

# Meeting minutes

## Inner Darling Downs

### Consultative Committee Meeting

#### Date / Time

22 June 2022  
6.00pm to 8pm

#### Location

Pittsworth Motor Inn,  
51 Helens Street, Pittsworth

#### Facilitators

Bill Armagnacq, Inner Darling  
Downs CCC (BA)

#### Minute taker

Katie Unipan – (ARTC Inland  
Rail) (KU)

#### Distribution

All

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

- ▶ Bill Armagnacq, Chair (BA)
- ▶ Clinton Weber, Individual (CW)
- ▶ Ken Murphy, Individual (KM)
- ▶ Larry Pappin, Inner Downs Inland Rail Action Group (LP)
- ▶ Chris Joseph, Individual (CJ)
- ▶ Paul Hanlon, Individual (PH)
- ▶ Paul McDonald, Southern Queensland Landscapes (PMc)
- ▶ Rob Loch, Pittsworth District Landcare Association (RL)
- ▶ Vicki Battaglia, Individual (VB)F

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

- ▶ Gary Garland, Individual (GG)
- ▶ Kylie Schultz, Individual (KS)
- ▶ Lance MacManus, TSBE (LM)
- ▶ Phoebe Mitchell, Individual (PMi)
- ▶ Todd Rohl, Toowoomba Chamber of Commerce (TR)

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

- ▶ Warren Crowther, BHQJV (WC)
- ▶ Melanie Richardson, BHQJV (MR)
- ▶ Dianne Loughnan, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications (DL)

#### Online:

- ▶ Craig Sleeman, Toowoomba Regional Council (CL)
- ▶ Trevor Mitchell, Toowoomba Regional Council (TM)

#### ARTC

- ▶ Alicia Mackay, Stakeholder Engagement Advisor Northern (AM)
- ▶ Andrew Doe, Principal Geotech Engineer (AD)
- ▶ Ed Matthews, Delivery Director Northern (EM)
- ▶ Katie Unipan, Stakeholder Engagement Lead Northern (KU)
- ▶ Phoebe Moore, Senior Environment Advisor B2G (PMo)
- ▶ Rob Smith, Senior Project Manager (RS)
- ▶ Harry Mercer, Director of Program Delivery (HM)
- ▶ Oliver Lupton, Geotech Engineer (OL)
- ▶ Brad Browning, Farming Operations (BB)
- ▶ Gabrielle Hickson, Senior Communication Advisor (GH)
- ▶ Jacqui Neill, Senior Government Affairs Advisor (JN)

#### Online:

- ▶ David Isbister, Senior Project Manager (DI)
- ▶ Jon Roberts, Engineering Manager (JR)
- ▶ Jacinta Griffin, Environment Advisor Planning (JG)

#### Members of the public

A number of members of the public were in attendance

## Discussions

NO.	ACTIONS
1	<p><b>WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ BA delivered an acknowledgement of Country.</li> <li>▶ BA welcomed the committee and thanked committee members, guests and observers for their attendance.</li> <li>▶ BA advised that Thomas Draper had resigned from the Committee</li> <li>▶ BA explained that during the meeting, committee members can ask questions throughout the proceedings whilst observers can ask questions at the end of the meeting.</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>CHARTER REVIEW</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ BA noted the committee members have been presented with a copy of the IDD CCC Charter drew their attention to the paragraph under membership resignations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>fails to attend more than two consecutive meetings in the calendar year without prior notice</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ BA advised if members are unable to attend the meetings, that apologies be advised.</li> </ul>
3	<p><b>ACTIONS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Chair noted the actions from the previous minutes and provided the following responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ ARTC will provide a presentation tonight on the Narromine to North Star (N2NS) black soil construction methodology.</li> <li>▶ ARTC have made improvements to their presentation and noted there we two slides that have been printed for the observers for readability.</li> <li>▶ ARTC will provide an update tonight the ecology work being done.</li> <li>▶ ARTC have contacted Toowoomba Regional Council (TRC) with reference to the various traffic changes which were highlighted at the last meeting, with additional traffic counts taking place on the feeder roads of Athol School Road based on the feedback at those meetings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The presentation from the last meeting was sent to the Committee.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ BA encouraged committee members to provide any items they would like to include on future agendas and any suggestions to hold the meetings at different locations.</li> <li>▶ BA noted there was a question with reference to gain more Toowoomba based representation. He advised with the exception the vacancy from Thomas Draper's (TD) resignation, Aboriginal and Islander representative, there are no vacancies at the moment, and he noted the process to replace TD is underway.</li> <li>▶ BA acknowledged there is an outstanding action item regarding groundwater, which will be presented at the next meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ KU noted this outstanding action was in relation to the Gowrie to Helidon (G2H) project, not Border to Gowrie (B2G) and noted the G2H team is apology tonight, however they acknowledge that the item is still outstanding and will stay on the action list until the modelling is complete and will be reported back to the committee.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ BA noted the minutes for the previous meeting have been circulated and acknowledged the committee feedback has been incorporated into the final minutes.</li> <li>▶ BA handed the meeting proceedings to DL to provide an update on behalf of the Department of Infrastructure.</li> </ul>

4	<p><b>DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE UPDATE</b> <b><i>Dianne Loughnan, Inland Rail Regional Liaison Officer (Dept of Infrastructure)</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ DL introduced herself as the Inland Rail Regional Liaison Officer for the Department of Infrastructure and provided the following update:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ there has been a bit on interest with the appointment of a new Federal Government and a new Minister overseeing Inland Rail.</li><li>▶ there is no new information to share, adding the Government and the Minister have received briefings about all of the projects and programs within the infrastructure portfolio.</li><li>▶ the Minister has not provided any information or direction with reference to the Inland Rail project, noting it is business as usual until direction has been provided.</li><li>▶ there has been no detail provided with reference to a review of Inland Rail.</li></ul></li><li>▶ DL noted she was happy to take questions on notice if there was something the committee would like to know.</li><li>▶ BA thanked DL and requested the committee to let KU or himself know if there are any queries they would like raised or issues addressed.</li><li>▶ BA handed the meeting proceedings to KU to provide an B2G Project update and Social Performance update.</li></ul>
5	<p><b>PROJECT UPDATE</b> <b><i>Katie Unipan, Stakeholder Engagement Lead Northern</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ KU thanked BA.</li><li>▶ KU made reference to the slide on the screen and advised it is being presented in response to an action from the Southern Downs Community Consultative Committee (SDD CCC) to provide a slide that talked through the entire alignment and the status of each project.</li><li>▶ KU presented the following high level status updates:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ Parkes to Narromine (P2N) is complete</li><li>▶ Narromine to North Star N2NS Phase 1 is in the delivery stage, with construction commenced.</li><li>▶ K2ARB is yet to enter the procurement stage, still awaiting approval.</li><li>▶ The remainder of the projects are in the procurement stage, undergoing environmental approvals, including:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ Totteham to Albury (T2A) – Southern Works Program</li><li>▶ Albury to Illabo (A2I) – Central Works Program</li><li>▶ Illabo to Stockinbingal (I2S) – Northern Works Program</li><li>▶ Stockinbingal to Parkes (S2P) – Rail Corridor Program, and Public Private Partnership (PPP)</li></ul></li><li>▶ KU noted these projects are all at slightly different points, and advised some have their draft EIS out, some have their response to submission done, some have just received the Request for Information (RFI) from the Coordinator General, noting it varies between the different states as well.</li></ul></li></ul> <p><b>Questions from the Committee</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ VB noted Toowoomba and Surat Basin Enterprise (TSBE), recently released a report with great press, which detailed that the Toowoomba to Kagaru project is approved, and she sought clarification on whether the report was correct.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ KU confirmed that it absolutely isn't an approved project at this point in time.</li><li>▶ VB asked KU if she can communicate via the committee to TSBE to advise the detail in their report is incorrect.</li><li>▶ KU advised she would confirm the wording in the report and discuss with TSBE.</li></ul></li></ul>

