

SUMMARY OF JSC's KEY CONCERNS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS

	Junee Shire Council assessment	A2I EIS response	Junee Shire Council comments on EIS
Item 1: Council SEARs request 31 July 2020	<u>Train Movements</u> Junee Shire Council (JSC) sought greater detail and assessment of the impact of increased rail movements, particularly in Junee township. Section 1.2.3 Operation stated current movements were “estimated” at 13 trains per day increasing to 24 trains per day by 2040. Junee requested more certainty and analysis of these “estimated” movements to inform the potential impacts (e.g., noise, vibration, level crossing safety, traffic, economic). The metric of movement numbers is limited in its application and interpretation. The length and speed of the movements needs to be accounted for in any assessment of impact. For example, 11 additional movements to the 13 daily movements is an 85% increase (almost doubling) in movements. Speed is another factor in the impact equation and there is some inference that the speed may reduce thereby further increasing the duration of impact.	Not addressed	The EIS indicates an increase in 12 trains per day in 2021, 18 per day in 2025 and further increasing to 20 per day in 2040. The total daily number of trains has decreased from a peak demand of 24 (Inland Rail Albury to Illabo Scoping report 2020) to approximately 20 (A2I EIS) in 2040 without explanation. This represents a 20 % differential in train movements at the level crossing located 50m to the north of the Junee Railway Station. Recommendations: The proponent be required to provide a detailed assessment of why the estimated total number of trains has been reduced from 24 to 20 by 2040. The proponent should also provide details on the maximum number of movements permitted by the upgraded infrastructure expected per day, i.e., are these movements artificially capped? JSC retains the view that the increase in the total number of trains 1800m long, combined with the speed of train travel, may significantly impact the road and pedestrian interface at some level crossings more than others. JSC has raised particular concerns with the proponent regarding the level crossing at the Junee Railway Station since 2019, calling for a comprehensive traffic study that would consider a range of the impacts at this crossing. The EIS has taken a generic approach to level crossing activation within the A2I section to assess the level of additional impact and inconvenience to all communities along the A2I section. The EIS applies a one size fits all calculation applying a maximum train length of 1800mm and a travel speed of 80km/hr to arrive at signal activation time. While the EIS refers to those estimates being impacted by any other track regulated speed controls, JSC made the proponent aware of matters that specially impact the level crossing at the Junee Railway Station level crossing and called on the proponent to analyse the extent of those impacts. Without such information the Council is not satisfied the level of impact can be appropriately considered within the EIS. Recommendations: That the proponent undertakes and provides a detailed analysis assessing the impact of the level crossing activation at the Junee Railway Station. The analysis should include all standard and current railway movements impacting the level crossing, including freight and passenger train movements, shunting movements, and train driver changeovers as conducted currently. Projected movements out to 2040 should be included in the analysis, noting the increase in frequency of those train movements to establish accurate road and pedestrian cumulative impacts at this location. Council also requires alternate arrangements be made to minimise the impacts of train driver changes on the level crossing whilst the Kemp Street bridge is closed to minimise time delays.
Item 2: Council SEARs request 30 July 2020	We noted the Kemp Street bridge will need to be raised by some 2m which will negatively impact pedestrian gradient approaches. The critical matter of disability access on both sides of the bridge is of concern to the Council. Council requested the SEARs include provision for an option designed study with alternative disability access; particularly of the eastern side approach is requested. The Council	Addressed	JSC has held positive discussions in recent times with the proponent with respect to pedestrian access at the Kemp Street bridge. The proponent is now proposing a separated pedestrian and cycle footbridge fully compliant with DDA and accessibility standards. The proposed location is just to the north of the current Kemp Street bridge. Statements of the proponent's intention have been expressed in the EIS. The proponent is

	previously proposed an alternative solution to ARTC that JSC requested be considered in the EIS.		consulting with JSC regarding suitable location and design which is appreciated. Council has taken significant measures recently to improve accessibility of Junee and any pedestrian access proposed for the Kemp Street bridge must reflect this community desire for improved accessibility. Recommendation: The intention reflected in the EIS regarding a separated foot and cycle footbridge to be fully compliant with DDA and accessibility standards to be included in any Notice of Determination.
