

## PIR Response – Timothy Crutchett

The PIR directs readers to the original chapter 5 of the EIS (unchanged) in regard to the ARTC's engagement practices. Within this it states:

*ARTC is committed to active engagement in accordance with the International Association for Public Participation's (IAP2) Spectrum of Public Participation (2018). Further detail on the IAP2's Spectrum, and the targeted approach to engagement, can be found in section 3 of Appendix F: Engagement report. ARTC's overarching strategy to communication and engagement is designed to:*

- o *build trust: through quality engagement and interactions with our stakeholders, including landowners and communities. Providing stakeholders with meaningful avenues for input and **accurate honest information**. This allows them to have some certainty about what is happening and what they can expect so that they can make appropriate plans and decisions*
- o *build credibility: through strong, **timely engagement** with key government and organisational stakeholders and communications to the wider community, including an increased focus on the events and milestones, and development*
- o *build visibility: through broader communications and marketing, including active participation in, and/or support for, local and regional community events as well as broader industry conferences.*

What is the ARTC's definition of "active engagement" in regard to the International Association for Public Participation's Spectrum of Public Participation?

It feels like we're getting passed around with lines such as "Where exceedances of the relevant air quality criteria are predicted as a result of planned Inland Rail operations (i.e. Inland Rail trains and consequential alterations to other train services), a review of relevant operating procedures will be undertaken, including consultation with the train operating companies to explore options to reduce train operation's contribution. " In the PIR. Passing the buck.

How is it fair that I have had barely any time to read the 2,531 pages of data, plus cross referencing 4,500+ pages of data from the EIS, to then come and ask questions siloed by one-on-one conversations, when a community forum might mend a few of these strained relationships ARTC seem to have made with the community? How long does ARTC have to respond to our responses to the PIR? They gave themselves 414 days last time when they only have us 42 days. Will there be an extension to the abysmally short turnaround that we're given for this PIR?

PIR 5.2 ongoing communications – How will ARTC actually stay on top of this? They have proven themselves inept to manage community engagement up until this date. The PIR does not cover how they will address previous issues, and how they are to improve their current forms of communication.

How does the error of my property apparently being 63m from the railway, but more accurately being 40m from the railway affect the “Estimated safe working distance for cosmetic structural damage”?

How can I respond to the ARTC’s response to submissions? The language used was patronising, and didn’t adequately respond to my concerns. Are there other avenues?

The ARTC has replied to the responses to the EIS from the community in their “Response to submissions report” in what can only be described as quite demeaning and belittling language. When issues of poor communication was raised, their response is to talk in circles, directing the reader to Appendix F of the EIS, as if that wasn’t read in the first instance. My EIS submission stated such lines as:

*“In appendix F, the ARTC states that their approach to communication and engagement is to ensure engagement activities meet the needs of community and stakeholders. Section 3.2 lists reasons and principals of engagement such as inclusivity, transparency, equitability, accessibility to name a few.”*

And

*“The advertising of ALL of the community sessions leaves a lot to be desired. I signed up for email information four times and received nothing. I have searched all folders in my inbox for anything related to ARTC, with only one recent result for the online session (13<sup>th</sup> September 2022). I signed up early on at the Wagga Marketplace when I stumbled upon a community information session (I was not informed of this session even though I live and work 25 meters away from the railway), I signed up online via a QR code that was sent to our house that took me to an online form. After receiving nothing, I signed up again on said online form and have given my email address, name, and residential address to an ARTC spokesperson on the 18<sup>th</sup> of August 2022 at the EIS launch/session in the Wagga Wagga Library.”*

This was apparently rectified by Nathaniel Boehringer on the 13<sup>th</sup> of September after the online session, with an email from him stating:

*Hi Tim,*

*Thanks for your attendance last night.*

*I checked our system to find that you were not on our e-news distribution lists. If you had previously signed up, sorry that there has been a technical error.*

*I have since added you, so please be reassured you will receive all A2I community enews going forward.*

*Regards,*

*Nathaniel Boehringer*

*Stakeholder Engagement Advisor – NSW*

Let's now fast-forward to the 22<sup>nd</sup> of November, 2023. I go to the information session scheduled on this date from 12-4pm at the Wagga City Library, only to be notified on arrival that the session has been postponed and emails were sent out. No such email was received. This is a direct example of ARTC's poor communication with the community, and total disregard for accountability by sending those who may disagree to "appendix F". ARTC stating in the response to submissions that "The engagement for the proposal has been carried out in accordance with the SEARs and relevant engagement guidelines, most notably Undertaking Engagement Guidelines for State Significant Projects (DPE, 2021a)" is either a down-right lie or massive oversight. They continue to gaslight the NSW DPE by stating that they have followed due process, whilst contradicting their own words and policies.

