



ACT
Government

City and Environment

OFFICIAL

Our ref: CED FOI 26-018

Dear [REDACTED]

Freedom of Information – Notice of Decision

I refer to your application under section 30 of the Freedom of Information Act 2016 (the FOI Act), received by the City and Environment Directorate (CED) on 22 January 2026. It is my understanding you are seeking access to the following information:

- “1. Any options assessment, briefing note, internal memo, email correspondence, or decision record that considers possible R1 termination / turnback arrangements, including use of the Dickson Interchange crossover.*
- 2. Any operational plan, service plan, or operational instructions developed for this closure period.*
- 3. Any safety assessment, risk assessment, hazard analysis, or operational risk register relating to use of the Dickson crossover for reversing services.*
- 4. Any communications strategy, internal briefing, or stakeholder communications plan relating to passenger information for the closure period.”*

Timeframes

In accordance with section 40 of the FOI Act, CED is required to provide a decision on your access application within 30 working days. As this matter required third party consultation, the decision due date was extended by 15 working days, in accordance with section 40(2) of the FOI Act. Under section 41 of the FOI Act, you agreed an additional amount of time to decide your application. A further 2 working day extension was sought on 22 June 2026.

Authority

I am an Information Officer appointed by the Director-General of the City and Environment Directorate under section 18 of the FOI Act to deal with access applications made under Part 5 of the FOI Act.

Decision on access

A search for records held by CED has been completed and 42 records within the scope of your application have been identified. Four records were transferred to CED from Infrastructure Canberra in accordance with section 58 of the FOI Act. The 46 records are listed in the schedule at **Attachment A**.

One of the records identified is already publicly available. Under section 43(1)(d) of the FOI Act provides that an agency may refuse to deal with an access application wholly or in part if the government information is already available to the applicant. Section 45 sets out the circumstances in which government information is already available to the applicant. Those circumstances include where the government information is publicly available.

As such, I have refused to deal with part of your application under section 43(1)(d) and section 45(g) of the FOI Act as record 46 is already available to you on the ACT Government Contract Register at <https://www.tenders.act.gov.au/contract/attachments?id=130871>.

In relation to the other 45 records, I have decided to:

- grant **full** access to 41 records.
- grant **partial** access to four records.

The reasons for my decision are detailed in the *Statement of reasons* section below. The records being released to you are provided at **Attachment B**, with redactions applied to any information contrary to the public interest to release.

I understand from the CED Light Rail Operations team that due to the scope of work required for Light Rail Stage 2A (including works on the new Traction Power Substation (near Swinden Street Stop), the option to use Dickson interchange crossover for light rail operations was not available and therefore not considered.

Statement of reasons

The FOI Act has a pro-disclosure bias, which requires information to be disclosed unless doing so would be contrary to the public interest. As an Information Officer, I am responsible for determining whether disclosure of the information within the scope of your application would be contrary to the public interest.

My assessment begins with Schedule 1 of the FOI Act, which outlines categories of information that are taken to be contrary to the public interest to disclose. If the information does not fall within any of these categories, I must then apply the public interest test under section 17 of the FOI Act. This test involves weighing the factors favouring disclosure against those favouring nondisclosure, as set out in Schedule 2.

In reaching my access decisions, I have taken the following into account:

- the FOI Act
- the information that falls within the scope of your application
- the views of third parties consulted
- the *Human Rights Act 2004*
- the ACT Ombudsman FOI Guidelines.

I confirm that I have not considered any of the factors listed in section 17(2) of the FOI Act, which outlines a list of considerations that must not be taken into account when applying the public interest test.

Schedule 1 – Information taken to be contrary to the public interest

- *No relevant categories identified.*

Schedule 2 – Public interest test

Factors favouring disclosure (Schedule 2.1)

- *Section 2.1(a)(i) - promote open discussion of public affairs and enhance the government's accountability.*
- *Section 2.1(a)(iii) - inform the community of the government's operations, including policies, guidelines and codes of conduct followed by the government in its dealings with members of the community.*

In reviewing the information within the scope of your application, I consider that disclosure promotes open discussion of public affairs, enhances government's accountability generally, and helps inform the community around government operations and policies. I have placed moderate weight on these factors.

