Meeting minutes

Distribution: **Distribute internally and to external business partners**

Inner Darling Downs
Community Consultative Committee Meeting

Date/Time	**Location**
19 February 2026 6:00pm – 8:00pm	Brookstead Community Hall Madelaine Street, Brookstead *And online via Microsoft Teams*

Facilitator	**Minute taker**	**Distribution**
Clare Siddins, **Stakeholder Engagement Lead**	Mieke Koorts, **Stakeholder Engagement Advisor**	All attendees and CCC members

Chair
Mr Bill Armagnacq

Inner Darling Downs Committee

Attendees

Inner Darling Downs Committee

- Mr Ken Murphy
- Mr Clinton Weber
- Mr Chris Joseph
- Mr Rob Loch
- Mr Gary Garland
- Ms Phoebe Mitchell
- Ms Vicki Battaglia
- Mr Brett Kelly
- Ms Kylie Schultz

Inland Rail

- Robert Smith
  Area Director B2G
- Andrew Roberts
  Engineering Manager
- Zeb Dawson
  Stakeholder Engagement and Communications Manager Qld
- Debbie McNamara
  Executive Director
- Wayne Window
  Environmental Manager Approvals
- David Thompson
  Project Manager
- Dave Fleming
  Environment Manager – Biodiversity and Offsets
- Clare Siddins
  Stakeholder Engagement Lead
- Mieke Koorts
  Stakeholder Engagement Advisor
- Kirsten Elliott
  Stakeholder Engagement Officer

Audience

- Kevin Bond
- Neil Owen
- Stephen Benecke
- Katherine Benecke
- Paul Clapham
- Frank Goodall
- Debbie Zeller
- Melissa Zeller
- Craig Porter
- Jim Keefer
- Lana Bradshaw
- Miffy Staines
- Trevor Marshall
- Gary Sterling

Apologies

- Mr Kev Loveday
- Mr Paul Hanlon
- Mr Paul McDonald
- Mr Lance MacManus

Meeting minutes

Guests (Show organisation if not IR)

Karen Oakley Director, Transport Infrastructure & Projects Industry and Infrastructure Development Office of the Coordinator-General	Paul Byrne Project Manager Industry and Infrastructure Development Office of the Coordinator-General

Discussions

NO.	COMMENTS
1.	**Welcome, introductions and acknowledgement** **Bill Armagnacq (BA) as Chair** – The Chair introduced himself as Bill Armagnacq, Chair of the Committee, and confirmed that a number of presenters from Inland Rail were present to address agenda items. – BA acknowledged Traditional Owners of the land. – The Chair formally acknowledged the attendance of representatives from the Office of the Coordinator-General (OCG), being Karen Oakley (Director – Infrastructure and Planning) and Paul Byrne (Project Manager). – The Chair advised that the meeting would proceed in accordance with the circulated agenda and called for any declarations of conflicts of interest. – Declared personal conflict of interest (fee from Inland Rail as independent Chair). – Confirmed no other conflicts disclosed.

2.	**Actions arising from previous meetings**
	Bill Armagnacq (BA) as Chair
	– Inland Rail provided information requested by Ms Robyn Nobbs regarding property acquisition.
	  ○ The requested property-acquisition details were supplied following the previous meeting.
	– Inland Rail provided a separate response regarding rail-freight modelling, confirming:
	  ○ Future freight-demand modelling is determined by rail operators and their customers.
	  ○ Inland Rail will increase network capacity once operational, with demand expected to build over time.
	  ○ Staged delivery of Inland Rail is designed to enable early access to additional freight capacity.
	– Inland Rail provided the location of groundwater assessment information completed for the revised EIS.
	  ○ Groundwater investigations (2018–2023) included permeability tests, groundwater-level monitoring, and groundwater-quality monitoring.
	  ○ Documentation is located in Section 15.4 of the revised EIS and its supporting appendix.
	– Inland Rail provided information on utilisation of constructed Inland Rail sections in the meeting papers.
	  ○ Members with specific questions were invited to raise them in General Business.
	– Inland Rail provided design information and methodology for the embankment trial.
	  ○ Additional material will be presented later in the meeting.
	  ○ The Darling Downs Soils Group met earlier in the day for a detailed technical briefing and reported the session was productive and well received.
	  ○ The group will review the information, develop its position, and respond to Inland Rail within approximately one month.
	– Community concerns were raised regarding weed management on Inland Rail owned properties.
	  ○ Photos were provided showing significant woody-weed growth on one parcel.
	  ○ Members expressed that current land-management practices influence confidence in Inland Rail's future operational responsibilities.

