

From: s22 (irrelevant)
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Narrabri to Narrabri - Questions and clarifications - ARTC Response [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, 26 September 2017 11:27:47 AM
Attachments: image001.jpg
image002.jpg
image003.jpg

Hi s22

We are going to propose that consideration of the N2N paper be held over for consideration until the next Sponsors Group meeting on 11 October. The overall thrust of the minute to our Secretary, as chair of the Sponsors Group, will be that while the difference between the N2N concept corridor and the preferred corridor is marginal, there are differences within several of the five sections that make up the N2N corridor that warrant additional advice before a preferred alignment can be endorsed.

In particular, we will be focusing on

- the Narromine to Burroway section – cultural heritage; stakeholder sentiment; technical and construction matters
- the Curban to Mt Tenandra section – stakeholder sentiment v service offering and cost
- the Barradine to Narrabri section – advantages and potential risks of traversing State Forest.

s22 (irrelevant)

Please let me know if I can assist further. I would be grateful for information as to what advice you are proposing to provide to your Secretary that may be in addition to or different to the above, eg. Whether or not you will be incorporating advice around ARTC's advice around possible additional costs. I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

s22

Stakeholder Engagement | Inland Rail Unit
Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development
GPO Box 594, Canberra ACT 2601

s22 (irrelevant)

www.infrastructure.gov.au

s22 (irrelevant)