The PIR states that (5.2):

*Ongoing consultation with the community and key stakeholders will be held in the lead up to, and during, construction (should the proposal be approved), with the following objectives:*

- *landowners, community and stakeholders have a high level of awareness of all processes and advanced notice of activities associated with the proposal*
- *accurate and accessible information is made available*
- *a timely response is given to issues and concerns raised by the community*

Again, how does ARTC's inability to communicate with stakeholders hold up here? I was not informed of the community information session date and time change prior to arrival at Wagga City Council. It was confirmed by an ARTC representative who was there inform the community that it wasn't on, that I should have received an email and that I am in the system correctly. This is the fifth time that a representative of ARTC has had to "look into" what is going on with their email system. I receive newsletters, community surveys, and other emails from ARTC, but they fail to keep me updated. I am just one of the 96 out of 145 responders that object the proposal. How many more aren't receiving relevant information? Section 5.2 of the PIR does not attempt to quell the concerns of lack of communication, and again is trying to brush any sort of complaint such as this under the carpet.

With only less than 5% (4.26%) of responses for the proposal, and an apparent (yet unproven) planned protest for the original Wagga information session that was supposed to be held on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of November, how can the language used by ARTC still be so insensitive to those issues raised? The blatant gaslighting and redirection that is apparent in the response to submissions and PIR is shameful. Not once does ARTC employ empathetic practices to collaborate with the community and empower residents to be part of the decision making (see ARTC's own spectrum for public participation as first seen in FIGURE F3-1 IAP2 SPECTRUM FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION from the EIS).

Now, are you a "sensitive receiver" Tim, I hear you ask. The PIR is very clear in detailing that my residence is affected by proposed pathway adjustments, proposed track realignment, directly opposite an access point during construction, on a construction route, amongst others. The utter lack of communication and understanding from ARTC is despicable. Does this make me a sensitive receiver as per ARTC's glossary?

6.2.2.1 of the PIR states:

*“Sensitive receivers, as described in the Rail Infrastructure Noise Guideline, are those that may be sensitive to noise and vibration levels, which includes residential dwellings, educational institutions, childcare centres, medical facilities and places of worship. Approximately 28,969 buildings within 2 km of the rail corridor between Albury and Illabo were identified as being potential noise- and vibration-sensitive receivers, with the majority being identified as residential properties.”*

The table found in appendix D part 2 has my “Sensitive residential receptors triggering review of mitigation”, ie. My house (215746), as 63 meters from the A2I alignment, and I have that as more like 40 meters. It’s 63 meters from the back (north side) of my property, but 40m from the front (south side). How accurate is this data?



When I sent an inquiry through ARTC's webform, the following was received:

*Hi Timothy,*

*Thank you for submitting an enquiry regarding the operational noise assessment for your property.*

*We have reviewed the distance of your property from the railway line and agree that it is less than the 63m documented in the assessment. SLR (noise consultant) advised that the distances in the tables on page 68 (Part 2 Appendix D) were extracted from the noise model. The intention was to present the distance from the closest building façade but in your case the distance is from the northern façade which is further set back from the railway. The mistake occurred due to the large dataset; the noise model includes over 28,000 buildings. We will review the distances to ensure they're correct for future assessments during detailed design.*

*SLR have confirmed that this issue does not impact the results presented in the report and the closest prediction point in the model is 43m from the main line.*

*We look forward to meeting you at the Wagga information session on Tuesday evening at the Kyeamba Smith Hall. We will have our noise specialists at the event who can sit down with you and talk about your property and further discuss any questions you might have.*

*Thank you again for your enquiry. Hope you have a good weekend.*

*Kind Regards,*

*Stakeholder Engagement Team*

*Albury to Illabo*

I thought I should look into this further. Surely it's just one aberration in the dataset, right?

