

Meeting title	Narromine to Narrabri (N2N) Community Consultative Committee – Narrabri Sub-committee meeting 3		
Attendees			
Michael Silver OAM (Independent Chair)	Cr Denis Todd (Warrumbungle Shire Council)		
Russell Stewart (Community Member)	Leanne Ryan (Warrumbungle Shire Council)		
Ted Hayman (Community Member)	Patricio Munoz, Stakeholder Engagement Manager NSW - North (ARTC)		
Elizabeth Tomlinson (Community Member)	Reannan Ellaby, Technical Approvals Lead (ARTC)		
Jane Judd (Community Member)	Matthew Errington, Environmental Advisor (ARTC)		
Cindy Neil (Community Member)	Kyle-James Giggacher, Project Delivery Engineer (ARTC)		
Bruce Brierly (Community Member)	Michael Clancy – Manager, Business Development and Property (ARTC)		
Cr Ron Campbell (Narrabri Shire Council)	Patrick Leahy – Property Specialist (ARTC)		
Bill Birch (Narrabri Shire Council)	Andrew Skele – Environment Manager NSW (ARTC)		
Observers			
Cr Cathy Redding (Mayor, Narrabri Shire Council)	Elisha Bailey (Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development- Dubbo)		
Cr Cameron Staines (Narrabri Shire Council)	Hannah Baldry, Manager, Stakeholder Engagement, Freight, Strategy and Planning, Transport for NSW		
Peter Dampney	Ella Somerset, Transport for NSW		
David Scillett			
Apologies			
Stewart Todd (Narrabri Shire Council)	Scott Divers, Senior Project Manager (ARTC)		
Christina Deans (Community Member)			
Location	Crossing Theatre, Narrabri	Date & start time	22 May 2019, 12.40 pm

Topic	Discussion
1. Welcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair welcomed all to the meeting noting the presence of the Mayor of Narrabri, Cr Redding, community observers and representatives of the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development and Transport for NSW.
2. Declarations of Interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Michael Silver – pecuniary interest - expenses of Independent Chair borne by ARTC. Cindy Neil - non-pecuniary interest. Property located within study area.
3. Chair's Minute	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair spoke to his report regarding out of pocket expenses for community members and particularly a travel protocol for the claiming of travel expenses. It was agreed that a rate of 65 cents per kilometre be implemented for claims for travel expenses to/from meetings subject to a community member only being eligible to make a claim where the distance from the community member's residence to the meeting venue is greater than 15 kilometres. It was noted that a claim for travel expenses was a matter for the individual community member make and would need to be declared at the next meeting as a pecuniary interest. There was general

	<p>acceptance of the proposal. Following a question from Jane Judd, it was agreed that the Chair and ARTC would establish a claim process for community members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair confirmed with the Sub-committee the purpose of the CCC, having regard to the CCC Guidelines and the requirements of the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) issued to the proponent for preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Mr Silver noted that the N2NCCC was formed as a requirement of the SEARs under the <i>Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979</i>. He advised that the purpose of the CCC is to provide an interactive forum between the proponent and representatives of the community regarding issues associated with preparation of the EIS for the project. Mr Silver highlighted that matters raised by community members and questions listed in Other Agenda Items should relate to the project as it is proposed and not to historical issues which are outside the purpose of the CCC and beyond the scope of the proponent's project delivery team to answer. Mr Silver highlighted several questions listed under the Gilgandra Sub-committee that related to issues raised two years ago. • The Chair advised that all questions in the Other Agenda Items that related to historical issues and not related to the SEARs or the current proposal would be referred by him to the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development (previously the Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development and Cities) for comment. • The Chair advised that Ms Elizabeth Tomlinson had tendered her resignation from the CCC. Mr Silver thanked Ms Tomlinson for her contribution and advised that a replacement community member would be sought following advice from the NSW Department of Planning and Environment (DPE).
<p>4. Minutes of Previous Meeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that the minutes of the second meeting of the Sub-committee had been approved on 14 April 2019 and placed on the proponent's website.
<p>5. Business Arising</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liz Tomlinson noted advice from ARTC at the previous meeting that acquisitions matters are not disclosed and would not occur until the rail corridor had been confirmed. Whilst noting this advice was consistent with the Inland Rail Fact Sheet regarding acquisitions, she questioned the actual process being followed given that a local parliamentarian had indicated a property had been acquired by ARTC and this was general knowledge in the community. Reannan Ellaby indicated that this matter would be taken on notice. • Jane Judd noted that she had been referred to ARTC's Emergency Management Plan (EMP) (on its website) regarding how emergencies are dealt with, particularly in respect of the Pilliga Forest and bushfire management. Ms Judd advised that the document was generic and made no specific reference to the Narrabri section of the Inland Rail project. Ms Ellaby responded by advising that the Inland Rail project will be added to the EMP when it exists, adding that the Safety Management System is a key document to the design and maintenance of the infrastructure. Matthew Errington also advised that the DPE will probably require a Bush Fire Management Plan to be prepared for the N2N project, whilst Andrew Skele indicated that Inland Rail will be operated in accordance with national health and safety standards. • Cindy Neil sought clarification on noise and vibration matters and timelines highlighted at the previous meetings. Mr Errington indicated these would be answered as part of the proponent's report.
<p>6. Correspondence</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Chair advised that the DPE had confirmed the appointment of four additional