**Land Access Update**

- ▶ KU noted ARTC will continue to keep the committee updated with regards to land access, and advised the team are out at moment engaging directly with landowners about land access, noting to the committee that they may hear the community talking about that at the moment.
- ▶ KU noted that Land Access Agreements (LAAs) are currently being renewed to include any additional access requirements in preparation for the detailed design stage to allow for additional investigations in partnership with BHQ.
- ▶ KU noted the following fields investigations are currently being undertaken in response to supporting the revised Draft EIS:
  - ▶ Koala genetic survey
  - ▶ Ground water survey
  - ▶ Hydrology surveys
  - ▶ Noise and vibration surveys
- ▶ KU noted there are different contractors engaged to conduct the investigations, so you will see contractors with different logo's and branding on vehicles and advised it is ARTC's policy for site investigations to be undertaken in a branded vehicle, noting it doesn't have to be in and Inland Rail branded vehicle, but it must be branded with a logo, so it can be easily identified by anybody and can be raised with ARTC if there are any concerns.

**B2G Sponsorship**

- ▶ KU noted in the past there has not been a great community response to the sponsorship and donations program and acknowledged the team have been working really hard to increase awareness of the program and encouraged the community groups to apply, with great results, awarding 6 successful recipients in that last round.
- ▶ KU requested that everyone encourage community groups to consider making an application, and advised:
  - ▶ it is a really simple process,
  - ▶ support can be provided by the Inland Rail Team,
  - ▶ applications can be for between \$1,000 and \$4,000,
  - ▶ there are 4 Rounds every year, with the next round closing on 31 July 2022.

6

**SOCIAL PERFORMANCE UPDATE**

***Katie Unipan, Stakeholder Engagement Lead Northern, on behalf of the Social Performance Team***

- ▶ KU acknowledged the Social Performance team are an apology for tonight, and provided the following update:
  - ▶ Over the past two quarters several workforce development events have been held across the Goondiwindi, Toowoomba, Lockyer Valley, Ipswich and Scenic Rim local government areas.
  - ▶ Support provided to the Goondiwindi Talent Portal, which is about increasing their workforce, and encouraging people to enter their communities and get skilled up.
  - ▶ Indigenous participation meetings being held, working with the traditional owners, Banjima Native Title Aboriginal Corporation (BNTAC), Western Wakka Wakka and other endorsed parties to look at workforce and the Business Development Programs.
  - ▶ Inland Rail Skills Academy, has provided \$500,000 towards 13 Clontarf Foundations throughout the alignment (5 in QLD) - creating pathways to employment for indigenous youth.
  - ▶ Grand shake opportunities – virtual opportunities for high school students to participate in real workshops, providing them with knowledge and hands on experience of what it looks like in a real working situation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Industry participation initiatives, offering online webinars and one-on-one mentoring for small to medium businesses who would like to develop and improve their sustainability policies.</li> <li>▶ Workforce development program - rolling out a series of business development events across the alignment, in both Goondiwindi and Toowoomba.</li> <li>▶ Baseline surveys conducted around community wellbeing, which is something the project considers quite important throughout the life of the project. This initial survey looks at the liveability and wellbeing of the community living across the alignment, so we can continue to monitor that through the construction and operations phases.</li> <li>▶ Commenced initial engagement to develop the Community Wellbeing Plans, which will be led by the principal contractor, BHQ. At this point in time the engagement is at a Council level and will be expanded more broadly into the community over time.</li> <li>▶ BA thanked KU and asked the Committee if they had any questions.</li> <li>▶ BA handed the meeting proceedings to Phoebe Moore to provide an EIS update.</li> </ul>
<p>7</p>	<p><b>EIS UPDATE</b>  <i>Phoebe Moore, Senior Environment Advisor B2G and Rob Smith, Senior Project Manager</i></p> <p><b>Ecology Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ PMo thanked BA and             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ acknowledged at the previous meeting she presented on the main updates to the Draft EIS, from the January 2021 Draft EIS and noted during this time there has been ongoing site survey works and analysis, all of which will be presented in the next revision of the EIS.</li> <li>▶ noted progress continues across many of the technical areas of the EIS, including sustainability, ground water and cultural heritage, with some of the more technical items remaining.</li> <li>▶ noted baseline ecology surveys have been conducted by Ausecology and are now complete in accordance with the Commonwealth and State guidelines.</li> <li>▶ noted the report is currently with the regulators Department of Resources and Department of Environment and Science, the state agency for technical review and the results will:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ form the basis for all the impact assessment and the application of that data for all the remaining ecology components and the EIS,</li> <li>▶ be critical for forming the base information that informs detailed design, offsets and habitat definitions, and</li> <li>▶ supports the Koala Management Plan and the Connectivity Strategy.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ presented an example of the habitat mapping from the draft report currently under regulator technical review.</li> <li>▶ advised the teams focus is around the Koala Management Plan and the Connectivity Strategy, to identify potential barriers associated with the rail alignment and reviewing the baseline data to ensure we have adequate passage provided in the design for not only the koala, but all species through the area.</li> <li>▶ noted consultants from ERM have commenced the development the Koala Management Plan, and WPS have commenced the development of the Preliminary Fauna and Fencing Strategy.</li> <li>▶ noted in order to assess how fauna is going to be able to move and continue to be permeable through the landscape of the project, the following design elements were considered:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Embankments</li> <li>▶ Cuttings,</li> <li>▶ Fencing,</li> <li>▶ Cross drainage (culverts),</li> <li>▶ Bridge structures,</li> <li>▶ Width of corridor clearings (canopy cover).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- ▶ noted the outcomes of those two studies will ensure ARTC have a design that provides opportunities for fauna to move through the landscapes and the crossing and the culverts are appropriately designed with no unmitigated barriers to fauna movement.
- ▶ noted ARTC are also looking at a wild dog fence and trying to get an understanding of how that relates to the project as well and noted there will be more on those to come.

