

Meeting minutes

Gowrie to Calvert Community Consultative Committee

Date / Time

18 April 2023
6:00pm – 8:00pm

Location

Laidley Cultural Centre
3 Laidley Plainland Road, Laidley North

Facilitator

Simon Warner, Chair

Minute taker

Kylie Wendell, Secretariate

CCC Attendees

- Gordon van der Est
- Maurice Hennessy
- Neil Cook
- Michael Keene
- Daniel McNamara
- Darryl Green

ARTC Attendees

- Max Nichols, G2K Area Director
- Fleur McPherson, EIS Delivery Specialist
- Myf Jagger, Social Performance Principal
- Elysha Loiterton, Social Performance Advisor
- Amanda Reed, Property Access & Acquisition Manager
- Donna Cannon, Cultural Heritage Manager
- Kim Wheatley, Engagement Lead G2H
- Kylie Wendell, Engagement Lead H2C
- Shakira Sellen, Engagement Advisor H2C
- Jacqui Neill, Corporate Affairs

CCC Apologies

- Jason Chavasse
- Maree Rosier
- John Schollick
- Gary Stark
- Margaret McCarthy

- Amanda Quayle, Engagement Manager

Guests (Show organisation if not ARTC)

- Drue Edwards, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts
- Teresa Harding, Mayor Ipswich City Council
- Dianne Loughnan, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts

Discussions

NO.	ACTIONS
1	<p>Introductions and Acknowledgement of Country – 6:00pm – Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome to committee and observers • Chair welcomed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Drue Edwards and Dianne Loughnan, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts ○ Teresa Harding, Mayor Ipswich City Council ○ Representatives from the Lockyer Valley Regional Council ○ Representatives from Toowoomba Regional Council ○ Representatives from the Ipswich City Council ○ Observers

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Apology from Tanya Milligan, Mayor Lockyer Valley Regional Council ○ Apology from Paul Antonio, Mayor Toowoomba Regional Council ○ Apology Jim McDonald ○ Five apologies from committee members: Jason Chavasse, Maree Rosier, John Schollick, Gary Stark, Margaret McCarthy ● Nil conflicts of interest. ● Myf Jagger delivered the Acknowledgement of Country
2	<p>Actions from previous meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Social Impact Assessment sub plans (part of Social Impact Management Plan) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Included in tonight's presentation – closed.</i> ● Wellbeing Activity Workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Included in tonight's presentation – closed.</i> ● Overall delivery strategy and Tier 1 contractors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Deferred to next meeting.</i>
3	<p>Cultural Heritage – 6:05pm – Donna Cannon</p> <p>Presentation key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cultural Heritage in the project area is managed in accordance with approved Cultural Heritage Management Plans (CHMPs) that the Yuggera Ugarapul (YUP) People and the Western Wakka Wakka (WWW) People have developed with Inland Rail. ● ARTC recently met with both YUP and WWW to discuss upcoming works for 2023: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Early works surveys – geotechnical and soil investigations (works are occurring currently in the field) ○ Project activities surveys (small body of work) – scheduled from mid-2023 to identify additional and any remaining areas ○ Mitigation activities (large body of work) – where we have surveyed previously and identified artefacts and certified sites, we will be doing supplementary works such as test pitting to get a better understanding of those sites. ● Key contacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Donna Cannon, Cultural Heritage Manager, DCannon@ARTC.com.au ○ Selina Nalatu, Senior Cultural Heritage Advisor, SNalatu@ARTC.com.au <p>Question from observer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Have local contractors been involved in the investigations in those areas? ● Donna Cannon – ARTC does not engage the contractors, we engage directly with the traditional owners. ● Max Nicols – Donna is correct, ARTC does not engage or source local suppliers or directly engage the contractors / machine operators that are required to do these activities. With regards to the geotechnical investigations, these will be conducted by Regionerate Rail who will subcontract the work out through their processes. Similarly with the pit testing, contractors will be engaged and managed through the Cultural Heritage groups. Regionerate Rail has a prescriptive requirement of local suppliers that require local experience so they will be engaging local suppliers moving forward. <p>Addresses commentary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Various local (Project Area) companies have been approached by Regionerate Rail to tender for the small range of initial supply opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In some cases, Project Area companies declined to bid as they did not have the capability required to perform the work. ● Geotechnical work has been awarded to a combination of Project Area (Toowoomba) and Project Region businesses.