	<p>Community Members to the Narromine Sub-committee.</p> <p>2. The Chair advised that correspondence regarding the letter from A & G Nicholls from Narromine had been sent to relevant NSW Government and Commonwealth agencies. Mr Silver indicated that the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development had advised a response would not be provided until after the Federal election. The DPE had forwarded the letter to ARTC and would be raising the matter at its next meeting with the proponent.</p>
<p>7. Previous Actions</p>	<p>7.1 That ARTC forward a summary of the biodiversity assessment methodology to the CCC members when finalised. COMPLETED</p> <p>7.2 That ARTC present a report on the likely engineering design for the railway across the flood plain north of Narrabri at a future meeting of the Sub-committee. PRELIMINARY VISUALISATIONS OF TYPICAL VIADUCT ARRANGEMENTS PRESENTED – DETAILED DESIGN TBC</p> <p>7.3 That ARTC deliver a report on how personal individual circumstances will be considered and addressed in the Social Impact Assessment to the next meeting of the CCC. COMPLETED</p> <p>7.4 That ARTC provide a presentation from a suitably qualified property specialist regarding the land acquisition processes, and considerations for landholders, associated of the <i>Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991</i> as they may apply to acquisition of land for the Inland Rail corridor. COMPLETED</p> <p>7.5 That the Chair prepare and circulate a travel allowance protocol to members prior to the May 2019 meeting of the CCC. COMPLETED</p> <p>7.6 That Michael Clancy of ARTC be invited to present to the CCC on future freight operation matters associated with the Inland Rail project – May meeting. COMPLETED</p>
<p>8. Proponent's Report</p>	<p><i>Patricio Munoz, Kyle-James Giggacher, Matthew Errington, Reannan Ellaby, Michael Clancy and Patrick Leahy from ARTC presented the Proponent's Report.</i></p> <p>General Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patricio Munoz opened the presentation and advised that he had recently been appointed as Stakeholder Engagement Manager NSW – North with ARTC following a restructure. He would be responsible for community engagement in the Parkes to Narromine, Narromine to Narrabri, and Narrabri to North Star sections of the Inland Rail project. • Mr Munoz highlighted progress on the cadastral survey noting that the Narromine and Narrabri sections had been completed and the Gilgandra area would be finalised by the end of May 2019. Most survey work had been undertaken on-road. Where access by surveyors had been required to private property, this had not been an issue and no formal action under the <i>Surveying and Spatial Information Act 2002</i> had been necessary. • The Sub-committee viewed a video outlining Inland Rail's Aboriginal Cultural Heritage investigation and assessment processes undertaken by ARTC. • Ms Tomlinson questioned the extent to which project vehicles are being identified as 'ARTC' vehicles when undertaking surveys. She highlighted a specific issue with a convoy of vehicles, noting some were not badged with ARTC insignia. Mr Munoz advised that it was a requirement that all vehicles are badged. Mr Giggacher acknowledged that during a cultural heritage survey some vehicles were not badged although they were 'chauffeured' by ARTC vehicles. Mr Giggacher noted the concerns

and advised it would be addressed.

- Mr Munoz highlighted Inland Rail's new community sponsorship initiative with the second round closing on 31 July 2019. The program will provide financial support (\$1000 to \$4000) to eligible community organisations. The sponsorship program has four rounds annually.
- Ms Neil commented on the proposed pop-up stalls which will operate from 10am to 3pm. She requested that ARTC consider an evening pop-up store that would cater for workers. Mr Munoz noted her comments.

Engineering

- Kyle-James Giggacher updated the Sub-committee on the current status of the project. He indicated that the project is still at the feasibility design phase with the development of the EIS.
- Mr Giggacher advised that due to the Commonwealth Government entering a caretaker period due to the Federal election, discussions with affected landholders regarding the narrowing of the study area to a focus area (150 metres wide) had been postponed until the Commonwealth Government resumes normal operations.
- Mr Giggacher advised that almost all geotechnical work was completed, although some further investigations are being undertaken in the Gilgandra area around Square Mountain/Black Hollow area. This work should be finalised within a week.
- Mr Giggacher confirmed that cadastral surveys are scheduled to be completed by the end of May 2019.
- Mr Giggacher advised that hydrology work is progressing as is road/rail interface and transport analysis.
- Bruce Brierley sought clarification as to likely locations of overpasses and underpasses particularly with stock and farm machinery movement in mind. Mr Giggacher advised that this level of detail will not be determined until the focus area is defined and the type and location of structures will be based on topography and specific landowner requirements. Ms Ellaby further advised that the crossing treatments will be determined using the Australian Level Crossing Assessment Model (ALCAM) relative to a risk assessment of the crossing location. She suggested that the preference is to go under the rail track, but this will be dependent on topography at specific the location.
- Ms Tomlinson questioned who was responsible for maintaining underpasses and who should be contacted if there are maintenance issues. Ms Ellaby advised that ARTC is responsible for maintenance and generally the local provisioning centre will be the maintenance contact. Mr Skele advised that private crossings will be subject to a licence agreement with the landholder.
- Michael Clancy advised that there are numerous factors that determine the location of public rail crossings including consideration of train speed, train loads, sight distance and road users.

