

**Freight Access Working Group Meeting****Monday 12 January 2024****11:00****By Teams****Attendees: -**

<b>Person</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Present</b>
Quentin Hedderly	DB Cargo	
Diane Thomson	DB Cargo	
David Smith	Freightliner	
Alex Belk-Sumpton	Freightliner	
Ian Kapur	GB Railfreight	
Darren Pell	GB Railfreight	
John Owens	NR - Route Maintenance	
Joseph Lloyd	NR - Route Operations	
Ross Hardy	NR - Route Planning Team	
Alison White	NR - Route Planning Team	
Joe Warr	NR - Route Planning Team	
David White	TRU – Freight Liaison	
Elsa Richards	TRU - East Access	
John Connor	TRU - West Access	
Steph Lugsdin	TRU - PMO Access	
Rob Bozeat	TRU - PMO Access	

**Optional Invitees: -**

Neil Roberts	TRU – West Alliance	
Lewis Pursglove	GB Railfreight	
Richard Mannion	GWRR	
Vincent Waddelove	NR -	
Ross Ashton	NR - Senior Sponsor	
Kevin Newman	NR (Snr Customer & Commercial Manager)	
David Hunter	NR (Snr Regional Freight Manager)	
Mark Bridel	Freight MK	
Matt Parker	Freight MK	
John Carpenter	Colas	
Kevin Edmeads	GB Railfreight	
Steve Sellers-Wilkinson	TRU - East Access	
Wes Brook	TRU - West Access	
Tony Menzies	TRU - East Alliance	
Lewis Hannibal	TRU - Hope Valley	
Phil Montgomery	TRU - Hope Valley	
Chris Wan	TRU - PMO Access	
Rob Cocking	TRU - West Alliance	
Sarah Clarke	TRU - West Alliance	
Dave Eley	TRU West	

A	Hope Valley Nine Day Block March 2024	Lead
1	<p><b>Capacity Study</b></p> <p>23/01/24 - Post-Meeting Note: received from Darren P: Cemex flows have been rejected in week 51 offer as they clash with passenger services even though we bid as per TT study. "As a matter of urgency, we need to discuss these services and what can be done to have them offered, also note the week 5 plan for UB38, we will need to apply the same agreed plan."</p> <p><b>30/01/24</b> - Elsa R updated Darren P that Email received from Tim Stephenson at FL (30/1/23 at 07:39) advising that 6V36 will not be running in Q1. Therefore, GBRf's H86 may run. Elsa said that Freight MK will be taking V36 off the system and re-looking at H86 to resolve. Darren asked for correspondence to be copied to Andrew Pearson (at GBRf) <b>ACTION – Elsa R to forward the email correspondence to Andrew Pearson and follow up with Freight MK.</b></p> <p><b>30/1/24</b> - Darren P asked that if attention could now be given to resolving 6M15, which is also a regular "runner". <b>ACTION - Elsa R to investigate and speak to Freight MK and respond to Darren P at GBRf, noting three affecting services 2S04, 2S73, 6J46.</b></p> <p><b>30/1/24</b> – Diane confirmed that DB Cargo has no outstanding questions and none have been received from Freightliner. Darren added that the plan for the 9-Day block will be used for Week 5 (Bowden Lane Bridge).</p>	FOCs
2	<p><b>Hope Valley Non-TRU Work e.g., Bridge 38 (aka Bowden Lane) at Earles</b></p> <p>The bridge is scheduled to be replaced in <b>week 5, 2024 (c/ Saturday 27<sup>th</sup> April 2024)</b> with the support of the FOCs. Block noted as agreed (on Internal Access WG on 17/11/23).</p> <p><b>On 04/12/23</b> Darren/Diane/David said that bids will be to run trains on the same basis as those for the Hope Valley block study (described in 2. above), and that as this block is in the same period block there should not be a problem (noting relevant comment recorded in the week 40 TTP2318 Interim Determination on the portability of studies). Ross said sense would suggest so while "not being 100% certain", relevant teams, such as Informed Traveller, are working more closely and that additional resource is being made available (e.g., by Matt Parker) to pick up the work needed (in response to a prompt from Ian on communications, timeliness, and efficiency).</p> <p><b>19/12/23</b> – Week 5, being bid 22/12/23. TT work being undertaken, TPE will make statement once complete. Current assumption ok apart from TPE (NW&amp;C).</p> <p><b>30/1/24</b> – FOCs re-stated that they will use the Hope Valley 9-Day Block plan for the Week 5 Bowden Lane Bridge work, see 1 above.</p>	FOCs