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic Management work has been awarded to a Project Area (Lockyer Valley) business. • Clearing work has been awarded to a Project Area (Lockyer Valley) business. • Utilities investigations work has been awarded to a Project Region business. • Regionerate Rail's PPE supplier is a First Nations business based in the Project Region.
4	<p>Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) update: 6:10pm – Fleur McPherson</p> <p>Presentation key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARTC's consultant has almost finished preparing the existing case flood models to incorporate the outcomes of the Independent Flood Report. • Since the last CCC meeting in December 2022, ARTC has completed the baseline ecological surveys that will support the dEIS's for Gowrie to Helidon (G2H) and Helidon to Calvert (H2C) projects. • ARTC has been undertaking additional noise monitoring to inform baseline conditions for G2H and H2C. We need to revisit four sites (Gowrie, Gatton and Laidley areas) following recent damage to the equipment in May 2023. • Updating the revised dEIS chapters and reports and building on lessons learnt from the Border to Gowrie and Calvert to Kagaru revised draft Environmental Impact Statements (EIS). <p>Question from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the dEIS was out for public notification in 2021, the Committee expressed concern that it lacked depth in terms of detailed design because as at that time, the preferred proponent hadn't been identified. When the revised dEIS is submitted again to the OCG, will the original issues that were raised about the design be dealt with or will Regionerate Rail need to wait for commentary or feedback from OCG? • Fleur McPherson –the revised dEIS is based on the Regionerate Rail design and all of the supporting information ARTC and Regionerate Rail have developed. ARTC works with Regionerate Rail on a daily basis to understand their design and management plans and all of this will be incorporated in to the revised dEIS. The level of design maturity is at a concept design stage (not yet detailed design in engineering terms) however we are collaborating back and forth to understand how the construction methodology might work in reality and consider those for the revised dEIS. <p>Question from Gordon Van der Est:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I have two questions: Will the flood modelling findings, the answers to address those findings, will these be shared publicly in the future? And with regards to the noise modelling, most of it was done on private property so why does it have to be done again? ○ Fleur McPherson – ARTC will engage with community and stakeholders and present the finding of the flood analysis. This engagement will be done through a number of forums such as information sessions, CCC meetings, one-on-one meetings with landowners. Our technical consultants are able to present the results property-by-property and will be there to answer questions or concerns. ○ An additional piece of work we are doing for the revised dEIS is collaborating with the OCG to establish a way to present the flooding results in a digestible format as it is very data heavy with thousands of individual maps. We are investigating the creation of a website (similar to Social Pinpoint) to allow visibility of flood results for a number of different flood events and overlaid aerial imagery with the proposed alignment visible. It is anticipated it will be available when the revised dEIS goes out for public consultation again. It will be another useful tool to help share and communicate the results with communities. ○ Fleur McPherson – not all of the noise monitoring needs to be done again, only a couple of locations (which are not on private property). Some of the tubing / wiring to the cameras

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>were deliberately severed and one camera was physically removed from site which prohibited us in receiving results at those locations.</p> <p>Statement from Chair (FORWARD ACTION):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be useful for the committee to be presented with and have visibility of the flood modelling results before the 2nd round of EIS consultation, rather than during. Fleur McPherson – will take that as a forward action and ensure the CCC is provided with the information once it is available and before the dEIS public notification periods. <p>FORWARD ACTION</p> <p>Question from Darryl Green:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When do you expect the concept designs to be available to directly impacted landowners? Any projected timeframe? Max Nichols – ARTC is working through the general design with Regionerate Rail at the moment and that is the design that the revised dEIS will be based on. These earlier studies we are undertaking is to ensure we are getting the right information and to understand the impact of the design. It is not drastically different from the previous design but it is about making sure we are doing the right work so when we go out and consult with the community we are actually able to consult a bit more meaningfully (with regards to the design). The flood modelling is one of the studies we are going through. When it is validated and verified and reviewed appropriately by a number of stakeholders and we have confidence in it, we will be able to be shared more broadly. The timing of this will be the second half of 2023. Fleur McPherson – communication of the design and any changes that have occurred since the initial dEIS is progressive in nature. Where we know a change has occurred, we will present this information to the specific landowner via the engagement teams with support of a technical person. This will be ongoing and is already occurring now. In terms of the EIS, the design drawings will be presented in the revised dEIS across various appendices. <p>Statement from Chair (FORWARD ACTION):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of the issues raised by the tourism industry was visual amenity and in the environmental sense, the impact to native wildlife and flora and fauna. Some of those things are not possible until you have the detailed design (particularly visual amenity). In the first dEIS, the public were given some concept drawings of what the infrastructure would look like from certain viewpoints etc. From a committee perspective, we'd like to be presented with the design 'mock-ups' of what some of the major infrastructure would look like so people can identify where there might be issues or where they can perhaps compliment Regionerate Rail on good results. For example, where there is going to be a large piece of infrastructure on Laidley Plainland Road near the Laidley Cultural Centre and through the Valley Vista residential estate. Fleur McPherson – similar to the previous EIS, the revised dEIS will include visualisations and indicative viewpoints that will be updated with the current concept design. So, we can and will produce those visualisations which will include vegetation treatments, public artworks etc. Additionally, embankment size, bridge type etc, we have sufficient knowledge at this time to understand what they will look like and will be included in the revised dEIS. Once that information is available and in additional the flooding information, I commit to providing that to the Committee ahead of the revised dEIS public notification. FORWARD ACTION

