

Meeting minutes

Scenic Rim and Ipswich Community Consultative Committee

Date / Time

1 December 2022
5:30–8:10pm

Location

Peak Crossing Hall, Peak Crossing

Facilitator

Ms Kathy Baburin (KB) – Chair

Minute taker

Ms Karen Hillery (KH)

Attendees

- Ms Kathy Baburin (KB) – SRICCC
- Mr Simon Birrell (SB) – SRICCC (online)
- Mr Robert Collett (RC) – SRICCC
- Ms Angela Collyer (AC) – SRICCC
- Ms Alison Duke-Gibb (ADG) – SRICCC
- Ms Robyn Keenan (RK) – SRICCC
- Ms Jan McGregor (JM) – SRICCC (online)
- Ms Narrella Simpson (NS) – SRICCC
- Ms Rosemaree Thomasson (RT) – SRICCC
- Mr Mike Townsend (MT) – SRICCC
- Mr Don Piggott-McKellar (DPM) – ARTC Inland Rail
- Ms Myf Jagger (MJ) – ARTC Inland Rail
- Ms Karen Hillery (KH) – ARTC Inland Rail
- Ms Donna Cannon (DC) – ARTC Inland Rail
- Mr Ian Baldwin (IB) – ARTC Inland Rail

Apologies (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- Mr Adrian Stephan (AS) – SRICCC
- Mr Phillip Bell (PB) – SRICCC

Discussions

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
1	<p>Introduction and Acknowledgement of Country</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – KB addressed housekeeping – advised meeting was being recorded for minutes. – NS presented Welcome to Country on behalf of the Yuggera/Ugarapul people. – KB asked observers at the meeting to keep all the questions after the main body of the meeting and leave them until the end depending on time. – KH raised ARTC IR are still exploring ways to better articulate and communicate noise, values, and measurements. ARTC IR is still working on the issue. – KH has been communicating with Council and libraries regarding 4 metre maps and flyers – AC suggested the Boonah Library as they have glass walls. – ACTION: ARTC to investigate whether the Inland Rail maps could be displayed on glass windows e.g. libraries. – AD-G suggested making them into 1-metre portions rather than a large 4 metre map – KH advised the maps had already been made but will investigate the option in the future. KB suggested looking into putting maps in empty shop windows in the community as well. – AD-G mentioned that some information gets lost in an email and asked if there was an option to tag the information onto the appropriate meeting minutes. – KH proposed that she could note when an email was sent in the minutes. – AD-G was concerned about how the public would access the information. – KB advised some of the information is on the website, therefore can relevant links be inserted in the minutes. – ACTION: ARTC to include website links in meeting minutes where possible.

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KH offered for the team to present the slides on level crossings again for anyone who missed the previous Scenic Rim and Ipswich CCC (SRICCC) session. - AC raised the action re: ARTC to talk to TMR regarding parcel options. Discussed that at the Beaudesert meeting it was stated "each one would be dealt with on a case-by-case basis." This was causing some confusion as TMR was saying they "advised that a severed parcel of land which remains in the ownership of the landowner will have the same lot plan as the balance of land and is not granted a separate title. Should the landowner not wish to retain ownership of the severed parcel, then they are encouraged to discuss this with ARTC who will provide this information to TMR". AC concerned about parcels of land being landlocked and how that will impact the landowner. - IB responded that he acknowledged the impact the rail line will have on property and landowners. Stated there were two options - option 1. The landowner can approach ARTC to suggest we acquire a said property or option 2. Case by case dependent on what the landowner wants. IB stated the landowner will dictate what they want to do about their land severance. - AC also raised issue about associated costs and IB confirmed costs will be covered by ARTC as the property will stay as one lot. IB also mentioned that subdividing a property is beyond the current scope of work. - RK raised rural land under 100 hectares cannot be subdivided and wanted to know why ARTC (as a government entity) does not have the power to change the legislation under special circumstances. - MT questioned severed land and whether a stock access can be built. IB responded that infrastructure solutions will be sought. - KB reiterated that all relevant parties related to severed /changed lots have been met with by IR. - DPM confirmed this was the case. - AD-G would like communications materials to be provided to in a shareable format eg for social media and other forums so the community can be appropriately informed regarding ARTC's future activities. ADG wants more communication to be distributed throughout the community in different methods. - ACTION: ARTC will provide information regarding ARTC's future engagement activities via different formats eg shareable formats for social media as well as physical materials in the community eg flyers. - KH thanked AD-G for the social media advertising undertaken regarding the C2K November workshops, as well as the other members for their part in helping to communicate these sessions. - AD-G would like more advertising around when ARTC will be available at other times for consultation activities eg having a presence in Peak Crossing. - ACTION: ARTC to arrange to be more present in the community eg Peak Crossing drop-in sessions in the new year. - KH advised she is trying to contact the Peak Crossing petrol station, but they have not contacted her yet. - ACTION: AD-G to arrange with Peak Crossing petrol station owners to contact KH about drop-in sessions. - RT and AD-G believe that communication is being distributed too late within the community and should not always be online. - KB added a request for committee members to provide ideas on how Inland Rail can best share information.

