

**Subject: WA Rail Access Regime - Public Submission.**

**Date:** Tue, 29 Jan 2002 16:35:07 +0800

**From:** "keith jones" <keithjones@arach.net.au>

**To:** <tammy\_ng@railaccess.wa.gov.au>

I offer the following comments in response to the advertised request for public submissions:-

1.) It is interesting to note that the WAGR still claims management and control of the section of dual gauge track from Robbs Jetty to Fremantle. (Ref WAGR Segregation Arrangements 7.12.01, page 2.)

This is particularly curious in view of the fact that Westrail previously disposed of the railway reserve at Robbs Jetty, and the WA Planning Commission decreed in 1998 that the former reserve was not required for any future station or railway use whatsoever.

It seems therefore that the WAGR is retaining control of a 3km section of track which runs south from Fremantle to nowhere in particular. Moreover, because this is the freight line to Fremantle Port, the section would likely be leased to ARG and this could result in a clash of access interests with WestNet Rail.

The WAGR might like to clarify the demarcation arrangements which will apply here, and the purpose for retaining control of this section of track.

2.) Likewise, the WAGR is claiming management and control of the narrow gauge track running south from Armadale to Mundijong.

This section is designated as a freight railway by the Ministry for Planning, and WAGR interest in it gives rise to the same request for clarification as above.

3.) On the subject of competition for train paths it is noted that "WAGR will use its best endeavours to enable the applicant to **purchase** its desired train path," and "WAGR will allocate the train path in order to achieve the best **commercial outcome** for the WAGR." (Ref WAGR Train Path Policy 2.12.01, page 9.)

I submit that, in the case of any applicant who wishes to operate trains for the tourism/recreational niche market, that applicant should be granted train paths free of charge by the WAGR.

The thought here is that the WAGR should make a contribution to tourism for the benefit of the state, and niche market operators would thus be assisted to continue rail tourism/recreational ventures which bring positive gains to the community.

4.) Further again to item 3.) above, I do not see any consideration of community benefit in the documents apart from "best commercial outcome for the WAGR."

The basic concept of the rail access regime is to foster efficiency, growth and competition of rail transport, and as a result to get more freight (and people) off road and onto rail for the good of our environment.

The best commercial outcome for the WAGR (or any other railway owner) should therefore also be examined in the context of the likely benefit to the community in the long term, which may not necessarily be the most profitable option at first.

With my thanks for this opportunity to comment.

Yours sincerely, Keith Jones.