NO.	ACTIONS
5	<p>Mayoral update: 6:30pm – Teresa Harding, Mayor Ipswich City Council</p> <p>Presentation key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ipswich local government area has two projects in the region – the Helidon to Calvert and Calvert to Kagaru. I am very grateful to be able to provide Council’s views here tonight. • I want to make it very clear that I am not part of the Inland Rail team, I am the Mayor of Ipswich and am here to represent our community. • South-East Queensland is the fastest growing area in Queensland and Ipswich City Council (ICC) is the fastest growing council in Queensland. This means that our community’s’ needs change over time. It is interesting to note that councils don’t just deal with rubbish, roads and rates anymore, we are very involved with the social and economical development of our communities as well. • Council’s approach to the project is to maximise the benefits for the residents as well as minimise the impacts for our residents. Inland Rail is a double-edged sword for our communities and is seen with minimal benefits with maximum impact. Dr Kerry Schott’s recent report indicated we are looking to see an intermodal built at Ebenezer and Council supports this and sees it as a good economic decision which will create job opportunities. • While the Inland Rail Review highlights areas of concern, it reiterates the importance of Inland Rail and I appreciate the economic opportunities it will create. • The challenges for ICC was identifying items in response to the Terms of Reference. ICC has previously stressed proper work needs to be done with regards to the flood modelling. We know the flood modelling, particularly in Grandchester is not accurate and the 2022 floods were very impactful. Any accurate flood modelling will be beneficial for our residents as well as Council. • In terms of social impacts, Council’s biggest concern are the two level crossings proposed for Grandchester. The 1.8km trains will have massive safety impacts to our community and everyday lives, picking kids up from school etc. Council has been consistent in its discussions with Inland Rail in this regard and will continue lobbying that we do not want to have any level crossings in the project at all. • Ipswich takes in 42% of Queensland’s waste. We have eight private waste operators who operate landfill around Ipswich and one of Council’s concerns is that we don’t want waste trained up by other states. Council is very concerned and serious about this issue. • 94% of the waste is commercial and industrial and construction and demolition non-household waste. • 20,000 complaints to Odour Abatement Taskforce received by ICC. • Thank you to the residents who attend these meetings and thank you Inland Rail for your constant work and I appreciate the engagement work that is being undertaken within our communities.
6	<p>Inland Rail Review – 6:35pm – Drue Edwards, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communication and the Arts</p> <p>Presentation key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions and background of the Inland Rail Review. Key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In October 2022, the Australian Government announced the appointment of Dr Kerry Schott AO to undertake an independent review to assess the governance and delivery of the Inland Rail program. • The review completed by Dr Schott takes consideration of the scope, schedule and cost of the Inland Rail program. It also assesses options for the new Inland Rail