#### **Fauna Design Examples: From the Guidelines for the ARTC Inland Rail Program**

- ▶ PMo presented images of some fauna crossing examples from the ARTC Fauna Design Guidelines and noted these designs will be considered for the B2G design. Image examples included:
  - ▶ Co-use culverts,
  - ▶ Canopy connectivity,
  - ▶ Bridge underpass that is open with native vegetation,
  - ▶ Koala fence with a sheet metal strip to stop the koala's from climbing over into the infrastructure,
  - ▶ Other aspects that are aimed at providing safe passage points for fauna.

#### **Koala Management Plan and Fauna Movement and Fencing Strategy**

- ▶ PMo presented diagram demonstrating how the Koala Management Plan and Fauna Movement and Fencing Strategy will be incorporated into the revised Draft EIS and noted:
  - ▶ the documents will be included as appendices to the revised Draft EIS,
  - ▶ the documents will be in draft format to allow them to continue to evolve throughout the detailed design and construction phases of the project,
  - ▶ the revised Draft EIS will be delivered to the regulators and to the public for the second round of exhibition at the simultaneously.

#### **Koala Genetics Study**

- ▶ PMo noted the team of experts have commenced the koala field studies for B2G using detection dogs for conservation (USQ Research Group) and advised:
  - ▶ the studies have been undertaken for the past 2 weeks and are almost finalised, noting they are currently in Inglewood.
  - ▶ the study will continue along the project to NSW.
  - ▶ the study is an Inland Rail initiative not just a QLD initiative and does not relate to the EIS but recognises that there will be a lot of useful information that will come out of the study.
  - ▶ fieldwork commenced in K2ARB and B2G sections.
  - ▶ samples collected will be analysed for population genetics and diet preference.
  - ▶ genetic analysis of scats conducted to assess forage tree preference.
  - ▶ vegetation assessments undertaken to identify eucalyptus in survey areas.
  - ▶ diet preference can be used to identify best species for local forage preference in restoration works offsets.

#### **Questions from the Committee**

- ▶ VB noted at the last meeting, they offered to assist with the Koala Genetic Study and field surveys by showing ARTC where the Koala's have been located and asked if ARTC invited the community to attend the field study.
  - ▶ PMo advised she was unable to comment with reference to the Koala Genetic Study as it was not related the B2G EIS.
  - ▶ KU confirmed the locations selected for the Koala investigations were based on the submission provided by the Pittsworth Landcare Group and noted a response was provided to that group in response to their request, advising that unfortunately the team conducting the field study could not be accompanied by the public, as it could interfere with the detection dogs that were being used.
  - ▶ VB asked for clarification that the dogs were only used for the genetic study.

- ▶ KU confirmed that was correct.
- ▶ VB reiterated they offered at the last CCC to accompany ARTC so we could find the koalas and asked how many koalas were found.
- ▶ PMo noted she did have the exact figures in front of her and advised she would take the question on notice and noted it is a full comprehensive baseline survey that was undertaken in accordance with the guidelines, and not targeted.
- ▶ VB requested the figures be provided for the number of koalas found at each site, from the baseline survey.
- ▶ VB noted the request was made at the last meeting and again requested the details be provided outlining what the Koala Management Plan looks like, including:
  - ▶ the elements of the plan,
  - ▶ the chapters,
  - ▶ the distance covered by the plan.
- ▶ VB noted a request was also made at the last meeting, for a copy of a Koala Management Plan from an existing approved project be provided to the Committee so they can understand what is being achieved and noted it was not received and requested it again.
- ▶ VB noted it was her understanding that the first round of the EIS was fairly roundly criticised because ARTC didn't bother to listen to the community and it looks like this is the second round of the EIS and ARTC are going to do the same thing - so don't expect a different outcome when you submit this and the community goes "you haven't listened", because you haven't listened.
  - ▶ PMo advised it was a recent requirement for the Koala Management Plan to be developed and noted there was no requirement in the first draft EIS.
  - ▶ VB acknowledged there was not a requirement, however ARTC committed to producing a Koala Management Plan and noted during the first study ARTC identified there were only 2 koalas along the B2G alignment and noted this was inconsistent with the community records and reiterated they would like to know how many koalas have been found during the study, so they can confirm the numbers are consistent with their records.
  - ▶ PMo reiterated the Koala Management Plan will be consistent with the guidelines of industry expectations, which is currently undergoing technical review and noted all that information will be in the report and will be available.
  - ▶ VB advised she doesn't want it in the report and advised she and the community want to know now, from the surveys that were recently undertaken – the numbers of koalas you found at the sites you surveyed, and reiterated that's what the community want to know, because that is what we offered to do. We offered to take you to sites where the koalas were. We don't want you to turn up in 18 months' time with an EIS that says no koala's were found.
  - ▶ PMo acknowledged VB's comments.

#### **Land Resources**

- ▶ PMo noted Land Resources is another key aspect of the EIS, which has significant progress and a chapter that is going to have new information presented in the revised Draft EIS including:
  - ▶ Soil baseline assessments - survey that delineates the spatial extent of the soils and presents the soil mapping in accordance with the soil management units across the alignment – is complete,
  - ▶ results of the geomorphology and contamination assessments (to be presented in the draft EIS and as standalone reports in the appendices),
    - ▶ contamination assessment is primarily a desktop staged assessment in accordance with the contaminated land guidelines and includes a slide history study, limited soil sampling program, and EMR contaminated soils database search across the whole alignment.
    - ▶ The revised Draft EIS will present the results along with the future work requirements for the detailed design phase for assessment and management.

- ▶ Earthwork planning and soil management strategy,
- ▶ Implications for design, construction, and operations.

#### Questions from the Committee

- ▶ RL noted in the preparation of the first Draft EIS, a number of the studies were presented to the committee and asked if there will be any presentation to the community prior to the EIS on this occasion.
  - ▶ PMo noted ARTC have a session planned on Friday, 24 June 2022 with RL and colleagues from the Darling Downs Soil Conservation Group, and will be targeting the content around the submission that was received and as part of addressing that it will involve an update of the findings of the baseline survey, which will alleviate some of the concerns that are highlighted in the submission.
  - ▶ PMo advise that all of the EIS needs to be delivered together to public and regulators at the same time, so unfortunately ARTC can't release parts of the EIS in advance, but can update in terms of what's in there – the findings, the process and any other technical detail that you might be after or interested in.

#### Hydrogeology

- ▶ PMo advised that all water courses are now field verified and noted the revised Draft EIS will present the results on the long-term surface and groundwater baseline sampling, which is now complete.
- ▶ PMo advised the groundwater modelling, bore survey and make good strategy are now finalised.
  - ▶ Groundwater modelling was undertaken based on the earthwork construction cuts and compared with the predicted draw down zone, which was then compared to the findings of the bore survey, with only a few bores identified as being outside the footprint of which the bores will be decommissioned from the direct impairment.
  - ▶ Make Good Process will be presented as a flow diagram in the revised Draft EIS, which is the compensation element, recognising that the make good agreements are the nuts and bolts of what will be undertaken, however she noted that is a detailed design task that will be done in conjunction with the affected landowner and the contractor based on a case by case basis.