NO.	COMMENTS
	○ Inland Rail confirmed a site meeting will be arranged with the affected landowner and committed to addressing the issue. – A correction to the previous minutes was noted: ○ "Pittsworth to Westbrook" should read "Pittsworth to Brookstead." – Outcome noted.
3.	**Program update** **Zeb Dawson (ZD) provided a program update** – A program overview was presented, providing a snapshot of each Inland Rail section, project type, and current status. – ZD noted the southern portion of the map (circled on the slide) highlights areas where construction is underway or scheduled to commence shortly. ○ Much of this work involves enhancements to existing rail infrastructure. – For the remaining section in NSW, Inland Rail continues to progress required approvals and ongoing land acquisition. – In Queensland, approvals and land acquisition activities are continuing in line with the Australian Government's response to the Independent Review of Inland Rail, adopting a staged delivery approach. – Future decisions regarding delivery of sections north of Narromine remain under consideration by the Australian Government and are dependent on Inland Rail securing all environmental approvals and acquiring the required land. – A suggestion was raised that maps and slides be provided in colour, as project types are distinguished by colour and are difficult to interpret in black and white. – Project type colour coding was clarified. – Project status categories were also clarified. – No questions.
4.	**Project approvals and next steps** **Presented by Wayne Window (WW)** – WW provided an update on project approvals. – WW outlined that project designs can evolve over time as investigations progress, approvals are refined, and detailed design work identifies additional technical information. – The approved reference design will form the baseline for assessment. ○ As detailed design progresses, refinements and mitigations may result in changes. ○ Where changes are significant, they may trigger the requirement for a formal change process. ○ These refinements are not expected to represent wholesale alignment shifts or major route deviations. – WW advised it aims to secure approval for the baseline reference design within the year. – WW confirmed that all EIS submissions receive a detailed, line-by-line response. ○ Each issue raised within a submission is addressed individually, rather than a single generalised response. ○ Technical specialists, including those who met with stakeholders earlier that day, prepare the responses. ○ The Coordinator General reviews these responses for adequacy before publication. ○ Once the Coordinator General deems the final EIS adequate, it will be published alongside the Coordinator General's evaluation report. – Traditionally, the final EIS is not published separately before this point. – WW agreed to confirm this process with the Office of the Coordinator General if required. – WW explained the broader assessment process, including: ○ Submissions being broken into individual issues. ○ Review by technical experts and departmental specialists.