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>intermodal terminals to be built in Melbourne and Brisbane, and improved links to the ports of these cities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr Schott’s report outlines 19 recommendations to improve the delivery of Inland Rail including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ strengthening the governance arrangements and establishing a subsidiary company to deliver Inland Rail ○ reviewing ARTC’s risk management and reporting systems, with a view to addressing issues experienced with approval processes ○ a further assessment of the scope and cost of Inland Rail, conducted by an independent specialist in conjunction with a cost estimator/value engineer ○ a revised delivery that prioritises sections of Inland Rail that allow revenue to be generated earlier ○ deciding and developing intermodal terminals in Melbourne and Brisbane ○ maximising regional opportunities available from Inland Rail, including through intermodal opportunities in Parkes and prioritising delivery of the enhanced rail capability to enable double stacking through to Beveridge. • To read more, click independent review of Inland Rail • To read the Australian Government’s response, click Government’s Response. <p>Question from Maurice Hennessy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has any consideration been given to how the American system operates where freight trucks are loaded on to the trains and transported and unloaded at the final destination. Is this something ARTC is considering? • Drue Edwards – Inland Rail’s business case is for a rail system. The capability for wagons to carry trucks sits with the rail operators. With regards to physical height and width, I do not believe there would be any reason why they could not use Inland Rail. Part of the economic opportunity for Inland Rail is that double staked containers provide significant efficiency in terms of volume of freight carried by individual trains but where people were looking to load the trailer with a truck and container on it, I’m not aware of any reason why that could not happen. <p>Question from Gordon Van der Est:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have three questions to ask tonight: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) with regards to the report and some of the recommendations, we can appreciate how ARTC is going through a process on addressing the recommendations and what type of process the organisation is going to adopt, however specifically relating to the termination and freight centre (intermodal) at Ebenezer, if that goes ahead does that mean the current route to Bromelton will cease? 2) regarding the alternate route around Gatton and Forest Hill, ARTC has a land bank that almost runs from Laidley back to Gatton (aligned with Warrego Highway), for the land they don’t own, the vast majority is owned by GOCs and is owned by local government, we would like to know the timeframe and the process in evaluating an alternate route. 3) on the financial viability regarding the 100% cost to build IR, how will that impact the project? • Drue Edwards, I will answer in parts: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the Government has announced that it is examining an end point at Ebenezer and that is still subject to the outcome of a business case. That Business Case is expected to be completed in the latter half of this year. The service offering for Inland Rail program will be modified to have it terminate at Ebenezer and would only be a single-track line from Ebenezer to Kagaru and there would be no track upgrades between Bromelton, Kagaru and Acacia Ridge. Basically, double stacking would stop at Ebenezer and potentially shuttle trains operating from there to the existing East

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>Coast line. Part of the reason for that connection from Ebenezer to Kagaru is needed is to ensure that the National Rail Network has resilience. Traffic moving down the East Coast line and there is an outage on that track way going south, traffic can then come round onto Inland Rail, move across Queensland and then south to NSW and vice versa. It is about building further resilience into our network connectivity. The double stacking of freight for Inland Rail will move between Beveridge and potentially a terminal at Ebenezer.</p> <p>2) In the Inland Rail Review, Dr Schott has been quite clear that the first steps in any of these instances are to understand what the impacts are as part of the regulatory process and examine how they can be mitigated. That is the current process that ARTC and Regionerate Rail are going through with Lockyer Valley Regional Council. They are looking at identifying those impacts and doing assessments around whether they can or cannot be mitigated. Where they can be mitigated then those are the actions that need to be taken before an alternate route is considered but also a part of the consideration is to understand how train traffic volumes may grow beyond those that are forecast and planned for and whether that is the case in the future options have been put in place to bypass at that time. They are the steps that are set out in the report.</p> <p>3) the cost of the project has significantly increased over the last 2-3 years, this isn't inconsistent with what is occurring in the construction industry in Australia because it is a very heated construction process at the moment. Material costs are rising and access to machinery is increasing in cost. Delays in moving through the EIS process and approvals in both NSW and QLD have also added to the cost. The Government has been clear that it supports the Inland Rail project but it really does want to understand what the turnout cost will be. The Government needs ARTC to continue working through its approval processes to get those environmental approvals and understand what the conditions are attached to those approvals, to acquire land and to take other steps to de-risk the project through geotechnical and geo-morphical studies so that when approvals are achieved and we move through to the final design we can be certain as best as possible, the risks have been addressed and costs are known. ARTC and the Government still have a lot of work to do to test these costs and understand where there are going to.</p> <p>Statement from Drue Edwards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am happy for CCC members to email any further questions or put them through the minute process. I am also happy to come back to the next meeting and advise on any progress. <p>Question from Darryl Green:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the blowout expected to be in 2031 when Inland Rail is completed given the cost predication now? Drue Edwards – the cost estimate indicated in the report is the cost to complete the project assuming that it is built for a planned completion date of 2031. Dr Schott has indicated she is not confident around that completion date given the EIS process at large in both NSW and QLD. The timely completion of those to allow design to allow the decisions to be made on future cost are uncertain. At this moment in time, the Government has not set a completion date for this project. Through the Department, the Government will engage cost and design evaluators to look at the design that is in place and test the cost that ARTC's developed to provide that certainty around the cost but also to ensure that the process activities are needed to get those environmental approvals completed and acquire the land to secure the corridor do the investigation works that are needed to test and proof

