

MEETING MINUTES

Inner Darling Downs and Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative
Committee Meeting



Meeting Minutes

Inner Darling Downs and Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee Meeting

Date / Time

18 June 2024
6.00pm – 8.00pm

Location

Millmerran Cultural Centre
47 Walpole Street, Millmerran QLD

Co-Chairs

Mr Bill Armagnacq (BA)/Mr
Graham Clapham (GC)

Minute taker

Rebecca Murphy

Distribution

All committee members

Attendees

Inner Darling Downs Committee

- Mr Gary Garland (GG)
- Mr Ken Murphy (KM)
- Ms Kylie Schultz (KS)
- Mr Chris Joseph (CJ)
- Ms Myf Rigby (MR) - online
- Ms Phoebe Mitchell (PM)
- Ms Vicki Battaglia (VB)
- Mr Brett Kelly (BK)
- Mr Rob Loch (RL)

Southern Darling Downs Committee

- Mr Robert Barrett (RB)
- Ms Maria Oliver (MO)
- Mr Andrew McCartney (AM)
- Mr Justin Saunders (JS)
- Ms Rosalie Millar (RM)
- Mr Robert Webb (RW)

MEETING MINUTES

Inner Darling Downs and Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative
Committee Meeting



Inland Rail

- Mr Michael Farrell (MF)
Delivery Director
- Mr Robert Smith (RS)
Senior Project Manager
- Ms Naomi Tonscheck (NT)
Head of Stakeholder Relations
- Mr Bill Quince (BQ)
Program Property Director
- Mr David Dodd (DD)
Advisor, Approvals, QLD
- Ms Isabella Hall (IH)
Stakeholder Engagement Lead
- Ms Clare Siddins (CS)
Stakeholder Engagement Advisor
- Ms Kirsten Elliott (KE)
Stakeholder Engagement Lead
- Ms Rebecca Murphy (RM)
Stakeholder Engagement Advisor

Apologies/Absent

- Mr Paul Hanlon
Inner Darling Downs Committee member
- Mr Lance McManus,
Inner Darling Downs Committee member
- Ms Georgina Krieg
Southern Darling Downs Committee member
- Mr Clinton Weber
Inner Darling Downs Committee member
- Mr Kev Loveday
Inner Darling Downs Committee member
- Mr Jeffrey Chandler
Southern Darling Downs Committee member
- Mr Lindsay Krieg
Southern Darling Downs Committee member
- Mr Rick McDougall
Southern Darling Downs Committee member

Guests

- Clarissa Farrington (CF)
Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional
Development, Communications and the Arts
- Maria Morozova
Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional
Development, Communications and the Arts

MEETING MINUTES

Inner Darling Downs and Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative
Committee Meeting



Observers

- Maree Klemm
- James Keefer
- Russell Stevens
- Jon Andison
- Ian Douglas
- Kim Stevens
- Scott Reed
- Nikki Macqueen

Agenda items

NO.	AGENDA
1	<p>Welcome and introductions.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of Country</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• GC opened meeting and welcomed everyone and invited Justin Saunders to provide the Welcome to Country.• JS provided a Welcome to Country.• GC noted that the meeting would be recorded and asked if there were any objections.• No objections noted to recording. <p>Committee member updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• GC noted there were no changes to the committee.• GC noted apologies of Paul Hanlon, Lance MacManus and Jeff Chandler <p>Declaration of conflict of interests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No conflicts of interest were declared.
2	<p>Actions arising from previous meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• GC noted the action from the previous meeting was for the Chairs to write to the Coordinator General on public response timeframes for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Chairs have decided to write once the Coordinator General has received the entirety of the EIS and the release of it is imminent, and to then request the maximum amount of time.
3	<p>Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts update</p> <p><i>Slide 6-8</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CF introduced herself and her role, (Director of the Inland Rail Program Assurance team) to ensure that Inland Rail (IR) and ARTC implement the project in line with the directives of the government and review recommendations.• CF summarised the independent review completed over 12 months ago, 19 recommendations were made, and the government has agreed, or agreed in principle to all. 13 of those recommendations have been completed or implemented and 6 are still in progress.• Inland Rail Pty Ltd (IRPL) has been established as a fully operational subsidiary of ARTC and established with a permanent CEO, leadership team and board to drive the project.• The current priority is to ensure double stacked trains can operate from the new terminal at Beveridge, north of Melbourne to Parkes by 2027. Progress is well underway for these sections.

