
From: Jim Harries [jim.harries@transdevplc.co.uk]
Sent: 01 October 2006 11:16
To: Paul Allioitt; Mason, Christopher; Susan Clark
Cc: Stewart Hardy; Dixon, Andy; Dorrington, Kim (Edinburgh Tram); David Thornton; Phil Douglas; Andie Harper; Alastair Richards - TEL; Roger Jones (Transdev); Carl Williams (Transdev)
Subject: RE: HMRI Meeting 3rd October 2006
Attachments: 40-91-REP-001886 - Roseburn Noise Mitigation paper.pdf; Noise barrier impact on speed.xls

I have seen Paul's email inviting me to attend this meeting. I have serious reservations about the Roseburn Noise mitigation paper, the only paper issued for the meeting:

1. The protocol that we had agreed for managing the HMRI interface seems to have been abandoned for the sake of misplaced expediency.
2. In Transdev's opinion, the attached documentation issued to HMRI is not in a fit state for HMRI's consumption (see comments below). Transdev was not given the opportunity to review this documentation or the Agenda before it was issued to HMRI.
3. I have personally been involved almost all meetings with HMRI on 3 separate projects now (Metrolink, DLR Lewisham and NET), and I feel my own personal and professional credibility with HMRI is being undermined by the project's approach to HMRI.
4. The operator's full involvement in the process is essential from HMRI's perspective, but the project is not allowing this to happen. The project is not using the knowledge and expertise that the DPOFA should provide it with.
5. Previous meetings with HMRI have not been well managed, as a study of the associated records will demonstrate. Actions from previous meetings have not been adequately addressed in a timely manner. The project is losing credibility with HMRI, and this is a serious risk to us all.
6. Had proper process been followed in the validation of this document prior to issue to HMRI, the issues raised below could all have been avoided.
7. This matter needs urgent discussion with Transdev to reach an appropriate resolution. Unfortunately, in our view, further damage has already been done.

Comments on the Roseburn Noise Mitigation Paper that is attached to this email follow:

High level comments:

1. The paper demonstrates that the proposal does not work. This sends a very strange message to HMRI, who needs to understand that we do have a proposal that does work. Why waste his time in this way? If there is a reason for doing so, we should make it clear.
2. The proposals are not compliant with Part G in that there is insufficient clearance from the barriers to the tram. RSPG sets out a clearance of 600mm (from memory), but this proposal will be for about 100mm. This distance is to allow people to get out of the way of a tram to avoid being crushed between the tram and an obstruction. This is a fundamental issue that has not been addressed, other than inadequately in 2.2, item 4. In essence, if we want to progress this option, we need to demonstrate that a derogation from RSPG requirements presents no increased risk to all concerned than would have otherwise been the case. The paper does not attempt so to do.
3. The issue of sightline obstruction probably kills the concept. I estimate that maximum operational speeds are as set out below. See attached spreadsheet – it needs checking, but at least there is some work done on this aspect now. What work has SDS done on this aspect and to assess the impact on the business case as a whole?

speed, kph	minimum radius, m
80	14113
70	8273
60	4465
50	2153
40	882
30	279
20	55

4. The proposal could work for a totally segregated railway, but we do not have the powers to build one.

5. A critical issue is the height of the barriers. As drawn, these are about 600mm, but in reality we think they would be about 350mm, so the drawing is very misleading.
6. The central noise barriers would, I think push the tracks apart, resulting in increased width requirement that is inconsistent with the dimensions on the drawing, and may not be deliverable in parts of the route at all. Has this been checked?
7. To conclude that "SDS require feedback/approval...from the HMRI" demonstrates a lamentable lack of understanding of HMRI's role. They approve nothing and HMRI does not react well to being "required" to do anything. SDS and PB should know better.

