

## APPENDIX B

ARTC appear to be able alter its reports after time-lined events. To assist with this inquiry I ask the committee to please consider the following additional information. It specifically deals with the issues experienced for Burroway to Curban on the N2N greenfield section of Inland Rail during the route selection process and ARTCs reporting of that process. I refer primarily to their Route History document - Route History of the Inland Rail from 2006 to 2019 provided by the Australian Rail Track Corporation, which was uploaded to this inquiry's website on Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> May 2021.

This document I believe is the same "original" Route History document I obtained from ARTC's website on the 6<sup>th</sup> February in 2020.

However, for your information, ARTC had edited/changed/updated the contents of this original document (obtained in February 2020 by me and the same one recently uploaded to your website as additional information) since February 2020.

I downloaded their "current" newer version (Route History 2006-2020) this year - in February 2021 - from ARTC's website, at the time of making my objection to the EIS of Inland Rail for Narromine to Narrabri. It is the version assumed ARTC refer to in their EIS document (see A6.2.3 Phase 1 concept design assessment, Options assessment (p.A6-12)) but note the title given in the EIS document is "Melbourne to Brisbane Inland Rail Route History 2006–2019 (ARTC, 2020a)".

It is important for the committee to know the changes between the two versions. Again, the information provided here specifically relates to the Burroway to Curban section of Inland Rail only.

### Differences between the two versions.

The first major difference between the two versions is that the current one on their website is now 126 pages long but the original one I first obtained in the beginning of 2020 (being the same as the one you have now uploaded to your website) is only 112 pages long.....ARTC are obviously able to keep editing/altering their documents without cataloguing on their website previous versions for public viewing. I think and I'm sure you would agree, this only creates more suspicion toward this organisation, especially given the fact that

the original document was created after all the discrepancies and unanswered questions about certain sections (particularly for Burroway to Curban) surfaced with landowners and the community between 2018 and 2019....

I will try and relay the changes to you in the most simplest of terms I know how;

To begin, in the *original* version page 64 has a narrative explanation under the heading “Gilmours Road Alternative option” and basically explains how it came about. In the *current* version, this explanation has been altered and now shown under two headings “2016 Concept Alignment and alternatives” on page 64 and “Gilmours Road alternative” on page 65.

The *original* Version (p.64) states;

“Based on community input near Burroway, a new option further to the east of the 2016 Concept Alignment (Option 109 **on the map to the right**) was considered in the December 2016 MCA as an alternative that would potentially reduce property impacts by following property boundaries and ‘paper’ roads. This was one of two options (the other being the concept alignment) progressed for further consideration. (Paragraph 2)

The analysis found that Option 109 was longer than the concept alignment, and required a total of 94km of greenfield development compared with 86km required for the concept alignment, and presented more issues relating to constructability and environmental impacts. Therefore, the concept alignment remained the preferred option. (Paragraph 3)

Accordingly, ARTC and its technical consultants GHD proposed a refinement of Option 109 (Gilmours Road Alternative) that maintained many of the advantages of Option 109 while being shorter and hence had a higher potential as a reasonable alternative to the concept alignment (shown in orange **on the map to the right**) (Paragraph 4)

The Gilmours Road Alternative (refer to map on page 66), was discussed with landowners and the community in March 2017 and April 2017 and assessed in the May 2017 MCA workshop. (Paragraph 5)

While landowners did not support either the concept alignment or the Gilmours Road Alternative option, ARTC and its technical consultants considered the latter offered several benefits when compared with both Option 109 and the 2016 concept alignment even though it is slightly longer than the 2016 concept alignment. (Paragraph 6)

ARTC considered that if a superior alignment to the concept alignment were to be found in this section it would more likely be to the east rather than the west of the concept alignment. Accordingly, the concept alignment and Gilmours Road Alternative were subsequently used as the western and eastern boundaries of the Narromine to Narrabri study area endorsed by the Australian Government, so that more detailed investigations in this area could be done.” (Paragraph 7)

\* The map referred to as being “to the right” is *apparently from* the December 2016 MCA Workshop Report and is titled as such This same map appears also

in the *current* version (page 64) however in this newer version arrows now point to “Gilmours Rd” (the concept alignment) and Eumungerie Rd (Option 101).

