

30 October 2015

Ian Kapur, GB Railfreight  
Stan Kitchin, DB Schenker Rail UK  
Chris Wilson, Freightliner Group

***by email only***

Dear Ian, Stan and Chris,

**Access to the East Coast Main Line**

1. Thank you all for taking the time to meet with us on 16 October.
2. We discussed a number of concerns that you had with Network Rail's letter of 2 October 2015, in particular in relation to future freight access to the ECML. In summary:
  - You felt that Network Rail had not properly represented the current state of freight traffic or future growth needs in its analysis. For example, the need for some freight access to run via Welwyn (due to weight restrictions on the Hertford loop) and to the ECML via Grantham for electric rolling stock and route knowledge had been overlooked.
  - You were concerned that any work needed to align VTEC and TSGN requirements must allow for freight.
  - You were surprised to hear of power supply issues around Doncaster and wanted to see a clearer explanation of these.
  - You stressed the importance of Network Rail achieving value for money from past and future investments, including those that benefit freight (e.g. W10 clearance to Scotland). Specifically, as part of this work, you urged Network Rail not to forget about getting value for money on schemes that have already been completed, e.g. ECML (North) W10 gauge clearance. If no W10 freight paths can be found or used, you noted the significant investment, based on a defined number of Intermodal services per day, will be wasted.
  - You agreed the four-tracking Huntingdon to Woodwalton and Werrington Grade Separation projects were clearly important for LDHS, GTR and freight services individually.
3. We have listed the specific points you wanted Network Rail to address (attached). Please let me know if we have overlooked or misunderstood any of your concerns. We will publish this letter on our website.

Yours sincerely



**Rob Plaskitt**

Page 1 of 6

<i>NR 2 October letter reference</i>	<i>Concern as raised by FOCs</i>
Page 2, last paragraph	It should be noted that all projects are conditional on the Hendy review and we need to keep in mind what uncertainties this may cause – a lot of schemes are dependent on others and the Hendy review may affect schemes that the benefits of other schemes are dependent on.
Page 3 – TSGN	It is important in the context of the Dec18 Timetable for TSGN that there is no mention in NR’s letter of the freight requirement Hitchin to Cambridge – under DTT2011 this was impossible and is not mentioned in DTT2014 (assumption no freight on the line). There is existing freight on the route section.
Page 3, table	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. London-Peterborough: GBRF had questioned the weight limit stated for the Hertford Loop but NR has now confirmed the correct limit is 2200t – NR needs a process for regularly updating FOCs with all Route Loads Books so this mis-understanding doesn’t occur again.</li> <li>ii. London-Peterborough: FOCs believe based on freight growth they need to move more than 2200t so there will be a requirement for a Class 6 via Welwyn. To align with freight traffic forecasts elsewhere on the network (and with NR's specification in the table on Page 13) the Class 6 path via Welwyn will need to be capable of at least 2600 tonnes trailing;</li> <li>iii. Peterborough-Doncaster: 1 class 6 via Welwyn and GN/GE at least is required. Need for freight via Grantham for diversionary route knowledge and for electric freight services was noted;</li> <li>iv. Doncaster-York: also requires at least 1 class 6 Doncaster to Shaftholme Junction as SFN money has been spent on upgrading Shaftholme Junction for all services and freight needs to be able to be routed this way. Query what the 1 regional Local at Doncaster was;</li> <li>v. No mention of Doncaster-Leeds route in this table, which is critical to freight (although power supply was mentioned elsewhere).</li> </ul>

Page 4	Comment relating to Northallerton to Newcastle freight loops – what would be the impact on freight capacity of this? The table on page 4 should include key power supply works.
Pages 6-8, table	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Kings Cross remodelling should be in this table;</li> <li>ii. Stevenage and Gordon Hill turnbacks: NR has informed the industry that Stevenage is not going ahead. This either needs splitting out from Gordon Hill or clarifying;</li> <li>iii. Some dates seem inconsistent – e.g. between GRIP stage projects are currently at and the GRIP 3 forecast date. Each date needs checking and this needs to be made clearer, possibly by reordering columns so the GRIP 3 date is to the left of the completion date.</li> <li>iv. Werrington: DfT has not confirmed funding is available in CP6, as has been discussed at the East Coast Programme Board. Can NR provide any further detail on CP6 funding? It was noted that there were issues about freight traffic reaching the Peterborough Up side yards that had to cross the ECML Fast Lines, which was a problem that wasn't recognised in many circles. Costs for Werrington looked higher than the East Coast Programme Board's last briefing.</li> <li>v. ERTMS is not in the table – what is the assumption? It would be helpful to include and articulate if no link to capacity is being assumed. This may be linked just to KGX remodelling, or further along the route, in which case make that clear either way.</li> </ul>
Page 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The answer to point 9 does not answer the question or mention any works, it just mentions the restrictions. Please can NR explain the works that are needed;</li> <li>ii. Mirfield services: Trans-Pennine freight services need to be recognised and mentioned here.</li> </ul>
Page 10	Services to Newcastle-Sunderland: resignalling of this line is proposed for 2016/17, and this would be the ideal time to see what is needed to cater for a mix of services. This could be a missed opportunity if NR replaces like for