MEETING MINUTES

Inner Darling Downs and Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee Meeting



- CF stated there is full commitment to funding that part of the alignment (south of Narromine) and securing everything necessary, including engaging the appropriate contractors and working through how communities are going to interact with the project.
- CF confirmed the Government has told the new CEO and the Board to secure all the necessary approvals and to acquire properties needed to secure the corridor north of Narromine.
- CF advised there is no construction start date but the commitment of funds and time to both processes is unwavering.
- CF noted NSW IR is very close to having all the necessary approvals north of Narromine.
- CF provided brief update on Ebenezer business case
 - Planning with National Intermodal Corporation to ensure the interfaces are appropriate and valid, and;
 - Working with the economic development team in Queensland and TMR to provide certainty.
- VB questioned if compulsory acquisition in Queensland was occurring?
- CF responded that this would generally occur after approvals, but we are working with the Department of Transport and Main Roads on some early acquisitions.
- GG spoke of a 60-year lease on Queensland Rail?
- GG asked to confirm a lease operation signed in 2012?
- CF believed that all necessary leases are in place for ARTC to run their normal business operations and noted one of the reasons to establish IR was to separate business of ARTC from the project build.
- GG continued to state that ARTC can only make single tracks.
- CF believed the design is that it's single track with the necessary passing loops.
- RB questioned if it is still intended that dual gauge be used?
- RS responded predominantly dual gauge; a section from the Macintyre River to Kurumbul will be standard gauge until it joins the Queensland Rail line when it becomes dual gauge.
- RM asked CF what are the 6 recommendations yet to be delivered?
- CF requested to take on notice, adding that the big one was the cost and schedule and others on transitioning to operations.
- GG questioned if ARTC is a statutory authority?
- CF responded that it is a government business enterprise.
- GG asked if people could buy shares?
- CF responded no, the two shareholders are the Minister for Infrastructure and the Minister for Finance.
- BK restated the request for clarity on the 19 recommendations not completed. Additionally, questioned if the project is unfunded, is there funding for acquiring the land?
- CF responded that the original commitment of funding, \$14.5 billion still exists. That will deliver south of Parkes and necessary activities north of Parkes. The cost and schedule review will then inform further business decisions.
- BK asked what would happen to the \$14 billion if doesn't get past Parkes, noting the Dr Schott review saying it would cost approximately \$31.5 billion.
- BK relayed information on infrastructure project costs accelerating and believed there was still large capacity in the road freight industry, referencing observations from nearby highways.
- CF acknowledged the issue with that modal shift to rail, but the IR project is continuing and looking to provide more certainty on costs. Additionally, a substantial amount of funding in the budget for ARTC addresses issues on the existing network.
- BK questioned the taxpayer return dollar value.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CF noted that the return on investment to the taxpayer is not all always a dollar value, also of value are environmental benefits, efficient freight movements and road improvements. • VB asked if the assessments were going to consider advances in technology for environmental impacts? Also asked if results of current freight on rail and the factors can be shared? • CF encouraged everyone to review (ARTC's) annual reports that provides business entity information and outlines the future use of their network. • KM questioned if there was a timeframe for the final review on costs? • CF responded that the approach to market was underway and were expecting the preliminary report before Christmas. The preliminary report would focus on assurance of costings for south of Parkes, but market conditions can be extrapolated. • GC asked if the intergovernmental agreement that was struck with the previous Federal Government about IR in Queensland was still binding and what affect these delays are having? • CF responded all bilateral agreements that were signed with all three State Governments stand. They are subject to review at any time. Queensland Government and Federal Government are working on the IR project as well as business cases for Toowoomba to Brisbane, Gowrie to Gladstone, Salisbury to Beaudesert and Ebenezer. CF advised can't talk to Cross River Rail, but arrangements are still in place and progressing. • RL asked if the review of cost would include maintenance and reliability of service factors? • CF responded yes, quoting the Government has committed over \$500 million for existing network issues. • PM raised concern about all the work and focus on the southern portion, noting ongoing uncertainty and delays, and what happens if it stops in the South? • CF stated that the Government has been quite clear, that the entire project is necessary but there is a need to see incremental benefit via the construction south of Parkes • GC stated that the negative impacts on people's lives from the considerable delays and uncertainty of this project needs to be relayed to the Federal Government.
