

Meeting minutes

Scenic Rim and Ipswich Community Consultative Committee meeting

Date / Time

7 December 2023
5:30-7:00pm

Location

Rosewood Uniting Church Hall

Chair

Kathy Baburin

Secretariat

Laura Jarman

Distribution

All members

Attendees

- Robert Collett (RC)
- Robyn Keenan (RK)
- Narrella Simpson (NS)
- Rosemaree Thomasson (RT)
- Phillip Bell (PB)
- Fleur McPherson, EIS Delivery Specialist (FM)
- Harry Lister, Stakeholder Engagement Advisor (HL)
- Jacqui Neill, Corporate Affairs Manager (JN)
- Max Nichols, Acting Area Director (MN)
- Bill Quince, Program Property Director (BQ)
- Shakira Sellen, Stakeholder Engagement Advisor (SS)

Apologies

- Alison Duke-Gibb
- Jan McGregor

Guests

- Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts (DITRDCA) representative
- Michael Hawkins, Office of the Coordinator-General (OCG) (MH)

Discussions

| NO. | DISCUSSION |
|-----|--|
| 1 | <p>Welcome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Chair delivered an Acknowledgement of Country, noting Aunty Narrella would provide another upon her arrival. - The Chair welcomed members, observers and guests from DITRDCA and OCG. - The Chair advised the meeting was being recorded for the purpose of preparing meeting minutes. - The Chair noted apologies from members Alison Duke-Gibb and Jan McGregor. - The Chair invited members and Inland Rail team members to introduce themselves and the group they represent. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LJ – Inland Rail Stakeholder Engagement Lead - RK – Represents the Logan and Allbert Conservation Association and the Kagaru community - RT – Represents the community of Walloon and Rosewood - MN – Inland Rail Area Director for Gowrie to Kagaru (G2K) projects - BQ – Inland Rail Program Property Director - MH – Mick Hawkins, Office of the Coordinator General - RC – Represents the community of Willowbank and Mudapilly |

| NO. | DISCUSSION |
|-----------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PB – Represents the Ipswich and Bremer Regional Chamber of Commerce - DITRDCA – Represents the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts - FM – Inland Rail G2K EIS Lead - HL – Inland Rail Stakeholder Engagement. <p><u>Questions and discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RK asked when the business case for the Ebenezer terminal was expected. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA responded that the business case process for the Ebenezer terminal is being jointly undertaken with the Queensland Government and the National Intermodal Corporation. It will clarify potential train numbers/freight volumes for the terminal, including trains travelling to Ebenezer from the east-coast line via the single-stacked connection from Kagaru. - The Chair asked if this detail was included in the Independent Review of Inland Rail report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA advised it was Dr Schott’s recommendation that that it be the configuration for the project going forward. The Commonwealth’s decision on this matter also means that the planned upgrade works on the Kagaru to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton section will not be going ahead as it is no longer part of the Inland Rail project. |
| <p>2</p> | <p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Item 3 – ARTC to provide noise modelling maps in more accessible format. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MN advised Inland Rail was discussing with our service provider how we can achieve that, including using colour coding on the maps to describe noise triggers. We will share those at the appropriate time. - Item 4 – ARTC to confirm train type in the draft EIS and clarify the consistency of numbers assumed in the Project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MN advised that an exercise is underway in association with the Ebenezer terminal business case that will help clarify the trains that are to be assessed in the EIS. We will share that in due course. |
| <p>3</p> | <p>DITRDCA update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA advised that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As part of an election commitment, Dr Kerry Schott AO was appointed by the Australian Government in October 2022 to undertake an Independent Review of Inland Rail. - The Australian Government released the Review findings on 6 April 2023 and agreed to its 19 recommendations in full or in principle. - Inland Rail are working closely with the Australian Government to deliver on its response to those recommendations. - The Government is committed: Inland Rail is nationally important infrastructure needed to meet Australia’s growing freight task, help improve road safety and decarbonise our economy. - The Government has announced that it remains committed to getting the delivery of the Inland Rail project back on track and re-focus the delivery. - The route of the Inland Rail project will connect the new intermodal terminal at Beveridge in Victoria with Kagaru in Queensland (the existing Sydney/Brisbane line). - The Inland Rail Service Offering (1.8-kilometre trains, double-stacked, 24 hours between terminals) will operate between the intermodal terminal at Beveridge in Victoria and the proposed terminal at Ebenezer in Queensland. - The Government is putting in place the arrangements needed for the delivery of the project. - The Government has supported the setup of Inland Rail Pty Ltd as a subsidiary of ARTC to deliver the project. A staged approach to the delivery of the Inland Rail: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complete the southern section of the project between Beveridge and Parkes to Narromine, NSW in 2027 |