#### Questions from the Committee

- ▶ VB referred to the desktop survey that was conducted for the contamination assessment and asked for the requirements and frequency for updating those assessments.
  - ▶ PMo noted the EMR database is based on land use, therefore it is assumed its land association is on the register, and noted if it's not on the register, but is associated with the land use that is known to meet the requirements with EMR, it is assumed to meet the requirements and is being treated accordingly.
    - ▶ in accordance with the guidelines there are constraints associated with how soil is managed across the soil boundaries, it needs to be assessed to ensure that there are no contaminants, as you can't move soil across the site boundary of a lot that's on the EMR register.
    - ▶ It's a staged approach, which involves desktop limited sampling and when you've got a little bit more information about what is proposed to be done in terms of construction and earthworks, then you target your sampling around the areas of concern and the contaminants of concern.
- ▶ VB acknowledged the officer's response and noted it makes sense and asked for an example of a Make Good Strategy that has been approved for another project, to be provided to the Committee.



- ▶ PMo advised there isn't one available and noted ARTC are developing their own strategy using the Coal Seam Gas (CSG) industries Make Good Strategy as guide, which is difficult to compare as it is completely different legislation and issues. ARTC are working with the regulators and legal team to demonstrate a very simple process, however there is a lot of complicated elements around land acquisition, with TMR and the different parties involved.

### **Flooding and Hydrology**

- ▶ RS thanked PMo and introduced himself and noted he provided a brief update at the last CCC Meeting regarding the progress to date with reference to the Flood Panel, and noted the Flood Panel was established by the Australian and State governments as an initiative to independently assess the flood modelling for the QLD Inland Rail Projects.
- ▶ RS provided the following updates:
  - ▶ ARTC have continued to engage with the Flood Panel on their requests to answer questions about the methodologies, supply any data as required and respond to any requests for information.
  - ▶ part of the process has been completed and the Flood Panel have gone away to develop their final report, which has not yet been released - state and federal governments will be responsible for determining when that is to happen.
  - ▶ flood modelling methodology and models themselves were updated based on feedback from the Flood Panel.
  - ▶ flooding impact objectives have been finalised, which are an updated set of parameters that will be used to assess the design against change in peak water, afflux, duration in inundation, flood flow distribution, velocity hazards/depth, and product, extreme event risk management and sensitivity testing etc.
  - ▶ coming towards the end of re-running hydrology models across the whole alignment with reference design so we can view the impacts of the proposed design against the new flooding impact objectives, noting they are much more rigorous objectives and will give a lot more data to the regulators and the public so that they can see exactly how any changes to 1 in 100 flood events will look with the final design in place.
  - ▶ gathering data, maps and information and looking into how we can present that back to the agencies and the community, which will be included in the revised Draft EIS.
  - ▶ increase to the resolution of the model to ensure it is focusing in at a more granular level and gives the accuracy that is expected and sought by the agencies and OCG – well progressed.
- ▶ RS asked if there were any questions.

### **Questions from the Committee**

- ▶ VB noted before the first EIS was released, the committee received some information detailing the flood plains out at Millmerran, which informed there were 30 structures that would be inundated with the current flood modelling that was proposed and she asked if that number had changed with the revised model.
  - ▶ RS noted the updates to the hydrology model and increase in accuracy for the resolution of the new flood parameters hasn't resulted in additional receptors (houses, shed etc) being impacted at this stage, however it is giving more confidence around the degree of change and accuracy for where the flooding is occurring at the receptors.
- ▶ LP referred to the design changes that were discussed, in particular regarding the number of culverts and bridges that were going to be incorporated and asked what the change has brought about.
  - ▶ RS advised from a design perspective the results from the updates to the model hasn't indicated any requirement to increase the number of structures (ie culverts) or bridge lengths at this stage. Results are still coming in and any changes to structures or sensitive receptors will be evident in the revised Draft EIS.

- ▶ VB sought confirmation that the committee would receive the updated data prior to it being released in the revised Draft EIS.
  - ▶ RS advised ARTC will engage with landowners who are shown by the model to experience a change in flooding behaviour before it is released to the broader community through the EIS. He noted on the back of receiving the Flood Panel Report, the plan is to ensure ARTC are able to consult with impacted landowners and understand what feasible mitigations may be required or otherwise not require as a result of the proposed design.
- ▶ BA asked if the Flood Panel was waiting on the outcome of ARTC's work at the moment.
  - ▶ RS advised ARTC have supplied everything to the Flood Panel has requested and the information is sitting with the panel to review and finalise their report.
- ▶ BA asked the committee if there were any further questions for PMo or RS and asked when the EIS is likely to be lodged.
  - ▶ PMo noted the revised Draft EIS is scheduled to be finalised towards November/December 2022, however noted the date can't be guaranteed as investigations continue it may identify the need for additional work that requires more time (eg as we go through the fauna connectivity assessment and the soils we review the compliance for the design against the needs for the fauna and we might identify an inconsistency that might require a redesign or further survey work that can effect schedule).
- ▶ BA asked how long the OCG will have to conduct their review of the revised Draft EIS and release it for comment.
  - ▶ RS noted it is hard to put a timeframe on that, adding the revised Draft EIS does have to go back out to the agencies.
  - ▶ BA questioned whether it could be another 3 to 6 months.
  - ▶ RS advised the OCG haven't provided a timeframe and noted ARTC have engaged with all the agencies upfront and will continue to do so, before finalising the revised Draft EIS to ensure all the methodologies are agreed by them, which will hopefully result in a more efficient review and reduce the request for further information.
- ▶ LP made reference to the discussion regarding the make good agreement for bores being modelled on the CSG strategy and asked if it is envisaged that private landholders have to negotiate with ARTC for these agreements.
  - ▶ PMo clarified the ARTC Make Good Agreements are not modelled on the CSG Make Good Agreements, they were looked to for guidance, but were found not to be fit for purpose for this project.
  - ▶ LP asked if ARTC are you asking landholders to negotiate with them to come up with a make good arrangement.
  - ▶ PMo confirmed it is just the high-level strategy is all that is required at this stage for submission with the revised Draft EIS, and noted the purpose is to demonstrate that we do have a process that is going to result in arrangements that are done appropriate to the stage of the project. She noted a large part of it will be driven by TMR as the landlord authority that does the land acquisition, so they are an essential part of the make good arrangements which will be negotiated, with TMR, the contractor and the landowners.
- ▶ VB asked if there is a process to enter into make good negotiations for landowners who are a distance from the alignment, but have identified they have loss of water, because ARTC have dissected the water table.
  - ▶ PMo advised landowners are identified based on the hydraulic modelling where the significant cuts of the alignment will be and where they intersect the groundwater table.
    - ▶ modelling is based on draw down, which is expected to be 80m or less from the centre line of the cut,
    - ▶ worst case scenario has been applied to our bore survey and only 2 bores were identified as being affected outside of the permanent impairment footprint, so we've included those landowners who have the temporary effect from the draw down.
  - ▶ KU noted the information received through the bore survey is based on registered bores and landholders who would engage with us through that process. If there is anybody who