C	East	Lead
1	<p><b>E1a Holgate (November 2025) &amp; Manchester Victoria Turnback</b></p> <p>At Access WG on 21/7/23 it was advised that NR is moving towards favouring the 3/4x54hr weekends solution. The dates of the weeks are not yet defined but are likely to be in the vicinity of weeks <b>31 – 34 in November 2025</b>. Not the best time of year said Darren – Alison said that planning work between TRU and East Coast is ongoing. Work is still being done to determine if this will indeed be the preferred option (to be discussed at a National Deconfliction Meeting) on Wed 16<sup>th</sup> and Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> August (this week). Darren and Alex said a Timetable Study will be needed, noting that Tyne – Drax biomass and Tees Dock Intermodals will be affected.</p> <p>Colas and DRS may wish to note the potential impact on their traffic.</p> <p>Darren said that it will be disputed (on 14/8/23).</p> <p>Ross Hardy revisited the proposal in his presentation on 25/9/23.</p> <p>Darren/Diane/David S reprised their previously stated concerns with this proposal e.g., effect on Tyne – Drax biomass, Knowsley – Wilton, intermodal traffic, particularly in the context of the run up to Christmas.</p> <p>On 10/9/23 Darren said that the key for GBRf is ensuring that enough biomass trains can be delivered to Drax (from either Tyne or LBT) and that the easement of the simultaneous block of the route from LBT on the weekends of weeks 31 and 32 might be key – Ross said he would take this away.</p> <p>On 23/10/23 Alison W said that the proposal will now be taken forward, formally.</p> <p>On 4/12/23 Ross and Darren agreed that a key factor on timing is the work to deliver the Manchester Victoria East Turnback – because during the winter period (of strong requirement for fuel by Drax to generate electricity for the public grid) a block of both the routes from Tyne Dock and LBT is unwelcome. Manchester Vic East Turnback might be better slotted into the summer period – April 1<sup>st</sup> / 30<sup>th</sup> September. If the route for empty services via Manchester is blocked then, ideally, they should be optimally routed back via Diggle/Piccadilly. Ian referenced the conversation with Mark Gibbens, Head of Logistics, with Neil</p>	Ross H / FOCs

	<p>Holm, David Roberts, David White, Ian Kapur on 22/11/23 during which Mark said that Drax had, especially with notice, the potential to flex in the summer but close to none in the winter. Mark had also stated that Immingham is full so far as biomass shipping is concerned, without considerable investment e.g., in silo storage systems at both Immingham and Drax, and that Hull "is a red herring" (e.g. (panamax) vessels may switch to Immingham from LBT to Immingham but not Hull (e.g., because they are too big for Hull).</p> <p><b>15/01/24</b> – Ross H asked if FOC's were any more comfortable that the Diggle capacity is going to be adequate.</p> <p><b>15/1/24</b> – Post Meeting Note: Darren P said that comments were in relation to the wider picture (not just relating to Calder Valley/Manchester Tumbback specifically), that preventing or materially affecting the flow of biomass from both Tyne and LBT simultaneously, particularly during winter is a problem for Drax and GBRf. Darren advised: "There were some recent study works done for the weekends of 6, 7 and 12. The plan produced meant that I couldn't run all my services, but because of the time of year I can be a bit flexible. Manchester Tumbback blocks are currently all in winter months and clash with ECML blocks, as a result I would require all services to meet the demands of our customer".</p> <p><b>30/01/24</b> – Comments regarding banking or double heading trains between Manchester Victoria and Miles Platting are shown in Section D 2f below.</p>	
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Neville Hill Block 2028</b></p> <p>As per "Plan B," below, on 20/11/23 Rove B /Ross H advised FAWG that the Neville Hill three-month block will slip to 2028.</p> <p>Aspects of this likely outcome were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ross advised that the actual length of this block may be related to the number of engineering haulage trains that can be operated – which in turn will be related to the number of commercial haulage services to Hunslet East. The current assumption is the 12 weeks (weeks 2 -&gt; 14, 2028)</li> <li>Ian K said that whereas he had been made aware of the number of 3 potential services per day to Hunslet East, this had not yet been agreed by GBRf.</li> </ul> <p><b>19/12/23</b> – David W said that the TT study has been circulated to the FOCS (last week) and that John Carpenter at Colas, Ian Kapur at GBRf and David Smith at Freightliner preliminary comment had been fed back to Neil Simpson (the study author).</p> <p><b>21/12/23 – Post-meeting Note:</b> a call has been arranged between Chris Swan (Tarmac) and David Roberts (NR) on 05/1/24 to help TRU better understand operations at Cross Green. Neil Holm sent apologies and David White has also invited Ian Kapur.</p> <p><b>21/12/23 – Post-meeting Note:</b> Paul Whitaker has arranged calls on 09 and 11 January (at 10:30 and 13:00 respectively) to discuss the TT Study. David W has forwarded the invites to Ian Kapur and David Smith.</p>	<b>Rob B/Ross H/Ian K/Darren P</b>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>E234 – Christmas work not completed on Bridge CFM5 (Church Fenton)</b></p> <p>CFM5 (Bridge replacement near Church Fenton) was unable to go ahead during Christmas closedown due to high winds.</p> <p>Work is currently taking place to identify opportunities to re-plan delivery. Due to the risk to South Kirkby re-signalling delivery - driver training materials not supplied in time - in week 9 (bank holiday), NR is looking at the possibility of delivering CFM5 in this week.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ross explained if not delivered in a bank holiday, it would need to be midweek.</li> <li>FOCs (Diane T and David S) confirmed they are ok with this.</li> </ul> <p><b>18/01/24 - Post-Meeting Note:</b> Network Rail will seek agreement for a 4-day access opportunity in Week 9 Tuesday to Friday inclusive to undertake work on CFM5 following the cancellation due to high winds at Christmas. This will be formally submitted after the next call on 26/01/24.</p> <p><b>30/1/24</b> – Ross explained that the footprint of the block will now be Micklefield (excl.) to Church Fenton (excl.) so that the most affected operators will be TPE (divert via Castleford), Colas (divert Dunbar cement tanks via Castleford and Methley) and Cross Country. Darren P and Diane T said that there is no direct, significant, impact on GBRf and DB Cargo</p>	<b>Rob B / Ross H</b>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Ferrybridge TS11</b></p> <p><b>30/01/24</b> – Ross H advised that the Ferrybridge TS11 work has an extensive footprint and will not now be in week 9 (to keep the Castleford route open whilst bridge CFM5 is replaced – see section 3 above).</p> <p>The footprint was shown by Ross to look like:</p>	<b>Ross H</b>