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>the designs continue but the short answer, the estimated cost to 2031 if we continue as we are now is around the \$32b mark.</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>Project updates, Gowrie to Helidon and Helidon to Calvert, 6:55pm – Max Nichols Presentation key points:</p> <p>Gowrie to Helidon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regenerate Rail is currently performing following the activities to inform their design: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ecology clearance ○ Utilities Investigation ○ Geotechnical borehole drilling • An Independent Verifier has now been appointed • Utility relocation work in the InterlinkSQ site is progressing and nearing completion. • Studies being undertaken to inform the EIS include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Monthly surface water monitoring ○ Surface water sampling ○ Quarterly ground water monitoring ○ Ground water monitoring, accessing existing bores ○ Noise monitoring ○ Geomorphology survey ○ Soils investigations (G2H & H2C) ○ European Cultural Heritage. <p>Helidon to Calvert</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIS documents tranche 2 is being finalised for submission to the Office of the Coordinator-General • Minor changes to the Little Liverpool Range tunnel on the Laidley side, there is a grade change, it is now slightly flatter. That is an improvement from ARTC’s perspective, the flatter grade allows a connection between QR and Inland Rail to occur in the hills close to the Little Liverpool tunnel and where the best location is. • Little Liverpool rail connection with QR. • Crossover and turnout reduction (prioritisation of the Inland Rail route). No drastic change to the remainder of the alignment, simply opportunities to what I have mentioned. <p>Nil questions from committee or observers</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>Land acquisition – 7:00pm – Amanda Reed Presentation key points:</p> <p>Who will acquire or resume the land required for Inland Rail?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) is the acquiring authority for the Queensland section of Inland Rail and will manage the compulsory land acquisition process set out in the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i> legislation. <p>When will land be acquired or resumed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compulsory land acquisition for the rail corridor will only occur after the Environmental Impact Statement is final and the Coordinator-General has provided an evaluation report. <p>Compulsory Land Acquisition Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following relevant approvals, ARTC will request TMR compulsory acquire required land (that has not already been acquired). • Each impacted landowner will be consulted to be made aware of the land requirements, and their rights and entitlements under the acquisition process. • TMR will adhere to the land acquisition process as set out in the ALA, including providing landowners with a Notice of Intention to Resume, objection rights, and should the

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>acquisition go ahead, a Taking of Land Notice. Should land be taken under this process, then interest holders are entitled to compensation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More information is available at: https://www.tmr.qld.gov.au/Community-and-environment/Property-information <p>Compensation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eligibility for compensation – compensation can be claimed if you have a legal interest in the land taken e.g. if you are the owner or have other legal interest in the land e.g. a lease. • Compensation claims – to be lodged with TMR following the taking of land gazettal, application for payments as an advance against compensation can be made, with the final claim settled at a later date. • Compensation assessment – assessment is based on market value of the property (or interest), plus any loss in value due to severance and/or injurious affection to other land, plus disturbance costs (e.g. legal, valuation or other professional fees, storage and removal costs). • Settlement – an offer of compensation will be made following TMR consideration of the claim, if agreement on compensation cannot be reached, either part can refer the matter to the Land Court. • Title correction – a survey of the resumed land will be undertaken to show the new boundaries, no cost to landowners. <p>Land Rationalisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARTC and TMR will jointly agree the rationalisation strategy for surplus land. • Surplus land is generally disposed of following establishment of the rail corridor. • The sale of any surplus land will have regard to legislative requirements (offer backs), and TMR / ARTC policy position with generally the preferred method being sale to the open market. • Factors to consider in determining the rationalisation approach include how the land was acquired, practical and legal access, parcel size, potential uses etc. <p>Question from Gordon Van der Est:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I note your presentation refers to those who are directly impacted, however there are property owners who aren't directly impacted but will be less than 50m from the new rail line, I understand the responsibility is falling over to TMR and not ARTC, what will be available to them with regards to solutions and assistance for vibration which is bad for building damage of their homes, noise and liveability and impacts on their quality of life? • Max Nichols – the process that Amanda spoke about and the language term of “directly impacted” can be somewhat confusing. In this context, directly impacted is only for those where land needs to be acquired off an individual landowner for the purpose of the rail line so the compensation Amanda spoke about is the process where the actual rail corridor would require some of that individual landowners' land to be transferred to become rail corridor. The mitigation is the EIS process and essentially the process is to assess what the impacts of rail corridor will have on the environment, local area and community and that is across the broad range of EIS chapters. Noise and vibration are most certainly one of those chapters and assessments that are being carried out at the moment through understanding the criteria set by the Queensland Government. • The assessments look at the predicated noise and vibration outcomes from the train track and amount of traffic using the line. It is those assessments that provide an idea of the level of impact that would be on those landowners who are in close proximity to the rail corridor and if there are those sensitive receptors that are above certain nominated trigger levels that is set by the Queensland Government, we're obligated to do something in order to mitigate that impact. Those people are technically described as indirectly impacted – although their land is not being acquired – there is a form of impact to those landowners.