| NO. | DISCUSSION |
|-----|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Complete Narrabri to North Star Phase 1, NSW in 2023 – Complete environmental planning approvals – Undertake surveys and testing required to further inform the design of Inland Rail, environmental planning approvals and land acquisitions. – Secure land required for the Inland Rail corridor. – The Government will make further decisions on the delivery of Inland Rail as it has more certainty that the project can be built to an agreed budget and timeframe. <p><u>Questions and discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – RK asked why the project still included Ebenezer to Kagaru as it could not be used to run Inland Rail trains as the Review recommended it not be able to accommodate heavier and longer trains. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DITRDCA advised that the double-stacked 1,800-metre trains from Beveridge would come up on Inland Rail and stop at the Ebenezer terminal. Trains leaving Ebenezer, using the section of track between Ebenezer and Kagaru would be single stacked and of a length that is to be decided. – MN advised that the maximum length of trains on the east-coast line was 1,500m. – DITRDCA continued that the Ebenezer to Kagaru link would be built and allow single-stacked trains to run from Beveridge or elsewhere on Inland Rail to join the east-coast line at Kagaru. – RK asked if there was a derailment on Inland Rail either west or south of Ebenezer and the train had to come up the east-coast time and then across. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DITRDCA advised that the existing east-coast line couldn't accommodate double-stacked trains of that length so they wouldn't be able to come up that way. – RK commented that the original route of Inland Rail had been extended to include Bromelton after ARTC purchased land there. She asked if ARTC still owned land at Bromelton and for what purpose as they were not a rail operator, freight carrier or development company. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DITRDCA advised that ARTC still did own that land and will consider what the best use is for that land in the future. – BQ clarified that the extension of Inland Rail to Bromelton did not come about because of the ARTC-owned land, it was because of the SCT freight intermodal terminal development at Bromelton. – RT noted that the Inland Rail business case was undertaken in 2015. She asked if a new business case was going to be undertaken. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DITRDCA advised that the decision that Inland Rail is required exists and there won't be a further business case. Going forward, we need to understand the cost and when it can get built. – RT asked if the business case was one of the considerations of the review. – DITRDCA responded that it was not a finding of Dr Schott – she recognised that there was a business case done and here was a need for Inland Rail, which still exists and becomes more relevant as Australia's population grows, particularly in South-East Queensland, which is our fastest-growing population centre. RT asked how Ebenezer was going to be able to handle the rail traffic and truck traffic associated with the terminal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DITRDCA advised that the Department of State Development needs to look at the extent of that site and what the development of that site is. Noted that the Ebenezer terminal development wasn't part of Inland Rail and would be subject to its own environmental and planning approval processes. <p>The Chair added that this was the same sort of process that was applied when the area around the Bromelton estate was developed.</p> – The Chair noted that Auntie Narrella had arrived, welcomed her to the meeting and invited her to deliver a Welcome to Country. |

