

---

**From:** Tony Glazebrook  
**Sent:** 28 May 2009 13:06  
**To:** Kraemer, Robert  
**Cc:** Riley, John; stefan.rotthaus@bilfinger.co.uk  
**Subject:** Overrun protection at Newhaven and Airport tramstops

Hi Robert,

Again, taking your points in turn . . .

tie has not been formally issued with any DAS at all. The one "submitted" by SDS for route Section 2A was on an informal basis because it was incomplete.

Your comment on explanation of mitigating measures is welcome! However, it is extremely important that such safety arguments are tested and found to be valid within BSC before passing them on to tie, let alone the ICP John Dolan.

I reiterate that tie has at no time "accepted an engineering solution" to this issue. No change is involved because no properly argued, supportable proposal has yet been made!

This needs action.

Best regards,

Tony

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Kraemer, Robert [mailto:kraemer.robert@siemens.com]  
**Sent:** 27 May 2009 17:04  
**To:** Tony Glazebrook  
**Cc:** Riley, John; stefan.rotthaus@bilfinger.co.uk  
**Subject:** AW: Overrun protection at Newhaven and Airport tramstops

Hi Toni,

We should spend some time to have a detailed look at the Novation Agreement, Schedule 14 and the commitments tie gave in that.

You will find the statement, that the DAS is required for every design phase, which includes the design prepared under the guidance of tie.

Is there any DAS for the design available to be handed over to us?

As agreed in your absence with Colin Matlock, John Dolan and John Riley, the information of the ORA will be transferred into the hazard log, in which a reference will be given to a specific document explaining details of the mitigating measures to be transferred in the relevant design, cross reference might be given to the design documentation. Within the DAS tie will receive a confirmation, that the requirements stipulated in the hazard log have been incorporated into the design.

That the approach we agreed on, John is taking care on the details.

Detailed examination of potential solutions is given in the Trackwork Specification Chapter 4.2 The most economical solution might be the buffer stops, but we are not sure if this solution meets the expectations of the PSCC and the ICP. Following that we will not start an internal evaluation process and spending engineering hours for a solution already accepted by tie, on which demand we have eliminated the buffers.

In the event you ask us to make a proposal for the change of the design, we will be able to do so following the established process.

But you will understand that my management will not allow to give any internal order without considering this process.

So, we are sure that in this case the action is with the PSCC and tie first!

Beside that, we will proceed with our trackwork design!

Kind reagrds

Robert

Mit freundlichen Grüßen

Robert Krämer

-----Ursprüngliche Nachricht-----

Von: Tony Glazebrook [mailto:Tony.Glazebrook@tie.ltd.uk]

Gesendet: Mittwoch, 27. Mai 2009 17:33

An: Kraemer, Robert

Cc: Riley, John; stefan.rotthaus@bilfinger.co.uk

Betreff: Overrun protection at Newhaven and Airport tramstops

Hi Robert,

Taking your points in turn . . .

A design can only be considered fit for purpose upon acceptance of the offered DAS. No complete DAS has ever been offered to tie so far - hence tie has NOT to date accepted any design as being fit for purpose.

The assignment of the status "IFC" to any design package issued so far has been entirely outside of the DAS process.

From the outset of Transdev's Operational Design Reviews they have stated the need for terminal overrun protection. PSCC has noted this and is still awaiting BSC's proposals for closure of ORA concerns.

As Chairman of PSCC, my advice is that BSC/SDS need to determine a sound argument in support of a credible proposal which can be accepted by PSCC and proposed to our ICP, John Dolan. Hence, the action lies with BSC/SDS.

Best regards,

Tony

-----Original Message-----

From: Kraemer, Robert [mailto:kraemer.robert@siemens.com]

Sent: 27 May 2009 16:19

To: Tony Glazebrook

Subject: AW: Overrun protection at Newhaven and Airport tramstops

Hi Tony,

First of all we should come back to the design handed over to BSC for which tie confirmed within the Novation Contract, that this design is -let's say - "fit for purpose". We are still waiting on our request to get the "DAS" of the Basic Design as guidance for our further approach. Due to that lack we came up with our own proposal discussed and agreed two weeks ago. We are working on that, an agreement on the IDC is still outstanding.

Following your statement and concerns, we have to assume, that the design handed over was not "fit for purpose"; the rubber stamp was already given by accepting "IFC" status.

I am not sure what has been addressed by Transdev at what time, but I am pretty sure that this "problem" should have been addressed to the PSCC immediately.

I would get really concerned, if this has not been the case for this topic.

Is there any other place or committee better than in the PSCC, where all the knowledge of hazards and potential mitigation measures is combined?

So, we will wait for a clear and precise advice from the PSCC and proceed with our design in that understanding.

Thanks for your understanding and support!

Kind regards  
Robert

-----Ursprüngliche Nachricht-----

Von: Tony Glazebrook [mailto:Tony.Glazebrook@tie.ltd.uk]

Gesendet: Mittwoch, 27. Mai 2009 16:53

An: Kraemer, Robert

Cc: Riley, John; Dieker, Klaus

Betreff: Overrun protection at Newhaven and Airport tramstops

Hi Robert,

The design has NOT been "confirmed by tie". Confirmation of the design will be through BSC/SDS compiling the "Design Assurance Statements" for complete route section designs. DAS' for all sections are still awaited!