Item 3: Council SEARs request 30 July 2020	Requested the SEARs require the ARTC's Heritage Consultant contact the Council regarding items that may be of local historical interest if the existing Kemp Street bridge is demolished.	Addressed	The EIS refers to (27-7) The re-purposing of salvaged materials within the design of new road bridges for the following unregistered potential heritage items would be investigated during detailed design: Kemp Street bridge—red brick and streetlights. Council notes the commitment to gift the Junee pedestrian bridge to Council. Recommendation: The demolition and transportation of the existing pedestrian footbridge at the Junee Railway Station must be sympathetic to it being reused – disassembled in sections that can be easily reconstructed. Elements of the existing Kemp Street Bridge, such as the locally manufactured red brick and streetlighting should be retained where possible for adaptive reuse in consultation with Council.
Item 4: Council SEARs request 30 July 2020	6.7.2.2 Socio-economic Council supports the inclusion of socio-economic assessment reports. Council would encourage preliminary meetings with each council of the affected communities to identify local socio-economic issues prior to the development of such reports. In Junee's case for example, we have a Correctional Centre that is designed to house up to 1500 inmates. This has unique socio-economic impacts on our community that may not be present in other communities. High importance needs to be placed on the impacts of traffic and pedestrian connectivity of Junee as well as business and economic impacts resulting from increased train movements and intermittent physical separation to either side of the Junee township. The Council strongly request the inclusion of a comprehensive traffic study for Junee be included with the SEARs. The confluence of specific items raised in this submission regarding traffic management issues in association with: - The importance of the Olympic Hwy as a regional traffic route and its localised position in the town of Junee with intersection constraints at the level crossing [Junee Railway Station]. - The importance of the Byrnes Road running parallel to the railway line on its eastern side linking Junee to Wagga	Not addressed	Council notes the socio-economic assessment in the EIS does not specifically address matters related to the Junee Correctional Centre other than comments on workforce statistics. There are specific issues associated with having a correctional facility in a community, such as partners and their children travelling to Junee to visit inmates. Prior to Covid, visitor numbers were above 300 per week, placing pressure on local travel and available affordable accommodation. JSC requested the proponent address this specific issue within the EIS. The Correctional Centre has an inmate population of up to 1000, anticipated to be expanding to 1500. Therefore, particular analysis of the visitation issue was requested as part of the EIS, especially in relation to the socio-economic and workforce accommodation impact assessments of the proposal. Recommendation: The socio-economic assessment of the Inland Rail project be updated to include the Junee Correction Centre and related impacts of the proposal on the community in greater detail. The EIS (13-32) recognises that prior to closure of Kemp Street bridge, the proponent will investigate opportunities to reduce the duration of level crossing closures on Olympic Highway, Junee. The socio-economic assessment is strongly focused on the construction phase of the project. The legacy project outcomes after completion are not considered to have been adequately addressed in the EIS from JSC's perspective. JSC has consistently requested a comprehensive traffic study for the Junee township to adequately investigate the unique cumulative impacts of road and rail traffic movement through Junee and the consequences these impacts may have on residents and users of the Olympic Highway. From a post construction perspective, the proponent has selected to treat traffic matters of each individual construction project in the Junee township in isolation. JSC has already indicated in Item

	Wagga and providing access to the Junee Abattoirs (300 jobs) and the proposed Wagga Wagga Special Activation Precinct at Bomen. • The Junee Correctional Centre with 350 staff. • The rail bridge with its low-level road underpass at the northern edge of Junee township placing limitation of oversized (height) vehicle movements.		1 its' position on how project outcomes will impact the level crossing at the Junee Railway Station with increased train activity activating the level crossing. The EIS analysis for increased activation time at this level crossing is flawed in Council's view as it appears not to have considered other train movement factors. Anecdotally, train driver shifts change-over at the Junee Railway Station from trains travelling from Sydney to Melbourne can keep the level crossing activated for 10 to 15 minutes. JSC holds concerns that the level crossing data used to inform the EIS may be of generic nature and not site specific, or it may only be looking at trains passing through without recognising shunting movements or the changing of train driver crews at Junee Railway Station. Recommendation: That further analysis by the proponent be undertaken and detailed analysis provided assessing the specific impact of the level crossing activation at the Junee Railway Station during the removal and construction of the Kemp Street bridge, as well as during the operation of the Inland Rail. This analysis should be inclusive of all current railway movements impacting the level crossing by freight and passenger train movements, shunting movements within rail precinct and train driver changeover in 2022 with projections out to 2040 noting the increased frequency of those train movements to establish the road and pedestrian cumulative impacts at that location.
