

10th November 2022

Assistant Director – Inland Rail Review Secretariat

Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts
GPO Box 594

CANBERRA ACT 2601

Via email: IR.Review@infrastructure.gov.au

Re: My Personal response to the Independent Review of the delivery of the Inland Rail program

Please find attached an issues analysis to assist the Review in your investigations into the planning and construction of the Inland Rail.

I am concerned with both the 'Brownfield' and 'Greenfield' sections of this project.

Pease se the attached information for your consideration.

Yours sincerely

David Carter

David Carter



Since Inland Rail was given the permission to design and construct this project by the Federal Government, I believe they haven't had the knowledge to understand the needs of primary producers and how they will be affected by the proposed 'Greenfield' sections of this proposed route.

Since IR's conception their principal focus has been to construct a railway line with enough vertical/horizontal clearance with due regard to the natural environment but with little regard to the physical and social environment.

- The natural environment is the impact on the fauna and flora that will be affected
- The Social Environment is the impact on the social fabric, manageability and profitability of the various farming enterprises that the 'greenfield' sections will impact and
- The Physical Environment is the failure by the various Governments, Federal and State, to
 assist IR in improvements to changed Rail-Road Interfaces as a result of IR's need to only
 satisfy the vertical/horizontal clearances needed in order to safely put a train on the track.
 These improvements are needed in order to improve the connectivity of the road network
 to the rail network in order to justify the profitability of this proposed new infrascture
 project.

This review needs to look at both the 'Brownfield' and 'Greenfield' sections in determining the effectiveness of IR in their ability, and the governments inaction to assist them, to construct this very important project.

Brownfield

The major problem with the 'Brownfield' sections is going to be the substandard road-rail interfaces that will be created after IR is built. This is created by IR need to only replace the existing structure with something that suits its own needs, and the Governments need not to support major infrascture change when it would be cheaper to do so while changes are being made.



severely disadvantaged into the future.

An example of this is the road underpass in Junee, it has poor alinement, especially with its increased usage and larger trucks with the bridges 4.5m clearance making it increasing difficult for large trucks to safely transverse this structure. The bridge structure dosen't have the vertical clearances to allow the new trains, that will eventually operate on this new line, to pass each other. IR's solution is to replace the existing double track with a single track. This solution may seem ideal for IR however the community will be

Recommendation:

If the Government, be it Federal or State or both together, were serious about regional connectivity to make the Inland Rail compatible for the future when they would be working with Inland Rail to

make these interfaces work for the benefit of the community and the transport industry into the future.

Greenfield

This is the new built section of railway line built over virgin country. Inland Rail has failed to understand the social fabric as it applies to agriculture. From day 1 the farming community has been asking some basic questions which even today, several years later, the proponent has failed to answer. One would think that they would have these answers by now.

The questions

- What type of fencing are we going to allowed to have.
- What access are we going to have across our property
- What sort of compensation are we going to get

Fencing:

The proponent has developed a fact sheet that describes the fencing that they, IR, are recommending. The designs were totally unsuitable. IR then produced another fact sheet which wasn't much better.

Note: the information that producers need is easily found on Waratah and/or Cyclone fencing products web site. It's not rocket science.

Access:

One of the main things in any farming operation is connectivity across/around their business. To achieve this its important that access across the line is convenient. IR couldn't even supply basic drawings, even though NSW Dept of Agriculture and NSW Main Roads have draft drawings, there only answer was that's its up to them and the producer to sort it out. How can you plan your farming operation when the proponent can't give you any answers. The only solution that they are offering is a stock underpass which is totally unsuitable.

The other problem with access is that some producers won't be getting any and they are going to have to rely on using public/crown roads in order to access the other part of their property. This creates other hassles in relation to biosecurity for their livestock and having to register all their vehicles so that they can get to the rest of their property via these public/crown roads.

Compensation:

It took at least 2 years before it was known that it would be the NSW Act that would be used. Even this Act has problems.

Recommendation:

Inland Rail needs to understand, which they don't, the problems that relate to agricultural. The only way to do this is to personally understand how a property enterprise works and not rely on desktop studies.

Summery:

Inland Rail need to listen to the community, act on the suggestions and understand why the agricultural community is so upset, even though they ae willing to corporate, in principal, about the future need for Inland Rail across the eastern sates of Australia.