Chair's note:

Detail on ALCAM: <http://alcam.com.au/>

Transport for NSW ALCAM overview:

<https://www.transport.nsw.gov.au/projects/programs/level-crossing-safety/australian-level-crossing-assessment-model>

- Mr Giggacher advised that a total of 116 borrow sites had been volunteered, with 26 short-listed for further investigation. Aboriginal heritage and ecology clearance

surveys have been completed with geotechnical testing for the suitability of material to be carried out over the next few months.

Environmental Assessment

- Matthew Errington provided an EIS progress update. He advised that the majority of field work had been completed, with the exception of Aboriginal heritage surveys in the Pilliga State Forest and some private properties where access has been denied.
- Mr Errington highlighted the importance of completing the Aboriginal heritage assessment as part of the EIS and encouraged CCC members to bring this to the attention of the community and share the video.
- Mr Errington noted progress on biodiversity work and indicated that targeted seasonal flora surveys will be undertaken later in the year for threatened plant species.
- Ms Tomlinson asked, what happens if you can't access properties? Mr Errington advised that ARTC would like gain access for engineering and environmental investigations to optimise the design and avoid impacts, otherwise assumptions need to be made which may be incorrect. Mr Skele advised that it is dependent on what is found. Should assumptions be used, it may be that additional surveys will be required post approval, after acquisition of the rail corridor.
- Mr Errington noted that road traffic noise monitoring will be undertaken at various locations along the alignment. Once the locations are confirmed, ARTC will provide an updated noise logger location map. Ms Neil question the location and spacing of noise loggers along the 300 kilometres length of the proposed alignment. Mr Errington advised that ARTC's noise specialist had confirmed that the logger locations were chosen to ensure they were representative of sensitive receptors along the route. He further commented that if DPE and the NSW Environment Protection Authority is dissatisfied with the noise baseline data when the EIS is submitted that additional logger data may be requested.
- Mr Errington provided a response to Action 7.2 above regarding personal individual impacts and how this will be dealt with in the Social Impact Assessment (SIA). He advised that when the one-one meetings with the 180 directly impacted landholders are undertaken, information will be gathered to support preparation of the SIA. No individual circumstances will be addressed in the EIS due to privacy issues. However, a representative sample of the 180 landholders (approximately 25) will be further evaluated through SIA meetings to identify specific potential impacts and themes in order to develop mitigation measures for inclusion in the EIS.
- Mr Errington commented that the ARTC Inland Rail Social Performance team would like to provide a presentation to the CCC. It was agreed that a presentation be made at the next meeting.
- Ms Tomlinson suggested that people not within the focus area will also be impacted – both directly and indirectly. Ms Tomlinson questioned how this will be addressed.
- Mr Errington advised that following the one-on-one meetings, opportunities will be provided to landholders outside the focus area to discuss social impact issues. This will occur at the 70% EIS phase through a public forum (format to be confirmed) which will also allow wider community consultation on the matter.
- Ms Neil indicated that members of the community are frustrated that there has been no response from ARTC to various questions recently, particularly regarding the one-on-one meetings. She alleged that ARTC was not been returning phone calls and that landholders needed answers to their questions. Mr Skele advised that the caretaker

period associated with the Federal election had impacted on ARTC's ability to respond.

- Russell Stewart complimented ARTC on the establishment of the new shop front in Narrabri. He suggested the initiative should have a positive impact with greater engagement and better communication with the community. Mr Stewart encouraged ARTC to optimise the opportunity by not closing during the lunch period. Ms Tomlinson supported Mr Stewart's comments and requested that ARTC investigate opening on Saturday morning.
- Mr Errington advised that updated SEARs would be issued by DPE with additional assessment requirements for the proposed borrow pits. He indicated that road upgrade considerations would be part of the Traffic Management Plan for the project.
- Mrs Judd asked how the finalised EIS will be presented – will it be sectional to allow the community with local interests to review the section specific to their area? Mr Errington advised that an EIS exhibition strategy was being developed, which will aim to utilise innovative methods to improve the community's accessibility to and understanding of the EIS.
- Mrs Judd noted that a minimum public exhibition period of 28 days for the would apply to the EIS.