I’d like to emphasise two things from this section of this *original* Route History document;

1. The map on the right in fact **is not from** the December 2016 MCA workshop report because it does not show “Option 108” another alternative option apparently considered in that MCA workshop of December 2016. Option 108 – Watershed appeared in all of the maps showing all of the alternatives considered for the Narromine to Curban section in the Dec 2016 MCA Workshop Report. This map has been changed to specifically not include this alternative! Maybe we should wonder why a map without 108 on it needs to be included in this document instead, is there a need by ARTC to alter what had already been evidenced in previous MCA Reports?

2. ARTC do not acknowledge in the paragraphs above the **real facts us landowners experienced for Burroway to Curban;**

- The findings of the December 2016 MCA Workshop Report were never consulted on with landowners at all – including the existence even of Option 109.

- Landowners in fact were **never** made aware of any of the other four options (at least 109, 108, 112 and 113) considered for the Burroway to Curban section from the December 2016 MCA Workshop Report.

- Option 109 was recommended in the Dec 2016 MCA Report to progress for further consideration with landowners and community once consultations commenced – ARTC did not do this! ARTC in paragraph 2 above say “This was one of two options (the other being the concept alignment) progressed for further consideration” – **False**, this statement is a deliberate attempt to mislead because Option 109 was never presented at all for consultation with landowners in 2017 – the existence of this option was not known at all to landowners! ARTC failed in their duty and did not carry out their own recommendations from workshops that the government and community is lead to believe.

- Paragraph 3 refers to an analysis comparing Option 109 to the concept alignment and states “the concept alignment remained the preferred

option” ....When did this so called analysis occur? Because the Dec 2016 MCA Workshop Report **actually** concluded that Option 109 scored a higher MCA when compared to the concept alignment and is the recommended option for further consultation! Statements like this by ARTC are attempting to mislead and are dishonest!

- In paragraph 4 their statement “GHD proposed a refinement of Option 109” is again **false**. Gilmours Rd Alternative (including Mawbeys Rd) is a completely different path to Option 109. Option 109 **never** was the Gilmours Road Alternative path – it is a path further East of both the concept alignment and Gilmours Rd Alternative! See map on page 66.

- ARTC studied Gilmours Rd Alternative (including Mawbey’s Rd) instead of Option 109 as recommended by their own Dec 2016 MCA Workshop! They studied a completely different path, going **against** their own workshop recommendations. ARTC chose to consult only on the Gilmours Rd Alternative path as the only other available alternative to the concept alignment (which is documented as arising from a landowner suggestion) and never informed landowners of all the available alternatives. Their process was **interfered** with!

- This Gilmours Rd Alternative which included Mawbey’s Rd was the only path presented to landowners on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2017. This path changed **or was refined** to become the Gilmours Rd Alternative now known as “Option B”. It changed by no longer including Mawbey’s road but now included Old Mill Rd instead.

- Paragraph 5 refers to the new Gilmours Rd Alternative (Old Mill Rd) Option B and infers it “(refer to map on page 66), was discussed with landowners and the community in March 2017 and April 2017 and assessed in the May 2017 MCA workshop.” Another **false** and **dishonest** statement – because the option presented to landowners on a map included Mawbey’s Rd and is not shown as such in any maps referenced by ARTC in reports.

- We furthermore question the MCA scores given and used in this May 2017 MCA Workshop because the path presented to landowners was different to this new path known as Option B....

- For your information, there is in **fact** no Map in any report that actually shows the map of the Gilmours Rd Alternative which included Mawbey’s Rd presented to landowners on the 5<sup>th</sup> April 2017 (only one month prior to final MCA of May 2017). All ARTC reports show the refined Gilmours Rd Alternative including Old Mill Rd – otherwise known as Option B. A deliberate attempt by

ARTC to **hide** the **wrongdoings** of our consultation process – not providing accurate and precise information. Misleading!

-ARTC never mentioned Option 109 and never showed us any other alternative besides this Gilmours Rd Alternative (Mawbeys Rd) and the 2016 Concept Alignment. We were not even advised that at this stage that Option 101 had been discarded (see Dec 2016 MCA Workshop Report)

- The findings of the December 2016 MCA Report were never relayed to landowners and its release date to the public via ARTC's website did not occur until approx June 2018 – 18 months after the workshop occurred.

