

Hi Catherine King and Dr Schott,

I wish to show my **OPPOSITION** to Proposed Inland Rail Greenfield Route.

From : Darryl Piper

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
Can be made public with your scrutiny.

We have many concerns about the proposed Greenfield Rail route. While I am not against the inland rail itself. I am against the current proposed route. There is better alternative that make more logical sense, top of that list is using existing line that was put in in 1902 so it is a **PROVEN** line and **PROVEN** route.

1/ The Consultation process was flawed from the start. To Consult means to take advice, **NONE** has ever been taken or used. Consultation meant there should have been a dialogue between the 2 parties with both sides listening and decisions made by taking into account concerns from both parties. Never happened. All Inland Rail meets were them presenting what was going to happen, but no justification.

2/ Hydrology. Major concern, especially the last 3 wet years. Speaking locally, we have had 3 exceptional wet seasons for the Armatree/Tonderbrine area. The proposed route will change water flows, change velocities all which will greatly impact landscapes and farming operations. It will change the landscape by causing erosion and greatly impact access. The so-called modelling without final design and detail is just guessing which will effect the costings and suitability.

3/ Directly impact a unique " Endangered Weeping Myall Woodland species" This stand is a unique stand that is surround by cropping land and has been held and managed privately by the one family since the 1930's. It is linked by other woodland corridors all owned and managed privately. These will be severed and greatly impact the safe movement of native wildlife that coexists within these corridors. The endangered Weeping Myalls woodlands is a thriving population, whilst small in area, it is unique because it is protected in this corridor and managed since the 1930. The initial proposal was that 3.05Ha were to be totally removed. But since the crossing loop has been shifted, the proposed impacted area has now doubled to 6.05Ha. This is still an estimate as still lacking final design detail so it could be a bigger area to decimate this endangered Weeping Myalls woodlands  
This continued lack of final design information is causing stress, frustration and concern to those directly affected landholders and the wider community when they are made aware of the details.

4/ Route selection was never discussed publically. We became aware when finally shown drawn on a map. There are **BETTER** options and timeframe criteria is **NOT** valid reason to be discounted and removed. Costing reasoning for route removal **NOT** valid when you consider that initial budget estimates have exploded from low 4 **BILLION** to unsustainable estimates of 24**BILLION** and

**forecasted to rise even further past 35BILLION. As a nation building scheme, it will financially cripple this nation and hamper other more beneficial projects that will achieve greater and quicker return to the Australian community.**

**The aspect of freight subsidies to falsify the rail transport competitiveness of Inland Rail is conveniently missing from most budget figures.**

**The lack of detail is causing distrust and apprehension for the whole project.**

**Finally, again using existing rail line is logical. The Gilgandra/Coonamble line was put through in 1902 so it is tried, proven route, so make sense to use what already works.**