Other Agenda Items Presentation

- Reannan Ellaby provided a brief presentation on the following matters:
 - Indicative fencing types
 - Cadastral survey
 - Elevation modelling and follow-up flood presentation
 - Typical viaduct arrangement
- Ms Ellaby confirmed that one-on-one meetings had been postponed due to the caretaker period. When this period is over the one-on-one meetings will be held in the Local Government Areas in the following order:

1st: Warrumbungle & Gilgandra
 2nd: Gilgandra & Coonamble
 3rd: Narromine & Narrabri

- Ms Ellaby advised that notice and property maps will be forwarded to landholders well in advance of one-one-one meetings. Mr Munoz added that there would be no public meetings regarding the focus area. He indicated that two weeks' notice will be provided to affected landholders of a meeting with a follow-up phone call to confirm arrangements. Landholders will be provided with options regarding meeting times and locations.
- Mr Munoz highlighted that meeting 180 landholders will take time. ARTC will have multiple meeting teams undertaking the one-on-one meetings. It is anticipated each team will complete two to three meetings per day.
- Ms Neil enquired if landholders not in the focus area will be contacted. Mr Munoz advised that landholders in the focus area will be contacted first, with remaining property owners subsequently contacted to advise they are outside the focus area and will not be directly impacted.
- Mr Brierley asked whether landholders may have solicitors, accountants or professional advocates present. Mr Munoz indicated that landholders may have

whatever level of support they desire, however it will not be until the formal acquisition process commences that professional costs can be recovered from ARTC.

- Ms Neil enquired as to when publicly available Inland Rail mapping will be updated to detail the focus area. Mr Munoz advised this will not occur until all affected landholders have been contacted.
- Mr Brierley requested a copy of the latest overall Inland Rail alignment map. Mr Munoz advised he would forward a copy to CCC members.
- Ms Ellaby detailed the standard exclusion fencing advising that alternative standards could be created. Mr Skele noted that consideration needs to be given to the fauna to be excluded.
- Ms Ellaby advised the cadastral survey would be completed at the end of May 2019. She highlighted that some survey work relevant to the project may be outside the study area.
- In response to the question from Ms Neil regarding construction across the Narrabri floodplain, Ms Ellaby presented examples of typical viaduct arrangements, noting that design depends on assessed flooding impacts. Ms Tomlinson asked who is responsible for clearing debris from piers. Ms Ellaby advised that ARTC is responsible.

Future Freight Operations

Refer to Freight Operations slide pack

- Michael Clancy, Manager Business Development and Property provided an insight into future freight operations associated with the Inland Rail project.
- Mr Clancy provided an historical overview of the rail network in NSW, noting that tracks were laid along the alignment of least resistance, mainly following valleys floors and other flat areas. These alignments remain today over 100 years on. He commented that the existing track infrastructure is inadequate for future development and requires rebuilding.
- The Inland Rail project is based on a different operating scenario. One key issue is cost/time but there are other matters/issues to be considered and addressed in relation to the long-term benefits of the project:
 - Safety – less trucks on roads
 - General demographics – long-distance truckies now aged 40/50+ with likely future shortage of long-distance truck drivers
 - Economic viability – unviable to drive trucks long distances
 - Truck v Train – 25 tonnes on truck v 6,000 tonnes on train
 - 1 train driver required v 40 truck drivers required to move 6000 tonnes of product
- Mr Clancy advised that contrary to popular belief, all eastern seaboard ports (Brisbane, Newcastle, Sydney, Port Kembla, Melbourne) are connected by standard gauge rail – it is a matter of whether it is used or has the capacity viz, passenger v freight.
- Mr Clancy also advised that no port can accept double stacked container trains. To achieve this, brownfield corridors would need to lift bridges, adjust overhead electrical gantries, reduce station awnings as well as other infrastructure at a huge capital cost.
- Mr Clancy advised that to attract product to rail, such as supplies to major grocery stores, the Inland Rail must meet their short timeframes. This process involves product transfer off the train directly to a truck and straight to the store. This process is designed to reduce costs by removing the amount of warehouse storage required and limiting shelf space costs.
- Mr Clancy said that the future is no distribution centres with containers pre-prepared

for direct transfer to stores. In terms of the supply chain, he suggested the market will find the most efficient way to handle product.