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>Those impacts are assessed through the EIS process and we must comply by those legislative requirements set by the Queensland Government in order to manage and mitigate those community members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fleur McPherson – the EIS will identify where the impacts need to be reduced and we will work through a series of mitigation measures, for example noise walls and at property treatments to mitigate noise and vibration. <p>Statement from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basically, it is not under the property acquisition process but under the EIS or under mitigative action. <p>Question from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You didn't make any comment about voluntary acquisition and I understand there has been a bit of that, is this correct? Amanda Reed – correct, ARTC has acquired some properties early (ahead of compulsory acquisition) if a landowner is a willing seller and would like to be considered for early acquisition, we have a policy and a criteria so if the landowner would like to be acquired for certain reasons. The reasons may include suffering hardship or if there is some pressing need to sell the property now but can't because of Inland Rail program, we will look at them on a case by case process. <p>Question from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has there been many early acquisitions occur to date? Can you give us a figure? Amanda Reed – across the Queensland projects, we have acquired 21 different sets of properties.
9	<p>Stakeholder Engagement, Gowrie to Helidon and Helidon to Calvert – 7:15pm – Kim Wheatley</p> <p>Presentation key points:</p> <p>Recent engagement for G2H and H2C:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meetings with tourism and accommodation providers about peak periods, hotel capacity and opportunities for workforce accommodation during construction periods Meetings with schools along the alignments about proposed road network changes during construction, likely disruptions to school bus routes and commuting parents Meetings with new landowners in Gowrie Junction, Laidley and Helidon to provide awareness about Inland Rail, proximity of the proposed alignment to the property and discuss general concerns. <p>Recent events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grandchester consultation (H2C), 15 March 2023, 9am – 4pm Social and Sustainability EIS Workshop (G2H), 16 March 2023, 6pm – 9pm Laidley street markets (H2C), 24 March 2023, 8am – 2pm Toowoomba Show (G2H), 30 March 2023 through to 1 April 2023, all day <p>Upcoming engagement events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flora and Fauna EIS workshop (combined G2H and H2C) Wednesday 19 April 2023, 6pm – 8pm Murphys Creek Community Centre Social Performance and Sustainability EIS workshop (H2C) Thursday 27 April 2023, 6pm – 8pm Lockyer Valley Cultural Centre, Gatton

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laidley RSL markets Saturday 29 April 2023, 7am – 12pm • Forest Hill consultation Wednesday 3 May 2023, 9am – 3pm <p>Nil questions from committee or observers</p>
10	<p>Social Performance – 7:20pm – Myf Jagger Presentation key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Performance program is maintaining momentum with our key partners in areas which are helping communities and key stakeholders to get 'Inland Rail ready' and to also understand what skills and opportunities are available with the Inland Rail program. Some of those focus areas are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ STEM on Track ○ Upskilling local businesses with workforce development and capability events ○ Skills training (these will be promoted as we get close to mobilisation for projects however are starting conversations with First Nations and key stakeholders to identify their aspirations for skills training and employment pathways) ○ Scholarships ○ Grand Opportunities is a partnership that is focused on engaging with youth and virtual work experience opportunities and mentoring with programs that have been designed with Grandshake and Inland Rail which are focused on Inland Rail careers ○ Clontarf Foundation is another key partnership we have which is focused on supporting First Nations, young men with skill development and education and supporting their careers aspirations. • Social Impact Management Plan (SIMP) social outcome monitoring. The SIMP has been drafted for the EIS's for both G2H and H2C projects and is publicly available: <p>Helidon to Calvert Social Impact Assessment (released 31 March 2021): https://www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0031/52789/Q_Social.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H2C SIMP sections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Community & Stakeholder Engagement – Section 8.2, Page 261 ○ Workforce Management – Section 8.3, Page 290 ○ Housing & Accommodation – Section 8.4, Page 299 ○ Health & Community Wellbeing – Section 8.5, Page 307 ○ Local Business & Industry Participation – Section 8.6, page 319 ○ Monitoring, reporting and review – Section 8.7, Page 329 <p>Gowrie to Helidon Social Impact Assessment (released 2 August 2021): https://eisdocs.dsdip.qld.gov.au/Inland%20Rail%20Gowrie%20to%20Helidon/draft-EIS/Q_Social-Impact-Assessment.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G2H SIMP sections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Community & Stakeholder Engagement – Section 8.2, Page 258 ○ Workforce Management – Section 8.3, Page 288 ○ Housing & Accommodation – Section 8.4, Page 297 ○ Health & Community Wellbeing – Section 8.5, Page 303 ○ Local Business & Industry Participation – Section 8.6, page 316 ○ Monitoring, reporting and review – Section 8.7, Page 324 • The revised dEIS will look at revisions to these management plans based on consultation, public submissions received during the projects public notification period in 2021 and the OCG's Request for Additional Information.