<p>4</p>	<p>Program update</p> <p><i>Slide 9-13</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NT introduced the new Area Director for Queensland, Michael Farrell, who will be responsible for approvals and other necessary requirements for the delivery of IR in Queensland. • NT spoke about the new IR CEO, Nick Miller and his relevant qualifications and experience. • NT summarised the IRPL establishment and work completed to date: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Legal establishment of IRPL ○ Statement of expectations ○ Announced our Board and appointed the Chair ○ CEO, Nick Miller was appointed in December ○ January to March, a final review and submission of governing documents. Three key areas, equity of financing agreements, project development agreement and deliveries and service agreements. ○ May 2024, IRPL became operational • NT provided brief update on the program for Victoria and NSW, with Federal and State approvals, land acquisitions and construction status. • An observer questioned that the area to the north of Moree was not complete? • NT confirmed, this was the Narrabri to North Star Phase Two project and was still going through approvals, an outcome is expected next year. • PM sought clarification on the North Star to Border section, asking if all the government approvals were obtained? • NT responded yes.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM asked if land acquisitions were complete? • NT responded that IR is progressing well with land acquisitions, but a couple remained outstanding. • PM asked if there were approvals from the Border/river into Queensland? • NT responded that section needs to be approved under the Border to Gowrie EIS. North Star to Border approval is for 30km in NSW only. Anything in Queensland did not have approvals.
<p>5</p>	<p>NSW/Qld Border to Gowrie revised draft Environmental Impact Statement update</p> <p><i>Slide 15-17</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RS summarised the steps involved in getting the EIS to notification, noting currently completing and submitting the EIS chapters and appendices to Qld Coordinator General (CG). • RS stated once CG confirmed documents adequate for exhibition, they would set the date for notification. During that period, it's open to the community to put forward submissions on the revised draft EIS. • RS noted that the majority of chapters have been submitted. There are several new and supporting appendices, some with new information, for example, the Millmerran realignment and some laydown area changes. • RS said there would be an appendix detailing the submissions that were received in the last round of notification, and our responses to those. • RS noted that there would be new technologies used in this round (of EIS public notification) to enable the public to find information more easily. • KM asked RS if there was a date for completion? • RS responded that IR is aiming for finalisation and submission of those chapters for adequacy review prior to the end of the year. However, the time it takes OCG to absorb and review and deem adequate is not within our control. • VB asked how many of the 27 chapters have been sent to OCG for reconsideration? • RS responded around 20. • RW remarked that previous statements there were only 2 chapters left, can you give a definite date as can't blame the Coordinator General for not approving something he hasn't received? • RS stated he did not recall saying two, rather few, but that the majority are in, which is around 20. • RW asked if (IR) would finish by the end of the year? • RS responded this is the aim. • MO asked if the changes to the alignment near Millmerran and laydown areas spoken about previously, had already been updated on the interactive map online? • RS responded that social pinpoint has been updated with those changes. • MO asked if land holders affected were aware of those changes? • RS responded yes, it was spoken about at a previous CCC meeting, and we've engaged with relevant landowners, including those who would no longer be impacted by the alignment. • MO asked if that included the lay down areas? • RS responded yes. • PM questioned if the 20 chapters completed included the appendices? Also, clarity on adequacy, does a chapter get sent to the CG, checked if it meets the requirements, and if not you have to resubmit again? • RS responded yes (re: adequacy requirements). There is a similar number of appendices completed, unsure of the exact number. • BK asked about the Gilgai crossing, which was touted to remain as a level crossing, we've now been advised that in the EIS it will be a road under rail crossing. BK stated there is a need to get