	<p><b>Spring 2024 Engineering Access changes</b> Ferrybridge Re-signalling (F2G)</p> <p><b>Key Impacts</b> Northern: All weekend Leeds - Knottingley &amp; Wakefield - Knottingley services cancelled Leeds - Sheffield services divert via Altofts and not call at Castleford Saturday am Leeds - Lincoln to start Sheffield Chesterfield - Leeds to terminate Barnesley + Leeds - Nottingham to start Barnesley</p> <p><b>Key Impacts</b> Grand Central: Saturday Services unable to call at Pontefract Monkhill - all services to via Wakefield &amp; Hare Park in Transpennine Saturday am Manchester Airport services to /from York divert via Morley Manchester Airport to Sheffield services to divert via Dore</p> <p><b>Key Impacts</b> Crofton Depot Saturday Services unable to call at Pontefract Monkhill - all services to via Wakefield &amp; Hare Park in</p> <p>The period will be circa 00:30 (Saturday), after the passage of 4E68, – 05:00 (Monday). The “wheels free” nature of the block in the first ten hours would mean that GBRf trains to/from Drax would need to be re-routed (via e.g. Doncaster to access Drax via the Askern Branch).</p> <p>Rory J confirmed that Wk12 is due for submission by Friday 02/02/24 and essentially this is a change prior to a decision going out. Ross opined that Week 14 (29th June) is the currently favoured option and is the earliest solution that puts us the right side of bidding offers.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Ross H to discuss with TRU options and opportunities.</p>	
5	<p><b>Mirfield</b></p> <p>Rob B explained that a work involving the laying of 180 metres of railway will need 4 consecutive days, between end of November 24 and early February 25 – Darren said that assuming access from Tyne to Drax to make job more palatable, in the winter period, Christmas was the obvious solution – noting that Christmas Day 2024 is on Wednesday. Darren said that LBT is otherwise preferred over Tyne.</p> <p><b>18/01/24 - Post-Meeting Note following call</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NR does not currently intend to submit a request for any additional access for Mirfield works (Eye of Needle) within TTY 2024. Alternative proposals will be provided as soon as the relevant reviews and impact assessments have been completed.</li> <li>This Mirfield position would only alter (Network Rail may propose additional access in TTY 2024) if it is deemed critical South Kirkby is completed before Christmas 2024.</li> </ul>	Rob B

D	West	Lead
1	<del>Intermodal Status Update</del>	<del>Pending</del>
2a	<p><b>EoTN / W7 / Capacity Study / EoTN Blocks 2027</b></p> <p>Also see “Plan B,” below, on 20/11/23 Rob B/Ross H advised FAWG that the plan as it presently stands for EoTN is one 30-day block in 2027 preceding weekend blocks e.g., in 2025/26 to be determined.</p> <p>Aspects of this likely development from Plan B were that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ross advised that freight may not be able to presume priority at weekends, where a large majority of the EoTN blocks are now planned in summer months (April / September), as weekend blocks.</li> <li>Ross said that freight to be prioritised in during the winter and in midweeks – but passengers’ needs predominated at weekends and in the summer (with the notable exception of the Thornhill block): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2025: 9 weekend blocks</li> <li>2026: 11 weekend blocks</li> <li>2027: 19 weekend blocks</li> </ul> </li> <li>Each weekend block or group of similar blocks may require its own Study.</li> <li>The 30-day Thornhill block would still require diversion of affected freight services via the Hope Valley.</li> <li>The FOCs also said that weekend blocks may also still require freight diversions via the Hope Valley.</li> <li>The Hope Valley diversions would also still need traincrew route learning because of the numbers of e.g., construction industry orientated traincrew at Peak Forest during ordinary periods to conduct i.e., Week 40/bank holiday one offs cannot be.</li> <li>Diane said that this could be challenging for Suez because they need both their services as scheduled e.g., 6E26 on Saturdays.</li> <li>Ian said that he would like to see NR “really ... try” to deconflict blocks where diversions around EoTN are affected by blocks on the diversionary routes e.g., Section 5’s (such as Sheffield – Tapton, see Appendix 1 below). David S added that this could be important for e.g., Earles/Dewsbury Cement –</li> </ul>	Ross H / FOCs