Item5: Council SEARs request 30 July 2020	Fencing We note much of the existing rail corridor in Junee township is not fenced on both sides. The SEARs should request a review of safety and security associated with increasing use of the corridor to mitigate risks.	Not addressed	Recommendation: That the proponent addresses the need to provide adequate fencing to the rail corridor through the township of Junee at detailed design stage to address community safety concerns related to increased rail traffic movement.
Item 6: EIS	Summary of Key Findings of the EIS	To be addressed:	Throughout the EIS, Construction Traffic Transport and Access Management Plans is proposed to be developed for each enhancement site prior to construction. To the best of JSC's knowledge, the EIS does not confirm these plans will be developed with the cooperation of local councils. Recommendation: That any Notice of Determination provides greater certainty for Councils being consulted during the preparation of Construction Traffic Transport and Access Management Plans.
Item 7: EIS	Waste and Resource Management (Chapter 23)	Request	JSC may be able to accept reasonable quantities of waste at the Junee Landfill from project work occurring within the Junee LGA boundary. It will not be accepting waste material generated from outside the LGA boundary. Further consultation with JSC is recommended once more accurate quantities of waste are known to determine whether these amounts can be accommodated at the Junee Landfill. Additional clarification is also requested regarding the stockpiling of excavated material within the identified compound areas and whether the anticipated amounts of excavated material can be accommodated in these areas. Recommendation: The proponent undertakes waste disposal activities in consultation with Council, noting that Council will preference preserving landfill airspace for the local community. Further analysis should also be provided identifying the suitability of the identified construction compounds for the proposed quantities of stockpiled material.

Item 8: EIS	Groundwater (Chapter 19)	To be addressed	Council notes significant dewatering of the groundwater at the Kemp Street Bridge location is anticipated to be required, however no storage solutions are proposed as part of this EIS with further detail to be provided prior to construction. This is considered to be an inadequate approach to addressing this issue. Recommendation: That the EIS be amended to include options for storage of this groundwater in consultation with Council. Amendments should include an assessment of potential impacts of dewatering, such as additional heavy vehicle movements, potential impacts to existing stormwater infrastructure and any other relevant issues.
Item 9: EIS	Transport (Chapter 3-12)	Misprint	The paragraph: The proposal site crosses the Riverina Highway (Albury), and the Olympic Highway (Culcairn, Junee and approximately 2 km north-east of Illabo). These roads pass over and under the rail corridor. The crossing located 2km northeast of Illabo is a level crossing.
