



## Inland Rail Sponsors' Group

### Chair's Briefing

---

#### NARROMINE TO NARRABRI PREFERRED CORRIDOR

LEAD:

ARTC

#### ISSUES

ARTC is seeking Sponsors' Group endorsement of the Preferred Corridor for the Narromine to Narrabri (N2N) project.

#### OUTCOME SOUGHT


- Note the results of the *Narromine to Narrabri Preferred Corridor Report* (the preferred corridor report).
- Note the sensitivities concerning ARTC's preferred corridor.
- Endorse ARTC's report for the purposes of providing advice to the Minister.

s47C

## BACKGROUND


ARTC is seeking IRSG's endorsement of a preferred rail corridor.

The high level results of the multi-criteria analysis, as discussed in the Narromine to Narrabri Report, show no significant differences between the Narromine to Narrabri concept corridor and ARTC's preferred corridor. However, within the corridor options assessment there are three (of five) sections likely to be contentious:

- Narromine to Burroway – ARTC prefers an option via Eumungerie Road to the concept corridor. This corridor has superior technical and constructability attributes and a lower flood risk. However, the preferred option will cost an additional \$37 million. It also has higher potential heritage impacts and is likely to attract vocal opposition from some stakeholders;
- Curban to Mt Tenandra – ARTC prefers the concept corridor. However, affected landowners (backed by the Gilgandra and Coonamble Shire Councils) prefer the option that uses the Coonamble freight line to Gulargambone before following Box Ridge Road to Mt Tenandra. This option has less impact on properties and productive farming land. There is little difference between the options on technical viability and constructability grounds. However, the option preferred by stakeholders would cost an additional \$34 million and increase transit time by nine minutes compared with the concept corridor.
- Barradine to Narrabri – ARTC and many local landholders have a strong preference for the corridor option through the Pilliga State Forest and then adjacent to the Newell Highway. <sup>s47B</sup>  
 The cost estimate of the preferred alignment is \$83 million less than the concept alignment and the transit time is seven minutes faster.

A table setting out key information on each of the five sections is included in **Attachment A**.

In response to questions asked by Inland Rail Unit and the Department of Finance, ARTC has provided some additional information to support its preferred corridor recommendation. This highlighted some issues won't become clear until later in the development process but there is sufficient information to take the recommendation forward.

The Inland Rail Unit has requested further information and supporting reports. <sup>s47B</sup>  


## Narromine to Narrabri Inland Rail Corridor

The table below sets out key information concerning each of the five sections of the Narromine to Narrabri corridor and matters for further consideration.

Corridor section	ARTC's preferred option	Contentious Yes/No	Cost difference to concept corridor	Transit time difference to concept corridor (h:mm:ss)	Technical viability <sup>2</sup>	Safety assessment <sup>2</sup>	Operational approach <sup>2</sup>	Constructability and schedule <sup>2</sup>	Environment and heritage <sup>3</sup>	Community and property <sup>3</sup>	Approvals and stakeholder risk <sup>3</sup>	Overall multi-criteria analysis score <sup>1</sup>	Other considerations
Narromine to Burroway	Option via Eumungerie Road	Yes	\$37,093,861	+0:00:24	3.50	1.50	-1.67	5.75	0.25	-4.00	-2.00	+0.55	<p><b>Issues: Stakeholders' sentiment and potential heritage impacts v. constructability</b></p> <p>Constructability, technical viability and reduced flood risk strongly favour ARTC's preferred corridor via Eumungerie Road. However, the Eumungerie Road option affects more properties (40, compared with 29 on the concept corridor) and has higher heritage impacts. Opposition to the Eumungerie Road option is more organised and vocal than for the concept corridor.</p>
Burroway to Curban	Option via Gilmores Road	No	-\$4,257,193	+0:01:20	1.75	0	0	1.00	1.00	-1.00	0	+0.43	<p>There is little difference in overall scores between the concept corridor and the alternative options. The final corridor will be determined by outcomes of the Technical and Consultancy Approval Services.</p>
Curban to Mt Tenandra	Concept corridor	Yes	\$34,620,629	+0:09:04	-0.88	-0.25	-3.33	-0.25	-0.75	4.00	1.00	-0.27	<p><b>Issues: Stakeholder sentiment and property impacts v. cost and service offering</b></p> <p>Organised and vocal stakeholders, backed by Gilgandra and Coonamble Shire Councils, want Inland Rail to follow the Coonamble rail line to Gulargambone and then along Box Ridge Road to Mt Tenandra. There are no significant differences between technical viability and constructability scores between the options. However, the option preferred by local stakeholders would cost an additional \$34,620,629 and increase transit time by +0:09:04 compared with ARTC's preferred corridor (that is reflected in the significantly lower score for operational approach).</p> <p>s47B</p>
Mt Tenandra to Barradine	Concept corridor	No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>This section did not have an option to assess in the May 2017 MCA workshop, so there are no results to discuss. With the results of further geotechnical investigation and landholder consultation through this area generated in Phase 2, a formal multi-criteria analysis will need to be undertaken to confirm the alignment of any refinements.</p>
Barradine to Narrabri	Option via Pilliga and Newell Highway	Yes	-\$83,400,331	-0:07:35	4.88	2.50	1.67	6.00	4.25	2.00	1.00	+3.18	<p><b>Issues: NSW Government approval of transit through State Forest, conservation areas and controversial gas project.</b></p> <p>Most criteria assessed measurably favour the route through the Pilliga State Forest and adjacent to the Newell Highway. s47B</p>

## Key:

- Measurably positive score or attribute
- Measurably negative score or attribute

1. A score of positive 5 suggests the option is measurably better than the Base Case Modified. A score of negative 5 suggests the option is measurably worse than the Base Case Modified. (Total score)
2. A score of positive 3.125 suggests the option is measurably better than the Base Case Modified. A score of negative 3.125 suggests the option is measurably worse than the Base Case Modified. (Technical aspects)
3. A score of positive 1.875 suggests the option is measurably better than the Base Case Modified. A score of negative 1.875 suggests the option is measurably worse than the Base Case Modified. (Non-technical aspects)