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DPM advised that he has also left flyers regarding the C2K revised reference design at the Peak Crossing pub but we will continue to pursue in-person and online communications options.
2	<p>Conflict of interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No conflicts raised in the meeting.
3	<p>Inland Rail Moree Flooding Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KB – shared photos of recent trip to Moree and the construction of Narrabri to North Star rail line. - Discussed how the series of culverts, road level and railway crossings were designed and constructed with flooding issues in mind. - Mentioned how unobtrusive the works were whilst they were driving through the construction area. - Noted there was a small number of machines were on site and how there was only a small number of employees working on site at the time.
4	<p>Cultural Heritage Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DC outlined that cultural heritage is managed under a Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP) - ‘Early works’ surveys have been undertaken and are about 90% completed. - From the information gathered, heritage sites/objects such as stone artefacts, scatters, isolates and scar trees have been identified. - Surveys are ongoing and more investigations will be continued next year. - RT enquired about other heritage areas such as Grandchester, which although is not in C2K, is interested in how this will be offset. - DC stated that with all heritage, ARTC has to identify and look at the significance of it and record it historically. Some areas can be avoided and some mitigated. ARTC will liaise with the group as to how it is managed. - KB asked if residents along the rail route can report area of significance. - DC advised that this is right and ARTC will do an assessment on it. Community members are encouraged to bring this type of information forward to the culture heritage team. - RT enquired about whether an assessment had been done for Grandchester. - DPM responded with his acknowledgement of the importance of the rail network in Grandchester and requirement to protect buildings of heritage value but will discuss it further at the next CCC. - ACTION: ARTC to provide a Cultural Heritage update regarding Grandchester at next SRICCC meeting. - MJ added that the social impact assessment investigates what happens and what the impacts on community facilities are. - SB asked whether any scar trees were found on the alignment? - DC advised yes and that the location of the tree/s is confidential. The option always is to avoid scar trees where possible. It is unlikely that we would be removing them. We would be in consultation with the respective liaison group about this. - Participant raised issue about vibration must be considered with regards to trains. - DPM agreed that ARTC assesses noise and vibration for both construction and the ongoing operations of the rail line. Noise and vibration specialists are also available at the community engagement sessions and more will be run next year for anyone interested in noise and vibration queries.