- Mr Clancy noted that over 40 grain rail sidings are along the proposed Inland Rail route with only three privately owned – the balance being part of the ARTC NSW lease. He advised that no active sites (grain sidings) are being closed.
- Mrs Judd enquired as to where intermodal hubs will be for access to the Inland Rail.
- Mr Stewart commented that the market will determine where intermodal hubs are required, suggesting that the private sector will research and develop its opportunities.
- Mr Clancy discussed opportunities for access to the Inland Rail and also advised that the locations of intermodal hub sites would be determined by market forces and are not in the scope of Inland Rail, therefore are matters for the private sector and local government to pursue. He noted that hubs would require a separate approval.
- The Chair invited Ms Elisha Bailey of the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development to provide advice on programs and strategies the Commonwealth government has initiated that would support maximising the opportunities provided by Inland Rail.
- Ms Bailey advised that the government is committed to building a strong regional Australia. As part of this commitment and to support regional outcomes from Inland Rail the Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development and Cities has established Inland Rail regional offices in Albury-Wodonga, Dubbo and Toowoomba. The regional offices will work with stakeholders to maximise local procurement and employment opportunities arising from the construction of Inland Rail, as well as preparing industries and regions to take advantages of the opportunities arising from the operation of Inland Rail.
- Ms Bailey said that the Inland Rail Supply Chain Mapping Study - Parkes to Narromine Pilot project in collaboration with CSIRO tested the suitability of TraNSIT to analyse existing regional freight supply chains and looked at the potential transport cost savings available from Inland Rail. The results demonstrate significant savings, when shifting specific agricultural supply chains from road to Inland Rail.
- Ms Bailey indicated that during 2019 the study will be expanded to include other supply chains and capture a broader geographic region, from Narromine (NSW) to Seymour (Victoria). The department will be working closely with State Governments, local councils and other key stakeholders to ensure the project complements local land use planning and freight network strategies.
- Ms Bailey further advised that the Federal Government has committed \$44 million to an Inland Rail Interface Improvement Program to maximise connections to the national freight rail network – integrating regional lines and connecting local communities to the benefits that flow from Inland Rail. Further, the Regional Australia Institute (RAI) has been commissioned to help communities along the route make the most of Inland Rail.
- Mr Clancy drew attention to the slide on the CSIRO Northern NSW Transport Study which analysed Local Government Authorities in the north west. It demonstrated a likely cost saving of between \$7.75 and \$9.80 per tonne utilizing larger trains with a full payload.
- Mr Clancy emphasised that the Inland Rail project is based on 24 hours transfer time with a 98% reliability. Consequently, actual time needs to be 21 hours. This is to allow a 2-3 hours buffer in the network if there are any issues. He advised that the rail network is currently operating at 79% efficiency whilst running time into Brisbane is 68% on-time.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Clancy advised that it was intended to have connecting networks upgraded and in place before Inland Rail is completed through co-ordinated investments across all tiers of government and the private sector. This will involve having wagons with 25 tonne total axle load and trains that have a minimum length of 1350 metres. He anticipated having a standardised and robust rail network in place by 2024. <p>Property Report</p> <p><i>Refer to property slide pack.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patrick Leahy provided a presentation regarding the land acquisition process for the Inland Rail project having regard to the provisions of the <i>Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991</i>. Mr Leahy advised that ARTC is not an acquiring authority under the <i>Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991</i>. ARTC is currently in discussions with Transport for NSW (an acquiring authority) regarding the compulsory acquisition process. Mr Leahy reinforced the need for the rail corridor to be defined and confirmed before any property acquisition discussions could commence. Mr Leahy indicated that the process followed by ARTC in acquiring land will be the same as that outlined in the <i>Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991</i>. Mr Leahy advised that ARTC's Community Engagement team can provide information on the acquisition process. Bruce Brierley suggested the presentation was irrelevant until the final corridor is determined. Cr Todd advised that many impacted landholders wanted to sell the whole of their property. Mr Leahy responded by advising that ARTC is not a property developer and is tied to identifying and acquiring the land necessary to build the Inland Rail project. Cr Campbell suggested that comment and question regarding acquisition were irrelevant until the feasibility design and EIS are at the 70% stage. Ms Ellaby confirmed that the corridor will be narrowed to 40-60 metres when the feasibility design is at the 70% stage. Mr Leahy commented that acquisition prior to an approval may result in a proponent being left with unwanted or unnecessary property. The Chair suggested to the Sub-committee that the purpose of the presentation was to provide community members with an understanding of the acquisition process and not what property may be required. Mr Silver commented that there did not appear to be a clear understanding of the acquisition process and particularly the provisions of the <i>Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991</i> in the community.
<p>9. Actions required</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> That ARTC provide CCC members with a copy of the latest map of the overall Inland Rail alignment. The Chair to refer Other Agenda Items questions regarding historical matters associated with the Inland Rail project to the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development for comment. That ARTC provide a response to recent public suggestions that a property acquisition associated with the Inland Rail project has been completed prior to determination of the final corridor. That ARTC provide an updated noise logger location map at the next meeting of the CCC.
<p>10. Other Agenda</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members' questions on matters specific to project. It was noted that 26 questions from

Items

members of all Sub-committees of the N2NCCC had been placed on the agenda. It was further noted that two questions had been listed by a member of the Narrabri Sub-committee.

