

To whom it may concern,
We write in response to the report
***“Department of Infrastructure, Transport,
Regional Development & Local Government
Adelaide Rail Freight Movements Study
Discussion Paper
October 2009”***

We live on [REDACTED] Blackwood, approximately 50 metres from the Blackwood Station level crossing.

We have owned our current home since 1989 and in that time have noticed a significant increase in freight volume and an almost unbearable increase in the noise level. If we are outside our house when a freight train is passing, we need to wear earplugs as the noise is physically painful.

We have looked closely at the above report and would like to make the following comments.

1. We would strongly oppose **option 1**. In the past we were assured that various upgrades etc would not result in any inconvenience to us. This has proven to be blatantly false. Increasing the size and weight of the trains does not leave us reassured that the noise will decrease and certainly the inconvenience of longer waiting times at the level crossing will be a factor in reducing our quality of life.

2. **Option 2** is clearly being rejected for option 3

3. **Option 3** will virtually eliminate the problems for us, but may result in shifting them to people living near the new alignment. We are not convinced that it is the best option, though we favour it ahead of option #1.

4. **Option 4** would be our preference even though it is the most expensive in terms of initial cost. The paper does not discuss the cost per kilometer of transporting freight, but given that option 4 is much shorter than any of the others and we are talking millions of tons per year, there must be a huge saving in cost and greenhouse emissions over the lifetime of these options.
Additionally there is no mention of the possibility of passenger services using the bypass rail link, but this option needs to be considered.
Are we looking at a single line with passing loops or a double line?
Presumably there will be provision for double stacking.
There does not appear to be any reference to the effect on road freight, and it is not clear to us why option 5 has the potential to move significantly more freight than option #4.

5. **Option 5** seems to be an each way bet with hills residents still suffering the trauma we currently endure. We would see this as most unsatisfactory. As mentioned above, we do not understand why this option is estimated to carry much more traffic. We also are not reassured that any upgrade will result in less noise or inconvenience.

In summary: we see option #4 as being the option which is most innovative, potentially most satisfying to hills residents, and offering the possibility of opening a new rail passenger

service at a time when the hills suburbs are being gridlocked with road traffic and a poor public transport service.

Yours Sincerely,

Jill and Terry Tierney