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
5	<p>Social Performance presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MJ advised that Beaudesert State High School was announced as a recipient of the sponsorship and donations round for their STEM/Science camp for year 10 students. - Round 16 sponsorship / donations program is open now until the end of January 2023. - MJ advised that upon taking the advice of AD-G she will contact the local schools to promote the sponsorship and donations program in their newsletters. - MJ discussed that she is exploring an option for accredited training in land management/property/conservation management on one of the ARTC properties. - MJ requested information about particular stakeholder groups who may be interested in this form of training. This will be done through an expression of interest (EOI) process. - MJ discusses the cultural awareness training for SRICCC members in the new year and requests feedback on a way to do engaging training on the matter. - MJ noted an idea for another bus tour incorporating some cultural awareness training and experiences. - KB asked members for their thoughts about whether they would like another bus tour to see if there's any changes in the alignment or whether this is necessary. There have already been two alignment tours. - MJ discusses workforce development events across the Beaudesert, Ipswich, Gatton and Toowoomba area followed by one-on-one sessions with business for business capability workshops. - MT stated that the information has been shared through the Beaudesert Chamber of Commerce in meetings, through emails and on their website. <p>Action: Social Performance team to look into information for sponsorship and donations to be placed in the local school newsletters</p>
6	<p>Project update and Engagement update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DPM mentioned that ARTC Inland Rail is still working on the revised draft EIS. This includes engagement with the community and all three levels of government. The document will come out for a second round of formal public consultation next year. There are also numerous meetings with impacted landowners and stakeholders occurring. Another key component is addressing questions from the Coordinator-General. - DPM discussed the second draft of the revised EIS in detail. The first draft was released in early 2021 and ran for three months as part of the formal public consultation. Submissions regarding the report could be forwarded to the Coordinator-General. In 2023, ARTC Inland Rail will be running the second round of public consultations and will provide plenty of notice for stakeholders and landowners to provide feedback. The timing that the second round of public consultation will be released will be dependent on the Coordinator-General, ensuring they have reviewed and provided outcomes for the first round. - ACTION – ARTC to provide the Coordinator-General (EIS) Flowchart. - JM asked when ARTC is expecting to submit the second/revised draft EIS to the Office of the Coordinator-General? - DPM responded within the next calendar year – sometime in 2023. He advised it is hard to give a specific date as there are so many different parts to the process to commit to a set timeframe. - RK mentioned August 2023. - DPM responded that was the Coordinator-General's lapsed date for the EIS Process. - DPM discussed hard copy versions of the fact sheets were available at the CCC meeting and were also available online at: https://inlandrail.artc.com.au/where-we-go/projects/calvert-to-kagaru/consultation/ .

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [Note: online link added to the minutes after the meeting.] ARTC is also going to be updating the version of the interactive map to include the changes such as the removal of the level crossings. - DPM proceeded to demonstrate the interactive map to show where the changes are. 1. Change at the Wild Pig Creek Road east. 2. Wild Pig Creek Road West where possible changes are still under review. - RK enquired if further down the actual junction from the Wild Pig Road has the curve changed for rail alignment. - DPM advised that there may have been some very minor changes. - RK asked if to the south of Wild Pig Creek Road has been extended. - DPM advised that he is confident it has not moved but will investigate both issues. - ACTION – ARTC to provide more details about the changes at the junction from the Wild Pig Creek Road and to the south of Wild Pig Creek Road. - DPM summarises some factors that the stakeholder engagement sessions have incorporated. Firstly, the flood modelling for the project has been discussed. Due to the information being presented at previous meetings, it was going to be a more questions and answer discussion. - DPM stated that the Independent International Flood Report has been released. One of the key findings were the flood models that ARTC are using are fit for purpose and do demonstrate best practice for this stage of the design life. One of the key outcomes was to define “flood Impact objectives” which is the quantifiable design criteria for different flooding conditions. The criteria covered is peak water level, varying targets of separated land uses and changes in the velocity/speed of the water. Hazards (the depth of water and the speed of water) also needs to be identified. DPM mentioned there is a flyer with similar information available which has been tabled at previous engagement sessions and is available at: https://inlandrail.artc.com.au/assessment-and-management-of-flooding-and-hydrology-in-queensland-fact-sheet/ . - [Note: online link added to the minutes after the meeting.] - RT asked about a link to the International Flood Panel Report - ACTION: ARTC to provide a link to the International Flood Panel Report. - The International Flood Panel report can be found here: https://www.tmr.qld.gov.au/projects/inland-rail/independent-panel-of-experts-for-flood-studies-in-queensland - [Note: online link added to the minutes after the meeting.] - KB asked about the definition of sensory receptors. - DPM explained that they are frequently used when discussing noise but can be used in various assessments. In this instance it could be the structure or farmland affected by the event such as the flooding. If it was a noise issue, the sensory receptive will be the building and the discussion will be around the effect the noise has on the building. He mentions that the report discusses numerous impacts as it is a large technical report but there has been focus on flooding on roads, farmlands, and habitable floor level houses. The link to the report is online. ARTC will now be focusing on some targeted engagement as the final design is close. This will be covered at future CCC meetings. - DPM discussed the engagement required for noise impact regarding the whole of the operational rail line. The current draft EIS is based on the NSW guidelines as the Queensland Government’s Department of Transport interim guidelines for operational railway noise and vibration assessment. ARTC is in the process of running the assessment against the Qld guidelines. The Queensland Guidelines are modelled on the train numbers the predicted year that the project opens and up to the theoretical year of 2040 (the year