Item 10: EIS	Table 6-5 Options assessment summary - Junee (Chapter 6-14)	To be addressed	Kemp Street Bridge: JSC informed the proponent of concerns it had relating to reconstruction of the approach roads (approx. 80 m long) on both sides of the Kemp Street Bridge Deck not being constructed to a compliant standard. JSC requests the design reflects this or Council concerns on this matter being reflected in the EIS. It is considered the EIS has not adequately included or addressed this request. Council considers the proposed works will have significant negative impacts on residential properties located directly adjacent to the Kemp Street bridge approaches, which have not been adequately assessed in the EIS. The increase in the overall height of the bridge and approaches are considered to directly impact these residences. Recommendation: Consideration should be given to purchase of affected properties if the owners are agreeable as part of the I2A project and returned to buffer/open space. The purchase of these properties would also enable the intersections either side of the bridge to be upgraded. These intersections are currently constrained and have been assessed as posing safety concerns, as outlined in the attached Junee Freight and Transport Plan – Draft Traffic Study Report. Council notes the A2I have committed to a DDA compliant separate pedestrian bridge crossing nearby to the Kemp Street Bridge. Council notes the open space at the Kemp Street bridge will be required to be reconfigured to accommodate the associated intersection. Recommendation: Council requires the landscaping of this space be completed to a higher standard, recognising the prominence of this location as an entrance point to CBD of Junee at the detailed design stage. Council also notes an opportunity for the adaptive reuse of certain heritage elements to preserve the heritage fabric of this location as part of these landscaping works. Olympic Highway Underbridge Council retains an objection to the preferred outcome as lifting the bridge would improve road clearance to avoid future disruption to Inland Rail should there be road traffic collision with the

			structure at that location due to the low height for traffic travelling under it. JSC has drawn this matter to the attention of the proponent and TfNSW (Transport for NSW), who appear to be accepting of such risk. Recommendation: The proponent should reconsider the preferred outcome to include road lowering in this location to increase clearance height under the bridge and reduce the risk of road traffic collision with this infrastructure.
Item 11: EIS	Option Development and Assessment (Chapter 6-16)	To be addressed	Opportunities for grade separation ARTC policy is that rail–road interfaces would be grade separated when there are level crossings with four or more rail tracks. The level crossing at the Junee Railway Station currently has 4 rail tracks at this crossing. The EIS does not appear to mention that this level crossing does not meet the ARTC policy for grade separation or the reason as to why it is diverging from this policy. JSC recognises graded separation is not practical at this location. However, an assessment of mitigation measures and options as to why the policy was not followed would have been helpful. It also draws more attention for the need to consider the JSC recommendations in item 1 and 4 of this submission. As a general comment the EIS has been understated in recognising this level crossing as the major level crossing within the Junee LGA (other than within the context of alternative traffic routes while the Kemp Street Bridge is under construction) when compared to other level crossings within the Junee LGA in the EIS. It does not appear to have been assessed against the ALCAM assessment criteria as have other level crossing. Nor has the EIS recognised the Council request for a detailed assessment at this location be included with the EIS Recommendation: Council requests further investigation and analysis into the operation of the Olympic Highway level crossing adjacent to the Junee Railway Station, including anticipated waiting periods due to driver changeover. Installation of appropriate driver change infrastructure should be considered as a mitigation measure to reduce wait times at this location, where grade separation cannot be achieved.
Item 12: EIS	Preferred Option (Chapter 6-16)	Information	The EIS refers to Wornes Gate Lane level crossing throughout the EIS as Wornes Gate Lane (LX1472), indicating the crossing would be upgraded from a passive to active. JSC notes that Wornes Gate Lane on the southern side of the Rail corridor is an unformed public road. The proponent may wish to examine this further to avoid moving from passive to active controls on this level crossing. Recommendation: The proponent reviews the requirement for active controls at the level crossing at Wornes Gate Lane (LX1472).