	<p>having regard to one of the points made in the Interim Determination on TTP2318 on deconfliction. Ross said he was unable to commit to this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restated that updated Box Plan (reflecting Plan B) is likely to be available in February.</li> </ul> <p><b>21/12/23 - Post-Meeting Note:</b> Ross Hardy circulated a note (including to FOCs) on 20/12/23 (at 15:24) with a Plan B Scenario 3.1 update, with the intention of discussing this further with FOCs at FAWG on 15/01/24. See 2b, below.</p>	
2b	<p><b>EoTN Diversionary Route(s)</b></p> <p>Quentin said that the letter from Hannah / Ross mandating routing via Hope Valley during W7 EoTN possessions remains pressing.</p> <p>FAWG noted that there is a call with Hannah Lomas at 13:00 on Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> February 2023 to discuss routing with especial regard to the Little North Western. At the arranged Teams call on 28/2/23 Martin Clerkin made a presentation to the FOCs outlining what might need to be reengineered on the LiNW to enable it to become a diversionary route, covering, especially, gauge. Until the choices for the project are resolved NR is not able to mandate the FOCs accordingly. Ian Kapur restated the importance of having 12 months' notice so that traincrew may learn the whole route including the diversionary routes (e.g., Sheffield – Drax via Doncaster – Askern, Doncaster – Hambleton, Thybergh – South Kirby – Hare Park.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By email on 25/4/23 Quentin advised that: <p>"We have made a bit of progress concerning the W7 waste traffic via Hope Valley. Most of what we asked for is now documented. We did request Guide Bridge – New Mills South Jn via Romiley which is not reflected on this form, but we do expect a response on this too. Given the scope and duration of TRU work it seems sensible to cover as many bases as we can – not least because of unexpected disruption etc. on the day!" Diane advised that all the paperwork is now in place.</p> </li> <li>On 4/4/23 Darren advised that GBRf will be seeking to operate some biomass services via the Hope Valley during the EoTN block w/e week 12, 2023. GBRf confirmed that at least 6E34 on 16<sup>th</sup> June is scheduled via Hope Valley.</li> </ol> <p>On 18/4/23 the results of (i.e., Martin Clerkin) studies in to the LiNW and New Mills Crossover were made available by Neil Kerry at Jacobs and circulated to the FOCs by David W at 17:36. The results indicated shot costs of £13-21mn for LiNW (to gauge clear to W7) and £13-£18mn for the New Mills Crossover (to provide additional capacity to accommodate affected freight services).</p> <p>See 2a above – no decision is expected before the results of the Capacity Study revalidation exercise being undertaken by Martin Hinley/Karol Tyszka have been published in August and assessed.</p> <p>On 17/7/23 Graeme P advised that there will be no trailing length limits impacting the operation of GBRf's biomass or DB Cargo's Suez' services via Northenden – Chinley North – Chinley East – Dore – Sheffield – Wincobank. This was confirmed by David Hunter by email (Hunter/White/Pollard) on 24/7/23 regarding the Hope Valley.</p> <p>On 17/7/23 Darren P confirmed that GBRf is aware that their biomass services operating via Hope Valley will need to be operated with class 60 locomotives to benefit from a permitted trailing load of 2,400 tonnes (between New Mills South Junction and Chinley North Junction).</p> <p>Notwithstanding the potential ability to operate their services via the Hope Valley during EoTN possessions [on 17/7/23] Darren said that such operation was not envisaged/accepted by GBRf for other (non-EoTN) possessions e.g., Manchester Victoria East Turnback extending out to Miles Platting.</p> <p>Ross said that thinking continues within NR as to how best to chart an acceptable solution – there is no clear line of sight on a solution yet.</p> <p>On 1/11/23 (at 11:05) Quentin emailed Andrew Newman (for the KOWG Freight Concerns forum (with e.g., Julian Worth, Kevin Newman) with his concern about NR clarity on its (apparent lack of) strategic plan for diversionary routes, particularly around EoTN. Appendix 2, attached.</p> <p>Rob said that there is still work evaluating strategy regarding EoTN.</p> <p>Ross added that a differentiation is being drawn between midweek nights and weekends. During the week freight is being prioritised, less so at the weekends. An emphasis has been made across the calendar to focus work at less busy times, to assist freight i.e., winter/summer balance. The number of weekends affected has also been managed down (to two in 2024). Ross said he needed to be clear and say that he "cannot let GBRf go with [with a view that it] .... is going to get all its trains diverted ..."</p> <p>Darren said they need one clear plan to go with, and which has all the operators buy in. He added that they are disputing week 40 and are going to hearing - bid 15 and got 2 paths back – a loss of 31,000 tonnes of biomass fuel in peak time (which he said was poor). And that he could not stress how critical it is to have a biddable, solid plan (that has the buy in of direct and indirectly affected stakeholders / participants).</p> <p>Ross said he understood this but needed to add that the TOCS have agreed to blocks being moved to times that support freight and that there is "probably not much more we can do .... cannot strip out [more] passenger services." Darren said that GBRf needs a standard timetable against which to make an informed decision. In 2025 it will be a struggle to get paths for biomass and Suez traffic at weekends.</p>	Ross H/Rob B