NO.	COMMENTS
	○ The Coordinator General assessing whether issues have been adequately resolved. ○ Conditions being imposed where further mitigations or ongoing management measures are required. – A community member expressed concern over past experiences where responses in earlier EIS processes did not appear to address submissions. ○ WW advised that the Coordinator General will consider this matter through the assessment process. – A question was raised regarding recent public comments by elected representatives about Inland Rail funding and priorities. ○ WW noted that the comments referenced appeared related to a different project (Toowoomba–Brisbane passenger rail) rather than Inland Rail. ○ Inland Rail offered to provide a transcript and meet with the community member to clarify which funding announcement was being referenced. **Questions** 1. Will designs remain fluid until close to construction in each area due to local unknowns? ○ Inland Rail confirmed some design evolution is expected, but changes must still align with the approved reference design, with significant refinements requiring a formal change process. 2. How will stakeholders know whether their submissions have been addressed, and will they receive feedback? ○ Inland Rail confirmed each submission receives individual issue-based responses, reviewed by the Coordinator General and later published online as part of the EIS documentation. 3. Will the final EIS and responses to submissions be made clearly available and advertised? ○ Inland Rail advised that the documents are released when the Coordinator General completes the evaluation. Inland Rail will seek clarification from OCG regarding visibility and notification processes. 4. Concern: Previous EIS processes did not demonstrate evidence that submissions were considered. ○ Inland Rail advised this would be addressed during the Coordinator General's assessment. 5. Question regarding recent statements in Senate Estimates by federal representatives and whether they relate to Inland Rail delivery or funding. ○ Inland Rail clarified the comments likely related to another project and offered to provide transcripts and follow up directly.
5.	**Design refinements investigations** **Presented Robert Smith (RS) and Andrew Roberts (AR)** Pittsworth – AR presented an overview of Pittsworth design-refinement investigations currently being discussed with potentially impacted landowners ahead of the CCC meeting. – Community members asked why refinements are occurring now; AR advised improved rail modelling, updated standards and EIS submission feedback have enabled new refinement opportunities. – Submissions from all parties, including councils/road managers, are considered equally. Submission details are separated into key issues and themes for responses to be developed. – AR advised updated modelling shows trains generally maintain momentum due to balanced up-and-down gradients across the alignment (1:64), resulting in minimal impacts on runtime, fuel burn, wear and operational performance.

NO.	COMMENTS
	– **Pittsworth alignment** – Project team advised that further detail on the Pittsworth alignment would be shown in upcoming slides regarding the design option and refinement proposal. – Two alternative alignments raised by both community and committee member – including 1km north of Pittsworth and the option behind Southbrook Hill. Both alignment options were assessed but not progressed due to multiple technical and environmental constraints, not only due to study-area boundary limitations. – AR acknowledged landowner concerns and the impacts on his property. – AR provided technical clarification, noting: o Feedback received during the EIS public exhibition, including TRC's submission, requested assessment of a one-kilometre shift north of Pittsworth. o Inland Rail discussed the alternative alignment option with Council and identified several issues. o The northern alignment shift would intersect two major landscape depressions requiring embankments of approximately 30 m and 28 m. o The route would cross a significant ridgeline; the cutting would be approx. 45 m deep (compared with 23 m on the preferred alignment). o Approximately 6 million m³ of additional earthworks would be required. o Resulting footprint would be substantially larger, with greater ecological and connectivity impacts. – **Southbrook alignment** – Project team explained an alternate route behind Southbrook Hill was assessed in detail as part of the alternatives review. – Technical findings included: o The additional curves required for the deviation would add approximately 600 metres of extra track. o The alignment would affect several local roads and would require introducing a new active level crossing. o Realignment of affected local roads would require approximately 3.5 kilometres of road upgrades. – AR explained the area behind Southbrook Hill has high ecological value and is important for fauna connectivity, including koala habitat. – Additional clearing required for the deviation would create ecological challenges. – In addition, the alternate route is not considered preferable due to the adoption of steeper gradients in the current design, now allowing the major 23-metre deep cutting to be reduced by almost half, improving the preferred alignment outcomes. – The project team reaffirmed confidence that the current alignment remains preferred for the Southbrook and Pittsworth area. – A committee member clarified that the alignment is not being reconsidered at this stage. – Current project activities relate to design refinement only. Earlier attempts by elected representatives to change the alignment were unsuccessful, and changes are now considered highly unlikely. – **Pittsworth Design Refinement** - AR continued and went on to explain design refinement investigations in Pittsworth. – AR noted design refinements are being progressed to reduce noise, visual amenity impacts and large embankment heights near Pittsworth. – AR noted original EIS design included a 10m embankment passing over the Oakey-Pittsworth Rd and near the Motor Inn at Pittsworth; the refined design lowers the rail by approx. 10m for it to be at ground level. As the alignment traverses to the north of Oakey-Pittsworth Rd, it transitions into a cutting and shifting the grade separation approx. 700m north-east. – The proposed Oakey-Pittsworth Rd realignment and road-over-rail bridge will be a flat road crossing, not a structure that requires ramp approaches.