Item 13: EIS	Preferred Option (Chapter 6-17)	To be addressed	Council notes it is intended that the Carter property access road (LX605) will be upgraded from a passive to active level crossing and traffic movements will be limited to left in and left out at the Olympic Hwy. Council also notes it is intended to construct a concrete median to control vehicular traffic at the intersection. Recommendation: Council considers limiting traffic movements to left in and left out will create traffic hazards, with trucks undertaking U turns across the Olympic Hwy to access the Council owned quarry and the Carter property. The intersection with the Olympic Hwy should allow for all turning traffic and include adequate storage lanes for turning traffic. Upgrades to Brabins Road are recommended to facilitate suitable site access.																																																											
Item 14: EIS	Proposed features and operation (Chapter 7)	To be addressed	The EIS indicates: Alternatives and proposal options. Any design modifications that occur as a result of matters arising during the exhibition of this EIS would be identified in a Preferred Infrastructure Report or Amendment Report. Recommendation: The proponent provides any Preferred Infrastructure Report or Amendment Report relevant to a particular LGA to those councils with sufficient time (21 days) to provide comment																																																											
Item 15: EIS	Traffic and Transport (Chapter 9)	To be addressed	The traffic data in the EIS refers to a maximum traffic volume of 2,590 per day with 33% heavy vehicles for Byrnes Road compared to Councils data which shows average daily traffic volume of 2,840 per day with 17% heavy vehicles. Table 3-1: Daily Traffic Flows (Typical Weekday) and Heavy Vehicle Percentages <table><tr><th rowspan="2">Survey Site/Street</th><th colspan="4">Daily Traffic Flows (Typical Weekday)</th></tr><tr><th>Total</th><th>Light Vehicles</th><th>Heavy Vehicles</th><th>% of HV</th></tr><tr><td>Site 1 - Old Junee Road</td><td>1,132</td><td>826</td><td>306</td><td>27.03%</td></tr><tr><td>Site 2 - Queen Street</td><td>786</td><td>533</td><td>253</td><td>32.19%</td></tr><tr><td>Site 3 - Olympic Highway (East of Junee)</td><td>2,002</td><td>1,460</td><td>542</td><td>27.07%</td></tr><tr><td>Site 4 - Broadway</td><td>2,690</td><td>2,305</td><td>385</td><td>14.31%</td></tr><tr><td>Site 5 - Olympic Highway Main Street</td><td>3,262</td><td>2,903</td><td>359</td><td>11.01%</td></tr><tr><td>Site 6 - Olympic Highway Seignior Street</td><td>2,950</td><td>2,694</td><td>256</td><td>8.68%</td></tr><tr><td>Site 7 - Lorne Street</td><td>4,162</td><td>3,702</td><td>460</td><td>11.05%</td></tr><tr><td>Site 8 - Gundagai Road</td><td>1,102</td><td>889</td><td>213</td><td>19.33%</td></tr><tr><td>Site 9 - Olympic Highway (West of Junee)</td><td>1,921</td><td>1,443</td><td>478</td><td>24.88%</td></tr><tr><td>Site 10 - Byrnes Road</td><td>2,840</td><td>2,358</td><td>482</td><td>16.97%</td></tr></table> Source: Traffic Survey Data 2021 Recommendation: Council notes the traffic data included in the EIS differs to the data collected on behalf of Council in 2021 and should be reviewed.	Survey Site/Street	Daily Traffic Flows (Typical Weekday)				Total	Light Vehicles	Heavy Vehicles	% of HV	Site 1 - Old Junee Road	1,132	826	306	27.03%	Site 2 - Queen Street	786	533	253	32.19%	Site 3 - Olympic Highway (East of Junee)	2,002	1,460	542	27.07%	Site 4 - Broadway	2,690	2,305	385	14.31%	Site 5 - Olympic Highway Main Street	3,262	2,903	359	11.01%	Site 6 - Olympic Highway Seignior Street	2,950	2,694	256	8.68%	Site 7 - Lorne Street	4,162	3,702	460	11.05%	Site 8 - Gundagai Road	1,102	889	213	19.33%	Site 9 - Olympic Highway (West of Junee)	1,921	1,443	478	24.88%	Site 10 - Byrnes Road	2,840	2,358	482	16.97%
Survey Site/Street	Daily Traffic Flows (Typical Weekday)																																																													
	Total	Light Vehicles	Heavy Vehicles	% of HV																																																										
Site 1 - Old Junee Road	1,132	826	306	27.03%																																																										
Site 2 - Queen Street	786	533	253	32.19%																																																										
Site 3 - Olympic Highway (East of Junee)	2,002	1,460	542	27.07%																																																										
Site 4 - Broadway	2,690	2,305	385	14.31%																																																										
Site 5 - Olympic Highway Main Street	3,262	2,903	359	11.01%																																																										
Site 6 - Olympic Highway Seignior Street	2,950	2,694	256	8.68%																																																										
Site 7 - Lorne Street	4,162	3,702	460	11.05%																																																										
Site 8 - Gundagai Road	1,102	889	213	19.33%																																																										
Site 9 - Olympic Highway (West of Junee)	1,921	1,443	478	24.88%																																																										