Factors favouring nondisclosure (Schedule 2.2)

- *Section 2.2(a)(ii) - prejudice the protection of an individual's right to privacy or any other right under the Human Rights Act 2004.*
- *Section 2.2(a)(xv) - prejudice the management function of an agency or the conduct of industrial relations by an agency.*

Some of the records relevant to your application contain personal information of individuals, including the mobile numbers and signatures of ACT Government employees. The mobile numbers of employees are either personal phone numbers or provided by CED to staff for a specific purpose, such as out of hours contact. I consider that the disclosure of the mobile number is likely to prejudice the personal privacy of employees and their right to disconnect, and that the advancement to the public in disclosing this information is minimal as information on how to contact the directorate is already publicly available.

The signatures of ACT Government employees are often redacted to prevent the misuse of personal information. The FOI Guidelines emphasise that while there is a strong public interest in transparency, there are also significant privacy concerns that must be addressed. I consider the disclosure of signatures is likely to prejudice the personal privacy of employees, and comparably the disclosure of such information does not significantly contribute to public understanding of government operations.

Records 1, 4, 9 and 13 contains the direct phone numbers and email addresses of Canberra Metro, CMET and CED employees. The purpose of including contact information in internal procedures is to enable effective communication between agencies in relation to light rail services. I consider that the disclosure of this information is likely to encourage direct contact by external entities, including requests made directly from members of the public. The diversion of these requests is likely to prejudice the management of complaint, request or claims functions as they would not be received by the correct case management system. The misdirection of these requests circumnavigates processes in place to ensure effective responses, particularly in relation to contingencies for staff absence. I have considered that this information is not readily available to the public and has not otherwise been disclosed by CED.

I have placed substantial weight on the factors favouring nondisclosure.

Balancing the factors

In balancing the factors favouring disclosure against those favouring nondisclosure, I have carefully considered the public interest in promoting transparency, accountability and informed public debate. I acknowledge that disclosure of certain information would advance these interests, particularly where it relates to the government's operations and related policies and guidelines.

I find that considerations must be given strong public interest in protecting personal privacy and to the Light Rail Operations and how disclosure is likely to prejudice the management of specific functions. On balance, I find the factor favouring nondisclosure of the specific internal contact details and staff mobile phone numbers and signatures to carry greater weight than the factors favouring disclosure for the relevant information. As such, I find disclosure to be, on balance, contrary to the public interest. Accordingly, I have redacted this specific information under section 50(2) of the FOI Act.

Having applied the public interest test outlined in section 17 of the FOI Act, I have also concluded that most information contained in the records is in the public interest to disclose.

Consistent with the pro-disclosure intent of the FOI Act, I am satisfied that redacting only the information that is contrary to the public interest ensures compliance with the FOI Act while still providing access to the majority of the information held by CED within the scope of your application.

Charges

Processing charges are applicable for this application because the total number of pages to be released to you exceeds the charging threshold of 50 pages. However, I have decided not to impose a fee in response to your application.

Online publishing – Disclosure Log

Under section 28 of the FOI Act, CED maintains a disclosure log, which is a public record of access applications and decisions. Your original access application and my decision will be published on the CED disclosure log. Your personal contact details will not be published.

ACT Ombudsman Review

My decision on your access application is a reviewable decision as identified in Schedule 3 of the FOI Act. You have the right to seek ACT Ombudsman review of this outcome under section 73 of the FOI Act within 20 working days from the day that my decision is provided to you, or a longer period allowed by the ACT Ombudsman. If you wish to request a review of my decision, you may write to the ACT Ombudsman at:

The ACT Ombudsman
GPO Box 442
CANBERRA ACT 2601
Via email: actfoi@ombudsman.gov.au

ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal (ACAT) Review

Under section 84 of the FOI Act, if a decision is made under section 82(1) on an Ombudsman review, you may apply to the ACAT for review of the Ombudsman decision. Further information may be obtained from the ACAT at:

ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal
GPO Box 370
Canberra City ACT 2601
Telephone: (02) 6207 1740
<https://www.acat.act.gov.au/>

Please contact the CED Information Access team if you have any queries in relation to your application via 6207 2987 or CEDFOI@act.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

Craig Weller
Information Officer
City and Environment Directorate
24 June 2026