

s22

s22 (irrelevant)

From: MASHFORD Scott
Sent: Wednesday, 8 November 2017 3:55 PM
To: NERDAL Brendan <Brendan.Nerdal@infrastructure.gov.au>
Subject: RE: N2N announcement [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Apologies Brendan – I thought these matters had been addressed at Monday’s meeting with the Minister. Below are responses to your specific questions.

s22 (irrelevant)

Scott Mashford
General Manager | Communications and Stakeholder Engagement
Inland Rail Unit
Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development
GPO Box 594, Canberra ACT 2601
t +61 2 6274 7624 | [S47F \(personal\)](tel:S47F)
e scott.mashford@infrastructure.gov.au | w www.infrastructure.gov.au

Data

1. Could I get a copy of Appendix C to the ARTC Preferred Corridor Report (Attachment E to the MS17-002171) in '.xls' format, with the MCA comparison scores also included in columns associated with each of the corridor sections?
Already provided.
The report on the outcomes of the December 2016 MCA workshop is attached.

s22 (irrelevant)

s47B

s22 (irrelevant)

Land Acquisition

8. What is the estimated land acquisition task for the proposed corridor? It is unclear at this time what the actual task will be. ARTC has identified the number of properties that may be affected as:

Corridor sub-section	ARTC Preferred	Alternative
Narromine to Burroway	40	29
Burroway to Curban	19	21
Curban to Mt Tenandra	29	24
Mt Tenandra to Barradine	55	55
Barradine to Narrabri	50	74

9. When will that commence? Not until after the completion of the EIS approvals and detailed design processes – at a minimum 18 months to 2 years away. It is only after the completion of the EIS and design processes that the actual alignment within the corridor will be known.

s22 (irrelevant)

Narromine to Burroway (Alternative Route)

12. While the alternative and preferred option impacts more stakeholders in the short-term, by avoiding Narromine it reduces long-term impacts. s47C

Burroway to Curban

13. A 5km study area might have the criticism of rather than selecting a preferred corridor we have simply expanded an existing one. If the intention is to go to the east as suggested, it is difficult to understand why we would go with the wide corridor.
14. It is equally difficult to explain how a cost-saving is being achieved on the alignment if the existing option still exists?
 - a. Overall, it seems to me that there could have been a smaller final study area, located to the East, why are we not doing this? As set out in ARTC's preferred corridor report, the consultation concerning the alternative route prior to the MCA workshop was limited. By setting the wider study corridor, ARTC seeks to minimise the risks associated with the community not being fully engaged in the development of the refinements. Refinements will occur after further site work and consultation as part of Phase 2 – feasibility. The outcomes will provide a more open and robust basis for discussion with the community. s47C
The spreadsheet provided in ARTC's preferred corridor report (and again provided as an excel spreadsheet) reflects estimated construction costs, not investigation costs.

Curban to Mt Tenandra

s47B

Mt Tenandra to Baradine

1. No alternative was considered here, despite the report suggesting there is community concern. Is this because there is no substantially different option available? I can't pull from the ARTC specific details on this? There is no viable alternative. The topography of the area does not allow for it. Many land holders within the proposed corridor sub-section accept this. Others would prefer Inland Rail to make use of the Coonamble line to Coonamble before heading back towards Gwabegar/Narrabri. ARTC's Service Offering (and the overall budget for N2N) would be severely compromised if this deviation was to be incorporated in the N2N route.

Baradine to Narabri

17. As I've suggested in the letter, we should draw out that this Piliga Forestry Route uses an existing transport corridor. I think this is an important point in relation to the forestry fragmentation/biodiversity questions. This is already included in announcement strategies. The route identified by ARTC seeks to minimise environmental impacts by avoiding conservation areas.

s47B

From: NERDAL Brendan
Sent: Tuesday, 7 November 2017 12:25 PM
To: MASHFORD Scott <Scott.Mashford@infrastructure.gov.au>
Subject: RE: N2N announcement [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi Scott,

The Minister has taken the briefing with him on his travels to read closely. The timing of an announcement is something that I've asked him about and so no doubt we'll hear later in the week. Most likely not until Andrew joins him in Tasmania on Thurs/Friday.

You were also preparing responses to the questions that I asked last week, are you still planning on sending them through? It might be that the Minister needs more information, and some of those questions are likely to be the areas that he is interested in.

BN

From: MASHFORD Scott
Sent: Tuesday, 7 November 2017 9:34 AM
To: NERDAL Brendan <Brendan.Nerdal@infrastructure.gov.au>
Subject: N2N announcement [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi Brendan

Following on from yesterday's meeting, could you please clarify the Minister's intentions in relation to the announcement of the N2N alignment?

You had mentioned the possibility of an announcement in the w/c 20 November but the Minister seemed to suggest he was going to Mr Coulton's electorate some time in December.

Could you please confirm when the Minister will likely be in the area and whether that will be the opportunity to announce the corridor (assuming the Minister approves in the coming days!)

Cheers.

Scott Mashford
General Manager | Communications and Stakeholder Engagement
Inland Rail Unit
Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development
GPO Box 594, Canberra ACT 2601
t +61 2 6274 7624 | **S47F (personal)**
e scott.mashford@infrastructure.gov.au | w www.infrastructure.gov.au