	<p>knows of a bore that we may not have picked up or they are talking to a landowner who thinks they may fit the criteria, she encouraged them to reach out to ARTC, and noted we can only work on what we know and we have reached out to all the landowners who are within those corridors, but are working on what we have been given.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ VB so I am assuming that in your EIS you'll be very clear about them only being registered bores, because most properties have got 1 registered bore and 5 unregistered bores.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ PMo noted the Make Good Strategy recognises both registered and unregistered bores and will both be compensated equally accordingly.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ BA thanked the officers and handed the meeting proceedings to Andrew Doe to present and example of constructing on black soil.</li> </ul>
<p>8</p>	<p><b>N2NS – EXAMPLE OF CONSTRUCTING INLAND RAIL ON BLACK SOIL</b>  <i>Andrew Doe, Principal Geotech Engineer</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ AD thanked the Chair and introduced himself as the Principal Geotech Engineer with Inland Rail and noted he is a Registered Professional Engineer of Queensland and Chartered Geologist and advised he is taking this opportunity to speak about a previous example of where Inland Rail has constructed rail embankment on both black soil and in a floodplain, and noted he will talk briefly to the Geotech investigation that has been carried out through the Condamine River Valley and explain how it feeds into that process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Geology Map and Geotechnical Investigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ AD presented the aerial image of the geotechnical investigation and noted the purpose is to identify the parameters and conditions that need to be understood to design the embankments and the culverts and structures across the Condamine River Valley.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ the logging of the bore holes has been carried to the Australian Standard for site investigation, along with field testing and sampling and some detailed laboratory testing including some x-ray diffractometer.</li> <li>▶ as the result of the recent soil mapping and geomorphology reports are made final we will make sure they are incorporate into that Geotech investigation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ AD advised the Geotech investigation reports are included as an appendix in the revised Draft EIS.</li> <li>▶ AD referred to the aerial image of the geotechnical investigation, and noted the area presented is from Brookstead to Grass Tree Creek and noted there is a variety of investigations including:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ bore holes, up to 30-40 meters in depth for piles on bridges</li> <li>▶ test pits to identify the near surface materials and take samples</li> <li>▶ cone penetration tests, to identify parameters for piling and the piles for the bridge structures</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Questions from the Committee</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ RL advised he was a soil scientist and asked if cut on exchange capacity and clay content was tracked.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ AD confirmed that was in the suite of laboratory testing.</li> <li>▶ RL acknowledged the response.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ VB referenced the legend on the image and asked what CPT with DMT was.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ AD advised CPT with DMT is a testing method called Marchetti Dilatometer Test, which gives parameters for how much piles can resist sideways movement.</li> <li>▶ VB asked what the DZTP was.</li> <li>▶ AD advised DZTP is an acronym for Danger Zone Test Pit, which is the nominated danger zone within the Queensland Rail (QR) Corridor, a zone within 3 meters for nearest rail essentially. He noted we are conscious that we need to identify the soil types and the material that is underneath the rail and underwent a relatively lengthy process with QR to identify how we could take those samples and still meet QR requirements.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Geology Map and Geotechnical Investigation

### N2NS Overview

- ▶ AD presented the N2NS Phase 1 Overview, and noted:
  - ▶ the project upgraded 171 km of track, with poor existing track conditions on a wet reactive soil subgrade,
  - ▶ More than 25% of the N2NS alignment is in a floodplain,
  - ▶ Conventional design using a specified material would require significant waste and require import of materials, which does not align with the ARTC sustainability guidelines.
  - ▶ Sustainability and cost drove the beneficial re-use of material (using lime stabilisation).
  - ▶ Ground investigations carried out (330 test pits excavated, 60 bore holes)
- ▶ AD presented an image that shows conditions that were under pre-existing track, noting the orange line is the material that was placed level back in 1880, which was punched into the black soil over time.

### Questions from the Committee

- ▶ RL asked there will be presentation on lime treatment
  - ▶ AD confirmed that lime treatment will be presented after the next slide.

### Formation design in N2NS

- ▶ AD presented the Formation Design N2NS slide and advised a copy was included in the attendees' handouts and noted it was intended to demonstrate what the final embankment design would look like on the N2NS project.
  - ▶ the design that was adopted for N2NS was the 2 sections shown on the lower part of the drawings, where the blue shading indicated the lime stabilising material that reuses the ballast and the ash and the fill material and some of the black soil that were in their pre-existing embankment, combined together using a stabiliser and recompacted to form the rail embankment.
  - ▶ the material that is shown as yellow shading, is the capping layer – similar to a road sub-base, using high percentage of aggregate with some material mixed in to give it the characteristics like an unsealed road.

### Questions from the Committee

- ▶ RL noted for the benefit of the gallery that the design indicates a 6 metre width and asked what the width requirements would be to cross the Condamine with a 3 metre embankment.
  - ▶ AD noted the dimension being presented varies from 6.5-7 metre in various circumstances and noted the footprint that is underneath for where we have excavated into the existing ground will vary.

### N2NS Construction approach

- ▶ AD presented 8 images of the N2NS construction on black soil, which demonstrate the Lime Stabilisation process and noted:
  - ▶ materials are excavated to the design depth,
  - ▶ material is placed back into the excavation and mixed with spent ballast, ash, fill and black soil,
  - ▶ material is partially compacted with a roller,
  - ▶ 2% quicklime is then dropped onto the material,
  - ▶ slaking process commenced, by adding water to the quicklime which causes an exothermic reaction generating heat and steam,
  - ▶ lime is machined with a Stabiliser and mixed with a "cake mix", treated with the lime,
  - ▶ material is then compacted, trimmed, and rolled to form a smooth surface.