- The Chair indicated, that having regard to the comments contained in his Chair's Minute, that questions in the Other Agenda Items considered by the Chair to fall outside the scope of the CCC will be referred by him to the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development for comment.
- The following questions, as detailed in the Addendum, will be referred to the Commonwealth Department:
 - Q 10.1; Q10.2; 10.8; Q 10.11; Q 10.12; Q 10.13; Q 10.14; Q 10.15; Q 10.16; Q 10.17; Q 10.18; Q 10.19.
- In accordance with the previously agreed convention, responses to the questions were confined only to questions of immediate concern to Narrabri community members with written responses to all questions to be provide by ARTC as an Addendum to the minutes.

10.25 What recourse do property owners have after the Inland Rail is built regarding noise & vibration problems?

A. The EIS will identify a range of operational noise and vibration mitigation measures to be implemented at source e.g. noise walls along rail track and at receiver e.g. property treatment. During detailed design and noise model refinement, mitigation measures will be optimised in consultation with affected property owners. Once the project becomes operational, mandatory noise monitoring will verify the noise modelling results and efficacy of installed mitigation measures. If required, mitigation measures will be modified to meet the project-specific noise requirements.

- Ms Neil asked if a property is located one kilometre from the alignment, will it be assessed. Mr Errington advised that the noise study area extends two kilometres either side of the of the rail alignment. Mr Skele drew the Sub-committee's attention to the conditions of consent in the Parkes to Narromine Inland Rail project relative to noise impacts.

Chair's note: Inland Rail - Parkes to Narromine Conditions of Approval

https://majorprojects.accelo.com/public/494e74b24015bfa974a13989e6944f0e/Inland%20Rail_Parkes%20to%20Narromine_Signed%20Instrument%20of%20Approval%207June2018.pdf

10.26 Why are not all property owners within the corridor (Narrabri area) being contacted to meet with the floodplain and utilities surveyors, so that they can give them exact flood levels at their property?

A: The flood surveys referred to in this correspondence are for existing flood structures, such as bridges and culverts. The landowner engagement on the flood studies has not yet commenced but will be undertaken with the one-on-one conversations.

- Ms Neil questioned whether this will only be within the refined 150 metre wide focus area. Ms Ellaby advised discussions will also occur with other landholders within the study area. Ms Neil stated that given her property location, she can provide extensive historical flood level data.

<p>9. General business</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms Tomlinson again expressed her concern that property acquisition had allegedly occurred prior to finalisation of the rail corridor contrary to ARTC's stated policy. • The Chair thanked Ms Tomlinson for her contribution to the CCC.
	<p>Next meeting: Tentatively set for Wednesday, 28 August 2019 at Baradine.</p> <p>Meeting closed: 4.00 pm. The Chair thanked all for their attendance</p>
<p>11. Meeting minutes approved</p>	<div data-bbox="478 526 933 824" data-label="Text">  </div> <div data-bbox="446 851 718 974" data-label="Text"> <p>Michael J. Silver OAM Independent Chair 19 June 2019</p> </div>

Members' questions on matters specific to the project – the questions listed are from Community Members of all Sub-committees of the N2NCCC:

- **Narromine Sub-committee**

- Andrew Knop

10.1 Can ARTC fully explain its comparative costing analysis that suggests up grading an existing line is more expensive than building new rail line, having regard to the existing Dubbo to Curban rail line verses the 'green field' Study Area Narromine to Curban?

Member Comment: The community notes that the Senate Estimates Committee has asked similar questions over various sittings but ARTC has failed to adequately answer the committee concerns. This has noticeably frustrated the Senators and is of great concern to the community and tax-payers' funding this project. As a great deal of community dissension is directly attributable to ARTC's failure to maximise the use of existing track, this question needs to be thoroughly and critically analysed.

A: *Chair to refer question to the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development for comment.*

10.2 Given over 80km of existing track from Dubbo to Curban meets the same destination point as the green field Narromine to Curban alignment why wasn't a green field project linking Tomingley to Dubbo thoroughly analysed?

Member Comment: This alignment would require less green field disturbance, would directly link the project with western NSW largest centre for retail, transport, industry, manufacturing, health, education and agriculture and would take approximately the same travel time. It would cost considerably less, with the added benefit of creating a transport corridor around Dubbo which would future proof Dubbo for greater expansion whilst relieving traffic congestion and improving community safety and living conditions. This consideration directly links to regional plans providing additional Newell Highway transport capacity across the Macquarie River floodplain. It would also avoid considerable flood plain exposure risks.

A: *Chair to refer question to the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development for comment.*

10.3 Can ARTC provide a presentation on elevation modelling, at the highest available accuracy, for the Narromine to Burroway project section relating to:

- **Backwater Cowal Catchment area;**
- **Backwater Cowal;**
- **Narromine Township;**
- **Macquarie River Floodplain from Tantitha Road to 15km NW of Narromine Township inclusive of the all potential concept alignment study areas.**

- with elevation mapping to be tabled at the meeting.