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>ARTC has nominated with a highest theoretical number of trains the rail line can operate under).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DPM advised the noise modelling is being revised and the results will be in the revised draft EIS. - DPM talked about the issue of vibration and the key focuses will be the ground borne vibrations and the amount of vibration that trains create. - RT raised the issue of the sensory receptor regarding the environment. - DPM responded that ARTC is considering the limits set for fauna (through ecological assessments) and populations. - RK asked questions about the two forms of vibration – ground vibration and noise vibration and whether the noise/sound waves that cause vibration are taken into consideration also. - DPM will refer the question to the noise subject matter expert. - ACTION: ARTC will check whether the noise/sound waves that cause vibration are taken into consideration also in the vibration modelling. - Participant Question: How many sensory receptors are there in the C2K project area and what is the distance away from the line. - DPM responded that the vibrations testing showed that all sensory receptors were under the expectable levels set by the Queensland Government. Testing still needs to be done for construction and operational noise. DPM also mentioned that 13 triggers/sensory receptors have been identified at the moment, exceeding the acceptable noise level in the C2K project area. - Participant wanted clarification about what the distance is from the line to the sensory receptors. - DPM advised that the assessment area is 2 kilometres either side of the rail line. - Participant asked about the number of 13 sensory receptors and can this number be increased. - DPM stated it could be increased dependent on further assessments. - KB asked what happens if the noise travels where it has not been anticipated. - DPM stated that is where the Coordinator-General’s conditions as part of the EIS come in. A condition of the EIS is that noise will continue to be monitored whilst the railway is in operation. If a noise issue identified, ARTC will refer to the Coordinator-General’s conditions to rectify the issue. - AD-G asked what the standards for noise were; what happens if the noise level is only 10-20% below and what are the mitigation strategies for these scenarios. - DPM advised he will investigate and provide the details at a future SRICCC meeting. - AD-G enquired about whether the New South Wales guidelines are higher or lower. - DPM advised that there are different criteria. If it is not identified as being triggered over the noise management level, then no mitigation is proposed at the moment. Even though ARTC is offering a consistent high standard of mitigation, there are some complexities around different states having different guidelines. - ACTION: ARTC to provide more information regarding the noise standards and the associated mitigation strategies, including the different state guidelines. AD-G was concerned that some people have potentially gone from no noise to around 70 decibels and is concerned that it is “just too bad”. - DPM explained that noise levels near the trainline vary based on location therefore it is hard to comment on the 70 decibel comment. Therefore, you cannot treat every stakeholder the same way. Combining the new rail line next to an existing one, ARTC is considering the combination of the train noises. The study done near the rail line and in a greenfield area (ie

