

Our Ref: PJH:1143732

23 September 2022

The Hon. Anthony Roberts, MP  
Minister for Planning  
Department of Planning and Environment  
Locked Bag 5022  
PARRAMATTA NSW 2124

**Submitted via the NSW planning portal**

This document, including any attachments, may contain privileged and confidential information intended only for the addressee named above. If you are not the intended recipient please notify us. Any unauthorised use, distribution or reproduction of the content of this document is expressly forbidden.

Dear Minister Roberts

**Letter of objection to the Preferred Infrastructure Report for State significant infrastructure application SSI-9487 Inland Rail – Narromine to Narrabri**

1. We act for NSW Farmers in relation to the Narromine to Narrabri Project part of the Inland Rail Project (**N2N Project**) which is the subject of State significant infrastructure application SSI-9487 (**N2N SSI**).
2. The Australian Rail Track Corporation Ltd (**ARTC**) is the proponent for the N2N Project.
3. The Department of Planning and Environment (the **Department**) has sought submissions in response to the Response to Submissions Report (the **RtS**) and the Preferred Infrastructure Report (**PIR**) by 23 September 2022.
4. In preparing this submission we have had an opportunity to review the RtS and the PIR against our original objections (**Original Objections**) in response to the Environmental Impact Statement (**EIS**). We have also considered the feedback from the members listed in **Annexure A** at two meetings at Curban Hall on 19 September 2022 and in Narromine on 20 September 2022.
5. In our Original Objections we identified a number of specific concerns relating to the N2N SSI as it then stood. These were:
  - (a) the **flooding and hydrology** modelling used in the EIS is grossly inadequate and does not reflect the lived experiences of the landowners in the area, meaning that there is a significant threat of serious and irreversible environmental damage, as well as risks to people and property arising from the N2N Project;

Adelaide  
Brisbane  
Canberra  
Darwin  
Hobart  
Melbourne  
Norwest  
Perth  
Sydney

Doc ID 993059703/v1

Level 14, Australia Square, 264-278 George Street, Sydney NSW 2000 Australia  
GPO Box 5408, Sydney NSW 2001 Australia

Telephone +61 2 9334 8555  
Facsimile 1300 369 656 (Australia) +61 2 8507 6584 (International)  
hwlebsworth.com.au

ABN 37 246 549 189

- (b) the **groundwater** assessment is perfunctory at best and is inadequate in demonstrating that critical long-term impacts on groundwater resources resulting from drawdown will not occur;
- (c) insufficient consideration has been paid to the impacts of the proposal on **soils and erosion**, despite the fact that the proposal site is situated in prime agricultural farm land that is highly prized for its productivity;
- (d) the failure to conduct a proper **cost benefit analysis** in selecting the proposed route alignment, in favour of a misleading multi-criteria analysis which favours time saving over the provision of tangible and enduring benefits to regional communities;
- (e) the **ecological assessment** is deficient and does not adequately identify the scope of the impacts of the proposal on biodiversity, despite the huge amounts of clearing of native vegetation that is proposed in the N2N SSI;
- (f) the **noise and vibration assessments** for both the construction and operation of the N2N Project are significantly flawed in that they fail to identify the actual impacts by reference to the existing conditions, they do not adequately consider the impacts on sleep disturbance, and they fail to commit to appropriate attenuation treatments to mitigate acoustic impacts at sensitive receiver locations;
- (g) the failure to carry out a proper **visual impact assessment** by unreasonably restricting the scope of the assessment, not providing an appropriate number of photomontages and by drawing conclusions based on unfounded assertions;
- (h) the refusal to meaningfully address **access, fragmentation and severance** issues and opportunities to avoid these impacts, thereby causing significant adverse impacts to existing farming operations and rendering some businesses unviable;
- (i) the failure to meaningfully consider the impact of the rail line on the **farming capacity** of the district and **existing agricultural land uses** leading to enduring impacts on the productivity of an entire region in perpetuity;
- (j) the failure to carry out a fulsome quantitative assessment of the **air quality impacts** arising from the operation of the N2N Project, including assessment of a range of potential pollutants;
- (k) the proponent's misguided approach to **compulsory acquisition** and the nature of the impacts that can be appropriately compensated and those that cannot; and
- (l) the inadequacy of the proponent's proposed **fencing standards** which has practical implications in relation to the impacts of the proposal on existing land uses.