	<p>It seems unlikely that the New Mills Crossover will go ahead.</p> <p>David S opined that it needs to be remembered that the FOCs are fully [competing] private enterprises that [only survive by earning revenue from moving product in trains] and do not have a [state] safety net that the TOCs have. Ross said that there is “more than a level playing field” and that freight is absolutely prioritised during midweeks.</p>	
<b>2c</b>	<p><b>Plan B</b></p> <p>Rob B talked FAWG through a necessity identified by TRU to remodel the work bank and move it “to the right.” Specifically, Scenario 3.1 on slide 9, in the attached presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Huddersfield 1 – by five months</li> <li>• Huddersfield 2 – by 8 months</li> <li>• Ravensthorpe – by 12 months</li> <li>• Thornhill EoTN (30 days) – [<i>Post meeting Note</i>: to week 8 (May) 2027 (according to John Johnson at TRU West Resilience Meeting – Scenario 3.1 - on 21/11/23). There was a reference to an agreement with Drax</li> <li>• Neville Hill – to weeks 2-14 2028 [<i>Post meeting Note</i>: Plan B Scenario 3.1]</li> <li>• Diane asked for (and received) confirmation that the changed plan starts from week 1, 2025: the period until week 52 in 2025 (presently) remains unchanged</li> <li>• Darren asked when there will be sight of the overall changed plan – i.e., a new Box Plan. Rob B said that this would be towards the middle of Q1 2024 (before there is the right degree of confidence in it)</li> <li>• Darren added that he had worked through version 1 to view from a wider perspective and that he will await publication of version 2 for Plan B updates and then further review</li> <li>• David S said that a consequent issue will be misalignment between the different regions' planned blocks/possessions, Greek Street (Stockport) was referred to, and will need to be addressed.</li> <li>• Ian raised the question of the alignment of Section 4 and 5 route possessions (e.g., Sheffield/MML, see Appendix 1 attached) with Plan B to ensure freight services have access to the diversionary routes</li> <li>• Ian said that the rules responses to severity 3 &amp; 4 blocks should drive the production of relevant studies, and that FOCs needed to have these studies in good time to enable them to make informed decisions and responses. Ross said that the workload to produce the potential volume studies was/s challenging, especially if each instance required its own bespoke study; but the FOCs said they were keen to avoid an experience similar to that with the Miles Platting block in summer 2021 – Darren said that FOCs needed confidence that their responses would yield the necessary work (to path their services and meet end customer needs, e.g. construction industry, electricity generation etc.</li> <li>• David S said that Greek Street (Stockport) is also an “EoTN” for FL and so its alignment with TRU is important too – Ross confirmed that this is understood</li> <li>• David S also said that studies need to be available at least at T-18 but many are arriving later than that which is a problem for FOC planning</li> <li>• Diane said that there needs to be more communication between FOCs and (now) Freight MK on the assumptions and contents of studies during drafting – this has been a weakness in the past where the authors and Freight MK appeared not to have communicated and the FOCs have relied on studies to bid. Diane further confirmed that what FOCs need to see are the end-to-end F3s as reliable products of studies against which they can confidently bid.</li> <li>• Ian echoed Diane's comment on F3s, “need to find a way of getting it done”</li> <li>• Regarding Neville Hill, Ian said that the number of three trains per day was not agreed and that he needs to be further engaged in discussions on the MoW during the block.</li> <li>• Ross said he would forward (Paul Whitaker) TDA's work on Neville Hill to Ian. Ross added that there is a relationship between the length of the block and the number of trains to Hunslet East – the more trains to Hunslet East, the longer the block “nervous about conveying ... that there is a solution without consequences.”</li> <li>• Ross said that at weekends “freight doesn't have priority.” Ian challenged the assumption behind this, the need for each train needs to be taken on its own merits, the effect on customers and end markets (e.g., electricity demand, concrete in the construction industry, waste for disposal on Merseyside etc). Ian also added that there are services like RHTT which are integral to the operation of the network, and which cannot be simply switched off.</li> <li>• Darren explained that regarding train crew availability what might work for week 40 (when the construction industry in the Peak is on holiday) will not work on a regular basis at other times, particularly midweek: when the Peak drivers will not be available to either conduct or drive the diverted trains. The Liverpool based traincrew will need route learning via Hope Valley – Sheffield and the routes to Drax from there.</li> <li>• The Morley Line had been raised as a route for freight when that off the Calder Valley to Kirkgate via Ravensthorpe is blocked under Plan B. The FOCs pointed out that the added burden of having to route learn Liverpool drivers via the (new fast lines via Baker Junction and Whitehall) was not welcomed as a solution especially when combined with Hope Valley.</li> <li>• Diane confirmed that the problems that will affect biomass will also affect Suez traffic too e.g., route leaning Peak Forest drivers, routing via Morley.</li> </ul> <p><b>19/12/23 – RH emailed Plan A and Plan B scenario 3.1 comparison information for review and comment. RH reminded that Plan B is intended to create a resilient delivery schedule that closer matches operator access preferences, whilst seeking to minimise programme prolongation and associated costs, specifically completing EiS O by Dec 2028.</b></p> <p><b>Plan B (Scenario 3.1) key changes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>HUDDERSFIELD BLOCKADE 1 MOVED FROM APRIL 2025 TO SEPTEMBER 2025</b></li> <li>• <b>HUDDERSFIELD BLOCKADE 2 MOVED FROM APRIL 2026 TO JANUARY 2027*</b></li> </ul>	<b>Rob B / Ross H</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>THORNHILL / EYE OF NEEDLE BLOCKADE</b> MOVED FROM SUMMER 2026 TO SUMMER 2027</li> <li>• <b>NEVILLE HILL BLOCKADE</b> MOVED FROM 2027 TO 2028</li> </ul> <p>* Extended duration between Huddersfield Blockade 1 &amp; Blockade 2 to align Eye of the Needle access and Thornhill blockade to 'low burn periods'. The Document also included an EoL proposal that would allow for the removal of all but 3 weekends of disruptive weekend access in TTY2027 East of Leeds.</p> <p>Ross said it would be helpful to understand which proposal operators prefer, recognising the removal of 2027 access equates to an increase in volumes in 2026.</p> <p>15/01/24 – FOC's (Darren, Diane, David S) said they would review this further and feed-back but for the moment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Darren P said that for EoTN, outside of the Greek Street blocks (week 52 excepted), GBRf will have some flexibility to reduce volumes, but they won't be cancelling everything, and they will need to run some services via the Hope Valley – but noting that the EoTN will be in the summer period. Their approach will be similar during Greek Street blocks too.</li> <li>• Ross H said that priority is being given to (e.g., biomass, Suez) through the Hope Valley during the week – but the same priority is not slated for the weekends, and this is the reason NR has tried to keep blocks within the summer window e.g., 'low burn'</li> <li>• Darren said there is now a more constant demand and there are less peaks and troughs</li> <li>• David S asked Ross if NR will check that regular maintenance blocks (e.g., Tapton – Junction/ Gascoigne Wood, Appendix 1, attached) will be eased so that FOCs can be confident that their trains will have a route around - Ross responded, yes, but he can't commit NR to removing them because the network still needs maintaining</li> <li>• Darren P further asked if there was something Network Rail could do to look at alternative ways of delivering regular maintenance in the blockade.</li> <li>• Ross H said he would look at bringing relevant parties together.</li> <li>• Ross made it clear he was not saying trains can only run midweek.</li> <li>• David S asked how confident can we be that this plan ("B") will stay as it is. Ross confirmed that it could change given the competing constraints and priorities there are to be managed</li> <li>• Rob Bozeat talked through what the programme are currently doing to inform the risk position and provided the following timeline deadlines: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Line of Defence 2 – January</li> <li>o Line of Defence 3 – March</li> <li>o Control Point 4 - July</li> </ul> </li> <li>• FOCs expressed the view that a key concern is regular maintenance slots (e.g., Sections 5's) in the context of the large number of weekends affected by EoTN blocks.</li> <li>• FOCs said that some assurance is necessary to give them confidences by way of a study or studies to support the service groups expected to run. Ross H agreed that this necessary.</li> <li>• Ross H said that it needs to be considered that with longer blockades it is less likely we can forego regular maintenance activity - by reducing weekend volumes, longer weekday access is required.</li> </ul> <p>Darren/Diane/David S said they would jointly discuss this access point / proposal to review and communicate their initial thoughts back to Freight Access WG.</p>	
<b>2e</b>	<p><b>Version-0/1/2 2025 EoTN</b></p> <p>19/12/23 - Principal timetable items will be sent as a request batch document (weeks 38-7) pre V2; these changes will show in V2. Aim is to include Wks 8-37 Plan B changes in V2 – but due to resources, this is an aspiration. All changes for Plan B will be reflected in V3 proposal (29/03/24).</p>	<b>All</b>
<b>2f</b>	<p><b>Manchester Freight Routing</b></p> <p>Ross H and David W discussed this item (2f) along with items on Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> October. Ross said he would discuss the wider picture and possible process with colleagues in NW&amp;C, having regard to (but not exclusively):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Banking loaded trains between Man Vic and Miles Platting</li> <li>- Possible Stalybridge reversals to access Calder Valley</li> <li>- Greek Street</li> <li>- Castlefield Corridor</li> <li>- Locomotive, traincrew, timetabling &amp; capacity planning</li> </ul> <p><b>23/01/24 - Post-Meeting Note from Darren P:</b></p> <p>"The option of a banker loco needs to be fully explored operationally and to understand what a banker loco looks like in the Manchester area, I will have potential disputes for 2025 and therefore this option needs to be fully looked at as we simply can't go blindly onto this route thinking it will work. There will need to be agreement with all operators as to what movement of services there can be to accommodate diverted freight and additional light engine moves for the banker loco. When or if a plan is produced, we will assess this to see if it delivers what our customer needs as well as assess the impact on our resources."</p> <p><b>30/01/24</b> - Darren P said that previous tests had been carried out and the option was taken as far as it could be. He said that if Ross H is insisting this is a viable option, freight route, then further options need to be explored to make it viable – e.g. costs, timetabling, crewing, locomotive provision, staff training,</p>	<b>All</b>