In the *current* version on page 64;

Now some of the other options of the December 2016 MCA Workshop get mentioned. It is stated;

“....The more easterly part of Option 101, together with Options 111, 112 and 113, were discounted from further assessment on the basis that they all added distance and transit time” (see paragraph 2 p 64)

Note again - no mention is made here of Option 108 (another Dec 2016 MCA option) because it doesn't appear on the map of this document, but it **actually** was included in the actual map from that Dec 2016 MCA workshop report...

In the *current* version on page 65;

It is stated;

“While landowners in general did not support either the modified concept alignment or the Gilmours Road Alternative (identified as option B **in the accompanying map on this page**), ARTC and its technical consultants considered the latter offered several benefits when compared with both Option 109 and the concept alignment even though it is slightly longer than the 2016 concept alignment. (Paragraph 3)

The comparison between Option B and the modified concept alignment are summarised in the comparative analyses found on pages 66 and 67. The benefits of Option B over Option 109 included that it was shorter while still essentially following property boundaries to a greater extent than did the concept alignment. **Option B also scored slightly higher in the MCA analysis compared to Option 109.**” (Paragraph 4)

\* The Map referred to is **apparently** from the “May 2017 MCA workshop report showing the Gilmours Rd Alternative option.”

This same Map is used as a reference also in the *original* ARTC document (see page 66).

This map used in both documents clearly shows 2016 Concept Alignment (Gilmours Rd), Gilmours Rd Alternative (Option B) and Option 109. However, a reference is now made to a “Modified 2016 Concept Alignment (east of Narromine)” in the *current* version.

For your information;

- This map **did not** come from the May 2017 MCA Report as referenced. See all maps on pages ii, 2, and 9 from that report showing the Burroway to Curban section.
- This map **did not** exist at the time of the May 2017 MCA Report.
- In **fact** Option 109 was not referenced or mentioned at all in that Workshop Report of May 2017.
- This map, comparing 2016 concept alignment, Option B and Option 109, **dose not** exist in any prior reports of ARTC even at the time of Chester’s approval. It only appears in the Route History documents 2006-2019(original version) and 2006-2020(current version).
- The Narromine to Narrabri Options Report November 2017 does not even show a comparison (see pages 19 and 27). In **fact** the map on page 19 clearly shows only Option 109 and the 2016 concept alignment and is titled “Figure 12 December 2017 (?) MCA outcome”. However option 109 was never consulted on! Furthermore this options report does not even mention options 108 or 113 and there is **no map** at all showing all of the options for Burroway to Curban as reviewed in Dec 2016 MCA in this November Options Report - but there are maps for other sections! There appears to be a **clear intent** to not disclose all information for Burroway to Curban – why?
- In **fact**, this map (now produced and shown in the Route History documents) was created as a result of a request made by a NSW Farmers employee acting/assisting on the behalf of myself and other landowners whilst we were gathering information specific to our area for the Senate Estimates hearing to be held in Feb 2019. This map was requested because there was no official map of ARTC showing Gilmours Rd Alternative side by side with the concept alignment and also Option 109. We were wanting to show that the Gilmours Rd Alternative was not Option 109 as we believe ARTC neglected to study the

recommended and correct corridor as evaluated in the December 2016 MCA. We only became aware of the Dec 2016 MCA Report findings in the second half of 2018 – this report was not available to landowners prior to this. Landowners were deliberately **not** kept informed!

- This map was therefore *only* created by ARTC well after all the discrepancies and questions were brought to attention by landowners, especially after the release of the Dec 2016 MCA Workshop Report by ARTC in approx June 2018.

In summary for this part – a refresh for the reader;

- \* Option 109, along with all the other options for Burroway to Curban from the Dec 2016 MCA Workshop Report were never shown to landowners and community.

- \* Any maps showing Option 109 or the other options of the Dec 2016 MCA and the May 2017 MCA Workshop Report findings were **never** shown to landowners in the lead up to Minister Chester's approval (November 2017) – **crucial evidence!**

- \* Landowners did not know Option 109, 108, 112 and 113 were even alternatives considered in the Dec 2016 MCA Report for Burroway to Curban.

- \* Landowners were not given an opportunity to declare that Option B in the May 2017 MCA had been changed by ARTC from Mawbey's Rd to Old Mill Rd, prior to Chester's approval – MCA scores would not be reflective of this!

- \* The recommendations of the Dec 2016 MCA Workshop Report were never carried out by ARTC.

- \* No proper and/or thorough consultation and alternative route selection process was carried out for Burroway to Curban.

- \* ARTC failed in their duty.