NO.	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each of the sub-action areas, this lists what additional information is being sought by the CG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Social Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Updated SIMP mitigations and expected outcomes ❖ Describe legacy projects ○ Workforce Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Latest workforce data ❖ Indigenous participation plans ❖ Inland Rail Skills Academy ○ Industry participation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Local and Indigenous participation plans ❖ Commitments to cooperate with Queensland Government departments ○ Housing and accommodation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Housing and accommodation impacts ❖ Tourism industry peak periods ❖ Supports available for vulnerable residents ○ Health and community wellbeing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Mental health supports ❖ Commitments agreed with local councils ❖ Social use of local environments in operations phase ○ Community and stakeholder engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Consultation results and plans ❖ Stakeholder key concerns ❖ Stakeholder influence on design and mitigation measures • ARTC has made a commitment to develop a Community Wellbeing Plan (the Plan) within each of the Queensland projects and the objectives of the Plan are to recognise the environmental controls that will be in place to help mitigate impacts at source and at sensitive receptor but to also look at ways we can minimise the impact of our construction and our operations on community wellbeing (including mental health), to minimise our impacts on social infrastructure (community facilities, health and emergency services) and find ways in offsetting social impact in ways with other community investment activities and community support activities which need to be sought by and led by communities. • Social Performance to share the links and share the framework at the next committee meeting (ACTION closed, included above). <p>Statement from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage committee members to attend the Social Performance and Sustainability workshop on 27 April 2023 in Gatton and to share this opportunity within your community networks. • Myf Jagger – ARTC recognises some significant social impacts associated with the Inland Rail program so we also look at ways that that funding and investment support could contribute to social character in a positive way. The other areas we would like to focus on is community cohesion so looking at community events or ways to support the community to remain connected and resilient through the construction and operation of Inland Rail.

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>The other area we'd like to focus on is opportunities to enhance on connectivity recognising there will be changing to connectivity as a result of the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Furthermore, another part of the activity will assist in understanding the legacy benefits Inland Rail can leave within the community after construction is complete and the rail line is operational. <p>Statement from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When the Committee was first established, one of the objectives we wanted to achieve as a Committee was to mitigate the impact and maximise the outcomes. These activities here tonight are a way we can contribute to that, especially making comments in relation to the legacy that the project leaves behind. Regardless of your views on whether you think the project should go ahead or not, it is important that if the project does go ahead, what is the legacy that you want to see left in your community. When the planning is in place, there is at least an understanding of what the expectation of the community is at ground level rather than those who have expressed in a political manner. This is a great way for the community to step up and communicate what is important to them.
11	<p>General business – 7:40pm – all</p> <p>Question from Michael Keene:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the information that we've all seen in recent days and weeks, it is quite obvious that the Government is prioritising the Melbourne to Parkes segment of the project and it is also quite obvious to me, that we are not likely to see the project at this end for 8-10 years. In that context, is this committee going to be sitting here four times a year for the next 8-10 years doing this? I'm wondering about the practicalities of committee fatigue. Max Nichols – I completely appreciate the comment about committee fatigue. The core purpose of this committee format was to support the EIS process as it went through and got to a conditions of approval and at that point, the form of this committee would dissolve and there would be a new type of committee more focused on construction and delivery. The intent has not been to keep this form of committee going for as long as it has or for as long as it still may have to run however but there was always a level of sunset of this committee being when the EIS is completed. So, it is not another 8-10 more years of the committee but definitely through the remainder of this year, it is intended to continue to keep you informed about the EIS process until we get those conditions of approval from the OCG. <p>Statement from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I believe the reason for the focus on Melbourne to Parkes is because the majority of the infrastructure is already in place. For the Queensland projects, it will predominately be brand new infrastructure, which in itself is an enormous feat with significant environmental approvals required. I've been on this Committee for 6 years already and I fully understand the concept of fatigue. I recall when the first EIS went public, I reminded members that this wouldn't be the last time we'd have to go through this process. And when the next EIS is public, it also won't be the last time either. The OCG informed us that the Cross River Rail project progressed through 10 EIS's before it started construction and then progressed through a number more after they started construction because of design modifications. I acknowledge there will be a turnover of committee members in the future. The Committee's role in reviewing the EIS remains an important one. The Committee cannot expect only the general public to review and respond to the EIS, we all need to be

