

As an Adelaide Hills resident living in proximity to the rail freight line, I can attest to the unacceptable level of noise emanating from freight trains on this line day and night. Apart from noise, we experience at times vibrations travelling through the ground which are strong enough to rattle windows in their frames. Such train-induced vibration is I believe partly the cause of wall cracking we have experienced in our home.

I am very concerned that option 1 (upgrading the existing route) seems to be a pretext to allowing even longer and heavier (double-stacked) trains to use this line.

This would increase the problem with vibration, and is therefore in my view completely unacceptable.

I am not convinced at all by anodyne statements about 'a range of measures to reduce the social impact' to make this option more acceptable: it is up to the proponents of this option to provide conclusive proof that these 'measures' would in fact be successful. We have had promises before that the squealing noises from these trains will be fixed: the fact that this is still a problem, years after such promises were made, proves that such promises can not be accepted.

We have been treated as second-class citizens in comparison with residents under the flight paths around Adelaide Airport: not only do they enjoy a night curfew but they have received generous assistance to sound-proof their homes.

I note that a similar (11 p.m.-6 a.m. in the metropolitan area) curfew is not being considered as an option for the Hills rail freight line. No doubt objections as to the practicality of this will be made. However, are the problems with imposing a night curfew really insurmountable, or would surmounting them cost more than the \$1.4 - 2.4 billion proposed to be spent in re-routing? If the answer to this question is no, then why is this not an option under consideration, at least as an interim measure? I am aware of the potential problems this would cause related to scheduling, lay-offs and re-starting locomotives etc., but again, would solutions cost \$2 billion? Even a shorter curfew (e.g. midnight-5 a.m.) would be a significant improvement.

Sleep disruption is a serious health issue for residents living along this line, and we have already waited many years even for this problem to come under active consideration. Will the government allow us at least five hours uninterrupted sleep a night?

As to the relative merits of various re-routing options, I can not comment apart from saying that qualified engineers/planners should be able to assess these options to determine which disadvantages the least number of citizens while keeping within a realistic budget.

The fact that governments are actively seeking to increase our population by 65% by 2050 means that such infrastructure issues will only gain greater prominence. If such a population increase is government policy, then it is up to government to provide solutions to these problems.

Mr GE WALKER