	<p>SSOW, communication protocols etc. The idea of Network Rail engaging an experienced operator to look at how it can be done efficiently was reprised.</p> <p>Diane indicated that DB Cargo would likely adopt a different solution, "double head" and drop off two FCA twins; with NR picking up the additional direct costs; but noting that for Suez (and DB Cargo) this would be sub optimal because any train would be running 18% light, fundamentally affecting the economics of the traffic (both absolutely and viz road competition).</p> <p>Joe W said that he understood Ross H's view to be that – throughout the TRU Programme – Network Rail cannot avoid situations where both Diggle and Calder Valley are not simultaneously blocked especially in the context of North West &amp; Central blocks such as Greek Street. Darren P confirmed, in response to a question from Alison W, that he (and other FOCs) are making representations to NW&amp;C directly.</p> <p>An invite to a meeting between NW&amp;C and TRU scheduled for Tuesday 06/02/24, chaired by John Connor was forwarded to David W – who said he would attend (subject to the Access Team Meeting at the same time).</p> <p>Darren P stated that Network Rail, as a whole entity, should be providing a divisionary route across the Pennines. Ross H said he disagreed with this (both providing a route (and being a single entity).</p>	
2g	<p><b>Drax Power Station Outages</b></p> <p><del>Darren said that GBRf request that they be invited / be involved in any discussions with their customers, e.g., Drax.</del></p> <p><del>10/12/23 Meeting at Drax scheduled 16/01/24 – meeting subsequently postponed.</del></p>	See attachments at Appendix 3