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>new rail line corridor) is done the same way (though there are different noise limits applied to existing rail corridor as compared to new rail corridors) and is not sure of any other options for these kind of assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AD-G suggested offering different mitigation strategies for different areas. The example is in a greenfield area, the mitigation strategy could be offered at a level of 50 instead of 70. - Online question: Which noise guidelines will be the criteria for the revised Draft EIS: the one used for Melbourne/Brisbane, the original EIS; or does the Queensland one now override it? - DPM explained when the revised draft EIS is released, people will see the Queensland Government's Guideline assessment. - RK asked - in the original EIS there were two different levels of noise criteria for the greenfield site or for the existing line. Will that still apply? - DPM clarified that the new standard does have slightly different standards regarding noise levels. There are also different noise management levels based on when there is an existing rail line in comparison to when a brand-new rail line is being introduced. - RK asked if there will be a specific workshop on noise before the EIS comes out. - DPM advised that ARTC will be hosting more engagement sessions next year. - KB (asked question for JM) - will the maximum still be 80 decibels? - DPM will double check with the Queensland Government Guidelines. - ACTION: ARTC to review what the maximum decibels allowed is as per the Queensland Government's Guidelines - AD-G wants clarification of the assessment for an idling train in comparison to a moving train. - RT wants clarification about noise levels if there is one train an hour in comparison to for example 3 trains per hour. - DPM will seek further clarifications on these two points. - ACTION: ARTC will seek clarification on assessment of idling trains in comparison to moving trains. Also, clarification on noise assessment for the number of trains in a set period. - KH summarises 2022 workshops on: Water, Level Crossings, Level Crossing removal, Noise and Vibration, General Project Queries including rail/road alignment and flooding and hydrology. - AD-G raised concern about the recording of information gathered at workshops and that only summaries are giving out afterwards. - KH responded that a comprehensive overview will be provided to members and any feedback can be contributed prior to the document going to the OCG. - DPM advised that notes are taken, then summarised and the information is placed in the revised draft EIS. - AD-G raised a concern that she has received a message advising that "outcomes from the workshops have been captured; and that they are draft; but given your comment below about us avoiding issues, in an effort to improve our transparency, I am sending you a draft, not formatted, not properly edited or rewritten document, to show the feedback captured from the September session. This information will be edited and included in the EIS". AD-G was unsure whether she could share the document with the community and whether the information is accurate. She proceeded to say that she encourages community members to attend workshops etc. but there is a concern about how what is being said is being interpreted by those who read the notes and how the information will be used. The community gets discouraged from turning up if the CCC members cannot take the information back to them and say, "is this what you meant." - KH said it was a big task to compile the information from the workshops into a few slides. Members have the ability to input into reading all the summary information collated from the

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<p>workshop, but ARTC only presents a collated list of important points (both positive and negative) from the workshops.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KH discusses the Koala workshop in August. 17 Community members attended and 2 observers. It was mentioned that all the comments would not be read out but participants at the workshop would like some fencing at connection points at certain areas; they would like the use of scat and scent detection dogs; mentioned that numbers are sparse in some areas. ARTC has collected this information and referred it to the relevant teams. KH mentioned that detection dogs have been used on recent studies. - KH referred to the community wellbeing activity and sausage sizzle in September. 15 people attended but ARTC received a huge amount of information and really appreciated the community members for attending. Some feedback/concerns received on the day were koala land preservation; corridors preservation; TMR land donated to council to preserve; ARTC taking local jobs when businesses are struggling to find people; traffic volume on roads with dual lanes required; funding for Purga School Road after rain events could have been used elsewhere; community involvement in decision-making and local knowledge and Inland Rail to lessen the impact on community and existing population. Also mentioned was the limited coverage of mobile coverage; no NBN and structures need to be more pleasing to the eye. - AD-G suggested that a solution could be that a summary of what everyone has said at a meeting is captured in the document so the community can feel like they are being heard. - KH asked if the PowerPoint presentation at the CCC (uploaded online) is sufficient. - AD-G responded that it does not cover everything. - KH stated that it will be included in the EIS. - AD-G reiterated that the EIS can be a long way away and the community might not be able to recall correctly what was said. The community would like to be able to refer to it and might be able to talk to the project team for clarification closer to when the issue was raised rather than waiting till they find it in the EIS. - KB sought clarification if AD-G wanted minutes taken at workshops. - AD-G said she is happy with the key feedback listed in the slides but rather than have key notes provided for review, also wanted the full response provided from ARTC. - MT asked how the feedback, notes etc are recorded at a workshop – whether they are verbally or via text. MT queried how community members made suggestions. - KH stated they are normally given verbally, sometimes on post-it notes. - MT suggested that they put some boards up and place post-it notes on them to capture the feedback. - KH stated that records have been taken from every single workshop within the last two weeks and that staff members would write down what was happening there. - MT suggested that after putting the post it notes with feedback on a board, possibly take a photo. This photo could be distributed as “completed yellow post it notes from the Peak Crossing Event”. - DPM advised that introducing a process to improve the ability to capture information is important and will investigate ways that ARTC can make improvements. - DPM advised that not only is there note - taking but there are also follow up phone calls to stakeholders as required. - DPM mentions some of the feedback may be anonymous and that different types of workshops are run in different ways. - MT said the information needs to be captured and presented to the community. - KH thanked members for the feedback. - ACTION: ARTC will look into providing information from the Peak Crossing and other workshops sooner than via the EIS.

