scenes. For the noise and vibration session, there's some changes to the way that the information is going to be presented in the revised draft EIS and some tweaks as to how it's being assessed also. So the main focus of that is going to be an informative session. The outcomes for noise and vibration are directly linked to where infrastructure goes. Regarding the traffic and level crossing workshop, we have been consulting on this project for a long time and have been taking feedback. This is one of the hot topics that apply to C2K, along with ecology and noise. There are some anticipated changes to some of the roads and associating level crossings with the project. We need to confirm that detail before we come out into the community, which will be as a result of consultation that's been undertaken to date. Whereas noise and vibration will be more informative because there have been some changes to methodologies and the way information will be presented.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>RK</b> asked at the noise and vibration workshop if it would be possible to have some sort of demonstration/comparison or similar regarding what the various noise levels are like. There have been examples in the past that equate a decibel level to a lawn mower, which does not provide an accurate level as this is open to interpretation. This may be very difficult, but on the whole, people do not understand what the noise level is. Most of the noise levels listed in the various reports are averages. However the noise with trains that's annoying is the sudden burst of noise that only lasts for a short period of time.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> noted that it was a very difficult subject to broach. There are examples online of what different noise levels are. We have consciously chosen not to try and play noise levels over speakers because the way you experience that in a hall or out of a speaker is different to what it is experienced in real life. At some point we were trying to line up a CCC with where a train was going to come past - obviously, using</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- real life examples is the most effective way. Part of our job is trying to communicate very complex issues to the community, in a way that allows them to better understand, so we will try to come up with a way to do that around noise levels.
- **FM** reiterated that this is a very important focus in her role, to try and clearly communicate and articulate what this very scientific and detailed analysis actually means for people in real life.
  - **ACTION ITEM** – ARTC to explore ways to better articulate and communicate noise values and measurements, particularly for the upcoming C2K noise workshop.
  - **RK** asked if ARTC currently have leasehold of the West Moreton line?
    - **AR** noted that this is managed by Queensland Rail (QR).
  - **RK** commented that the various corridors from Toowoomba will utilise a few sections of the West Moreton line.
    - **DPM** remarked that there's the existing QR line and then ARTC are building three tunnels and we come close and build our new rail line next to QR in a few locations. ARTC are not building in the QR corridor but are building a new rail line.
    - **RK** queried how Inland Rail interacts with the West Moreton line.
    - **DPM** replied that Inland Rail comes down and continues towards Kagaru. At that intersection, there's a spur line. The city-bound connection does tie into the QR network.
  - **RK** asked about the financing of the upgrade and maintenance of the West Moreton line – where the responsibility lies and who is responsible for financing it? Is it part of the PPP process or will it be funded by the Queensland government? It probably depends on what they are going to use.
    - **DPM** commented that **RK** has answered her question.
  - **AC** asked if the railway line going through the middle of Gatton will have a second line beside it, so there will be two lines running a few metres apart, parallel?
    - **DPM** confirmed that was the current plan.
  - **AC** queried if the tunnels that were being built were wide enough for two lines or just one?
    - **DPM** answered that it was just one line.
    - **AC** reflected that QR trains won't go through ARTC tunnels?
    - **DPM** said that it is assumed that some of the trains that currently use the QR line will be able to use the 6.5km Toowoomba tunnel that ARTC is planning on building. This will be an alternative to the bendy rail line that runs up the range.
    - **AC** commented that she thought the whole point was to avoid conflict between the two rail lines, ARTC and QR?
    - **DPM** noted that he wouldn't say that was the whole point of building the Inland Rail project but rather more likely to be one of the outcomes.
    - **AC** replied that her father was a railway signal man who kept the trains from crashing into each other. The best way to stop trains from crashing is to have them on separate lines. If you are now saying two lines are going to converge into one tunnel, that's asking for trouble.