A: *A presentation on digital elevation modelling for the Narromine to Burroway project section will be provided at the next meeting of the Sub-committee.*

10.4 Can ARTC provide a follow up presentation in respect of the Narromine – Burroway component of the Flood Modelling presentation provided by JacobsGHD at the March meeting inclusive of explanatory notes on the Macquarie River and Backwater Cowl Floodplain animation and any additional findings that are now available?

A: A follow-up presentation for the Narromine – Burroway component of the flood modelling presentation, including explanatory notes on the Macquarie River and Backwater Cowl Floodplain animation and any additional findings, will be provided at the next meeting of the Sub-committee.

- **Gilgandra Sub-committee**

- Stuart Mudford

10.5 Has ARTC or the Commonwealth Government purchased any land along the alignment between Narromine and Narrabri or will entire properties be purchased where a farmer wishes to leave?

A: ARTC has purchased land along the alignment, the details of which are confidential.

On occasion, Inland Rail will purchase a total property, even though only part of it is required. Any requests by a landowner for ARTC to acquire a property will be assessed on a case by case basis, and the decision to agree to a full purchase is at the discretion of ARTC.

10.6 Will there be any purchase of land outside the alignment? e.g. for gravel or fill.

A: ARTC presently has no plans to purchase properties for material supply that are outside the proposed project.

10.7 Some farmers are starting to use exclusion fencing - would it be possible for ARTC to use this type of fencing where it suits the farmer?

A: Yes, fencing requirements will be assessed on a case by case basis.

- Karen McBurnie

10.8 With reference to the response to question 8.8 (detailed in the addendum to the minutes) at the March 2019 meeting: What is the cost difference between redeveloping the existing rail line and cost of new greenfield line? Is this a feasible option?

Member comment: ARTC stated that it is not in the project scope and only want to discuss the greenfield. The community is of the understanding that these CCC meetings were to have community consultation and to provide information to satisfy it that ARTC were being transparent. Surely there has been a study on the costing of using the existing corridor or even to build the Inland Rail adjacent to the existing track to have freight all in the original corridor. The community would like evidence of why this is not an option, beside the 11 minutes longer claim.

A: Chair to refer question to the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development for comment.

10.9 Why is ARTC doing survey work outside the study area? Are ARTC concerned that there may be an inquiry into the route selection and have not done the appropriate study for the initial Inland Rail proposal?

Member comment: ARTC conducted survey work on Milpulling Road on Wednesday 8 May 2019 at the boundary of the properties 'Talah' and 'Wycott' which is situated approximately 13 kilometres from

the Newell Highway. This is outside the study corridor. The owner of 'Wycott' spoke to the ARTC people as to why they were there, but they did not answer.

A: ARTC did survey some marks on Milpulling Road outside of the N2N study area (and in some other areas of the project also). Survey Adjusted Cadastral Models (SACM) are done using as reference existing survey marks which appear on the cadastral plans. Most of the time those marks are outside of the property in question, and hence why they can be outside of the study area even if the property is within.

10.10 How much is the projected usage of water per day, in the greenfield section of construction. Where do ARTC propose to obtain this water?

A: As we are only at 30% Feasibility stage, we are still determining the quantity of water we require to build the project. There is groundwater monitoring currently underway to inform on the potential water sources. Surface water monitoring has also been undertaken and identified as not being a potential water source at this stage. ARTC may look to purchase any existing entitlements connected to existing bores where the groundwater impact assessment within the EIS shows the proposed extraction is not beyond the approved existing entitlement volumes at given bores. The amount of water required is also related to the moisture in the soils and this is currently being tested from the recent geotechnical investigations.

10.11 Why was the Gilmours Road Alternative original route (including Mawbey's Road section) changed to include Old Mill Road and does ARTC have evidence to support why this original path was altered?

A: Chair to refer question to the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development for comment.

10.12 When was Gilmours Road Alternative (Option B) first indicated as a preference for the Burroway to Curban section of Inland Rail?

A: Chair to refer question to the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development for comment.

10.13 Does ARTC have evidence to support its claim that the Gilmours Road Alternative route (Option B) had resulted from a majority of community preference- to be included for investigation?

A: Chair to refer question to the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development for comment.

10.14 The Gilmours Road Alternative route (Option B) was not considered in the December 2016 MCA Workshop but was consulted on in early 2017, Why?

A: Chair to refer question to the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development for comment.

10.15 Does ARTC have a map indicating where one-on-one landowner and community consultations had taken place during January to May 2017.

A: Chair to refer question to the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development for comment.

10.16 Why didn't ARTC consult and include in its investigation process in early 2017 the recommended route of Option 109 from the December 2016 MCA Workshop?

A: Chair to refer question to the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development for comment.

10.17 What evidence does ARTC have to support its reasoning as to why Option 109 should not be consulted on with landowners and the community, given the December 2016 MCA Report had recommended it should be?

A: Chair to refer question to the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development for comment.