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KH proceeded with details about the November workshops. Thanked everyone for supporting the workshops in the community. Purga had 19 stakeholders attend; Peak Crossing had 28 attend and Rosewood had 23 stakeholders attend. The main concerns raised were the land acquisition process; general property enquiries; road closures (referring to the maps) and the general road/rail alignment. Also raised was noise and flooding impacts; the lay-down areas and the mitigation strategies. It was advised that if landowners were unable to attend ARTC would continue to have one on one conversations. Advised that ARTC would not be consulting with stakeholders from mid-December to mid-January to give them their holiday (acknowledged by OCG). - KH addressed online question from AD-G regarding ARTC process when contacting newly affected landowners. When the stakeholder team becomes aware of a property change (either via the new owners, community member or the property team) a contact letter is sent to them and offering to arrange a meeting. The landowner will normally contact ARTC, and the process of offering more information begins. If a phone contact is provided, ARTC will follow up with them in a few weeks for questions. If a phone contact does not exist, ARTC might go to the property and do introductions or leave a letter in their mailbox. The information provided at a meeting is project overview, how it will affect their property and offer them information on project updates. Also, the property team could be in contact them to arrange a meeting time to discuss potential land access agreements. - KB acknowledged that it is good to know process so if the community asks what happens, they know. - DPM asked that if anyone is aware of new people moving into the area, please let ARTC know or pass on our details on to them. - KB reiterated that if anyone hears a community member is aggrieved or not contacted properly, please pass on their details to ARTC. - KB asked an observer if he had any questions. - An observer supported AD-G's comments about communication. Reference was made to meeting on 30th July 2022 at Flinders Uniting Church Hall. It was mentioned that the observer requested that a summary be provided by email to send to those who had attended the workshop, however this was never provided. The observer also raised concerns about - level crossings controls, referring to the Office of National Road Safety regulators belief that the only true safe alternative to a level rail crossing is to not build one. Questions were raised whether they will be passive (signs and devices not active during the passage of a train) or active (using flashing lights, signals, bells or other audible warning devise; gates or barriers or a combination of these). - DPM acknowledged the communication concerns. In the current version of the EIS (on the Coordinator General's website), there are eight level crossings. ARTC have proposed seven be removed and the one left will be an active level crossing (note – this is currently under review). - An observer enquired about the level crossing at Glencairn road. - DPM advised it has been removed with an alternate access road provided for property access. The level crossing left is at Wild Pig Creek Road. - KB asked if there were any more questions. - KH asked if committee members could encourage applications for sponsorship and donations from ARTC. - KH raised when the next CCC meeting date would be. - KB stated possibly late February /early March - KB reminded members to please consider attending the Cultural Awareness training. - RT asked what Cultural Awareness means?