### Questions from the Committee

- ▶ RL asked what depth of the layer was treated with lime.
  - ▶ AD referenced the previous side and noted it had a stabilised layer which then had imported material over the top about 200-300mm thick of structural fill before the capping layer was placed, in moving to the final design for construction it was decided we wanted to have 0 net waste, so we went with a thicker lime stabilised layer, normally 750mm layers, which is 2 x 400mm layers with about 50mm of re-working in between those layers.
- ▶ RL noted that roads only go 8 inches which is less than 250mm and asked if the greater stabilisation layer was used due to the weight of the rail line.
  - ▶ AD noted there are some key differences between using lime for road and rail construction, and advised the thickness was selected based on the high rail loading and various technical reasons that relate to Cyclic Stress Ratio (CSR) and the chance of material underneath liquifying etc.
- ▶ RL noted liquefaction occurs when a wet soil is vibrated, which you get underneath rail lines when the train goes over and it vibrates and noted on flood plain you get water sitting up against an embankment, sometimes for weeks which results in very saturated clay which is very susceptible and advised he would be curious to see the analysis that was done on that depth.
  - ▶ AD noted a lot of analysis conducted, however was unsure if it can be shared. He noted ARTC have taken the designers from BHQ down to the construction site to have a look at the process and materials being applied to have that first person view of the materials being used as there are a lot of similarities in the materials at N2NS and the Condamine River Valley.
- ▶ VB noted this soil was referred to as black soil and asked what soil type it was.
  - ▶ AD noted the black soil being referred to is vertisols.
- ▶ VB asked if the N2NS construction was a dual line and only one line was being reconstructed.
  - ▶ AD confirmed it was a single line, noting there were some sidings for a grain silo.
- ▶ VB noted that recycled materials were used and asked if that was the plan for the flood plains on B2G where there is an existing track.
  - ▶ AD noted there is a variety of designs the designers are considering and noted that would be one of the options being considered.
- ▶ VB noted the rail is designed on a flood plain and asked if it is designed for overtopping floodwaters.
  - ▶ AD confirmed the design recognises the flood model.
- ▶ VB asked how high do you go with this line for the N2NS, across the floodplain what is the height of the line?
  - ▶ AD noted it is different in the sense that the vertical alignment was maintained at a similar level to existing, but it varies between ground level to approx 2.8m.
- ▶ VB asked if the existing line was already constructed at 2.8 m and is being maintained, or was it reconstructed to 2.8 m because the flooding impacts were found to be too great to continue the 24hr transit time.
  - ▶ AD advised he will take the question on notice.
- ▶ VB noted the proposed height for the B2G floodplain is 2.6 m and asked if this impacts the depth or width of the black soil excavation.
  - ▶ AD confirmed the depth won't increase, noting it must go to the same depth to avoid having shrink and swell of the black soil affecting the embankment and the rail line. He advised the width will vary and is calculated based on the height (ie 2 m height, with embankment going out 1:2, will result in 4 m of embankment batter on each side and the width of the formation on top being 6.5-7 m)
  - ▶ VB noted that's a lot of black soil coming out and noted the base case budget does not include excavation or disposal of the soils and suggested ARTC make allowances for this.

- ▶ RL asked what safety protocols were implemented on the N2NS project to mitigate the risk of skin burns from the calcium oxide in the lime and other safety risks.
  - ▶ AD noted the construction site has an exclusion zone and whether conditions were also considered during the lime stabilisation process and noted the safety risks will be managed with the appropriate safety management plans to ensure the workers and public are kept safe.
- ▶ BA asked if that would cover the lime being transported and stored and asked if it would be stored in containers.
  - ▶ AD advised he will take the question on notice.
- ▶ RL noted it is a mildly hazardous material that will be going out in very large quantities and request a detailed safety protocol be included in the revised Draft EIS.
- ▶ RL noted he had come across a reference indicating lime's effect might diminish after 30 years and sought confirmation.
  - ▶ AD confirmed there is that potential and noted in the design for N2NS there is recognition that over time railway lines do have the potential to attract water into the material underneath and the design allows for a 50% reduction in strength of the material both underneath the embankment and the lime stabilise material within the embankment.
- ▶ CJ noted there is a lot of floodplain country between Oakey and Bowenville, Jondaryan, west and other side of Dalby to Warra and asked if ARTC have made contact with the design/construction companies who constructed the rail line on those floodplains and noted they are running 6 trains a day for coal with 20 carriages at 20 tonne and noted they may have some records that could assist with the flooding impacts, as they have experienced floods in those areas, so there must be some sort of record on what they did and how they did it that could assist ARTC.
  - ▶ AD noted the designer for BHQ has those interfaces in the QR, as did the designer for N2NS so they will see that level of design and share information.
- ▶ PH noted he is struggling to understand the lime stabilisation, when you look at Gore Highway which was lime stabilised, noting it has been constantly repaired, ripped up, repaired, ripped up repaired, etc.
  - ▶ AD noted that is one of the areas that ARTC have looked at with TMR to identify lessons learned and considerations for different conditions.

#### Questions from Observers & Committee

- ▶ A member of the public, Imad Jeddy (IJ) asked what the safety distance / exclusion zone distance for lime stabilisation area is.
  - ▶ AD noted he did not have the exact figure and advised he would take the question on notice to provide the exclusion zone distance.
  - ▶ IJ asked is it fair to assume if the area where the lime is being put down is larger or wider area, that the exclusion zone will grow.
  - ▶ AD advised the exclusion zone would not likely grow, as the dust travel will be from the edge of the excavation so the exclusion zone from the edge of the excavation wouldn't change, however if the width of the excavation is larger, the overall width from edge to edge would grow.
  - ▶ IJ asked if there is black soil along the Pittsworth alignment that will require lime treatment.
  - ▶ VB confirmed it is black soil.
  - ▶ IJ noted Pittsworth is located in a valley and as the track needs to stay level there will be embankments approx. 18ft high and asked if ARTC are going to have the lime treatment in Pittsworth and if the height to width ratios will be 2:1 at 18ft high based on that height what the footprint would be.
  - ▶ AD reiterated the safety element will be managed in the construction phase.
  - ▶ IJ continued to explain, if we are going 18ft up, the footprint is going to be pretty wide, then the exclusion zone has to be even wider and asked if that was a fair assessment.
  - ▶ AD confirmed the exclusion zone would be measured from the edge of the excavation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ VB asked if the town of Pittsworth would need to be evacuated if the exclusion zone encroaches on the township.</li><li>▶ RS encouraged we don't want to be getting ahead of ourselves and advised that lime has not been confirmed as the treatment option for the Condamine or Pittsworth areas and noted as detailed design progresses and those methodologies progress all those things will need to be taken into consideration.</li><li>▶ IJ expressed further concerns regarding the safety and the distance of the exclusion zone from the highway.</li><li>▶ RS confirmed that ARTC and the construction company will not propose any solution that could not be managed to an acceptable level of safety for the community and reiterated safety is the number one priority and noted any construction techniques or materials such as lime that a subject to the dust, will be managed in such a way to mitigate the risk. He noted it is not something the community needs to be alarmed about.</li><li>▶ LP stated lime stabilisation was discussed at a previous meeting held in Millmerran 2 years ago and it was noted at that time that the option of using lime stabilisation had a limited life, and he hopes the contractor has a limited warranty period.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ RS noted that all the designs proposed today, have a design life of 50 years which is certified by the engineers.</li><li>▶ LP stated they will be in charge of maintenance if it falls down within that 50 year period and asked how long TMR roads get.</li><li>▶ RS advised he can't talk to a TMR road and advised ARTC are taking onboard all the lessons learned from across the industry and does have the benefit of having a number of inhouse expertise, as well design houses along the alignment all brining experience and knowledge to draw upon.</li></ul></li><li>▶ BA handed the meeting proceedings to Warren Crowther from BHQ to give his presentation.</li></ul>
9	<p><b>BHQ UPDATE</b> <b><i>Warren Crowther, Program Manager (BHQ)</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ WC thanked the Chair and introduced himself as the Program Manager for BHQ and acknowledged he presented at the last meeting about 3 months ago to introduced himself and the joint venture and tonight will provide an update on some of the activities that will be taking place on site over the next 9 months.</li><li>▶ WC advised the following site activities are proposed:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ Surveys, including Bathometric, Hydrology and Feature Surveys</li><li>▶ Conditions Assessments - surveying the condition of all the public assets that will be within the site that may get used (ie roads that may get used as haulage routes), to ensure we have a record of the current conditions of the assets should they be damaged during the project.</li><li>▶ Geotechnical Investigations - continuation of the investigations that have been happening for some time.</li><li>▶ Borrow site investigations - looking at areas where we can quarry materials for embankment construction.</li><li>▶ Public Utility Plant (PUP) locating - digging holes to confirm that public utilities assets are located where we think that they are, so we can proceed with the design.</li><li>▶ Groundwater monitoring and new bores.</li><li>▶ Trial embankments - constructing very small embankments out of black soil to run trials and tests on it to establish the technical options that are being considered and how effective they are and prove they are applicable in the local conditions.</li><li>▶ Pile trials - construction of bridge foundation piles to conduct tests on to allow the design of the bridges to be fine-tuned.</li></ul></li><li>▶ WC noted BHQ are hoping to get the activities underway one at time commencing from September 2022, with the expected completion proposed for May 2023.</li></ul> <p><b>Questions from the Committee</b></p>