E	Non-TRU / Off-Route	Lead
1	<p><b>Shipley / Leeds North Western – Easter 2026</b></p> <p>Putative proposal for 16-day block of the line between Skipton and Leeds concerning commission works for the new Shipley Depot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Andrew said he thinks he still prefers the block strategy</li> <li>Darren said he preferred Easter</li> <li>David said he has no affected traffic</li> <li>Diane said she preferred the bank holiday period too</li> </ul>	Rob Bozeat
2	<p><b>Post Meeting Note: Tri-link: WCML North</b></p> <p>The Tri-link Programme is briefed on the updates to the TRU Programme as looking at intelligent renewals on WCML North from 2026 onwards, starting in the Carlisle area and working south. It has 'suggested' two closures in a calendar year - a fortnight around Easter and a month during June. This is a deconfliction priority.</p>	To Note
3	<p><b>South Kirkby</b></p> <p>Ross advised that he may be contacting the FOCs/operators because of a potential need for supplementary work.</p> <p>Ross H said that driver training material not supplied to operators in readiness for week 9.</p> <p>It was agreed between the FOCs and Ross that a 54-hour block would need to be taken at a bank holiday because of the quantum of traffic otherwise affected.</p> <p><b>18/01/24 - Post-Meeting Note following call</b> – current preferred option for South Kirkby would be Christmas 2024, however, resource and integration challenges may mean this preference becomes Easter 2025. Should the current reviews being undertaken prevent either of these dates being suitable and/or should the commercial risk exposure of these dates become unaffordable then Network Rail may seek to explore opportunities in 2024. This would be constrained to August or September (recognising impact of access to services during a high burn period) but would mean it would not be on a bank holiday weekend. <b>Update meeting scheduled 26/01/24.</b></p> <p><b>26/01/24 - Post-Meeting Note following RH update</b> – Not yet determined a date for an alternative for commissioning – remains true our preference is Christmas 2024, Easter, or Spring 2025. Once national conversations have been concluded, Ross H will update.</p>	Ross H

F	Other/General Business	Lead
1	<p><b>Utilisation of ESG Timetable for Studies</b></p> <p>Rob B asked if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Is there endorsement to use the ESG timetable's raw data for the development of capacity studies for EAS comments?"</li> </ul>	Rob B



	<p>Rob confirmed that NR will use a working cut of the Dec 24 TT to inform studies, and discussion continued as to whether the timetable data is fit for purpose for bidding against.</p> <p>FOCs considered it a reasonable start to look Dec 24 for studies, recognizing that this data won't be perfect – but which shouldn't mean that imperfection becomes an excuse for rejecting bids (said David S). It was said that it is important that Freight MK supports/"buys-in" to them too. Ed will be asked to confirm the change so NR can see the full freight picture. David S said that studies needed to be started sooner rather than later to provide a level of assurance with train planning that a) they are workable and b) that they are available for bidding i.e., T-22/24 would be good. It was also raised that end-to-end F3s were available – i.e., origin to destination involving all the Regions affected (i.e., off Eastern route interface should be considered in studies).</p> <p>08/02/24 – Update slide shared.</p>	
--	---	--

The dates of the next few meetings are below at 11am (except were shown otherwise): -

- Monday 12 February 2024
- Monday 26 February 2024
- Monday 11 March 2024
- Monday 25 March 2024

OFFICIAL

Network Rail  
East Coast, East Mids and North & East  
London North Eastern

Engineering Access Statement 2023  
Rules Proposal  
Section 4 – Standard Possessions and Opportunities

Version: 1  
Date : 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2021  
Page : 113 of 168