agricultural machinery through there, could you give accurate measurements for the clearance of that bridge?

- RS responded he would action and respond after the meeting.
- BK noted his email requesting copies of the inundation maps for the floodplain, which asked for copies of the maps prior to EIS release?
- RS responded, no, whilst the hydrology chapter is undergoing adequacy checks, (Including mapping) there is a need to respect the process and let the OCG deem adequate or not.
- BK moved on to question if 40 train movements per day through the Gowrie to Helidon section was still the stance?
- RS responded that in the EIS, the train numbers are static, if that was in last EIS, it will be the same in the revised EIS.
- BK responded he had previously asked for a schedule to show how 40 trains could travel up and down that range in 24 hours, BK can only envision that 20 is possible?
- RS responded that the business case for Ebenezer is being reviewed and updated, which will provide further insight into train numbers. The EIS is currently using the original business case. To provide a schedule is difficult but RS will see if he can provide some more information to assist.
- PM asked for clarity if it was 40 complete runs Border to Border, or are they partial?
- RS confirmed a combination, there are multiple start and endpoints, some are express all the way.
- RS returned to BK's query on road versus rail freight, noted that this was the reason for the project, to enable direct and dedicated freight from the southern states up to Queensland.
- RL enquired that the Independent Flood Panel required the IR project get measured erosion threshold velocities and if that had happened?
- RS responded not as yet but is about to start.
- RL wanted to know if the ETV would be included in the cost review due to impacts on design.
- VB requested advance copies of the chapters submitted to the OCG.
- RS responded that the OCG views the whole document and deems adequate before the public can see, we can't circumvent that process.
- RS continued with the biosecurity and weed management slide (*Slide 17*):
 - How biosecurity and weed management will be managed
 - IR is active in the field, for example undertaking site surveys
 - We have robust plans for contractors to keep clean
 - Will be a biosecurity management plan (BMP) in line with all legislative requirements for construction and operation of the project
 - The BMP will specify roles and responsibilities, monitoring corrective actions, reporting, auditing, preventing or limiting environmental harm.
 - Our efforts concentrate on avoiding wherever we can. That will be in the EIS so people can comment on that.
 - The ARTC website has information and their own environmental management plan that addresses the operational stage.
 - ARTC acknowledges weeds are a challenge with their extensive network, but they respond as quickly as possible.
 - As a neighbour, you would be covered by the law effectively, but ARTC's position is first and foremost, they're available to be on hand, to work through and rectify issues.
- PM questioned the large stockpiles of excess fill (poorer quality), particularly at Gowrie Junction and if they would they be included in this (biosecurity) management plan?
- RS responded that the area is in the Gowrie to Kagaru (G2K) section, so would not be in the B2G EIS. An area has been designated for stockpile, but was not across the detail; understood that it would be rehabilitated, can check the details and respond later?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM responded not necessary, but asked where a stockpile is on the alignment, do they come under management plans? • RS responded yes, soil management plans. Stockpiling is not being relied on in the B2G project. • RL suggested to everyone, when reading the EIS, to look at the relevant chapter and see if it includes commitments on managing and repairing any harm. • RL continued to provide an example, if one of the culverts should fail and end up with a gouge down the landscape for a km and several hundred cubic metres of valuable topsoil gone, what does ARTC do then? People will be looking to see that spelled out in the EIS, if it is not, you (addressing the room) need to make a comment and suggest what they do. • RS thanked RL for his comments.
<p>6</p>	<p>Border to Gowrie revised draft EIS notification stage – proposed engagement plan</p> <p>Revised draft EIS notification stage – proposed engagement plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MO moved to skip this section and come back if time allowed. • All present agreed <p>Hydrology digital platform</p> <p><i>Slide 26-28</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RS spoke to the Flood Impact Objectives (FIOs) being updated and the vast number of maps needed to be produced. To make this more manageable and accessible to the public, a digital platform to display how the project will perform against our FIOs will be available during notification. • RS referred to the example on the slide of the Canning Creek property, demonstrating the different parameters and scenarios. • RS noted that the platform is something that the team will be able to help people through during notification period and the link would be built into the EIS. • GC enquired if needed any specific technology to run it? • RS responded no that it is just a web browser.
<p>7</p>	<p>Upcoming Investigations</p> <p><i>Slide 31-34</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RS advised that in later part of 2024 and into 2025 there will be some site surveys and utility investigations (ground truthing and feature surveys for accuracy), as well as geotechnical investigations (test pits and boreholes) along the Southwestern line, mainly in the corridor. • RS noted works are bound by land access agreements, environmental management principles and vehicles will be branded. • RS stated we will keep you updated but to call us (IR) if you notice anything untoward. • RS noted new ETV testing was a new requirement and it tested for the velocity at which soils erode. Site investigations will be done at specific and selected sites along the alignment and inform our flooding and hydrology and performance of design. ETV ensures we can assess, manage and determine where those mitigations are required, like scour protection. • RS noted that the ETV testing had been completed on projects in southern states. RS described the method of the ETV testing (<i>slide 34</i>) (dig trench, insert soil frame, push along guides, soil sampled, taken to the lab, then flume method applied, three samples from each site, backfill and rehab site). • RS noted this is an extra level of assessment the project undertakes to ensure detailed design has appropriate supporting evidence. First round of testing will be at several sites, including the

Condamine region, where there are particularly challenging soils. Tests will be completed in line with EIS approvals.