6. At the outset, we wish to make clear that NSW Farmers do not object to the Inland Rail Project itself and would support a version of the N2N Project which

appropriately avoided, mitigated and managed the impacts of the project and provided key benefits to the communities along the proposed alignment. However, NSW Farmers still have serious and enduring concerns regarding the Project and say that in its present form the current application for the N2N section must not be approved.

7. A number of matters identified in the Original Objections have not been addressed by the ARTC and those matters have been identified in this submission.
8. We would also observe that through our face to face meetings with landholders earlier in the week it is clear that the ARTC's approach to consultation with affected landholders has not improved since our Original Objections.
9. Until such time as the proponent can resolve the remaining outstanding issues our position remains that you must:
  - (a) refuse to formally amend the application, and
  - (b) refuse consent to the N2N SSI; or
  - (c) alternatively, if you are minded to grant consent to the application the application must be granted subject to the conditions identified in this submission.

*Grossly inadequate community participation*

10. The community engagement undertaken by the ARTC in relation to the N2N Project continues to be appalling.
11. The ARTC continues to not be willing to provide reference designs for the N2N Project to landholders. Discussions with landholders continue to be advanced on the basis of concept designs. The failure to also exhibit the reference designs as part of the PIR also means that there is still simply no objective information by which landowners and other stakeholders can assess whether the claims made by the ARTC in the EIS regarding the acceptability of the impacts of the N2N Project are fair and accurate. We can only assume that the ARTC's refusal to produce the reference designs is an attempt to stymie objections by withholding key information that could inform any independent assessment.
12. The continued failure of the ARTC to consult in any meaningful way can be demonstrated most recently in its approach to dealing with proposed amendments to the N2N Project.
13. The location of all seven of the crossing loops in the exhibited EIS have changed following the closure of the exhibition period. Crossing loops at Burroway, Balladoran and Armatree/Tonderburine have been moved onto impacted landowners land without prior notice and consultation with them.
14. Changes to public road alignments and crossing points were first advanced to individual landholders in the context of discussions about compulsory acquisition. That was the first time that it became clear that ARTC was proposing to change road alignments in some instances requiring the acquisition of more privately held land.

Again this only occurred after the EIS had been exhibited and the opportunity for submissions had closed.

15. Following on from our Original Objections and further criticism of the hydrology and flooding by Brewsher Consulting in March 2021 the ARTC subsequently remodelled the impacts along the alignment. That work only validated the landholders concerns that velocities outside of the alignment would exceed the threshold and cause scouring and damage to the farming land downstream. To seek to rectify the situation additional areas of land identified as drainage control areas started appearing on maps being provided to landholders. Again with no explanation of what those areas would be used for. Correspondence sought information about what those areas would be used for and the first meaningful response came in the PIR where a range of approaches was identified from no physical works (velocity management structures) through to erosion protection provided by rip-rap rock. Here again ARTC had identified a range of outcomes that may occur without providing details. Landholders are right to ask what those drainage control areas will be used for and what impact structures in those areas will have on the productivity of the farm. ARTC's position is that details of what will be located in those areas will be resolved by further farm scale modelling and discussions with landholders. That approach is entirely unsuitable because the impacts of the N2N Project must be known before any approval can be given.
16. At this point there is still no disclosure of the reference design and the project is still being advanced on the basis of a concept design which does not provide sufficient information to allow any assessment to be made of the impacts on particular properties.
17. Finally, as is the case with the EIS the revised mapping relating to flooding does not operate at a farm scale. That means without details of the locations and design of crossings and details around location of culverts and treatment within the identified drainage control areas it still remains impossible for a landholder to understand and properly respond to the impact of the Inland Rail Project on adjoining properties.
18. Community consultation is a fundamental feature of the assessment regime for SSI. The approach that is continued to be advanced by the ARTC falls well below the threshold for what is acceptable.

