

Submission Inland Rail Inquiry ARTC

ARTC ineptitude in managing an effective stakeholder engagement process renders the progressing of the rail via the current route as null and void.

ARTC have displayed complete incompetence in their management of the Inland Rail process. ARTC have put the "con" into consultation by overstating attendance at community meetings, staging drop-in sessions at times and venues where they knew that they would get nonattendance and by being completely unresponsive to legitimate questions regarding the rail line. ARTC are putting the "gag" into engagement by running their meetings without any time for questions from the public and by threatening the attendees if they dared to try and ask questions.

The culture of an organisation is set by their management and it is clear in ARTCs case that the indifference and dismissive attitude displayed by Mr Fullerton to the Senate Estimates Committee has set this as the bench mark for ARTC employees. In addition, the aggression shown by Mr Wankmuller at the same Senate Estimates debate would seem to provide ARTC employees permission to behave like that.

From the outset, we have tried to engage meaningfully with ARTC but are yet to receive a straight answer on any questions. Initially questions were emailed to ARTC directly, but ARTC then said that they would not take our questions directly and we had to refer our questions via the CCC members. However, ARTC would not supply the contact details of the CCC members, so only the couple of members who had provided their emails were targeted with questions. ARTC then did not allow these members to ask the questions as they said all CCC members should have a say, essentially stopping any ability for questions to be answered.

The CCC meetings themselves consist of presentations which take up the whole three hours and can not be read by attendees. The image below is a screen shot from the front row of the last Inner Downs CCC meeting in Pittsworth. As you can see, the audience had no chance of reading this slide.

Impact Assessment

Licensed groundwater volumes (take/interfere with water):

Total % available for new entitlements:
0.01% (GABORA2017)

Water to be sourced from existing entitlements,

Water Plan	Water Source	License/Entitlement	Number of entitlements	Water available (ML/yr)	Total available (ML/yr)
Gaboran River	River	Regulation	700	10,000	10,000
		Industrial and commercial	10	1,000	1,000
		Regulation and storage	50	5,000	5,000
		Trans water and other supplies	10	1,000	1,000
		Domestic supply and storage	10	1,000	1,000
		Agro	10	1,000	1,000
		Total % of licensed water volume			100%
Gaboran River	River	Regulation and storage	700	10,000	10,000
		Industrial and commercial	10	1,000	1,000
		Agro	10	1,000	1,000
		Commercial and industrial	10	1,000	1,000
		Trans water and other supplies	10	1,000	1,000
		Aquifers	10	1,000	1,000
		Drainage	10	1,000	1,000
Total % of licensed water volume			100%		
Gaboran River	River	Regulation and storage	700	10,000	10,000
		Commercial and industrial	10	1,000	1,000
		Industrial and commercial	10	1,000	1,000
		Agro	10	1,000	1,000
		Trans water and other supplies	10	1,000	1,000
		Aquifers	10	1,000	1,000
		Drainage	10	1,000	1,000
Total % of licensed water volume			100%		
Gaboran River	River	Regulation and storage	700	10,000	10,000
		Commercial and industrial	10	1,000	1,000
		Industrial and commercial	10	1,000	1,000
		Agro	10	1,000	1,000
		Trans water and other supplies	10	1,000	1,000
		Aquifers	10	1,000	1,000
		Drainage	10	1,000	1,000
Total % of licensed water volume			100%		
Gaboran River	River	Regulation and storage	700	10,000	10,000
		Commercial and industrial	10	1,000	1,000
		Industrial and commercial	10	1,000	1,000
		Agro	10	1,000	1,000
		Trans water and other supplies	10	1,000	1,000
		Aquifers	10	1,000	1,000
		Drainage	10	1,000	1,000
Total % of licensed water volume			100%		

When issues have been raised with all levels of government, we are just referred to ARTC who won't respond. How can ARTC get Inland Rail right if they won't listen?

The following are just two examples of ARTC and their non-responsive attitude.

EXAMPLE 1:

The following is an example of an email trail between myself and ARTC. This was a simple question after the floods in NQ and the train derailment - noting that the Inland Rail is crossing significant flood plains in NSW and QLD. The question is what will ARTC do when this happens – note ARTC are looking into this as at 11 Feb 2019 – it is now **29 Nov 2019** and **no response**.