NO.	COMMENTS
	– Dallman Road will be upgraded to maintain property access, with staggered intersections to meet engineering and safety requirements. – Visualisations were presented comparing the EIS design and the refined design, showing reduced embankment height and rail in cutting. – A new crossing loop has been added north of Brookstead; the Linthorpe Road loop has been relocated north toward the service station; no crossing loops remain in close proximity to the Pittsworth township. – AR noted preliminary noise results indicate narrowed noise profiles as the rail enters cutting, reducing exceedances through town. – Community members expressed concerns about road connectivity and access in emergency scenarios; Inland Rail agreed to take these issues away for further review. – Additional concerns raised about consultation occurring without all the detail; Inland Rail acknowledged feedback and committed to more detailed engagement at upcoming community sessions. – Some attendees requested more accessible and detailed noise-modelling information; Inland Rail advised noise maps are available in the revised draft EIS and committed to presenting updated modelling at information sessions. – Concerns were raised about the timing of information sessions (held during work hours); Inland Rail agreed to reconsider session times and offer one-on-one meetings. – Inland Rail confirmed design refinement is ongoing through 2026 and will continue beyond approvals, with further opportunities for consultation. **Questions** 1. Why were design refinements not undertaken earlier? o Improved modelling, updated standards and issues raised through submissions have enabled refinements now. 2. How are submissions assessed and are council submissions treated differently? o All submissions are summarised into issues/themes and assessed equally; council submissions are not treated differently. 3. Will the varied gradient (1:64 up/down) slow trains or increase fuel use? o Modelling shows minimal impacts on runtime, fuel burn, train dynamics and rail wear due to balanced terrain. 4. How will property access and detours be managed with the new road layout? o Dallman Road and local road connections are redesigned to maintain access and reduce detour length; details still being finalised. 5. What happens if there is an accident or derailment – will alternative access routes be available? o Inland Rail agreed to review scenarios involving accidents/derailments and provide further advice. 6. Will visibility and sight-distance issues at hill crests be addressed? o Design will include widening and cutting to ensure safe visibility at hill crests. 7. Will wide-load movements still be possible with the new intersection layout? o Road designs will accommodate long vehicle and oversize movements; more detail will be available at community sessions. 8. Why were community members not consulted earlier before developing refinements? o Design refinements were in direct response to issues raised by community and agencies. Inland Rail acknowledged feedback and committed to earlier engagement as design evolves. 9. Why are noise contour maps difficult to find, and can more detailed modelling be provided? o Detailed contour maps and assumptions are in the revised draft EIS; updated modelling will be shared at upcoming sessions. 10. Will community sessions be offered outside work hours?

NO.	COMMENTS

- Inland Rail will review timing and offer one-on-one meetings for those unable to attend daytime sessions.