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DC answered that Cultural Awareness is about the understanding and respect for the Traditional Owners or First Nations People and understanding their culture. - KB provided an example of an incident about how she sought advice on how to communicate with someone from an Indigenous community so she would not offend. - RT advised that the training is necessary for all cultures. She raised the issue that we all multi-cultural not just one culture. - MT responded stating that rather than traditional owners, they talk about “traditional Custodians” and engaging in a respectful manner. Cultural awareness is more about having respectful relationships. It is about talking about the impact of our statements/conversations in a respectful manner within a non-invasive environment. - AD-G query for more information regarding the Peak Crossing crossing loop. - Action: ARTC to provide more information about the crossing loop at Peak Crossing. - RK questioned the truth in the north/south branch at Kagaru will be extended by 250 metres north and south to lessen the curve. - DPM advised he is pretty sure that it is the same but will address the concern at the next meeting after he gathers more information. - ACTION: ARTC to confirm whether the north/south branch at Kagaru will be extended by 250m north and south to lessen the curve. - RT concerned about state of maintenance on the existing line at Kagaru and was referred to Enviroline. The response was extremely poor from them. Since the discussion with KH, someone from inside ARTC has taken it upon themselves to tighten maintenance procedures. The news has been greatly received within the community.
7	<p>General business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AD-G wanted to discuss a quicker turnaround time for the meeting minutes. - KH advised that the Chair’s summary of the meeting is usually distributed within 7 days/1 week after the meeting but due to KH being unwell, they were delayed. Also, the minutes will be distributed within 2 to 3 weeks.

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	ARTC to investigate whether the Inland Rail maps could be displayed on glass windows eg libraries, shops.	ARTC	Next SRICCC meeting
2	ARTC to include website links in meeting minutes where possible.	ARTC	Next SRICCC meeting
3	ARTC will provide information regarding ARTC’s future engagement activities via different formats eg shareable formats for social media as well as physical materials in the community eg flyers.	ARTC	Next SRICCC meeting
4	<p>ARTC to arrange to be more present in the community eg Peak Crossing drop-in sessions in the new year.</p> <p>AD-G to arrange with Peak Crossing petrol station owners to contact KH about drop-in sessions.</p>	ARTC	Next SRICCC meeting

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
5	ARTC to provide a Cultural Heritage update regarding Grandchester at next SRICCC meeting.	ARTC	Next SRICCC meeting
6	Social Performance team to look into information for sponsorship and donations to be placed in the local school newsletters	ARTC	Next SRICCC meeting
7	ARTC to provide the Coordinator-General (EIS) flowchart.	ARTC	Next SRICCC meeting
8	ARTC to provide more details about the changes at the junction from the Wild Pig Creek Road and to the south of Wild Pig Creek Road.	ARTC	Next SRICCC meeting
9	ARTC to provide a link to the International Flood Panel Report.	ARTC	Next SRICCC meeting
10	ARTC will check whether the noise/sound waves that cause vibration are taken into consideration also in the vibration modelling.	ARTC	Next SRICCC meeting
11	ARTC to provide more information regarding the noise standards and the associated mitigation strategies, including the different state guidelines.	ARTC	Next SRICCC meeting
12	ARTC to review what the maximum decibels allowed is as per the Queensland Government's Guidelines.	ARTC	Next SRICCC meeting
13	ARTC will seek clarification on assessment of idling trains in comparison to moving trains. Also, clarification on noise assessment for the number of trains in a set period.	ARTC	Next SRICCC meeting
14	ARTC will look into providing information from the Peak Crossing and other workshops sooner than via the EIS.	ARTC	Next SRICCC meeting
15	ARTC to provide more information about the crossing loop at Peak Crossing.	ARTC	Next SRICCC meeting
16	ARTC to confirm whether the north/south branch at Kagaru will be extended by 250m north and south to lessen the curve.	ARTC	Next SRICCC meeting

Next meeting

March 2023 – Date TBC