From:

Sent: Monday, 11 February 2019 9:26 AM

To:

Subject: FW: ARTC Resolution to this issue

Hi Vicki

Thank you for your enquiry. I'm still looking into this one for you.

Kind regards

From: V Battaglia <

Sent: Friday, 8 February 2019 9:07 AM

To:

Subject: [EXT] ARTC Resolution to this issue

Hi Willow

Can you please provide ARTC's management plan for a situation as outlined in this news article?

<https://www.northweststar.com.au/story/5893826/freight-train-derailed-in-floodwaters-at-nelia/>

Thanks

EXAMPLE 2:

Another example is the issues of flood modelling in one of the local catchments in the Inner Downs. ARTC presented an out of focus power point at a CCC meeting. I requested the hydrology report, only to be told I could not have it. I then requested the power point, to be told it needed to be explained so I could not have it either. I said I would come and meet them to have it explained, which was arranged. I arrived on time for the meeting to be kept waiting for 15 minutes. When I finally got into the meeting room the presenter decided to take a break leaving me waiting another 10 minutes. When I finally was given the opportunity to see the presentation and I asked for some additional information to be told (you guessed it) I could not have it! When I questioned why ARTC flood modelling was not consistent with Toowoomba Regional Council and Dept Natural Resources with ARTC flood extents being much less I was not provided with an answer.

Attachment 1 is the Hydrology Power Point for Westbrook Creek. It is out of focus and not able to be assessed in any way for validity.

If ARTC are confident in what they are producing why does it have to be a secret? As locals we know what is going on with water flows so why don't they want our input? Why do they release statements saying their flood modelling is "fit-for-purpose", when the data the model is based on is flawed?

The following are just some of the questions we are still awaiting valid answers on. Yesterday ARTC did provide a water estimate but did not say what distance the volume of water used applied to, so the information was useless:

ARTC have been requested to provide information on:

Water

Embankment construction and progressive consolidation of these banks will require not just significant, but massive, volumes of water as will tunnel boring.

1. How much water will be used in construction?
2. How has the water use figure been calculated?
3. How much water will be used in boring tunnels?
4. Where will the water come from?
5. What impacts does ARTC envisage on bores from blasting?
6. What long term impacts have been identified on bores?
7. How much water was used in the construction of the Toowoomba Bypass (Second Range Crossing)?
8. Where did the water from the Toowoomba bypass come from?
9. If water allocations to farmers are being cut, how can ARTC source water?
10. Who will be responsible to provide water to those properties/ businesses/ residents who will lose their water because of this Greenfield project? Federal or State?

Construction

1. How is the rail being constructed across flood plains - is it ballast or dirt with ballast?
2. How will ARTC mitigate the affects of blasting on structures?
3. Will consolidated roads be bitumen?
4. What are the envisaged time delays during construction?

Noise and Vibration

1. What noise mitigation mechanisms are available and what have ARTC got in place in other areas where they have tracks?
2. There are numerous studies about the adverse health effects of both noise and vibration. Given it cannot be disputed that the noise and vibrations will cause residents illness, what will ARTC do about this? Will they pay the relevant medical expenses?
3. Will ARTC pay compensation for houses damaged by the rail vibrations?

Communication

1. What communication strategy is in place of the newly announced bridge crossing at Gowrie?
2. How many additional properties are affected by this new crossing?

Route Realignment

1. Media reports say the route from Boggabilla to Yerlarbon is being re – visited. What process needs to happen of the Yerlarbon to Gowrie section to also be reexamined?

Costing

1. We would like to request that the new costings be provided and that an independent audit be undertaken of these costings.

Not being able to answer these questions proves ARTC are simply not up to the job. They were selected so the government did not have to put the budget for this project on their books so they can hide the expenditure and the non-return on investment. The consultation process, or lack thereof, negates the ability for ARTC to progress the rail route as they have no credibility amongst stakeholders.

This Inquiry needs to request an independent assessment of the business case, and from there appoint properly equipped organization to undertake the construction tasks. ARTC are simply not fit-for-purpose.

Yours sincerely

V Battaglia