    - **DPM** said that the existing rail lines will be there. This is about the role of the passing loops. From the time that your father worked in the railway lines, a lot of it is technology-based now. The safe working systems associated with that are extensive. At the moment it will be mostly one rail line with the passing loops at strategic locations to allow as many trains to run as is required.
  - **RK** asked if at the Toowoomba end of the line, the coal trains will somehow have to get from the Queensland system onto the Inland Rail system and come down via Kagaru and up into Brisbane and eventually to the Port?
    - **DPM** confirmed that In Gowrie, Toowoomba, the Inland Rail line will be built next to the QR line. There are some connections being built that allow the two rail lines to be connected. So they are not totally separate pieces of infrastructure.
    - **AC** asked if they are the same gauge as QR?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> replied that they weren't, but ARTC is building dual-gauge rail, which allows both narrow and standard-gauge trains to run. Most of the network in Queensland is narrow gauge.</li> <li>- <b>RK</b> asked what the purpose of the branch line is at Calvert, that goes in towards Brisbane?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> replied that a part of it is the interoperability piece, to give operational flexibility in the future. Obviously, there is also the potential need for trains near the Brisbane CBD area to use Inland Rail.</li> <li>○ <b>RK</b> commented that trains go down the West Moreton line and then come down the branch line onto the C2K corridor. The only place it can go is down to Kagaru and back up into Brisbane and she doesn't really see the point?</li> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> said that they can go to Kagaru and they head south because that is part of the network. These designs evolve over time, but essentially it is providing the opportunity to make it operational.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>KB</b> read out a question from <b>SB</b> (logged in as 'Malcolm' online), related to the 25 per cent coal freight component. Can Inland Rail be viable without coal component? The project will face political hits/wins if it is perceived to be publicly funded fossil fuel infrastructure. There will be big concerns if the project offers a means to open up a new coal mine. ARTC needs to do more public disclosure on this issue. Perhaps for the next meeting. The Federal election shows there's much community concern over climate change and coal exports, etc.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>DPM</b> replied that Queensland currently has coal trains that run from west of Toowoomba that are assumed to run in the Inland Rail business case. One of the key metrics of how you work out if a project is worth building, is to calculate the dollars' worth of benefits that a project is going to produce over its life and compare that to how much it's going to cost to build. In the overall benefits of the whole of Inland Rail, from Melbourne to Brisbane, the benefits associated with coal are (DPM noted that this was his recollection and that he would need to confirm the percentage here) less than 10 per cent of the overall benefits of the whole project. The change of attitude towards fossil fuels is something that Inland Rail's decision-makers, the Federal Government also consider. But we are talking about less than 10 per cent of the benefits with coal, we are still talking about providing economic and world competitive freight throughout Australia for all sort of goods.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>KB</b> encouraged any observers who are listening tonight to keep the conversations continuing in between meetings. Observers can talk to Inland Rail staff or contact their committee members or go online to seek any further information.</li> </ul>
--	--

## Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	Provide further information available about the Intergovernmental Agreement.	ARTC	10/11/2022
2	ARTC to talk to TMR regarding lot parcel options available to landowners.	ARTC	10/11/2022
3	Land maintenance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ARTC to talk to TMR regarding noxious weeds on TMR-owned properties</li> <li>- ARTC to confirm if a centralised contact point for maintenance queries can be established</li> </ul>	ARTC	10/11/2022

4	ARTC to look into distributing the C2K koala workshop invitation list to the invitees in advance.	ARTC	Distributed on 11/8/22 Closed
5	ARTC to talk to TMR whether a property-focused workshop could be held, where interested stakeholders could hear from and ask questions of subject-matter experts.	ARTC	10/11/2022
6	ARTC to look at ways to share the C2K Ecology workshop activity to encourage more stakeholders to identify local flora and fauna they've seen along the alignment.	ARTC	10/11/2022
7	ARTC to explore ways to better articulate and communicate noise values and measurements, particularly for the upcoming C2K noise workshop	ARTC	10/11/2022

### Next meeting

10 November 2022, Peak Crossing Hall, 5.30 – 8pm