	<p>like. Also, MCBOD level crossings are going to be put in on this route. This “will probably” lead to a drop in usable capacity – could NR provide further details on the impact.</p>
Page 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Point 10, 4th paragraph: so is any power upgrade actually needed and, if so, on which sections of line? FOCs noted problems with power supply north of Newcastle and are under the impression that all hooking in points to national grid have been used – if so is there any chance of any more electric capacity north of Newcastle?</li> <li>ii. Last paragraph: this is the first FOCs have heard of this power supply constraint. What does this mean? More information is needed on this constraint.</li> </ul>
Page 13, table	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. In general this table doesn't show: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Royal Mail Class 1s;</li> <li>b. NR measurement trains (Class 1), Test Trains (Class 3) and RHTTs (Class 3); and</li> <li>c. National Delivery Supply Chain trains.</li> </ul> <p>Further – accommodation of these trains is not mentioned in any ECML capacity report or the latest DTT2014 report.</p> </li> <li>ii. Current timetable column – FOCs do not agree with the specifications listed – this is a recycled table from over a year ago and is incorrect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. London-Peterborough via Welwyn – in certain hours there are 2 Class 4s an hour instead of the Class 6.</li> <li>b. London-Peterborough via Hertford – can run up to a 2200t Class 6 currently. The 2200 tonne weight limit is subject to the train in question being formed of vehicles fitted with coupling strengths rated at 56 tonnes. For trains formed of vehicles with 34.5 tonne coupling strength the trailing load limit in the Loads Book is 1175 tonnes.</li> <li>c. Peterborough-Doncaster via Grantham – spell out what “varying weight and class”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>means.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. Peterborough-Doncaster via GN/GE – this should be a Class 4 1800t, and should also include a Class 6. To align with freight traffic forecasts elsewhere on the network, the Class 6 via GN/GE Joint Line should be capable of a trailing load of (at least) 2600 tonnes. Given the recent infrastructure upgrade of the route via Lincoln as a freight artery, this should be easily achievable on this route section.</li> <li>e. Doncaster-York – To align with freight traffic forecasts elsewhere on the network, Class 6 should be at least 2600.</li> <li>f. York-Newcastle – this should instead be 2 Class 4s at 1800t and 1 Class 6 but maybe not every hour. To align with freight traffic forecasts elsewhere on the network, Class 6 should be at least 2600.</li> </ul> <p>iii. Freight growth forecast column:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. London-Peterborough (via Welwyn) – “none” is incorrect and NR needs to look at the freight market study. There will need to be some paths due to Hertford loop weight restrictions. This should be 2600t.</li> <li>b. London-Peterborough (via Hertford loop) – due to network capability the Class 6 2600t cannot go this route and must be via Welwyn. The Class 4 remains via Hertford.</li> <li>c. Doncaster-York – no Class 6 has been mentioned. At the very least Class 6 paths will need to exist between Doncaster and Shaftholme Jn, and Colton Jn and York. It may be possible to satisfy the Class 6 freight requirements between Shaftholme Jn and Colton Jn by alternative routing, subject to no time penalty. The Class 4 intermodal trains, however, will continue to require ECML routing throughout between Doncaster and York due to the restrictive loading gauge on other routes.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iv. Freight paths alongside 7 LDHS column: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Peterborough – Doncaster (via Grantham): There’s no weight of freight train mentioned.</li> </ul> </li> <li>v. Freight paths alongside 8 LDHS column: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. London-Peterborough (via Hertford loop) – this does not match with the growth that is forecast.</li> <li>b. None via Welwyn or Grantham ignores weight limits and need for electric freight/route knowledge purposes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Page 14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Page 14, 2nd paragraph under London-Peterborough: freight growth figures show that 2600t is required.</li> <li>ii. Page 14, 1st paragraph under York-Newcastle: as before this should be 2 Class 4s and a Class 6 rather than 3 low-weight Class 4s.</li> </ul>
Page 15	The point related to Stillington branch line is not quite complete – it has limited capacity, severely affects freight journey times and is not gauge-cleared to W10.
Annex	<p>FOCs are surprised by the cost figures provided in the annex for the four tracking Huntingdon to Woodwalton and Werrington Grade Separation projects – these costs are significantly above what has been seen by FOCs at the programme board.</p> <p>Also, in the cases where the AFCs have changed, have the business cases been re-checked and revised, if required? King’s Cross Re-modelling has already just increased in cost as an example.</p>