

15 October 2009

RE: Moving the freight train line. Adelaide Rail Freight Movements Study Discussion Paper

Dear Sir/Madam,

My family and I are the residents of Panorama. We live near the freight train line and so I wish to make our submission for consideration.

We are strongly in favor of options to remove the freight train away from our residential area. The main (but not only) reason is high noise pollution by freight train which we believe is more than a nuisance.

My family house is located near the freight line at a distance of about 300-400 m. This is a substantial distance if compared to a distance to a conventional road. However the level of the freight train noise is so enormously high that it can be compared to a loud speech inside even with all windows closed. I refer to the Hon. I.F. Evans (Davenport) submission (13/10/2008) which quotes the level of noise above 100 decibels. This exceeds Australian and World Health standards. The freight train often travels through the dense populated area many times during the night. I believe the noise pollution is far more than merely a nuisance as it is likely to impact the health and wellbeing of thousands of residents who live near the freight line.

I suggest that the impact to the health of residents who live near the freight line should be included to the study. That is the extent to which the enormous and systematic noise pollution increases the risk of mental or physical diseases in the area. The associated medical costs to be included in the cost/benefit analysis.

I am a certified Project Manager (with Project Management Institute). From reading the materials available to me I see an order of magnitude direct costs associated with each project (the option). For such large projects more assessments can (and should) be made. Below are my suggestions.

1. The costs associated with non satisfying the quality expectations need to be assessed and considered in the cost/benefit analysis. For example these are the costs associated with health impacts to residents, additional greenhouse costs, cost of traffic delays etc. Each option may fully or partially eliminate or reduce these negative costs.
2. As it is now the freight train causes risks. Each project (option) fully or partially reduces negative risks listed in the considerations (page 17). I suggest the quantitative risk analysis to be performed. That is each risk has a probability and a specific negative cost. Such cost needs to be included in the cost/benefit analysis for each option. For example the derailment is a risk which has costs. One option eliminates the derailment as it shifts the freight train while another may not effectively address it as it leaves the train on the current track. In the case if the freight train is used to carry chemical compounds or fuels then there is an additional significant negative risk associated with pollution, health hazard or large fire.
3. Each project has also positive risks (the opportunities). I suggest to identify and assess new opportunities which may become available as a result of each project implementation. These shall be considered in cost benefit analysis. Typically larger projects have more capacity to result in more opportunities.
4. Given the large size each project (option) by itself is a source of jobs, a stimulus for many businesses and the economy of the state. Large innovative projects have positive impact to community and often bring additional indirect benefits. Such economical benefits ought to be assessed and included in the cost/benefit analysis. Typically larger projects have potential to

bring more benefits than smaller projects and hence offset part of their additional costs. For example a program to support small businesses can be redirected to flow through such large infrastructure project and hence offset some project costs.

5. Public responsibility and ethical issues. I do not know whether or not it is legally permitted in this state to operate the train with the level of noise which breaks all safety regulations. If it is, this is outrageous. The ethical side of this question however is obvious.

Thank You,
Alexander Popov
M. Sci. CAPM, MCTS BI, MCTS SSIM, MCITP DBA, MCITP DBD, MCITP BI