

Anthony Corderoy

Dr Kerry Schott AO
Independent Review of the delivery of the Inland Rail Program

20 November 2022

Dear Dr Schott

We submit concerns regarding ARTC's management of the Inland Rail project with reference to the following review issues.

1: ARTC governance and management arrangements for the delivery of the Inland Rail Program.

3: The processes for the selection and refinement of the Inland Rail route and whether these processes are fit-for-purpose, including consideration of benefits and impacts.

In December 2017 ARTC informed us that they were moving the Inland Rail route from the western 2010 IRAS alignment to our properties east of Narromine. This alignment change occurred without any consultation into an area well outside the 'alternative study area' mapped by ARTC's '2017 Inland Rail Fact Sheet'. ARTC did not provide us procedural fair hearing before moving the alignment.

The new eastern alignment area ARTC selected has been flooded over fifty times over the last 10 years, with floods occurring in every year. We have had two major floods, one moderate flood and two minor floods in the past eight weeks (the two major floods were at 1955 levels in the Backwater Cowal, prior to the Macquarie River coming through the Webb Siding Overflow). Additionally in a 1 in fifty-year flood event the Macquarie River will outflow into the alignment area with larger flood events presenting substantial risk to the planned Inland Rail infrastructure. 21km of the new Narromine to Burroway alignment is impacted by large event flooding not the 1.6km quoted by ARTC in their 'worlds best practice' Inland Rail MCA route selection process.

In 1955, 100,000 megalitres a day exited the Macquarie River through the Webb Siding outflow into the Backwater Cowal landscape. This flood water destroyed over 2km of rail alignment and then united with the Backwater flood waters to create a massive, moving inland lake. The 1955 flood was a smaller event than a 1 in 100-year climate escalated flood scenario which would likely see widespread Inland Rail embankment failures resulting in a very destructive flood surge.

ARTC did not conduct any flood research before moving the alignment into our area. Flood management plans, topographic flood maps and consultation with the local

farming families with landscape knowledge dating back to the 1880's was all available but ignored by ARTC. It exposes the project and the community to extreme risk.

We are aware that local community members have compiled a comprehensive list of Inland Rail governance and management failures which has been sent to the Inland Rail Shareholder Ministers. We fully support this community initiative and hope you will take the time to directly speak to all involved. A copy of the letter is included below.

Yours faithfully



Anthony Corderoy

On behalf of Anthony Corderoy, Malcolm Corderoy, Ian and Amanda Corderoy.

Letter to Inland Rail Shareholder Ministers

We raise the following complaint issues on behalf of the impacted Inland Rail communities. These issues relate to ARTC's corporate conduct with reference to the transparency, accountability, integrity, probity and reporting requirements of the Australian Government Inland Rail Australian Rail Track Corporation Limited Statement of Expectations and Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 2013 (PGPA Act).

The complaint issues are listed below, with detailed instances available for each criterion:

- 1. Inland Rail Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) data and reporting errors;*
- 2. MCA failure to disclose previous study findings and utilise readily available desktop analysis data;*
- 3. ARTC failure to provide newly impacted individuals meaningful and timely consultation prior to altering study areas and alignments;*
- 4. Demonstrable procedural bias wherein ARTC provide certain individuals substantial consultative opportunity which enabled those parties to have the alignment changed;*
- 5. False and misleading information published in the ARTC 'Route History' document;*
- 6. ARTC refusal to answer MCA and route selection questions during Inland Rail Community Consultative Committee (CCC) meetings;*
- 7. ARTC systemically failing to meet State planning CCC reporting requirements;*
- 8. ARTC devolving questions and issues raised in CCC meetings as a responsibility of the Federal Inland Rail senate inquiry;*

9. *ARTC misleading landholders during the route selection process;*
10. *ARTC misleading landholders during property negotiations;*
11. *ARTC's failure to research significant and potentially beneficial alternative route alignment options;*
12. *Significant IR project cost escalations resulting in cost transfer to State, Local government, regional communities and landholders;*
13. *Potential corporate governance failures relating to the significant cost escalations;*
14. *Transparency and probity issues regarding ARTC's procurement procedures;*
15. *Misleading claims and statements in ARTC's IR project EIS documentation;*
16. *Flood modelling and design concerns which increases risk to life and property;*
17. *ARTC ignoring community submissions which identified Matters of National Environmental Significance impacts overlooked by the projects EIS.*
18. *Shareholder Minister conduct during the years 2018-20 where certain ministers used the media and parliament to disrespect, alienate and isolate impacted individuals who attempted to raise IR project concerns.*

We greatly appreciate the Australian Government's and Shareholder Ministers' commitment to an Inland Rail review. The concerned citizens listed below include experienced Inland Rail Community Consultative Committee (CCC) members and councillors acting in private capacity. To date communities along the alignment have struggled to obtain fair hearing and we look forward to the opportunity of a transparent discussion and analysis of the issues. Issues which seriously threaten the successful planning and implementation of this once in a lifetime regional infrastructure project.