- \* We believe ARTC are now deliberately misleading the government, community and landowners by creating this document and these altered maps, referencing past MCA Workshops. They are falsifying information.

- \* Interference we believe was definitely experienced in the Burroway to Curban section.

Further Analysis of the Of the Route History documents:

In the *current* version on page 66;

A diagram is used to show the alternative routes evaluated under N2N Route Option Analysis: Narromine to Curban

This Diagram also appears in the *original* version on page 65. However, the Diagram and its narrative information has been edited and changed for the *current* version;

- The left hand side (LHS) of the diagram refers to the “HIGH LEVEL COMMUNITY/ STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION” it flows to the point of “ESTABLISH STUDY AREA” and then the right hand side (RHS) of the diagram refers to the “INCREASING LEVEL OF DETAILED CONSULTATION WITH LANDOWNERS AS IT BECOMES CLEARER AS TO WHO WILL ACTUALLY BE IMPACTED”.

In the *original* version, no right hand side analysis had been conducted. In the *current* version editing on this side now appears. However, the information on the LHS has been altered as well – differing from the *original* version.

In the *current* version on page 67;

Under the title N2N Route Option Analysis: Narromine to Curban, An explanation referring to comparative results has been changed from stating “not considered feasible” (in the original version p.66) to now “not considered desirable for reasons of time and distance” in the current version.

Visually the main difference between this page’s comparative analysis as opposed to the *original* version (on page 66) is an expansion of the Tabled columns but **more importantly the title** of the compared routes from Narromine to Curban has now changed on the table shown.

The comparison in this table is used and referred to in Paragraph 4 on page 65 of the *current* version.

This Paragraph 4 is a new paragraph, an additional paragraph added – not previously included in the *original* version. It states “The comparison between Option B and the modified concept alignment are summarised in the comparative analyses found on pages 66 and 67. The benefits of Option B over Option 109 included that it was shorter while still essentially following property boundaries to a greater extent than did the concept alignment. **Option B also scored slightly higher in the MCA analysis compared to Option 109.”**



Why is it necessary that ARTC alter their documents? There should be no change in information at all from the original version to the current version, basically because all of that so-called consultation process and the collating of that information by them for that Phase 1 has already passed. The only reason one can assume as to why they need to change that information is because of the discrepancies brought to attention since the end of that Phase 1. They are changing information as a need to justify their wrong doing and to make it look like they did their job correctly (especially according to their own recommendations from MCA Reports). They are simply *falsifying information to make it fit!*

For your consideration;

In the current version on p67:

First column of Table titled “Modified Concept Alignment. Narromine to Curban (east around Narromine)” has changed from the original version title which was “Concept Alignment. Narromine to Curban (west around Narromine)” although all the information in that column regarding distance, Service Offering/Transit time and Construction Cost remain the same in both versions....this should be investigated – is this correct?

Second column of Table titled “Narromine to Curban via Gilgandra (Option 101, (east of 109)), 112, 113)” has changed also from the original version title which was “Narromine to Curban via Gilgandra”. Importantly it should be noted;

-this new heading now includes Option 101 (east of 109), 112 and 113.

- the MCA score (-3.56) is not a true representation of all the titled options included in that actual scoring. This causes confusion and is misleading. ARTC are incorrectly tabling route options with scores!

The Dec 2016 MCA Workshop Report gave a -3.56 MCA score for Option 101 only which was a combination of Eumungerie Rd and the Dubbo to Coonamble line to Curban. Different scores from the Dec 2016 Workshop Report exist, for example, for option 112. This option 112 is a combination of option 101 and a section of option 113 creating a Gilgandra bypass. It scored -2.04 in that workshop (see p.23) – so including these alternatives under this title is wrong and incorrectly showing study information. We do not think this score is a true reflection of those alternatives in this title for Burroway to Curban.

Furthermore, landowners requested ARTC investigate early on in the Burroway to Curban section that the Eumungerie Road alignment from Burroway continue to possibly join a corridor on the western side of the Newell highway allowing inland rail to skirt around the western side of Gilgandra and link back up to the Dubbo to Coonamble line – especially as an alternative if the Dubbo to Coonamble existing line could not be fully utilised (because of grade separation of the Newell Highway). A petition stating this preference was handed to ARTC but not documented anywhere by them after Chester’s approval. This request by landowners was a possibility we later found out, after the release of the Dec 2016 MCA Report in approximately June 2018, by using a combination of option 101 and Option 113. However Option 113 was discarded along with option 108 in that MCA and considered not important enough to be evaluated by Workshop attendees – personal opinions of attendees or interference?