*Matters that are out of scope but that should form part of the N2N SSI*

19. There are a number of essential elements of the N2N Project that are either being deliberately excluded from the scope or are being advanced on the basis that impacts will be dealt with elsewhere:
  - (a) **Longer trains.** The PIR makes it clear that approval is not being sought for 3,600-metre-long trains. The impacts of longer trains should be considered as part of the N2N SSI because longer trains can be run on the line, notwithstanding the ARTC's assertions that approval is not currently sought for their use.
  - (b) **Additional clearing outside the identified footprint.** As a practical matter access to the alignment for construction purposes will require the construction of all-weather access points. These are alluded to in the

proposal but the impacts are not specifically considered. These should be included as part of any biodiversity assessment and their impacts conditioned. Alternatively, if these impacts have not been considered conditions should be imposed to make it clear that those activities are not authorised under any approval.

- (c) **Limited authorisation of borrow pits.** The N2N SSI only seeks approval for four borrow pits and does not consider the impact of the haulage of material from those pits to the alignment. Contractors are now being told to find their own way when it comes to sourcing rock for the N2N Project. The impacts on haulage routes to and from the authorised borrow pits must be assessed before any approval can be granted. To the extent that material will need to come from other sources conditions must be clear that no other pits are authorised to be used for the purpose of the N2N Project and that separate approval for any other pits and the impacts of the haulage route must be considered as part of a separate application.
- (d) **Access to groundwater.** Commercial arrangements have been made with the Gilgandra Shire Council for it to sink a number of bores for the purpose of providing water to the N2N Project. Arguably that work is unlawful in that it was carried out prior to any approval of the N2N SSI. Conditions should be imposed to make it clear that a separate approval would be required to authorised existing bores used for other purposes to be used for the purpose of the N2N Project.
- (e) **Grade separated level crossings.** The N2N SSI is being advanced on the basis that level crossings will be installed at Tomingley Road, the Castlereagh Highway, Eumungerie and Yarrandale Road. The impact of the installation of level crossings on those roads are clearly unacceptable. The ARTC is seeking to advance the installation of level crossings at the Castlereagh Highway at Curban and Tomingley Road at Narromine under the guise that they are part of a separate programme of works as part a grade separate road and rail interfaces programme funded by the NSW and Australian governments. In a Greenfield scenario the need for a crossing arises directly as a result of the N2N Project. The conditions of consent should require a grade separated level crossing at those locations. The associated changes to the road alignment to construct those crossings, ideally as rail over road because of the benefits to farm movements on either side of a road, must be considered before any decision is made to approve the N2N SSI.
- (f) **Possible future connections to other rail lines.** A number of connections to the existing rail network are foreshadowed but approval for those connections in not sought as part of the N2N SSI. If the N2N Project is to have any benefits to the regional community conditions must be imposed that require those connections to be constructed.

*Matters in the Original Objections that have not been addressed*

- 20. **Durability and safety.** Concerns remain about the track record of the ARTC when it comes to maintaining an repairing infrastructure that it is responsible for. The alignment will not be constructed to the 1% AEP without any freeboard leaving it

vulnerable to flooding. We also know from other landholders around Bogan Gate and south of Parkes that the ARTC does not adequately maintain its infrastructure and is not responsive to requests to repair or service existing infrastructure, including culverts and fences.

21. **Traffic assessment remains inadequate.** The traffic and transport assessment have not been comprehensively revised to reflect the varying train speeds or the additional analysis done by Wagga Wagga City Council about wait times at level crossings. The level crossings at Tomingley Road, the Castlereagh Highway, Eumungerie and Yarrandale Road must be grade separated. Ideally, rail over road because this approach is less impactful on adjoining rural land and provides increased opportunities for access under the rail alignment (provided clearances are acceptable) and avoids the need for wide embankments to support elevated roads. The revised traffic and transport assessment also does not anticipate the actual volume of traffic movements particularly during harvest time.