- VB stated the interactive flooding maps would be good so we can see the 30 plus structures that will be inundated once this is built. Questioned if the ETV will be overlaid so can see where the scouring, washouts and loss of topsoil will be?
- RS responded that under the FIOs there is a baseline assumption that ETV is 0.5 m/s and isn't to be increased by any more than 10%. That is the objective sought in the EIS. The ETV testing confirms if that 0.5m/s is appropriate or not, it might be less, and we would need to convince the OCG and others that we would be able to apply appropriate mitigations. The ETV values will be used to check against the EIS but not included.
- BK questioned if you (IR) get a lower velocity than 0.5 then you need to slow it down, but to do so would restrict the water and that's going to lift inundation on the upstream side.
- RS responded that the standard industry application is to apply scour protection on the downstream side. Additionally, some ETV values in the south had returned, unexpectedly, higher than 0.5 results.
- RL addressed BK, stating that if you narrowed the culvert, you would bank more water up on the upslope side, the gradient through the culvert would go up and your velocity would go up. To get velocity down you would need to widen the culvert. Downslope scour protection is great but there is a need to consider if there is an acceleration of flow before it gets into a drain etc, so you get scour on the upstream side.
- RS responded that RL was correct. RS spoke to the Condamine culverts, as there are so many and they are so generously sized, they act as balancing culverts and don't tend to have high velocity increases at either inlet or outlet as shown in the models.
- BK questioned the previous comment (RS) that can be above 0.5, the Flood Panel specified not over 0.5.
- RS agreed and that will aim to make no change in velocity, but it can't always be achieved.
- BK clarified that what he was asking is, if IR would change the design (mitigation/culverts) to go to a higher ETV value if that is what the testing resulted in.
- RS responded that the original basis is to try and minimise wherever possible.
- BK countered that it would be your (IR) decision rather than what the panel of experts have said?
- RS responded that the panel of experts note that adherence to the FIOs is to occur where practical and where achievable. The EIS will give more information on how to manage any exceedances of the objectives. There is a practicality limit, with an assessment against the material impact and capital expenditure. The design is good but further testing and validation through ETV testing then comparing against the FIOs we will better understand impacts for adjacent landowners along with engagement to find an acceptable outcome.
- BK commented on site surveys and hoped there were no more in Pampas area, as historically there had been extensive activity. Stated there had been unmarked vehicles without IR signage.
- RS responded he was not aware of any incidents but happy to investigate, but that it needed to be reported at the time. We make it clear to contractors that it is not acceptable to be unmarked.

Revised draft EIS notification stage – proposed engagement plan

Slide 20-25

- IH introduced herself as the lead for the B2G project and summarised her background with IR. IH introduced the stakeholder engagement team present. Noted that the team would be assisting the community through the notification stage and into the future. The plan was a draft and are seeking feedback. Emphasised the timeframe for notification stage is unknown and will be determined by the Coordinator General.

MEETING MINUTES

Inner Darling Downs and Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee Meeting



- IH noted the type of engagement approaches and material, informing of the notification period and information on engagement opportunities, where the submissions to the draft EIS have been addressed, access to the revised draft EIS and how to make submissions.
- IH advised that the indicative plan proposes an 8-week period that is adjustable on the advice from the CG.
- There would be drop-in style sessions with experts, appointments available and online sessions. Reiterated the want for feedback for how it might best work for you.
- IH referred to the material that will be available, including a summary of findings, which summarises the EIS chapters. We (IR) will be writing and making calls throughout the period, particularly near the closing of notification stage.
- There will be community information sessions and a CCC meeting for both committees.
- A USB drive, loaded with revised draft EIS can be requested and there will be the hydrology map, updated flythrough and interactive map, as well as a suite of communication materials and activities to ensure the wider community is aware (of the EIS).
- Hard copies of the chapters will be at Toowoomba and Goondiwindi office, but not appendices, due to scale. They will be online and hard copies can be arranged. Information displays will be at the libraries.
- Submissions on the revised draft EIS welcome.
- IH noted happy to receive feedback by phone or call the chairs by 2 July.
- MO stated that feedback time frame very quick.
- IH responded happy to work with you.
- VB suggested hardcopy letterbox drops to all postcodes touched by the line, including 4401, Pittsworth, Southbrook, Toowoomba, Oakey, Gowrie.
- IH agreed this sounded reasonable.
- PM noted consultation material but should be more than one CCC meeting, one within first week of it coming out and one other. Requested that each CCC member should get one, if not two USBs.
- IH responded it would be confirmed but sounded reasonable.
- BK asked if you (IR) would request to the CG a minimum of six month reply time for submissions.
- IH responded that would leave that decision to them (CG) but noted the request.
- PM stated that it was previously 12 weeks and if we requested, we could probably get it extended. PM said that 12 weeks was not sufficient and requested that the committee request more than 12 weeks now.
- GC responded that at last meeting it was agreed the Chairs would communicate to the OCG on timeframes. GC stated that a representative from OCG was here at the last meeting and noted size and scope of document, but he was not interested in excessive time frames (for notification). GC noted that ARTC (IR) does not direct the OCG in these matters, so if we want to influence, it needs to come for us (committee/Chairs).
- RS confirmed we don't push the OCG in any direction, IR is impartial.
- PM restated that ARTC need to be flexible and not narrow down a time frame if they are truly listening to us.
- RS responded that IR is putting out a broad outline and adjustment would be made where necessary.
- GC added that 8 weeks is the standard legislated time frame.
- IH noted that it was just an indicative timeframe, not suggesting that 8 weeks was a preference.
- GC closed the meeting and stated the Chairs would make a case to the OCG for the longest period possible and that last time it was successful.