| NO. | DISCUSSION |
|-----|---|
| | <p>NS delivered a Welcome to Country on behalf of the Jagera and Turrbul people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – RK noted that the Queensland an Australian government inter-governmental agreement was that there would be no coal trains on K2ARB – and by extrapolation Calvert to Kagaru (C2K) – until planning was done for the Salisbury-Beaudesert passenger rail project, or by agreement. She sought to clarify if the intergovernmental agreement still exists. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DITRDCA replied that there will be trains on the Inland Rail route that run past Ebenezer and go either to the Port of Brisbane or to Newcastle. These will be single-stacked trains for a specific purpose, but they won't be the only freight in that corridor as existing freight trains will continue to use the east coast main line corridor. – DITRDCA noted that the intergovernmental agreement is still live and a clear stipulation of it was there will be no coal on C2K to the east-coast line other than approved by the Queensland Government. – RK noted the difficulty with co-locating the Salisbury-Beaudesert passenger line in the same corridor as the existing freight line as it is not wide enough. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DITRDCA confirmed that working through competing train pathways is something that will need to be considered by the Queensland Government. – RK asked whether G2K would still be constructed as a PPP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DITRDCA advised MN would address that in his presentation. |
| 4 | <p>Inland Rail update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MN provided an update on the actions Inland Rail was taking following the review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Formed in July 2023, Inland Rail Pty Ltd, a subsidiary of ARTC, is delivering Inland Rail <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – comprises a Chief Executive reporting to a standalone Board – subsidiary directors with specific capabilities appointed to oversee a project of this complexity. – The sections of Inland Rail between Beveridge in Victoria and Parkes in New South Wales have been prioritised by the Australian Government for completion by 2027. – Inland Rail will then connect existing rail networks between Melbourne, Sydney, Perth, Adelaide and the Illawarra via Parkes and Narromine. – In a staged approach, Inland Rail will focus on achieving environment approvals and securing land for the rail corridor to provide more certainty as to the delivery and full cost of the Inland Rail program. – The Australian Government will determine the future delivery schedule for Inland Rail once approvals for all remaining sections are obtained and there is greater certainty on costs to deliver the Program. – Inland Rail is working with State and Australian Governments to expedite environmental approvals processes where possible to help reduce construction delays. – As a subsidiary of ARTC, Inland Rail Pty Ltd operates with its own governance and delivery arrangements in line with the Inland Rail Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Inland Rail's board comprises: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Executive Chair Robert Rust – Deputy Chair Louise Thurgood – Directors Erin Flaherty, James Cain, Vivienne King and Peter Duncan – The board members have been chosen for their skills, qualifications, knowledge and experience, including in the delivery of nationally significant freight infrastructure projects. – Revised EISs for G2K and NSW/Qld Border to Gowrie (B2G) sections are in progress. – Australian Government support for intermodal terminal at Ebenezer - subject to Brisbane Inland Rail Intermodal Terminal Business Case. – 39km of single-stacked, dual gauge rail proposed to connect Ebenezer and Kagaru to the Brisbane to Sydney East Coast line. |

| NO. | DISCUSSION |
|-----|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Recommendation 17 in the Independent Review of Inland Rail recommended that Inland Rail review the contracting model of the Public Private Partnership (PPP) for the G2K sections. – The Australian Government agreed with that Recommendation and since the Review was released in April 2023, Inland Rail has been working with the preferred PPP contractor, Regionerate Rail in response to this recommendation. – In November 2023, following negotiations, Inland Rail has agreed to not proceed with the PPP contracting arrangements. – Regionerate Rail has been conducting valuable work in G2K since being selected as preferred contractor in March 2022, undertaking a range of preliminary early works including site surveys, utility services investigation and geotechnical investigations that will help inform ongoing environmental approval processes and future construction works. – Inland Rail will now focus on gaining approvals for the G2K sections and continuing with land acquisitions to secure the corridor for Inland Rail. – Once these important tasks have been completed and the Australian Government has greater certainty around the program’s construction schedule and cost, there will be decisions on the delivery model for the G2K sections of Inland Rail. – Inland Rail will continue to keep the community updated. – The status of the Gowrie to Helidon, Helidon to Calvert and Calvert to Kagaru projects remains “subject to environmental approvals”. – Awaiting the Ebenezer terminal business case so we can ensure alignment. There will be a change of project scope with the Ebenezer to Kagaru section being single stacked. Inland Rail is adapting the design to make it cost efficient. – The Office of the Coordinator-General (OCG) has granted an extension to the declaration dates for the three projects to lapse on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Gowrie to Helidon (G2H): 1 February 2025 – Helidon to Calvert (H2C): 1 August 2025 – Calvert to Kagaru (C2K): 1 February 2026 – Inland Rail is currently preparing additional information to support the submission of the revised draft EISs for the G2H, H2C and C2K projects. <p>The C2K project, which connects to Ebenezer, will progress with a revised scope that we are in the process of determining with the Australian Government.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – LJ provided an overview of recent engagement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Drop-in information sessions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Laidley RSL Markets – 29 July 2023 – Peak Crossing Hall – 14 June 2023 – Purga Hall – 10 May 2023 – Laidley RSL Markets – 29 April 2023 – Peak Crossing Hall – 27 April 2023 – Yamanto Shopping Centre – 20 April 2023 – Regional Shows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Gatton Show – 21 – 22 July 2023 – Rosewood Show – 30 June – 1 July 2023 – Boonah Show – 2 – 3 June 2023 – Meetings with key stakeholders. – BQ provided an overview of the property acquisition program and status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Schott Review provided clear direction to continue work securing the corridor, including the acquisition of required land. |