#### **Objection 1: Inadequate flooding and hydrology assessment and concerns regarding groundwater**

22. Members of NSW Farmers, many of whom own properties that will be directly impacted by the proposed alignment still hold concerns about the approach to flooding and hydrology adopted in the PIR.

##### *Underestimation of flows in key areas - Backwater Cowal and Warrumbungles Watershed*

- 22.1 Landowners still have concerns around the treatment of the design in the area of the **Backwater Cowal**. The amended design does not account for the construction of a levee around Narromine. While the additional culverts do something to alleviate concerns for the issue to be resolved the line needs to be constructed as a viaduct up to 2 kilometres long.
- 22.2 Concerns also remain about the impact of the construction of the rail line in the area of the **Warrumbungles Watershed**. Some identification of quantitative design limits (QDLs) to ensure that velocities do not exceed the speed where water could potentially cause scouring but without detailed design there are still concern that even if the velocities can be managed within acceptable parameters fundamentally those structures are converting sheet flows into channel flow and changes to the nature of flows beyond land owned by ARTC cannot be authorised without an easement granted by the landowner.

##### *Risk of unacceptable groundwater impacts*

23. The approach to accessing water to support the project has changed. The initial approach in the EIS was that water would be sourced from 12 borefields that would take water from below the Great Artesian Basin. The approach in the PIR is different in that the approach now targets more water from the shallow aquifers. Sinking new bores near existing bores can lead to the situation where significant drawdowns will render existing bores largely used for stock and domestic purposes redundant.

### **Objection 3: Route selection and failure to carry out a proper cost benefit analysis**

24. In the RtS and the PIR the ARTC restates much of what it has said before about how decisions were made concerning the present alignment. We continue to maintain that the approach of using multi-criteria analysis and an economic assessment as the justification for the route 'stacks the deck' to ensure the fastest route is to be the most preferable and the economic assessment emphasises the benefits without any robust examination of the costs and risks inherent in the project as it is currently formulated.
25. The problem with the continued focus on the service offering is that the design of the N2N Project in fact results in very few benefits (if any) to the regional communities who will bear the burden of the infrastructure, because providing local benefits is not a consideration weighted highly in the MCA.

### **Objection 4: Inadequate ecological assessment**

26. The vegetation categories adopted in the revised biodiversity assessment report are not correct in that *Eucalyptus microcarpa* has been misidentified as *Eucalyptus pilligaensis* and land has not been properly categorised as derived grasslands. Also the significance of the clearing required as part of the N2N Project beyond the construction footprint for things like haul roads and all-weather access across private land has not been considered.

### **Objection 5: Failure to adequately assess noise and vibration impacts and commit to appropriate acoustic attenuation treatments**

27. There are still concerns about noise and vibration. Particularly the impacts of construction and operational noise on sleep disturbance. Landholders with properties as close to 100 metres from the alignment are being told that mitigation is not required. Our advice is that any dwelling within 400 metres of the alignment will likely not comply and that acoustic treatment is required also that night-time sleep disturbance will likely occur in dwellings beyond that 400 metre radius.

### **Objection 7: Failure to address access, fragmentation and severance issues**

28. Loss of access and the fragmentation and severance of properties remains a considerable concern to many, if not all, of the landowners along the proposed alignment.
29. This covers circumstances where, for example, the rail corridor would have the effect of cutting off a property from its principal access point to a public road. However, it also extends to cover access within a property itself, including access to internal road networks as well as farming infrastructure such as stock yards, dams, bores etc. In our view, it also covers connectivity between properties where farms are run as family cooperatives or community enterprises across multiple properties in different ownerships.
30. From speaking with numerous landowners along the N2N alignment, we understand that these concerns regarding access, fragmentation and severance principally relate to:

- (a) how properties, or parts of properties, are to be accessed where they become landlocked as a result of the N2N Project;
  - (b) how parts of properties are to be accessed and used where they are severed and sterilised by the proposed alignment;
  - (c) how access between paddocks and farms is to be maintained where existing access points will be impeded by the alignment (and its embankments);
  - (d) how and where the level crossings are proposed to be constructed and what are the proposed design parameters (will they accommodate the transport of machinery as well as livestock);
  - (e) the viability of paddocks for their existing land use as a consequence of interference or inconvenience caused by the alignment of the rail corridor;
  - (f) the extent to which any proposed access points will be serviceable during flood or heavy rain fall events; and
  - (g) how access to travelling stock reserves will be impacted by the N2N Project and the consequences of this on farming operations.
31. Despite landowners expressing these concerns for many years, the ARTC has still not made any real commitments in relation to how access, fragmentation and severance issues are to be resolved.
32. Rather, we have been told that the ARTC has simply been providing verbal assurances to landowners that access issues will be resolved at the detailed design phase. This approach of dealing with access post-approval is also reflected in the PIR which states that:
- Affected landholders would continue to be consulted during detailed design to refine proposed access arrangements and minimise the potential for impacts as far as practicable*
33. We consider that this approach is unacceptable and contrary to Item 5 of the SEARs which requires the proponent to demonstrate that the project minimises impacts to property and businesses including through the maintenance of appropriate access to properties and the minimisation of displacement of existing land use activities, dwellings and infrastructure. Item 5 of the SEARs also requires the ARTC to address agricultural land use impacts including in relation to:
- (a) division or fragmentation of property and changes to property management which could lead to the loss of viability;
  - (b) property access and the efficient and safe crossing of the rail corridor by machinery and livestock;
  - (c) connectivity of property infrastructure severed by the rail corridor; and
  - (d) livestock exclusion/management to minimise harm and losses.



34. The most fundamental reason why such an approach is unacceptable is the fact that the granting of consent to the N2N SSI would have the effect of 'locking in' the proposed alignment. This is problematic because the current alignment causes significant access, fragmentation and severance impacts and, due to the ARTC's failure to conduct meaningful engagement with landowners, opportunities to avoid these impacts by making amendments to the proposed alignment have not yet been explored.
35. For example, while it appears as though the ARTC have sought to locate the proposed corridor along lots boundaries, they have not explored the possibility that a neighbouring property might be in different ownership (for example, owned by a company rather than in a personal capacity) but as a practical matter, be run as part of the one farming enterprise. Similarly, the ARTC have not considered the fact that land might be in separate ownership but be run as a family cooperative with other neighbouring properties, with access to shared road networks and farming infrastructure being critical to the operation of that cooperative.
36. Accordingly, the ARTC have not taken any actual steps to avoid access issues, fragmentation or sterilisation of land. Rather, it has simply undertaken a desktop review of the cadastre without careful consideration as to the impacts of severing properties that are run together.
37. In our view, this has the consequence that the Minister must refuse the N2N SSI until such time as the ARTC has:
- (a) undertaken a detailed analysis regarding the properties most likely to experience access, fragmentation and severance issues;
  - (b) consulted with relevant landowners regarding appropriate measures that can be implemented to mitigate access, fragmentation and severance issues where possible, including via amendments to the proposed alignment, and identified proposed locations of easements for access, the placement of level crossings, and the location, height and width of under bridge access points; and
  - (c) identified those parcels which are likely to be severed, fragmented or otherwise severely impacted by the proposal and commit to appropriately compensating those landowners for not only the acquisition of that land, but the loss of value of the businesses which rely on that land.
38. In the alternative, should the Minister be minded to grant consent to the N2N SSI, then we would urge the Minister to include as part of that project approval a condition that would enable a mediator (nominated by the landowner, not the ARTC) to be appointed to mediate any disputes between the ARTC (or its contractors) and landowners relating to issues around access and farm impacts.
39. The costs of the mediator should be borne by the ARTC and the mediator should be working on the basis that the affected landowners are to be no worse off as a consequence of the N2N Project.
40. Such matters may not be capable of being adequately compensated under the relevant compulsory acquisition legislation and the fear is that unless suitable

arrangements are made through the project conditions, the somewhat ruthless approach to the management of costs will continue to prevail leaving landowners without all-weather access to their properties. This would be an entirely unacceptable outcome.