Site 10 - Byrnes Road	2,840	2,358	482	16.97%																																																										

			Council notes the recommendation for the rectification of pavement were necessary to support diversion of vehicles from the Olympic Hwy to local roads in Junee. The road network in Junee is highly vulnerable to damage caused by changes to the flow of traffic and increases in traffic and heavy vehicular movements both during the construction phase and ongoing operation of the upgraded rail network. It is considered these impacts have not been adequately investigated or addressed in the EIS. It is critical the integrity of the broader local road network is considered prior to construction, and improvements are made to accommodate the A2I works and ongoing operations of the upgraded rail network. Rectifying damage post construction is likely to be more costly and impose additional cost to the local community and Council. This requires the roads to be assessed and preventative upgrades to the pavement and road surfaces to be completed prior to traffic diversions and haul roads being activated. The EIS recognises some preventative road works will be required to offset the impacts from increased traffic movements (including heavy vehicles) during construction but provides no detail on the extent or type of preventative road works that will be undertaken. Council notes Road Dilapidation Reports will be prepared for all haul routes within each precinct and ARTC has committed to rectification of damage caused during construction to restore the road to the pre-work condition. Recommendation: Assessment of the road network requires consideration of the broader road network to extend beyond the roads directly impacted during the construction phase. Dilapidation reports should include roads used for diversions and detours along with haul roads and incorporate assessments of the structural integrity and load capacity of the subject roads. Identification of roads requiring preventative upgrades, prior to the commencement of A2I construction works, to ensure the subject roads will withstand the changes in traffic movements and minimise risk of road failures and defects that require reactive repairs. The proponent should identify the need to undertake proactive road upgrades where applicable, instead of reactive repairs as increased traffic leads to road failure and dangerous conditions for residents and through traffic. Council considers the A2I project provides an opportunity to improve the broader local road network and the movement of freight in and around Junee in conjunction with the rail upgrade. The rail network passes directly through the township of Junee; however, the proponent has failed to consider the knock-on effects on the broader road network and the movement of freight in and around Junee. The opportunity to improve the rail/road interfaces outside of the rail corridor has been denied by the proponent. Council notes the proposal for the replacement of the Kemp Street
--	--	--	--

			Bridge will be upgraded to be able to accommodate heavy vehicle (HML) traffic, however this upgrade should also include capacity for future use by A-Doubles and Road Trains and upgrades to the adjoining intersections. Council funded and recently received the Junee Freight and Transport Plan – Draft Traffic Study Report to assess key network constraints, including the constraints posed by the rail network. The assessment identified fourteen locations where there are existing safety and/or operational concerns related to movement of freight and the operation of the rail network through the township of Junee. A summary of these concerns is outlined in the table below (Appendix 1). A copy of the Junee Freight and Transport Plan – Draft Traffic Study Report is also attached to this submission. Recommendations: The refinement of traffic detours for Junee and the development of traffic control plans for the detours should be developed in consultation with Council, and any diversions/detours associated with the local road network will be agreed with Council before being implemented. The Kemp Street bridge and associated intersections should be designed to accommodate A-Doubles and Road Trains. Council notes the EIS refers to some tree clearing to accommodate works and improve sight distances. Recommendation: Clearing/trimming within road corridors and public spaces outside of the rail corridor must be consulted prior to undertaking with Council. Council notes some on-street parking will be lost to the community during the construction phase. Recommendation: Parking for construction vehicles must be located off-street and not impact on the availability of on-street parking for residents and business parking.
Item 16: EIS	Proposal Features and Operation (Chapter 7)	To be addressed	Recommendation: Proposed dust suppression seals at rail level crossings on gravel roads need to extend to 150m either side of the crossing as a minimum to be effective.