| NO. | DISCUSSION |
|-----|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A program of early acquisition work is currently underway and will continue on a considered basis. To be suitable for early acquisition, land will be of demonstrable strategic benefit and / or associated with a genuine case of hardship for the landholder. - Compulsory land acquisition processes for the rail corridor will be undertaken by the Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR). Inland Rail does not have the power to compulsorily acquire land directly. - The process of acquisition, landowner rights and the assessment of compensation is guided by the Acquisition of Land Act 1967. Noted affected landowners are entitled to be reimbursed for things like legal fees, valuation fees, costs associated with actually going through the negotiation and eventually concluding it. - Compulsory acquisition of land by DTMR will not commence until the final EIS is accepted and the Evaluation Report has been released. <p><u>Questions and discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Chair noted that she had seen the Inland Rail construction down around Moree and she had compared them with photos of the flooding and the rail line remains intact. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MN responded that Inland Rail was seeking to build the project to be flood immune for the infrastructure’s purposes and also not to create additional flooding impacts for adjacent landowners and general community. - RK asked whether the ongoing maintenance of C2K would now fall to ARTC on the cessation of the PPP arrangement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MN confirmed it would. <p><u>Observer questions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Observer asked if there was any concept of how much land would be required for the Ebenezer terminal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA advised that the purpose of the business case would be to work out where and what the footprint of the terminal would be. Noted that the Queensland Government owned existing land in that area. - Observer asked if the land referred to was “Ten Mile Swamp”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA responded that they believed it was. - Observer commented on the significance of this area from an environmental and heritage perspective. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA responded that the development at Ebenezer would be subject to environmental and planning processes. - Observer asked why environmental approval had not been sought prior to purchase. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA noted it could not respond on behalf of the Queensland Government. - BQ added that it was not unusual to purchase land without an approval in place. MH confirmed that some form of environmental impact assessment would be required for a large-scale development at the Ebenezer site. |
| 5 | <p>Office of the Coordinator-General update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MH provided an overview of the role of the Office of the Coordinator-General (OCG) and the project evaluation process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OCG evaluate coordinator projects – complex projects going through an approvals process, that don’t have another home in government. - Following the release of the draft EIS, the OCG received comments from individuals, state government agencies, Councils and the Commonwealth on a range of tops – some more |

| NO. | DISCUSSION |
|-----|--|
| | <p>material that others. These have been synthesised down and a request for information issued to Inland Rail, which is working on a response to those questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The next step is to review the revised draft EIS and then the OCG will make a decision as to whether ARTC has appropriately responded to the information request, then it will go on public exhibition again. Noting not every project goes through exhibition twice, but it is fairly normal on larger projects. - ARTC will then respond to the feedback and the OCG may seek further information from ARTC. Eventually, the OCG will make a decision that they have sufficient information to finalise the documentation and formally evaluate the project, then potentially conditionally provide an approval for the project to progress. - The evaluation would be published online by the Coordinator-General. It will detail imposed conditions that the State Government will impose on the proponent and some recommendations. There will be some recommendations to the Commonwealth Government and they have to provide subsequent additional approvals. <p><u>Questions/discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Chair asked how the changes to the scope of the C2K project would affect the EIS. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MH advised that he expected that update to the project definition and project description would be required and that all assessment would have to be updated to be consistent with the new project description. He continued that key changes are inevitable due to different train number and changes to noise and traffic impacts. - The Chair asked if it was possible that the EIS might be ready ahead of the EIS declaration lapse date/deadline. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MN responded that the project would seek to finish the EIS as quickly as possible; however, there will be some redesign work due to the change of scope, and then this will need to be assessed. - MH added that the OCG seeks specialist consultant advice on four areas: flooding and hydrology, noise, traffic and transport, and flora and fauna issues to ensure a robust evaluation and appropriate level of conditioning for the proponent to meet during the development of the project. - RK commented that the last EIS was more than 7,000 pages and the community had limited time to read and comprehend it, much less comment on it. She requested consideration be given to the public in looking at the EIS and that the Coordinator-General take notice of local knowledge and note where local knowledge has been taken on board and addressed in the EIS. She continued on to request that consultants' inputs to the EIS be verified and provided an example of an incorrect reference to the Beaudesert/Bethania line in the visual amenity chapter of the draft EIS. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Chair added that the Committee had made a suggestion for the revised draft EIS to make note of what changes have been made so the community did not have to read the whole document again. - MH noted that Inland Rail was required to prepare a Response to Submissions within the revised draft EIS. - FM added that the revised draft EIS will look slightly different to how the draft EIS was presented. She noted there would be a separate appendix – essentially a spreadsheet with details of the issues raised in submissions and a specific summary answer in response to that specific submission and often a reference to sections within the revised draft EIS. She noted that submissions can be grouped in terms of issues, which would allow a more detailed response. - She further noted that the revised draft EIS would include design changes, as have previously been discussed by this committee. |