#### **Objection 10: Misguided approach to compulsory acquisition**

41. There seems to be some grudging acknowledgement that the approach to compulsory acquisition advanced in the EIS was misguided and that certain things are not compensable under the *Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991 (Just Terms Act)* and that there will be instances where the Just Terms Act will not apply but there are impacts that still need to be addressed.
42. For that reason we suggest that important matters that fall outside the scope of the Just Terms Act be regulated by conditions imposed on any consent.

#### **Objection 11: Inadequate fencing standards**

43. The unwillingness of the ARTC to commit to an adequate fencing standard continues to be a problem.
44. This issue must be address through any conditions of consent.

*Conclusion: continued need to refuse the N2N SSI*

45. In light of the failure of the ARTC to address the concerns highlighted in our Original Objections we consider that the Minister is compelled to refuse the N2N SSI as currently formulated that is because the onus is on the proponent to demonstrate that the Project is capable of approval and the ARTC has not done that.

*Alternative approach: imposition of a robust conditions framework*

46. We say that for the reasons above you must refuse the application. If however you are minded to approve the application we say that a robust conditions framework must be imposed on the N2N SSI.
47. As a general approach the mitigation measures proposed by the ARTC should be dealt with by imposing specific and enforceable conditions of consent. Those conditions should address the following matters relevant to our Original Objections and this submission.
48. **Flooding and hydrology.** Conditions must be imposed that require that the development must be carried out in accordance with the QDLs and that the impacts of the development must be managed within the existing rail corridor. Changes to the natural characteristics of flows cannot occur without a registered easement.
49. **Compensation for impacts on farms beyond the scope of the Just Terms Act.** Conditions must be imposed that require that the development must not result in a reduction in access arrangements for impacted properties. The Minister, as consent authority, should impose conditions similar to those imposed for State significant mining, petroleum and extractive industry developments, seeking to mitigate the negative impacts arising from the N2N Project. Such conditions have been held to

be enforceable by the Court and the benefit for the NSW Farmers (and other landowners impacted by the N2N Project) is that they will not be forced into an argument with the ARTC (or Transport for NSW) about whether such impacts are compensable. Further, it seems to us that if the ARTC's position is that such impacts are compensable (as has been stated by the ARTC in its communications with various landowners), then we see that they should have no objection to any conditions being imposed on the project approval that make that plain.

50. **Need for an independent mediator farm impacts.** Conditions must require the appointment of a mediator to address disputes with landholders over access and impacts on properties.
51. **Adequate fencing standards.** Conditions of consent for that approval should mandate the adoption of a fencing standard consistent with earlier decisions of the Land and Environment Court. The minimum standard in any district along the alignment must be what is considered best practice for boundary fencing in that district. The required fencing standards should be clear and specify with more detail the type of fencing and should include details of strainers and creek crossings as well. See for example, the Roads and Maritime Services standard drawings. At a minimum, fencing should comply with relevant Australian Standards for steel products/welded mesh to ensure that the products used are durable. Fencing must also comply with requirements relating to exempt development for rural fencing, comply with manufactures specification, and entrance gates must not open outwards.
52. **Noise and vibration.** Conditions must be imposed that must:
  - (a) limit construction noise to normal daytime construction hours only to ensure that impacts on sensitive receivers from construction noise are acceptable;
  - (b) require mitigation and management strategies to be applied to construction noise as per the Transport for New South Wales *Construction Noise and Vibration Strategy* (ST-157/4.1);
  - (c) require the ARTC to undertake site inspections of sensitive receiver locations and commit the ARTC to carrying out works for acoustic attenuation treatments at sensitive receiver locations prior to the completion and operation of the line;
  - (d) require the ARTC to conduct a detailed assessment of sleep disturbance impacts arising from the N2N Project as per the World Health Organisation's *Night Noise Guidelines for Europe* criterion (49dBA external, windows open) and commit the ARTC to carrying out works for acoustic attenuation treatments at sensitive receiver locations prior to the completion and operation of the line;
  - (e) require the appointment of an independent project Acoustic Advisor;
  - (f) specify an acceptable Operational Noise and Vibration Criteria which is appropriate considering the acoustic sensitivity of the rural environment;