Therefore, a combination of option 101 and option 113’s entire section was never fully assessed and this column’s reference to it in this title only infers option 113 was studied – which is not true!

Also, in paragraph 2 (see page 64 of *current* version) ARTC state “The more easterly part of Option 101, together with Options 111, 112 and 113, were discounted from further assessment on the basis that they all added distance and transit time” this is not the correct reasoning as given in the MCA of Dec 2016. Please note again they don’t mention option 108 at all here – however option 108’s name does appear in the comparison diagram of page 66 (current version) and page 65 (original version) under unviable MCA options.

Third & Fourth Columns (*current* version) are an expansion of the *original* version’s third column. The third column is now titled “Eumungerie Rd (Option 109) and the fourth column is now titled “Gilmours Rd Alternative (Option B). In the *original* version the third column was called “Eumungerie Rd / Gilmours Rd Alternative option (east around Narrommine)”

\* The biggest issue here is the MCA scores (relative to Concept Alignment) shown. They are incorrect and do not reflect at all to the original scores of the MCA Workshops held in Dec 2016 and May 2017. *The scores are incorrect and have been changed - False and misleading!*

The correct scores from the applicable MCA Workshops are:

From the Dec 2016 MCA Workshop Report:

**Option 109 = +0.69** (see page 23) – Note this Option’s score of +0.69 is not shown anywhere on either the original or current version of the Route History documents.

From the May 2017 MCA Workshop Report:

Narromine to Burroway – **Eumungerie Rd Option = +0.55** (see pages ii, iii, 8 and 28) – Note this option is only scored +0.43 and is shown as:

Eumungerie Rd +0.43 in the original version, and

Eumungerie Rd – **Option 109** +0.43 – *falsely titled and underscored in the current version – down from +0.69 in the Dec 2016 MCA Workshop Report!! They have in tried to include option 109 as part of the Narromine to Curban option in this table, when in fact it was a specific option assessed for Burroway to Curban section only in the applicable MCA workshop. Again, falsifying information!*

Burroway to Curban – **Gilmours Rd Alternative Option = +0.43** (see pages ii, iii, 11 and 31) – Note this option is *falsely scored higher at +0.55* and is shown as ;

Gilmours Rd Alternative +0.55 in the original version, and

Gilmours Rd Alternative – Option B +0.55 in the current version

*Note : No mention of Option 109 is made and it’s score from the Dec 2016 MCA of +0.69 included on either table! Page 66 from the original version and page 67 from the current version has been attached at the end of this document for your reference.*

In **fact**, Option 109 had the highest MCA score for our area from the December 2016 MCA Workshop. It was recommended to be taken further for consultation and it wasn’t. ARTC’s statement in Paragraph 4 on page 65 of the *current* version of Route History 2006-2020 is incorrect. It is wrong and dishonest for them to say “Option B also scored slightly higher in the MCA analysis compared to Option 109.” – *when in fact the opposite was true!*

When ARTC change their document contents as outlined in this way – it only creates suspicion and doubt toward the accuracy, reliability and truthfulness of their reports and actions. Altering past information can only be seen as some kind of cover up.

These correct scores pointed out as assessed in the MCA Workshops surely help confirm that ARTCs ultimate decisions and the rationality used to

determine their chosen study corridor for the Burroway to Curban section was not as they have made it appear. The way they have falsified information in this Route History document and the changes they have made from the original to the current version is unacceptable. The organisation cannot be trusted and their findings should not be relied on, especially as being justified.

Landowners and community believe mateship agreements – you help me and I'll help you arrangements - unfortunately have chosen the greenfield route through our Burroway to Curban section. Some local council representatives and the positioning of their own properties along with that of political party candidates and the assistance given by political members and some landowners (who has friendships with them) has undoubtedly interfered with ARTCs route selection process for our area. Alternatives were entirely discarded and recommendations not followed because of interference. The livelihoods of many affected landowners and community significantly impacted for the benefit of others who hold the power to negotiate or have someone negotiate for them.

---

PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENTS:

- Attachment 1 of 2 inlandrail-route-history-2006-2019 - original version p66
- Attachment 2 of 2 route-history-2006-2020 - current version p 67