Item 17: EIS	Economics (Chapter 14)	To be addressed	Council is concerned the workforce demands of the project will cause negative impacts to the local workforce which is already experiencing the impacts of staff shortages. Council generally supports the use of local workers where appropriate, however the EIS has not adequately considered an employment scenario where there are no local workers available to furnish the required workforce. Recommendation: Council recommends sourcing materials/consumables from local businesses where possible to benefit local economies across the length of the project. Additional analysis of the workforce should be included where there are no local workers to furnish workforce requirements.
Item 18: EIS	Noise and Vibration (Chapter 15)	To be addressed	Council considers the approach taken in assessing potential noise impacts is not adequately able to draw conclusions regarding potential mitigation measures, especially to sensitive receivers such as educational facilities. Ground truthing exercises should be conducted at the EIS stage, especially at these locations and where significant exceedances of impact criterion occur.

			Recommendation: A more thorough Acoustic Impact Assessment be conducted that includes “ground truthing” exercises and measurements at sensitive receiver sites to identify and propose actual mitigation measures at these locations. A commitment to ongoing monitoring in these locations would also be recommended to ensure the mitigation measures proposed are effective over the ongoing life of the project.
Item 19: EIS	Hazards (Chapter 24)	To be addressed	The risk of bushfire as a result of “hot works” is identified within the EIS as being a potential hazard. Council notes several projects within the LGA are proposed to be carried out within peak bushfire season, but no mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the risk of bushfire or grassfire in these locations at these times. Recommendation: The EIS be amended to include appropriate mitigation measures for bushfire prevention, including rescheduling of hot works on days where “Stop Harvest” or similar notices are issued by RFS. Where works cannot be rescheduled, alternative fire protection measures should be proposed.
Item 20: EIS	Tech Paper 11 Hydrology, Flooding and Water Quality	To be addressed	Recommendation: Council recommends the project provides an opportunity to undertake a drainage/flood assessment of the entire length of the project rail corridor to identify and resolve existing drainage/flooding issues along the rail corridor. This assessment should not be limited to the proposed works locations given the impacts of the project as a whole on future rail operations. The assessment should include interfaces with Council stormwater systems – George Street, Railway parade.
Item 21: EIS	Appendix B – Strategic Planning Review	To be addressed	Refers to the Future Transport Strategy 2056, but the proponent has not considered the broader aspects of this strategy – confined to the rail and direct impacts on the rail corridor only. Recommendation: The proponent addresses the Future Transport Strategy 2056 with a more integrated approach, considering the broader aspects of this Strategy.
Item 22: EIS	Appendix D - Utilities	Clarification required.	Council requests clarification that the sewer at Kemp Street will be relocated as part of the bridge replacement works. The submitted Appendix only refers to concrete encasement, contradicting previous discussions with the proponent regarding the impacted sewer mains. Recommendation: Clarification be provided regarding the relocation of the sewer as part of the Kemp Street Bridge replacement works.
Item 23: EIS	Technical Paper 1 – Transport and Traffic	To be addressed:	Council notes reference in the technical paper that closure times at the level crossings would be 121 seconds with or without the proposal. This does not appear to consider train driver changeovers occurring at Junee resulting in the level crossing being closed for extended periods and queuing at the crossing. This will be exacerbated during construction when the Kemp Street bridge is closed, and additional traffic is diverted through the level crossing. Recommendation:

			In addition to comments provided at Item 1, the scope of works for the A2I should be expanded to include the relocation of the rail infrastructure for the train driver change overs to avoid impacts on the level crossing both during construction and the ongoing operation of the upgraded rail network.
			Reference to John Potts Drive table 5.50 in the technical paper seems to be in error – no relationship to the Olympic Hwy underbridge enhancement site.
			The table also references PCUs and Illabo Road as an urban road. Illabo Road also forms part of the Olympic Hwy – these references are confusing and need to be reviewed.