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>aware of what we are objecting to or supporting and you can only do that if you review and collect the information, as a Committee.</p> <p>Statement from Michael Keene:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would like to make a further comment on what informs my view of this, can I draw everyone’s attention here tonight to Government Recommendation 16: <i>the Government has decided to prioritise Beveridge to Parkes with further work north of Parkes to be undertaken on a ‘least regrets’ basis.</i> That comment sounds very glass half empty to me and it feels like the first attempt by the Government to open the door to not continuing beyond Parkes. If I had written this document, I wouldn’t have used this language as I believe it sounds quite pessimistic and it certainly provides the impression that there may not even be a will to progress the project beyond Parkes, particularly given the outrageous cost estimate that we all have visibility of now. It wouldn’t surprise me if the line is built to Parkes and the decision is made that it simply can’t be afforded beyond there. <p>Statement from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think that is a question we should have asked Drue Edwards earlier tonight, for example, given that wording, what is the Government’s real intention. <p>Statement from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If anyone has any questions or comments for Drue to contemplate and answer at the next CCC meeting, please can you forward these through to either myself or Kylie. Max Nichols – I’d like to state that the Government has stated its support for Inland Rail as the full project, I can appreciate you may understand and interpret Recommendation 16 as ‘walking back’ their commitment, however there is definitely a very strong push in the recommendation to continue with the EIS approval process and the corridor acquisition process all areas north of Parkes. That being said, Michael, I fully support your question to be put forward to Drue and encourage all members to do the same, should you have any other questions or would like more clarification of the recommendations. <p>Statement from Gordon Van der Est:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I find ARTC’s response rather concerning. What I heard ARTC say with regard to the longevity of this Committee is basically when the EIS is approved and delivered it will then convert to a ‘construction focus’ (which I have no objection to). However, since 2013 the community, individuals, stakeholder and Councils have engaged with ARTC at length about issues which have been included in the dEIS and ARTC’s response to those issues (including Cultural Heritage) was that “because the projects are being delivered under a Public Private Partnership (PPP) we cannot provide a solution at this current time and cannot do anything until the engineering comes back from successful PPP proponent”. If this group is dissolved in the near future, I believe those issues will never be addressed because ARTC will just ‘handball’ them to the PPP consortium. So, unless all the issues are addressed in the revised dEIS, then all those issues are going to go unaddressed. <p>Statement from Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As you are aware, in 2022 ARTC received a Request for Additional Information from the OCG after receiving significant and lengthy issues raised by communities, key stakeholders and the Government itself. ARTC will need to be address those issues. This is why the EIS is being reworked. As I mentioned previously, the revised dEIS version may not be the last. For example, if an alternative alignment is approved, there will be a whole series of issues that have never

NO.	ACTIONS
	<p>been investigated in the first dEIS, nor the revised dEIS. It is our role as a Committee as part of that process to point that out to the Queensland Government, through the EIS process and make sure ARTC are held accountable to that.</p> <p>Statement from Max Nichols:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everything you raised just now Gordon and for everyone here tonight, is why it is so important that you are engaged and involved in the projects now. Once we get past the EIS, what Regionerate Rail will have to do is outlined within in conditions of the EIS and we will contractually oblige Regionerate Rail that they must comply with the conditions of the EIS. You need to make sure that you are speaking up now. • The other point I would like to raise is that the OCG is the independent umpire in this respect. ARTC is doing its best to address the issues raised by the community and various agencies of the Government and if they are not addressed well enough, the OCG will ask ARTC to do more work. The Request for Additional Information provided over 700 comments where certain aspects of the EIS didn't have adequate information requiring ARTC to undertake further works and provide more information. While you have the OCG on your community's side, this is the time to communicate what your concerns are. If you do not believe ARTC has addressed the issues appropriately in the revised dEIS, please engage yourselves in the process, talk to the OCG, make an EIS submission. That way, the final conditions of the EIS will provide clearer path to resolution and that will be incumbent on Regionerate Rail to comply with.
	<p>Meeting conclusion: 8:00pm</p> <p>The Committee and ARTC participated in an activity to seek community feedback and input into particular initiatives, ideas and activities in terms of the scope of the Community Wellbeing Plan as well as a Legacy Scoping Activity to seek feedback and suggestions on how Inland Rail can contribute positively back into community amenity.</p>

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	Committee to be presented with the flood modelling results before the 2 nd round of EIS consultation (rather than during the public notification period)	ARTC	Late 2023? (TBC)
2	Committee to be presented with updated visualisations and viewpoints before the 2 nd round of EIS consultation	ARTC	Late 2023? (TBC)
3	Overall delivery strategy and the Tier 1 contractors	Myf Jagger	Next meeting (TBC)

Next meeting

TBA