What concerns me most in this case is that it appears that a track designer has made a safety mitigation proposal which appears to have been 'rubber stamped' right up the management chain, without any safety professional looking at it to see whether the proposed mitigation (i.e. nothing) is acceptable.

It is not PSCC which needs to address the issue, rather it is BSC/SDS who need to examine the issue and determine a credible proposal.

Incidentally, at no time has Transdev accepted the complete absence of overrun protection. On the contrary, they noted their concern at the lack of a proposal for overrun protection in their Operational Design Reviews (sent to BSC some time ago) for the sections concerned.

All the best,

Tony

-----Original Message-----

From: Kraemer, Robert [mailto:kraemer.robert@siemens.com]  
Sent: 27 May 2009 14:48  
To: Tony Glazebrook  
Cc: Colin Kerr; Riley, John; Dieker, Klaus  
Subject: AW: TQ 664

Hi Tony,

I can ensure you, that Infracore did not investigate in detail and did not any cross-check of the safety arguments.

The reason is that the subject was part of the basic design confirmed by tie and neither raised nor handled in the PSCC. Beside that there were no objections from Transdev. This wasn't an issue for us up to now and it took several weeks to receive only the required information.

Our trackwork design is receiving now level "C" comments also referring to the same topic.

During contract negotiation we have been demanded to eliminate all buffer stops, which were originally in our offer.

For sure we will not have any problem handling this topic within the PSCC, but it should neither be stressed nor be used to reject our trackwork design submission until final confirmation is given by the committee.

Thanks for your understanding and support!

P.S.: John, would you please address this topic in detail during the next PSCC meeting!

Mit freundlichen Grüßen  
Robert Krämer

-----Ursprüngliche Nachricht-----

Von: Tony Glazebrook [mailto:Tony.Glazebrook@tie.ltd.uk]  
Gesendet: Mittwoch, 27. Mai 2009 11:48  
An: Kraemer, Robert  
Cc: Elizabeth Parkes - Transdev; Colin Kerr; Riley, John  
Betreff: FW: TQ 664

Robert,

Just one question before I discuss this with John Dolan: Please can you assure me that your own (i.e. Infracore) people, having looked at the detailed physical arrangements at Newhaven and Airport and considered the risks, agree with this safety argument?

Cheers,

Tony

-----Original Message-----

From: Tony Glazebrook  
Sent: 27 May 2009 10:41  
To: 'Kraemer, Robert'  
Cc: 'Liz Parkes'; Colin Kerr  
Subject: FW: TQ 664

Thanks Robert. Very interesting.

The issue is the argument for the non-provision of overrun protection at Newhaven and the Airport. I see that the foundation of their argument is that those locations are no different to any other stop location adjacent to road/pedestrian crossing locations.

I will discuss with John Dolan.

Cheers,

Tony

-----Original Message-----

From: Kraemer, Robert [mailto:kraemer.robert@siemens.com]

Sent: 26 May 2009 17:16

To: Tony Glazebrook; Colin.Matlock@tie.ltd.u

Cc: Riley, John; Wilken, Michael

Subject: WG: TQ 664

Dear both,

I'd like to refer to the conversation we have had with the ICP in tie's office two weeks ago.

During that meeting John raised his concern on the track arresting facilities considered in the actual design.

Personally I do not remember to which location he was referring specifically.

After some internal investigations SDS has transferred the latest version of the Trackwork Schedule to me - please refer to the attachment.

On the last page under chapter 4.9 you will find the statement, that no tram arrestor facilities are required, neither on the mainline nor in the depot.

Please transfer this information to John, so that he is able to inform us about his potential objections.

Thanks for your support!

Mit freundlichen Grüßen  
Robert Krämer

-----Ursprüngliche Nachricht-----

Von: Kraemer, Robert

Gesendet: Dienstag, 26. Mai 2009 18:03

An: 'Reid, Chris (Edinburgh Tram)'; Dolan, Alan; Chandler, Jason

Cc: Riley, John; Stefan.Rotthaus@civil.bilfinger.co.uk; Wilken, Michael;

Colin.Brady@bilfinger.co.uk; Berrozpe, Miguel; Ney, Scott; Coupe, Mike; Dieker, Klaus

Betreff: AW: TQ 664

Hi Chris,

Thanks for your quick response, the documentation available is confusing.

Within the Trackwork Schedule (ULE90130-SW-SCH-00085 V2) there is a reference to Chapter 3.20 of the Trackwork Specification (ULE90130-SW-SPN-00050 V3). Details are given in Chapter 3.19.

While the schedule is explaining the reason for not providing arrestor facilities, the specification is listing 1 1/2 pages of functional requirements and specification. Following the process of revision of the schedule, a revision of the specification would have been recommended.

We will transfer the Trackwork Schedule to the ICP and ask him for comments as far as required.

Thanks a lot for your support!

Mit freundlichen Grüßen  
Robert Krämer