



Weealla

MERINOS & POLL MERINO STUD



www.weealla.com

Assistant Director – Inland Rail Review Secretariat,
Dept of Infrastructure Transport, Regional Development
Communications and the Arts
GPO Box 594,
Canberra

Independent Review Submission.

Dear Sir/Madam,

We OBJECT to The Inland Rail project in its current form and welcome this review.

We are a family operation running three properties along [REDACTED], which is in the Narromine to Narrabri section of Inland Rail. We have submitted previous submissions voicing our concerns with the project. We are a grazing and cropping enterprise as well as a Merino & Poll Merino Stud, and sell Rams, Ewes & Semen internationally and have won the Australian Supreme Merino Ram twice, this is a prestigious award among the Merino Stud Industry. We have two properties in the focus area, either side of Milpulling Road. We use Milpulling Road to get from one property to the other. The interruption of having a train also running through our property Brooklyn” will be detrimental to our lambing ewes. When there is an existing track that was an option, but because it takes longer, the Government has bowed down to big business.

The proposed track is bypassing towns, which means there will be of no benefit for businesses to grow.

Having the proposed Inland Rail track going through our properties will impact our business, by adding significant cost. ARTC do not realise that a farmer can have 2 properties adjoining each other in other family names and that they interact with each other. I am on the Gilgandra CCC, we still don't get questions answered, it's about listening to ARTC power point presentations then not having the time for questions.

1. *How could ARTC improve its management arrangements and structures to better facilitate the delivery of the Inland Rail Program? Listen to the local knowledge from farmers. They work the land and know, how the land works. ARTC have not listened to this knowledge, taking desktop studies as their reference. This review should focus on “greenfield” routes and the MCA implications of those decisions, and analysis what are the benefits to those areas.*

There are other routes that reduce the danger of flooding and improved economic outcomes, other than the one they have chosen. 24 hours travel time is their objective the two ends from port to port are still not connected as yet. We hope the review looks into the 24hr parameter for ARTC's decisions.

2. How could Inland Rail and access to intermodal terminals create new opportunities and benefits for your region/industry/community?

Inland Rail can benefit the community and regional Australia by going on the existing track, going close to towns to access intermodal terminals, instead of on greenfield disrupting prime agricultural farmland and costing taxpayers more money, initially there were other good route options nearer towns so the towns could benefit why not use them.

3. Do you consider ARTC's approach to engaging communities on the route is fit-for-purpose? How could ARTC improve its engagement with communities and stakeholders along the route in regard to the processes used to consider benefits and impacts?

This CANNOT be fixed we have no trust in ARTC, there has been lies spoken, and unskilled people trying to tell us what will happen. Be honest and truthful with landholders. Inland Rail is not fit for purpose, when only 9% of agriculture products will be carried on the track There are a lot of unanswered questions, but ARTC, expect landholders to make decisions pending threat of compulsory acquisition.

4. What has ARTC done well in engaging with communities, including addressing community concerns? In what ways could ARTC improve its communication and engagement processes with communities and stakeholders

ARTC sponsor many organisations in the town to get townspeople on board, but forget that it's not towns people they need to get on board.

With Stakeholders stop sending people out that don't know what they are talking about. Send someone who can answer queries on the spot. Send someone who listens to concerns, and act upon them.

Get Inland Rail back on the existing Coonamble rail, where it was one of the original routes. Melbourne to Narromine is on 90% of existing track, and to save ten minutes in the Narromine to Narrabri section they have to build a greenfield track through prime agricultural land, disrupting people's livelihood.

We do hope this independent review will find in favour of common sense and that ARTC need to go back to the drawing board and look at alternative routes, MCA values, flooding issues and listen to local knowledge. We welcome The Review Panel to visit the greenfield sites so you can get a better understanding of the disruption this track will cause, when there are alternatives.

Yours

DK KA SD McBurnie