Brookstead

- AR presented the revised draft EIS design for Brookstead, where the Gore Highway was proposed as a road-over-rail arrangement with the rail remaining at ground level.
- Under the revised draft EIS design, access to Ware Street would have been removed, and access into Brookstead from Toowoomba would occur via Madeline Street.
- Saal Road would have been realigned to connect with the Gore Highway to allow safe left-turn movements.
- AR explained that the level-crossing arrangement would require linked activation – boom gates would operate whether trains were using the Brookstead siding (GrainCorp) or the Inland Rail main line.
- A concern was raised about potential increased noise; AR advised preliminary noise modelling shows no worsening and in some locations improvement.
- Removal of the road-over-rail structure reduces road-traffic noise.
- Noise barriers can now run continuously (no gap required for a level crossing), reducing noise leaking back into town.
- Removal of boom gates, bells and potential train-horn use will also reduce noise.
- Noise modelling uses worst-case scenarios – full line speed, maximum throttle, and trains assumed not to coast.
- Noise barriers will be elevated where necessary to match the height of the rail formation as it rises.
- Concerns were raised that average noise values do not reflect sleep disturbance; Inland Rail advised night-time assessment methods and controls are governed by statutory guidelines.
- Community members questioned discrepancies in projected train numbers; Inland Rail clarified differences between Border to Gowrie (B2G) and Gowrie to Kagaru (G2K) freight volumes.
- B2G modelling uses 25 future trains per day, while G2K uses 40, reflecting additional freight from the West Moreton system.
- Forecast numbers are based on a 20-year future outlook and use peak-week predictions for conservative modelling.
- Inland Rail emphasised it must continue monitoring and mitigating noise if exceedances occur after operations commence.
- Questions were raised about the number of locomotives modelled; Inland Rail indicated the reference train typically assumes two locomotives but will confirm details.
- Noise modelling incorporates data from a national locomotive acoustic database, including different locomotive classes and notch settings.
- Train lengths were not changed as part of the gradient adjustments.

Questions

1. Will the new design refinement proposal in Brookstead create more noise?
   - Preliminary results show no increase in noise and some locations show improvement, due to lowered rail profile in some areas, continuous noise barriers and the removal of boom gate bells, horns and road over rail traffic noise.
2. How does gradient affect noise near the school?
   - The rail returns to natural surface before reaching the school, which reduces the noise footprint. Noise barriers remain in place and are modelled to rise with the embankment.
3. What noise scenario is used in modelling?

NO.	COMMENTS

- Inland Rail models worst case noise – full speed, maximum throttle, no coasting – to ensure mitigation meets the highest expected noise conditions.

4. Are continuous noise barriers possible in the refined design?
   - Yes. Removing the level crossing means barriers can overlap with no gaps, improving noise performance compared to the EIS design.
5. Why did train numbers change from 40 to 24 in EIS documents?
   - The numbers relate to different sections:
     - 40 trains/day is for Gowrie to Kagaru (G2K)
     - 25 trains/day is for Border to Gowrie (B2G)
     - These reflect different network inputs and future freight forecasts.
6. Does noise modelling account for future increases in train numbers?
   - Yes. The EIS uses a 20-year forecast and peak week predictions, providing a conservative estimate. Inland Rail must monitor and mitigate noise if train numbers increase beyond EIS assumptions.
7. How many locomotives are included in noise modelling?
   - Inland Rail advised the reference train typically uses two or three locomotives but will confirm the exact configuration. Modelling uses real acoustic data from national locomotive databases.
8. Were train lengths changed as part of the refined design?
   - No. Gradient refinements did not alter train lengths.

Pampas

- Inland Rail provided an overview of the Pampas section, noting the revised design includes both embankment and bridge structures; the pink line represents embankment, and the yellow line marks the transition to bridge.
- Under the revised draft EIS, Fysh Road was proposed to be closed due to short stacking and safety concerns.
- This required realignment of several local roads and creation of a new active level crossing at Harris Road, along with a new intersection on the Gore Highway.
- Inland Rail noted the original configuration created significant road access complexity, prompting a reassessment.
- A design refinement is now proposed to eliminate level crossings, using short, steep 1:40 grades to achieve grade separation.
- As the rail rises to the required grade, earthworks widen accordingly.
- A community member raised concerns about flooding between Pampas and Condamine, noting that existing rail in this area has previously washed out.
- Additional community comments were made about heavy vehicle safety, road accidents and the importance of moving freight from road to rail. Inland Rail acknowledged these concerns.