10.18 Why wasn't Option 109 included in the consultation process of ARTC in early 2017 yet was illustrated in a map presented to Minister Chester in late 2017 as the 'preferred study corridor' for this section? Was the Minister informed that this 'preferred study corridor' had not undergone consultation?

A: Chair to refer question to the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development and Cities for comment.

10.19 Why wasn't the Burroway to Curban section of Inland Rail indicated to the Minister as being a 'contentious area' before approval was given in late 2017?

A: Chair to refer question to the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development for comment.

- Peter Bonnington

10.20 Can ARTC indicate the proposed timeframe for when it expects to notify stakeholders of the compulsory acquisition processes to proceed under the Act?

A: ARTC is not an acquiring authority and as such, will write to landowners to request to acquire land once the project design is well enough advanced. Landowners and ARTC will have a minimum of six months to reach an agreement on an acquisition. If agreement cannot be reached, a compulsory acquisition process will then commence.

10.21 What is the full timeline ARTC is working to regarding compulsory acquisition in the Gilgandra section of the project?

A: The timeline for acquisition has not been distinguished into sections at this stage. ARTC is not an acquiring authority and as such, will write to landowners to request to acquire land once the project design is well enough advanced. Landowners and ARTC will have a minimum of six months to reach an agreement on an acquisition. If agreement cannot be reached, a compulsory acquisition process will then commence.

10.22 Does ARTC expect to utilise only the minimum notice period under the Act or will it provide an additional length of notice? If yes, what is the current proposed plan for the notice period?

A: ARTC is not an acquiring authority and as such, will write to landowners to request to acquire land once the project design is well enough advanced. Landowners and ARTC will have a minimum of six months to reach an agreement on an acquisition. This is a statutory process under the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act. Landowners will first receive a Proposed Acquisition Notice in relation to the proposed compulsory acquisition of the property, stating the intention to acquire the property after a certain time period, usually 90 days. If contracts for purchase have not been exchanged within the

notice period, usually 120 days, an Acquisition Notice is published, or 'gazetted', in the NSW Government Gazette.

10.23 Will ARTC be providing further specific community sessions on compulsory acquisition prior to the commencement of this process? If yes, what are the estimated timeframes? If no, what communication systems will ARTC put in place to ensure community members are kept up to date and well informed of this process?

A: Community information sessions will continue to inform landowners, stakeholders and others about our project plans for the Inland Rail project.

If landowners are directly affected by the Inland Rail project, ARTC will contact them face to face to:

- *confirm that their property needs to be acquired*
- *explain the process*
- *introduce the team that will assist them through the process.*

10.24 Where is ARTC up to regarding commitments made at the last meeting to meet with and inform landholders of the route refinement, discuss options regarding property division and access.

Member comment: The community has been provided with broad information regarding the Just Terms Compensation provisions over the past year. It would be beneficial for stakeholders to be provided with the best estimate timelines for this process to allow for future planning for, and engagement of, relevant professional assistance for those community members who wish to do so. Managing cashflow for the engagement of external assistance by landholders will be vital for affected community members and the better placed they are to understand timeframes ahead of time the better they can plan to mitigate the timing of cash outflows.

A: ARTC planned to start route refinement conversations with landowners in April 2019. As the Federal Government election was called in April, ARTC has respected the caretaker period and only conducted routine stakeholder engagement activities until the Commonwealth Government resumes normal operations.

- **Narrabri Sub-committee**

- Cindy Neil

10.25 What recourse do property owners have after the Inland Rail is built regarding noise & vibration problems?

A: The EIS will identify a range of operational noise and vibration mitigation measures to be implemented at source e.g. noise walls along rail track and at receiver e.g. property treatment. During detailed design and noise model refinement, mitigation measures will be optimised in consultation with affected property owners. Once the project becomes operational, mandatory noise monitoring will verify the noise modelling results and efficacy of installed mitigation measures. If required, mitigation measures will be modified to meet the project-specific noise requirements.

10.26 Why are not all property owners within the corridor (Narrabri area) being contacted to meet with the floodplain and utilities surveyors, so that they can give them exact flood levels at their property?

Member comment: An email was received from inlandrailnsw@ARTC.com.au on the 9th May 2019 at 12.32pm. It indicated that Flood & Utilities Surveys would be completed by Sunday 12th May 2019. It said that "Flood and utilities survey work will include taking photos and recording flood levels and will inform the project Flood Study Engagement Framework. Managing flooding is a high priority for

ARTC and we recognise that the community is concerned about potential changes in flooding behaviour.” A landowner was contacted who has lived in the area for less than 15 years, whilst a neighbour who can provide anecdotal evidence as the property has been owned by their family for over 100 years was not contacted.

A: *The flood surveys referred to in this correspondence are for existing flood structures, such as bridges and culverts. The landowner engagement on the flood studies has not yet commenced, but will be undertaken with the one-on-one conversations.*