- (g) undertake operational noise validation during the operation of the N2N Project; and
  - (h) require the preparation of an operational noise compliance report which is to be made freely available to the public.
53. **Telecommunications.** Conditions must require the development of a robust public telecommunications network prior to the commencement of construction of the rail line.
54. **Call Train Protocol.** Many landholders will have to cross the line to go to and from their properties. Conditions must be imposed that require any Call Train Protocol to be development in consultation with landholder and peak industry groups. That Protocol should also provide for arrangement relating to biosecurity, bushfire and general access to the alignment.
55. **Condition of the rolling stock.** It is trite to say that the noise from the rolling stock will be regulated under the *Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 (POEO Act)* by the Environmental Protection Authority. That does not obviate the need for conditions on the approval to must specify what type of rolling stock can be used on the N2N Project.
56. **Ongoing maintenance.** The ARTC rely on their existing procedures and asset management systems. However conditions must be imposed that establish a mandated protocol for dealing with responses as well as nominated response time to matters raised by landholders.
57. **Further detailed design.** Conditions must be imposed that require that the development cannot be carried out until detailed designs have been approved by the Planning Secretary. Those detailed design should include details of culverts and works within drainage control areas, details of crossings and bridges. The detailed design must comply with the performance criteria established by any approval irrespective of the cost to the ARTC of meeting the criteria.
58. Finally, we would like to thank you for considering our submission.
59. NSW Farmers feel that you would greatly benefit from the opportunity to visit Narromine and travel along the proposed alignment to Narrabri, and that this would give you a much clearer understanding of why they (and many of their members) take the position they do. We would be willing to facilitate such a visit, including access to numerous properties along the alignment, on your request and at a time that suits you.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Peter Holt', with a stylized, cursive script.

**Peter Holt**

Partner

HWL Ebsworth Lawyers

+61 2 9334 8970

pholt@hwle.com.au

## Annexure A      Schedule of Inland Rail Collective Members

No	Name	Region
1.	Helen Hunt	Black Hollow
2.	Jennifer Knop	Not disclosed
3.	Barbara Dean	Not disclosed
4.	Robert Webb	Not disclosed
5.	Lorraine Harrison	Tonderburine
6.	Thomas Lyons	Gulargambone
7.	Ian Uebergang	North Star
8.	Alex Worner	Wombat
9.	Ashley Hernes	Not disclosed
10.	Kevin Galley	Not disclosed
11.	Dave and Karen McBurnie	Balladoran
12.	Peter Dampney	Narrabri
13.	Tony Hill	Cootamundra
14.	Carl Baldry	Bethungra
15.	Gordon Lummis	Not disclosed
16.	Doug and K Wilson	Balladoran
17.	DA Sheperd	Armatree
18.	SJ and DJ Campion	Not disclosed
19.	James Claringbol	Not disclosed
20.	Charles Ryals	Cootamundra
21.	Ian Lambell	Not disclosed
22.	Cath and Dave Peart	Gulargambone
23.	Paul Galley	Dubbo
24.	Ian Dent	Gilgandra

No	Name	Region
25.	Susan Wilson	Not disclosed
26.	Andrew Deans	Not disclosed
27.	David Campion	Dubbo
28.	Bevan Peart	Tooraweenah
29.	Maxine Finlay	Baradine
30.	Gregory and Dianne Peart	Gilgandra
31.	George Colless / UBL	Gulargambone
32.	Cameron Halfpenny	Mount Tenandra
33.	Ian Friend	Bethungra
34.	Brad Cox	Dubbo
35.	Andrew Peart	Armatree
36.	Paul Anthony Tym	Coonamble
37.	Eric McKenzie	Not disclosed
38.	S A M B Chandler	Curban
39.	Greg Doolan	Baradine
40.	Stuart Mudford	Gilgandra