Detailed comments:

1. It has been issued in a pdf format that makes difficult to make comments in the first place.
2. The paper appears not been approved by anyone in PB with sufficient competency for the purpose of the document.
3. The paper has not been approved by tie, yet tie is the point of contact with HMRI.
4. 1.3, first line, replace "close" with "along". Tortology.
5. 2, 2nd para, "as close as possible" will depend on speed. What is being assumed?
6. 2, last para, the 3km is confusing. Will there be a total of 3*3=9km of barrier, or are we only putting barriers along one third of the route length?
7. 2.2, the design principle for vehicular access along the corridor should be made clear?
8. 2.2, in what way does it obstruct emergency egress? Does it stop tram doors from opening, create a step up out of the tram, make it hard to get off the barrier to the pathway, or what?
9. 2.2, 3rd bullet. What is proposed? A "lower form", or the as drawn form? Unclear.
10. 2.2, 4th bullet. Add that "anyone" should include animals or objects being removed.
11. 2.2, 4th bullet, delete "vehicle".
12. 2.2, 5th bullet. Are there any strength issues?
13. 2.2, 6th bullet, absolutely fundamental. See high level comment above with the table in it.
14. 2.2, 7th bullet. Only applies to non-rail borne vehicles. Is this an issue?
15. 2.2, 8th bullet. The real issue here is that there would have to be gaps in the noise barrier for this purpose, and this would reduce the effectiveness of the barriers at these locations. The report should say so.
16. 2.2, 9th bullet. What is the ecological view on this, and is the proposal aligned to Parliamentary undertakings? The proposal would probably create a continuous badger cull!
17. 2.2, 10th bullet will depend to some extent on the materials used.
18. 2.2, 11th bullet. Unclear. Construction is complex anyway with badger fences, noise barriers and boundary treatments anyway, so will it really be more complex?
19. 2.2. The proposed width of the barriers is not stated.
20. Appendix A leaves a maximum of 150 mm (= 3100-2950mm) for the barrier. Dimensionally incorrect? Certainly confusing
21. Appendix A shows a kerb upstand. Why? Was it done in a rush from another drawing produced for another purpose?
22. Appendix A has "pedestrian deterrent surface" on the track adjacent to the footpath, but not on the other one. Why?

All the best
Jim Harries

Mobile [REDACTED] work 0131 [REDACTED]
City Point, 65 Haymarket Terrace,
Edinburgh EH12 5HD

From: Paul Alliott [mailto:Paul.Alliott@tie.ltd.uk]

Sent: 28 September 2006 13:15

To: Dixon, Andy; Mason, Christopher; Dorrington, Kim (Edinburgh Tram); David Thornton; Susan Clark; Phil Douglas; Jim Harries; Raxton, Ian; ian.skinner@orr.gsi.gov.uk; Hazel.Yuill@hse.gsi.gov.uk

Cc: Stewart Hardy

Subject: HMRI Meeting 3rd October 2006

Dear all,

Please find attached agenda and discussion paper for the HMRI/HSE meeting on 3rd October. Look forward to seeing you there.

[Stewart – Can you make there is a projector and screen available too please]

If you are unable to attend please let Andy Dixon or myself know in advance

Regards
Paul Alliott
Design Manager

tie limited
Citypoint
65 Haymarket Terrace
Edinburgh
EH12 5BH

Tel: +44 (0) 131 [REDACTED]

Fax: +44 (0) 131 622 8301

Email: paul.alliott@tie.ltd.uk

Web: www.tie.ltd.uk

For more information on Transport Edinburgh go to:

www.transport-edinburgh.org.uk

delivering transport projects

The information transmitted is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail please notify the sender immediately at the email address above, and then delete it.

E-mails sent to and by our staff are monitored for operational and lawful business purposes including assessing compliance with our company rules and system performance. TIE reserves the right to monitor emails sent to or from addresses under its control.

No liability is accepted for any harm that may be caused to your systems or data by this e-mail. It is the recipient's responsibility to scan this e-mail and any attachments for computer viruses.

Senders and recipients of e-mail should be aware that under Scottish Freedom of Information legislation and the Data Protection legislation these contents may have to be disclosed to third parties in response to a request.

tie Limited registered in Scotland No. SC230949. Registered office - City Chambers, High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1YT.
