INQUIRY INTO IMPACT OF THE WESTCONNEX PROJECT

Name: Mr Victor Pinkerton

Date Received: 31 August 2018

Dear Public Accountability Committee,

The submission I'm making to the impacts of WESTCONNEX includes the questions relating to the building and sale processes.

Could you explain how Credit Suisse have done better analysis than the government?

Could Super fund members that have been shoehorned into this project suspect foul play ?

Considering that a number of players in this project would be barred from engaging in any government projects in Canada. Would the Canadian Superannuates be entitled to notification of these same dodgy companies are involved in this WestCONnex project and are in fact welcomed to participate by this government?

Does this not have a stench of corruption about it ?

Would a subsidy be required?

In essence that subsidy would most likely come from government coffers – i.e. future infrastructure spend on such frivolous non-necessities such as hospitals, schools and public transport. Conversely higher tolls would blow the distance cap out of the water, which would mean a different M4-M5 Link tolling structure and make usage cost prohibitive for many commuters and reduce the usage , which of course would make the whole scheme less profitable even to the point of loss-making. There goes investor interest and a return to the state from the 49% retained. The knock-on effect would be more congestion on existing roads and more pressure on an already woefully over-crowded and under-funded public transport system.

Do you see this scenario arising?

Many people have expressed grave concern about the planning processes in NSW,

Do you see this process as being anything but ideal ?

Do you see the definition of a monopoly, in the case of Transurban's domination of road ownership, as being wrong.

As the most expensive road project per kilometre in the world, why have so many many homeowners and business owners been denied fair compensation in the compulsory property acquisition program ?

The nearby properties that have not been acquired that have sustained damage due to the construction are entitled to fair compensation. Would you not agree ?

The fact that many homeowners have incurred substantial property damage already and are left to fend for themselves like a shag on a rock is not how any resident of the Commonwealth could expect to be treated.

Do you not see this as an outrageous abuse ?

Do you see a pattern of abuse developing here?