Address	Listed distance from A2I alignment (m)	Approx. true distance from A2I alignment (m)	Difference (m)
12 Donnelly Ave.	63	40*/43 (see email from ARTC)	20
10 Donnelly Ave.	65	39*	26
8 Donnelly Ave.	51	38*	13
6 Donnelly Ave.	61	37*	24
4 Donnelly Ave.	65	36*	29
2 Donnelly Ave.	62	35*	27

\*Data calculated using intramaps

(<https://maps.wagga.nsw.gov.au/intramaps99/default.htm?project=WaggaEx>). See below example:



How were the noise impacts, air quality assessments and vibration assessments modelled and calculated? If distance was not part of the calculation, was each sensitive receiver monitored for how long of a period? Since sound waves carry its energy through a two-dimensional or three-dimensional medium, the intensity of the sound wave decreases with increasing distance from the source. Have the numbers been fudged to play in the favour of the ARTC? Also, how are we sure this data is correct if there is this much discrepancy in distance alone? How can we trust these sources? I don't have time to go through all of the data (2,531 pages) before the 7th of December.

EIS Chapter 15:

### 15.6.3 Ground-borne noise

Based on the train speeds for each precinct, the following offsets have been calculated as the distance ground-borne noise assessment criteria are predicted to be met:

- ▶ Albury precinct: 45 m
- ▶ Greater Hume–Lockhart precinct: 45 m
- ▶ Wagga Wagga precinct: 48 m
- ▶ Junee precinct: 45 m

With the majority of residential receivers located at a distance of approximately 45 m or greater from the track, across the modelled enhancement sites, the residential night-time period ground-borne noise criterion of  $L_{Amax,(slow)}$  35 dBA would be achieved.

The receivers where the ground-borne noise trigger levels are predicted to be exceeded are:

- ▶ Riverina Highway bridge enhancement site: Three of the Scots School Albury buildings are within 40 m of the proposed track lowering
- ▶ Henty Yard clearances enhancement site: Three residential receivers are located within 35 m of the track realignment work.

The airborne noise levels during train pass-by events are, however, predicted to be the dominant noise contribution at these receivers. As such, the RING methodology does not require further consideration of ground-borne noise at these receivers.

ARTC released the EIS (a 4000+ page series of documents) for the community to respond to in an originally 28 day period, only to handsomely extend this response period to a whopping 42 days. ARTC then gave themselves 414 days to respond to the community. We now have 21 days to respond to 2,531 pages of data. As the ARTC's PIR suggest us to look at chapter 5 (engagement) of the EIS in regard to this, so I quote:

*ARTC is committed to active engagement in accordance with the International Association for Public Participation's (IAP2) Spectrum of Public Participation (2018). Further detail on the IAP2's Spectrum, and the targeted approach to engagement, can be found in section 3 of Appendix F: Engagement report. ARTC's overarching strategy to communication and engagement is designed to:*

- *build trust: through quality engagement and interactions with our stakeholders, including landowners and communities. Providing stakeholders with meaningful avenues for input and **accurate honest information**. This allows them to have some certainty about what is happening and what they can expect so that they can make appropriate plans and decisions*
- *build credibility: through strong, **timely engagement** with key government and organisational stakeholders and communications to the wider community, including an increased focus on the events and milestones, and development*
- *build visibility: through broader communications and marketing, including active participation in, and/or support for, local and regional community events as well as broader industry conferences.*

Accurate honest information. Incorrect (see data above).

Timely engagement. Incorrect (414 days to respond to the community's concerns).

Through multiple attempts as a stakeholder or *sensitive receiver* I have tried to be open to receive communications. Time and time again they have proved utterly incompetent in trying to facilitate genuine conversations with those directly affected by the A2I project. Their EIS, response to submissions and PIR are filled with lies in regard to communication with those of us living meters from the A2I project.

ARTC are happy to write that they are ticking all of the boxes to rush these approvals through NSW DPE, while gaslighting the communities and I cant sit here and not say anything. I have a well-documented list of contradictions from the ARTC (as seen in my response to EIS). I do not trust that they are acting in the best interests of anyone but themselves.