8	<p>General business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GC asked committee members if they were happy with the evening format or would they prefer to move to a different time. Consensus was to stay with evening format. GC noted a late apology from Georgina Krieg. GC stated next meeting would be during public notification stage, asked for RS to indicate timing. IH confirmed would hold one during notification but would update later if to hold one in between. GC indicated that it may be in October but would need to be confirmed. Unable to determine meeting at this stage but asked for agreeance with Millmerran as central location. VB commented if next meeting was on the EIS, it would need to be split so that can discuss issues that pertain to us. GC acknowledged VB concerns but noted the number of people able to attend and the preparation for these meetings, GC questioned the effectiveness of having two meetings. RL voiced that the committees should be given a chance to be as effective as possible with two separate meetings. IH confirmed if it was within notification period, intend to have two separate meetings, if was outside it would be subject to further consideration. GC advised the venue to be confirmed. VB stated that IR/ARTC purchased properties as offsets in Millmerran area. It was said environmental management plans and environmental uplifts would be done and were not part of the EIS. VB said a request had been made for that environmental management plan, and now requesting again and asking what actions against the environmental uplifts have been taken. RS responded that no specific offset information or plans will be provided as part of the revised draft EIS, they are prepared when the impacts are confirmed, and all offset properties are purchased for the B2G project. That is going through adequacy still. With approval requirements there will be an offset delivery strategy as an appendix, this will be done but likely prior to commencement of the action not prior to EIS approval. VB stated these offsets don't achieve anything for this project, but a considerable amount of land was acquired and questioned if any trees had been planted for koalas? RS responded that he doesn't believe any trees have been planted. VB questioned the 100km discrepancy between the original IR documentation noting 1700km and the current of 1600km, is it to achieve the 24 hours. CF responded that the premises was always 1800km in 24 hours and the difference is the altered endpoints, Beveridge not Tottenham and Ebenezer. VB asked how many kilometres? CF requested to take on notice. 									
9	<p>Conclusion and confirmation of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting closed at 8:15pm. <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">NO.</th> <th style="text-align: center;">ACTIONS</th> <th style="text-align: center;">ACTION BY</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>What are the 6 recommendations yet to be delivered from the Independent Review?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">DITRDCA</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Confirm the road over rail Gilgai Road Crossing measurements against suitability for agricultural machinery usage.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Inland Rail</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	1	What are the 6 recommendations yet to be delivered from the Independent Review?	DITRDCA	2	Confirm the road over rail Gilgai Road Crossing measurements against suitability for agricultural machinery usage.	Inland Rail
NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY								
1	What are the 6 recommendations yet to be delivered from the Independent Review?	DITRDCA								
2	Confirm the road over rail Gilgai Road Crossing measurements against suitability for agricultural machinery usage.	Inland Rail								

MEETING MINUTES

Inner Darling Downs and Southern Darling Downs Community Consultative Committee Meeting



3	Provide information on the calculations for 40 trains movements in 24 hours.	Inland Rail
4	Will the ETV results be considered in the cost review due to impacts on design.	Inland Rail
5	Confirm the altered kilometres due to the altered endpoints (Beveridge and Ebenezer)	DITRDCA
6	Submit a request to the OCG for extended review timeframes for the public notification stage on the B2G revised draft EIS.	IDD & SDD Chairs

Next meeting

Proposed to be at the beginning of the B2G EIS public notification period, with possibility of a meeting in the interim, timeframe dependent.