Questions

1. Will the refined design stay on the same alignment through Pampas to Condamine?
   - Yes. Inland Rail confirmed the refined design follows the same alignment as previously presented.
2. Does a train make more noise when travelling up or down a gradient?
   - Trains will be travelling at full speed through Pampas. Vertical curves before and after each grade create smooth transitions, meaning no expected increase in noise due to climbing. Steep grade noise is only expected when trains start from a stationary position, which is not expected in this section.
3. Could wheel squeal or gradient noise disturb residents?
   - Inland Rail advised gradient related noise is unlikely at full speed. Inland Rail took the question on notice and will evaluate potential noise at the transition to the bridge.

NO.	COMMENTS
	4. How will the refined design reduce reliance on level crossings? ○ The design applies short 1:40 grades to achieve grade separation, removing active level crossings – including all crossings on state-controlled roads. 5. Why were road realignments needed in the original EIS design? ○ Safety issues (short stacking), the need for a new level crossing, and required highway intersection upgrades drove the earlier design's complexity. 6. Will new grade separation designs address road safety concerns raised by the community? ○ Yes. The design aims to remove level crossings, improve safety outcomes and provide clearer traffic flows; Inland Rail will present detailed intersection layouts at community sessions. 7. Has flooding between Pampas and Condamine been considered? ○ Inland Rail noted the concerns and confirmed ongoing hydrology analysis and environmental assessments will inform the final design. 8. Will heavy vehicle and freight movement concerns be addressed? ○ Inland Rail acknowledged that one of the project's core aims is to shift long haul freight from road to rail, improving road safety and reducing traffic on regional highways. 9. Will community engagement be improved, including timing of sessions? ○ Inland Rail committed to providing accessible sessions and offering one on one meetings for those unavailable during daytime hours. 10. Community concern: major flood impacts between Pampas and Condamine River and the need for extensive bridging. ○ Inland Rail noted the feedback and thanked the speaker; detailed flood-modelling and bridge-design work continues. 11. Concern about heavy-vehicle safety and the need to move freight off roads. ○ Inland Rail reiterated that shifting freight to rail is a core objective of the project. Road-rail-interface upgrades – Key roads examined for refinement include Millmerran-Inglewood Road, Kildonan Road and Biddeston-Southbrook Road. – Refinements include changing some locations from rail-over-road to road-over-rail, based on safety and community feedback. – Visualisations for revised road/rail interfaces will be provided at upcoming community information sessions. – Inland Rail confirmed that in the refined design, no level crossings will remain on state-controlled roads, delivering improved safety outcomes. – Inland Rail confirmed further environmental assessments (including ecology) will continue as the refinements progress. – Feedback was noted regarding accessibility and timing of community information sessions; Inland Rail committed to ensuring staff availability for attendees unable to attend daytime sessions.
6.	**Field surveys and embankment trial** **Presented by David Thompson (DT)** – DT noted cultural heritage field surveys are underway with local Aboriginal groups, with cadastral surveys continuing to support voluntary land acquisition. – Inland Rail has progressed the embankment-trial design, now supported by detailed design from WSP. – The trial will test the performance of non-conforming materials to assess their suitability for reuse in rail embankments. – The trial consists of two adjacent 270m long, 3m high embankments representing full rail-embankment width.

NO.	COMMENTS

- Environmental assessments for the trial have been completed and EPBC referral documentation is being finalised.
- The trial site at Grass Tree Creek was selected for being outside the 1% AEP flood zone, having representative Condamine floodplain soils, and presenting minimal environmental impacts.
- The site contains suitable borrow material, reducing haulage distances previously estimated at 10-15 km.
- Site establishment will include a hardstand area and access road, with works involving stripping topsoil, preparing subgrade (200-400 mm) and placing material in layers.
- Monitoring equipment will include moisture probes, settlement devices, weather stations and four survey stations collecting daily measurements.
- One embankment will use structural CBR8 fill; the second will use lime-stabilised of the black soil from the borrow site.
- Simulated rainfall will be applied (10 mm/day for 30 days on, 30 days off) to replicate three years of rainfall over 12 months.
- A dry control embankment (no artificial wetting) will allow comparison against natural moisture conditions.
- Inland Rail noted the value of the trial is understanding soil behaviour, shrink–swell characteristics and construction practicality.
- Stakeholders suggested additional input from soil specialists; Inland Rail confirmed it will continue incorporating expert advice.
- DT noted maintenance and inspection program will operate through the monitoring period, including post-weather-event checks and fortnightly inspections.
- Inland Rail confirmed that experienced geotechnical specialists (40+ years' experience) are engaged on the project.