			The technical paper refers to Wornes Gates Road in Illabo as public level crossing. This is incorrect, this road is not a public road on the southern side of the railway line.
Item 24: EIS	Appendix H: Outline construction environmental management plan	To be addressed:	The proposed road link to the Harefield Yard site needs to be reconsidered, currently shown as an adverse angle access (Fig 4.5.1). Recommendation: The access to this site should be provided via the disused Byrnes Road immediately east of the level crossing in this location. Relevant figures in the EIS and supporting documentation should be updated to reflect this change.
Item 25: EIS	General Comments	To be addressed:	Recommendation: Council recommends separate Infrastructure Interface Agreements be prepared and agreed for all road crossings and interfaces with Council infrastructure prior to the finalisation of designs.
			Recommendation: Council requests as part of these works for the general clean-up of the rail corridor, including disused or redundant rail infrastructure such as overhead wires and poles.
			Recommendation: A commitment to the ongoing maintenance of IR/ARTC assets be provided over the life of the project including mowing/slashing, weed control, fencing etc

Appendix 1: Extract of Key Findings - Junee Freight and Transport Plan – Draft Traffic Study Report (SMEC 2022)

Location	Priority	Constraints/Issues	Potential mitigation measures
Belmore Street/Lorne Street (Junee town centre)	High	Conflict of HV movements within town centre environment (incl. pedestrian movements).	Upgraded pedestrian crossings Upgraded intersections (medians) Improved delineation and signage Reduced speed limits within “town centre”
Lorne Street, Peel Street and Cox Street (Junee town centre)	High	Conflict of HV movements within Town Centre environment (incl. Pedestrian movements).	Upgraded pedestrian crossings Upgraded intersections Improved delineation and signage Reduced speed limits within “town centre” Potential change in road priorities (to support HV movements) at Cox Street/Peel Street
Lorne Street (Belmore Street to Hill Street)	High	Conflict of HV movements through a school zone (and adjacent aquatic centre)	Relocation of school entrance (and parking) to Stewart Street
Olympic Highway Open Level Crossing (OLC)	High	Lengthy OLC closure times (due to train driver changeover)	Potential variable message signs (VMS) at key detour points Relocation of train driver changeover facilities away from level crossing (e.g., towards Harefield)
Kemp Street bridge	High	HV load limit, impacting freight productivity. Low bridge clearance for double-stacked trains (Inland Rail)	Replace bridge – part of inland rail project.
Intersection of Kemp Street/Ducker Street	High	Intersection geometry restricts HV movements Kemp Street Bridge upgrade (by ARTC) would facilitate larger/heavier HV movements through this intersection	Upgraded intersections (for improved HV passage)
Ducker to William streets: Ducker Street/Edgar Street intersection Edgar Street/William Street intersection	High	Intersection geometry restrict HV movements Kemp Street Bridge upgrade (by ARTC) would facilitate larger/heavier HV movements through these local roads	Upgraded intersections (for improved HV passage) Improved delineation and signage Potential change in road priorities (to support HV movements)

Olympic Highway /Queen Street intersection	High	Poor lane discipline and sight lines through intersection	Upgraded intersection to improve lane discipline, sight lines and reduce vehicle speeds
Queen Street near Junee North Public School	High	Heavy vehicle passage through school zone, with school crossing and parked cars (school drop off)	Potential relocation of staff, pick up areas (including bus) off Queen Street onto vacant land immediately west of school site.
Old Junee Road Bridge (HL Robinson Bridge)	High	Load limited bridge (limited to B-Double loads)	Bridge strengthening and/or replacement
Olympic Highway underpass	Medium	Rail overbridge clearance restricts movement of some heavy vehicles and loads	Regrading of the highway (and approaches) under the railway overbridge
Olympic Highway (South of Goldfields Way to North of Queen Street)	Medium	Decreased amenity from slow moving heavy vehicle travel through the Junee town centre, with intermittent impact of OLC closures	Traffic calming measures
Lord Street Bridge	Medium	Load limited bridge (Limited B-Double loads)	Bridge strengthening and/or replacement