| NO. | DISCUSSION |
|-----------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - She advised that at the beginning of each chapter, the key design changes relating to the assessments and the key themes/issues raised in submissions would be signposted. - RK asked when the National Intermodal Company was formed and, aside from the Ebenezer terminal, what other functions were in its scope. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA advised they would take the year it was formed on notice but noted it was a company that had been specifically established by the Commonwealth to look at, build and operate independent open access rail terminals. It has history in developing the Moorebank Intermodal Terminal and was responsible for the development of the Beveridge terminal in Victoria. - RK enquired as to the name of the other terminal in Melbourne that was unable to accommodate double-stacked trains. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA advised that terminal was the Western Intermodal Freight Terminal (WIFT), in Truganina. How that terminal will be developed is still in discussion between the Commonwealth and Victorian government. - RK asked at what point does someone consider the cost of Inland Rail and decide whether it is actually viable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA advise that as the design cost reviews will be undertaken to provide more certainty to the Government as to when the project will be delivered and how much it will cost. The Government will consider these and make decisions on the future delivery of Inland Rail and staging of the delivery. - RK sought confirmation that the work underway in NSW was upgrading existing corridors. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA advised that construction was underway between Beveridge and Parkes because there was an existing rail line there and most of it is of the standard required for double stacked freight trains but there needed to be some widening, bridge upgrades and work on station precincts to allow for safe passage of freight trains and passenger trains. It is a series of place-based projects as opposed to building a complete railway line from the dirt up. - DITRDCA provided an overview of the Inland Rail greenfield and brownfield projects. - RK asked whether the government might decide to stop Inland Rail at Queensland. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA replied that the Government has stated that Inland Rail remains a nationally important project. It was a challenge for the Government. Inland Rail is about long-range, intercapita freight. It is about getting goods to Queensland, predominantly; into the growing population centres; and moving basically non-perishable goods that are consumables. Inland Rail will pick up freight traffic from along the route and with trains able to join and leave the route providing improved network access and connectivity. But the intercapita movement of goods are critical to meeting the growing freight task. - RK asked whether the business case and purpose of Inland Rail will stand up against the scrutiny of the overall cost. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA replied that things had changed since the original business case was done in 2015. COVID placed the freight network under extreme pressure and brought to the fore the need for rail and Inland Rail. The significant floods experiences across the country in recent years had also highlighted the need to ensure we have a resilient rail network. Inland Rail as the spine from Melbourne to Brisbane would be a very significant part of this. |
| <p>6</p> | <p>General business and questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Observer asked a question regarding the Ebenezer terminal and whether there had been discussion with the Department of Transport and Main Roads regarding the Cunningham Highway in this area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA confirmed that roads are a critical consideration in any terminal development and that the business case and design for Ebenezer would have to accommodate roads in and out of the terminal. |

| NO. | DISCUSSION |
|-----|--|
| 7 | <p>Conclusion and confirmation of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LJ advised that she had only recorded one action, for “DITRDCA to confirm when the National Intermodal Terminal was formed”. However, going from the website, it looks to be in Feb 2022, so that is closed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DITRDCA has advised that, the National Intermodal Corporation (National Intermodal) was established by the Australian Government on 24 February 2022 with a mandate to support the delivery and operation of intermodal terminals in Melbourne and Brisbane. The National Intermodal Company was previously the Moorebank Intermodal Company. - The Chair thanked guest speakers, members and observers for their attendance. - The Chair advised of the intention to review the committee in early 2024 including consideration of new members and whether some people may be tired and want to step down. - The Chair wished everyone a very Merry Christmas and safe festive season. - The Chair closed the meeting at 7.00pm. |

Actions

| NO. | ACTIONS | ACTION BY | DUE DATE |
|-----|--|-------------|----------|
| 1 | ARTC to provide noise modelling maps in more accessible format. | Inland Rail | TBC |
| 2 | ARTC to confirm train type in the draft EIS and clarify the consistency of numbers assumed in the Project. | Inland Rail | TBC |