Questions

1. Will the embankment trial simulate the load of a train (e.g., 24 trains per day)?
    - Inland Rail advised train loading will not be applied during the trial.
    - The project team explained that laboratory geotechnical testing can replicate thousands of load cycles.
    - Inland Rail agreed to take the question on notice and provide further clarification.
2. What meaningful information can be gathered without applying rail loads?
    - Inland Rail stated the purpose of the trial is to understand:
        - Soil behaviour
        - Settlement under moisture variation
        - Performance differences between structural fill vs. lime-stabilised black soil
        - Practical construction methodologies
        - The trial complements (not replaces) the loading analyses conducted separately.
3. Concerns that hauling soil long distances may still be required
    - Inland Rail advised that using a nearby borrow source reduces environmental impacts, haulage distances, and local disruption.
4. How will the trial ensure realistic wetting and drying cycles?
    - The trial incorporates:
        - 30-day irrigation cycles
        - 30-day natural drying cycles
        - A control embankment exposed only to natural rainfall
    - Inland Rail acknowledged natural extreme drying may not be fully replicated but confirmed soil-behaviour issues will be discussed further with technical specialists.
5. Has Inland Rail engaged soil scientists or external expertise (e.g., CSIRO)?

NO.	COMMENTS
	○ Inland Rail advised it has highly experienced practitioners within its design team (40+ years' experience in relevant fields). ○ Additional expert advice will continue to be considered. 6. Has a maintenance/inspection program been established during the monitoring period? ○ Inland Rail confirmed a maintenance program will be in place, including: - Inspections after weather events - Routine inspections every two weeks - Verification that monitoring devices remain operational
7.	**Biodiversity offsets update** **Presented by Dave Fleming (DF)** – DF stated the revised draft EIS includes an Environmental Offset Delivery Strategy identifying offset properties acquired for the project. – DF noted Four properties (Glenlovely, Canning Creek, Hillside and Longsdale) have been secured, with two more still under negotiation. – Baseline ecological surveys have been completed and all properties are currently managed under interim management plans. – DF stated Offset Area Management Plans (OAMPs) are being drafted and will guide long-term biodiversity management, typically over a 20-year period. – Offset site selection has been completed using Inland Rail's assessment tool, and residual impact calculations are being finalised with State and Commonwealth regulators. – Re-baselining of property conditions will occur once approvals are in place, followed by activation of the OAMPs prior to construction. – DF noted legal mechanisms will secure offset sites in perpetuity, with annual reporting required throughout construction and OAMP implementation. – DF noted ARTC owns the offset properties, and if any were sold, replacement properties meeting the same ecological requirements would be required. – OAMPs are regulated through project approval conditions and enforce active management of the properties. – DF stated current management includes weed and pest control, fire-break maintenance, infrastructure upkeep, and grazing under lease-back arrangements. – Community concerns were raised regarding weed management, koala habitat suitability and fire-ant monitoring; DF confirmed active maintenance is occurring and will take the fire-ant query on notice. **Questions** 1. Are the four offset properties owned by ARTC? ○ Yes. The four identified offset properties, Glenlovely, Canning Creek, Hillside and Longsdale, are owned by ARTC for the purpose of potentially meeting Commonwealth and State biodiversity offset obligations. 2. If ARTC sells an offset property, would a replacement offset be required? ○ Yes. If any offset property were sold, ARTC would still be legally obligated to secure an equivalent offset property demonstrating the same ecological values and meeting the same offset requirements. Offset obligations remain with the project regardless of land ownership. 3. Is offset area management required for 20 years, or until ecological uplift is achieved? ○ The 20-year period is indicative only. Management must continue until the required uplift is achieved, which may be shorter or longer than 20 years. Active management continues until compliance with the approved Offset Area Management Plan is met. 4. Could changes in ARTC ownership affect offset obligations? ○ No. ARTC is a Commonwealth owned corporation and offset conditions are legislated obligations tied to the project approval, not to corporate ownership.