- ▶ VB asked if all of the activities can be commenced, without project approval from Coordinator General.
  - ▶ WC confirmed they are all activities that can be undertake prior to EIS approval.
- ▶ VB asked what the make good will be on these activities.
  - ▶ WC referred the question to RS.
  - ▶ RS noted that all the locations for the trials are yet to be confirmed and noted the agreements would have to be established and worked through with the respective landowner in question.
  - ▶ VB asked if there are some draft make good arrangements in place and if any sites have been selected.
  - ▶ RS confirmed there have not been any sites selected yet.
- ▶ VB asked if there is a website where the activities list can be made publicly available where people can see where you are going to be and what you are going to be doing, and noted most of the anxiety of the work that ARTC undertake comes from just turning up, even on public roads and easements that concerns people, and suggested to have an interactive map similar to what is up on the website now that indicates the dates, locations and activities being undertaken, so the community is informed.
  - ▶ RS acknowledged VB's comments and noted it is something to take onboard and advised that all activities will be undertaken within the constraints of the EIS and acknowledged communication will need to be carefully managed.
- ▶ LP asked if the timeline for the proposed activities was appropriate to be commencing works September when negotiations haven't been commenced.
  - ▶ RS we aim to work towards those dates, noting there is a caveat – “subject to change”. BHQ are keen to demonstrate and put forward designs and solutions that are shown to work, to give assurance.
  - ▶ WC noted these early works will provide an economic opportunity for local businesses who want to participate, and noted there is link on the screen to the procurement portal - ICN gateway <https://gateway.icn.org.au/project/4878/inland-rail-civil-works-program-northern> – which can be found by googling “inland rail ICN gateway northern”. He noted on this webpage there will be a list of all the subcontract packages that will be procured to conduct these works and encouraged if you are aware of anyone wanting to get involved to direct them to the ICN gateway.
- ▶ WC advised BHQ are in the process of developing a Social Delivery Plan and the processes that will be used for procurement and noted they are required by ARTC to deliver a range of social delivery targets, (eg Local and indigenous business participation, employment and training).
  - ▶ the process used to develop the procurement process involves customising processes to make sure we achieve our targets. When we go to tender for various packages, we have a number of criteria that we assessed including, cost and whether the business is local or indigenous
- ▶ WC asked if there were any further questions.
- ▶ VB noted social delivery isn't just local businesses, its far broader than that and noted its all the people who are going to be effected by the project, and stated it appears what you have been charged with is just what this preconstruction phase and engaging local businesses, and asked who is looking after the people that are going to be effected - is it BHQ or ARTC and stated ARTC don't do a good job, so she is hoping it will be BHQ.
  - ▶ WC advised the interface with landowners will be managed by ARTC through this phase.
- ▶ LP sought clarification on the definition of local for procurement and asked if it was local as in darling downs, or Australia, or Australia and New Zealand, and asked what percent it would account to.
  - ▶ WC noted there are different categories:



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ the highest scoring category being what is what is called project area, which means the business has to be based within the in the 2 local government areas the project passes through (Toowoomba Regional Council and Goondiwindi Regional Council),</li> <li>▶ the next category called regional, which means the business must be located with any other local government area within 125km of the alignment, so that takes in most of SEQ,</li> <li>▶ the next category being based in Queensland,</li> <li>▶ the next category being based Australia and New Zealand,</li> <li>▶ the next category being based everywhere else.</li> <li>▶ the higher you are up the hierarchy the better you score, the more advantage you get over other businesses.</li> <li>▶ BA asked if there were any other questions from the committee.</li> <li>▶ BA thanked WC and handed the meeting proceedings to KU to provide an update on G2H.</li> </ul>
10	<p><b>GOWRIE TO HELIDON (G2H) UPDATE</b></p> <p><i>Katie Unipan, Stakeholder Engagement Lead Northern</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ KU provided the following updates for the G2H project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Submissions from the draft EIS are currently being considered by Office of Coordinator General, and noted they are anticipating a Request for Information (RFI), so a very similar process that the B2G is undertaking.</li> <li>▶ In the interim there is still quite a lot of geotechnical and environmental investigations continuing as part of their ongoing studies and noted a focus has been getting images and flood markers from landowners and asked if anybody has contacts down in that area who would like submit any information to them, they are doing a call out at the moment.</li> <li>▶ Similar to B2G they are currently undertaking a groundwater survey and koala genetics study.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ KU noted she is happy to take any questions on notice for that G2H team if anyone has any.</li> <li>▶ VB noted the Lockyer Valley CCC area has been extended to include Gowrie, which will include Toowoomba and noted they have an expression of interest out now for CCC members and encouraged if anyone has an interest or know of anyone in the Toowoomba area to encourage them to represent that area, as it is not currently represented.</li> <li>▶ BA asked if there were any other questions from the Committee.</li> </ul>
11	<p><b>GENERAL BUSINESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ NIL</li> </ul>
12	<p><b>QUESTIONS FROM OBSERVERS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ BA advised he would take questions from public and asked the public to raise their hand, so someone can deliver a microphone to them and requested they state their name and ask their question.</li> <li>▶ A member of the public referred to land access for test embankments asked if landowners had a choice, and further what happens with their cropping, cattle and underground infrastructure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ WC advised the embankment trials and pile trials will be undertaken on ARTC owned land and noted any need to access private land will be for other non-invasive type investigations such as survey.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ VB asked WC if BHQ have access to issue the s109's or are they only issued by ARTC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ WC advised ARTC look after land access during this phase.</li> <li>▶ VB sought clarification if ARTC would force the landholders to give BHQ access and stated that's what they do.</li> <li>▶ WC advised at this stage there is no proposal to enforce access with any s109's for any trials or test work at this stage.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- ▶ VB asked ARTC if they have finished with all their s109's now and asked if they are going to leave the landowners alone.
- ▶ RS reiterated that with reference to the tests, as WC mentioned we are not aware of any s109's being proposed.
- ▶ VB sought clarification that the current s109's have finished.
- ▶ RS confirmed that round has finished
- ▶ VB sought confirmation that there were no more s109's planned.
- ▶ RS confirmed there were none that are currently planned, at this stage.
- ▶ VB sought clarification on how long "at this stage" was.
- ▶ RS clarified, at this point in time.
- ▶ VB asked how long is that expected to be.
- ▶ RS advised, if that changes ARTC will keep everyone aware of any changes of that nature.
- ▶ RL asked if some prior discussion and advice about the projects that would trigger those would happen next time.
- ▶ RS advised ARTC will always seek to engage with landowners to achieve a Land Access Agreement (LAA) on each and every occasion as best we can. If project believes there is an absolute requirement whereby we can't get a LAA, the s109 is available, however at this point in time we don't have a list of s109's that we proposed to issue.
- ▶ RL acknowledged the officer's comments and asked prior to commencing one of those projects and before you have started talking to landowners, are you going to tell this committee about the project.
- ▶ VB interjected - that require an s109 and stated what happened was, we got numerous calls.
- ▶ RL stated for example it would have helped a lot and would have saved you a lot of money and a few people a lot of angst if you had come and talked to us about the soil survey, the first we knew it was happening was when people were getting s109's.
- ▶ RS advised the process always starts with direct consultation with individuals and beyond that we can talk about how we share that information more broadly if there is a requirement to issue s109's.
- ▶ KU noted, as flagged on the land access slide, ARTC is working with BHQ on the extension of the Geotechnical investigations and noted she has been working closely with that team to look at where they are proposing to do those investigations and noted we are developing a plan to go an meet face to face with landowners to talk about what the investigations will look like and understand what their concerns are. She noted at the moment there is winter cropping to be considered, so we don't want to be approaching land owners to put massive test pits in amongst their crops and reiterated it is quite a one-on-one process at this point in time. She noted land access slide is proposed to give the Committee an early heads up, and that is the heads up that we are planning to extend our geotechnical investigations commencing from September. In the coming weeks our team will be going out with BHQ to talk to landowners one-on-one about those concerns, so we are certainly taking the learnings on board from the previous investigations, concerns from the community and the people that we have met with and looking at how we can communicate that better.
- ▶ VB noted the problem is that the community don't see the need for ARTC to force access on landowners, when ARTC own so much land and there is not a significant difference between a block of and land here and block of land next door and stated ARTC have never been able to explain why they have needed to force access.
- ▶ KU advised that is part of the tailoring ARTC are looking at.
- ▶ VB noted the officer's comment and advised our feedback to you is – don't get out the form 109's, use your own land, use Queensland government land, but if you are going to do the form 109's tell the committee that you are going to do it first, because the people ring us. She stated, we don't support the 109's, we think that is ridiculous way to treat a community that is going to be affected by something they never asked for in the first place and we

	<p>would like you to explain to us why you need particular access to particular land while you have other options and the committee would like to give you feedback on those options.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ KU advised the engagement for the geotechnical investigations is in the initial stage at the moment, where we have reviewed locations and are exploring options to move activities into road corridors, QR corridors and ARTC owned property where possible. She noted there are some crucial structures that will be built on privately owned land, so we are working through what that looks like, adding we have a pretty good sense of the landowners across the alignment from an engagement perspective, so we are sense checking that with BHQ and will explore that further and talk to people about why is it that investigations need to be in certain locations.</li> <li>▶ A member of the public, directed his question to AD and noted in your presentation before when you talked to N2NS section, you mentioned that 25% of that section was floodplain, he noted he is going to Yelarbon for a meeting tomorrow night and asked AD to do some research and can you tell me precisely where all this floodplain area is, because a lot of that country is just undulating country – can you enlighten me at that meeting where all this 25% is, thank you.</li> <li>▶ A member of the public, Brian Mathews (BM) referred to the discussion on stabilisation and noted on Gore Highway after floods in 2011 they used stabilisation on that, but if you haven't got something solid under your stabilisation, it will crack like the Gore Highway did and people down the road use to ride a motorbike to go pick up his machine, and he is said he is not game to ride his motorbike on the road because it will go in the cracks on the road, and if you not solid underneath your stabilisation, your stabilisation will move and crack and I often wondered why Main Roads and Shires don't build a solid foundation underneath and noted if you build a house you have to have soil tests to make sure you house is on solid and I often wonder why Main Roads and Councils build better roads railway lines, you have a look at most of the roads that are built today, they are narrow roads, there is nowhere to pull off to do anything and the thing is if you don't compact from the edge of your gutter through you will let water in underneath your road and that's why roads are broken up these days. I have contact with Main Roads and Shires through my life and this is a fact I've learnt, thank you.</li> <li>▶ BA asked if there were any further questions.</li> <li>▶ BA noted that committee member PMi who is apology and noted she wanted to put to the committee that new Federal Minister be asked to come along to one of these meetings and asked DL to make the request.</li> <li>▶ BA thanked everyone for their attendance and thanked ARTC and BHQ for their presentations and noted if there are any issue or concerns to raise them with himself or KU after the meeting and for future meetings is there is anything you want covered please let us know and thank you all for your attendance.</li> </ul>
7	<p><b>CONCLUSION AND CONFIRMATION OF ACTIONS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ KU reiterated the Action Items.</li> <li>▶ Next meeting dates are to be confirmed.</li> </ul>

**Actions**

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY
1	▶ Follow up TSBE regarding comments about approvals	ARTC
2	▶ Provide number of koalas located	ARTC
3	▶ Provide example koala management plan	ARTC
4	▶ Will height of line/embankment affect 24 hour travel time	ARTC
5	▶ Details of lime transport to sites and storage at sites	ARTC

<b>6</b>	▶ Provide details of exclusion zones when treating with lime	ARTC
<b>7</b>	▶ Will details of trials and works to be undertake be publicly available	ARTC
<b>8</b>	▶ Contaminated sites survey	ARTC
<b>9</b>	▶ Any make good strategies available	ARTC
<b>10</b>	▶ Invitation to new Infrastructure Minister	Chair

**Next meeting**

To be advised