NO.	COMMENTS
	Even if ownership or governance changed in future, the legal requirement to meet offset outcomes would remain. 5. Are offset properties actively managed for weeds and pest animals? o Yes. All properties are managed under an interim Property Management Plan to maintain property infrastructure, manage biosecurity risks and other obligations to maintain biodiversity values. 6. Does biosecurity management include weeds? o Yes. Weed management is a core component of managing biosecurity risks and is undertaken across all offset sites to maintain the ecological baseline. 7. Are the offset properties being properly maintained now (not left unmanaged for long periods) o Yes. Inland Rail conducts active maintenance, including: - regular weed and pest control - fire-break maintenance - fence and gate upkeep - routine property inspections o Some properties are also grazed under lease-back arrangements, which assists ongoing land management. 8. If there are no koalas on a property, how can it be used as Koala offset? o The revised draft EIS Environmental Offset Delivery Strategy identifies Canning Creek, Glenlovely, and Hillside as potential offset sites for Koala and Koala habitat. Koala have been detected and tracked at Canning Creek and Hillside. While no Koala have been recorded at Glenlovely, it lies within the Bringalily, Whetstone, and Yelarbon State Forest hotspot area and contains suitable habitat. o Inland Rail will review any additional ecological information previously provided by the community. o Inland Rail will review the assessment provided and consider relevant findings when drafting the Offset Area Management Plans for project approval. 9. Are the properties being checked for fire ants? o This item was taken on notice.
8.	**General business** – Question about revised draft EIS approval was raised. – Inland Rail advised there is no updated timeframe for the EIS; the Coordinator-General previously indicated mid-2026. – Timing of future CCC meetings will depend on when the EIS is released. – A request for after-hours information sessions was noted and taken on notice. – No further urgent matters were raised.
9.	**Conclusion and confirmation of actions**

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1.	Update the previous meeting minutes (page 3) to amend the reference from Westbrook to Brookstead as identified by Phoebe M.	Inland Rail	
2.	Provide a copy of the relevant Hansard transcript and direct the committee member to the appropriate contact.	Inland Rail	
3.	Review the timing of upcoming Community Information Sessions, including consideration of after-hours availability	Inland Rail	Completed

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
4.	Rob Smith to confirm that the number of locomotives referenced in the business case aligns with the assumptions used in the noise modelling.	Inland Rail	
5.	Provide Vicki B with further information regarding potential noise impacts associated with proposed design changes in Pampas. (Including taking on notice the discussion around potential noise behaviour in Pampas.)	Chairs	
6.	Provide further information to Brett regarding how train loading will be simulated as part of the embankment trial testing program.	Inland Rail	
7.	Dave Fleming to confirm whether fire ant inspections are included in the maintenance regime for Inland Rail owned properties.	Inland Rail	
8.	Send copies of design refinement and road-rail interface maps to CCC members ahead of the upcoming Community Information Sessions.	Inland Rail	Completed
9.	Stephen Beneke to investigate reported truck noise issues at the Dallman Road intersection.	Inland Rail	
10.	Provide groundwater monitoring results to Kylie Schultz	Inland Rail	Completed
11.	Send crossing loop maps to Chris Zeller.	Inland Rail	

Next meeting

TBC