**LN804 TAPTON JN TO GASCOIGNE WOOD (VIA SHEFFIELD)** Continued...

SECTION		Periods A and B 11.12.2022 to 12.02.2023	Period C 13.02.2023 to 26.03.2023	Period D 27.03.2023 to 20.05.2023	Periods E to G 21.05.2023 to 10.09.2023	Periods H and J 11.09.2023 to 09.12.2023	REMARKS
Nunnery Main Line Jn (Exc.) to Wincobank Jn (Inc.) <b>804.05</b>	WEEK END	0030 Sun to 0805 Sun BLOCKED	0030 Sun to 0805 Sun BLOCKED	0030 Sun to 0805 Sun BLOCKED	0030 Sun to 0805 Sun BLOCKED	0030 Sun to 0805 Sun BLOCKED	
	SUN / MON	Standard Possession Opportunity not available	Standard Possession Opportunity not available	Standard Possession Opportunity not available	Standard Possession Opportunity not available	Standard Possession Opportunity not available	
	MID WEEK	There are cyclical midweek disruptive opportunities available on this route section, please see Section 5 for details					Possession to be taken after passage of 2N45 (2305 ex Leeds to Sheffield). Possessions not to be taken with Tipton Jn and Nunnery ML Jn [LN804], Woodburn Jn and Nunnery ML Jn [LN736], Woodburn Jn and Aldwarke Jn [LN830] and Diggle Jn and LNW Jn [LN860]
Wincobank Jn (Exc.) to Masborough Jn (Exc.) <b>804.06</b>	WEEK END	0025 Sun to 0805 Sun BLOCKED	0025 Sun to 0805 Sun BLOCKED	0025 Sun to 0805 Sun BLOCKED	0025 Sun to 0805 Sun BLOCKED	0025 Sun to 0805 Sun BLOCKED	
	SUN / MON	Standard Possession Opportunity not available	Standard Possession Opportunity not available	Standard Possession Opportunity not available	Standard Possession Opportunity not available	Standard Possession Opportunity not available	
	MID WEEK	There are cyclical midweek disruptive opportunities available on this route section, please see Section 5 for details					

Good Morning Andrew,

In response to the question you posed with regard to confirmation of diversionary routes.....

Attached is an example below. The original proposal was (effectively) non-disruptive across the New Year holiday, but the extension becomes disruptive and takes out the Eye of the Needle (00:15 Sat 30/12/23 – 04:30 Tue 02/01/24).

Through some flexing of passenger services, we now have Offers for our services via the Hope valley, so have withdrawn the dispute we lodged. However, there is a point I really do wish to underline here. We have been asking for months for a written commitment from the TRU Project concerning diversionary strategy for the duration of the TRU project. We need the certainty that a common diversionary strategy is in place for all of the proposed Eye of the Needle blocks and that capacity will be made available over the selected diversionary route. We cannot be in a situation where NR play "pick and mix" concerning routing options. We have staff to train for the selected diversionary route and have requested a minimum 6 months' notice, in order to address route learning for the first of the blockades. We still await that confirmation which has become critical, the minimum 6 months notice having passed.

I am aware that at least one FOC has a timetabling dispute lodged with ADC concerning the disruptive blockade in week 40, because NR has thus far been unable to provide suitable assurances concerning diversionary capacity and journey-time.

Best regards

**Quentin Hedderly**

**Regulatory Specialist**

**Legal & Regulatory Affairs**

**From:** Mark Gibbens <[Mark.Gibbens@drax.com](mailto:Mark.Gibbens@drax.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 28, 2022 7:30:18 AM  
**To:** Ian Kapur <[Ian.Kapur@gbraillfreight.com](mailto:Ian.Kapur@gbraillfreight.com)>  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** RE: TRU & Drax Summer Outages

Hi Ian,

I hope that you are well.

I have been looping around my team, Drax and Peel on the below and also had a meeting with NR today for a briefing update on TPRU. I believe you know Christopher Wan well and I shared with him our key planning principles. We agreed it was important for Drax to have a high level oversight of the project but for all tactical routing details to of course be with yourselves.

ummer,  
 k of no trains  
 ember I think

The principles we wish to work to are:

- Summer blockades preferred over winter
- January most damaging as follows reduced Christmas week programme so ideally to be avoided
- We favour extended weekend possessions over multiple overnight ones (more efficient, allows us maintenance opportunity and stressed we value night paths the same as daytime so no logic for Freight to be squeezed this way)
- Drax plan our ships by Sept for the year ahead – i.e. 30-Sep-2022 we will lock in our schedules for 1<sup>st</sup> Jan 2021 to 31<sup>st</sup> Dec 2023. It is important for us to therefore have an update for Y+1 at the start of Q3. We are planning 6 monthly reviews likely July and Jan to achieve this
- Unplanned changes in year not desirable – in Y+2 thought we can be more flexible as time allows us to plan (possible eye of the needle 23 days in 2024/25? To consider but as a one off could be managed)

x will be Lee

Y08 8PH

[Andrew.Playford@drax.com](mailto:Andrew.Playford@drax.com)

**M:** +44 (0)7912 297989

[www.drax.com](http://www.drax.com)

- Diversion routes key – we prefer to have e.g. 75% capacity via a diversion than an absolute block any time

Regarding major outages there are not any known for 2023, 24 or 25.

Peel will take outages typically in April, June & September annually - roughly no trains one weekend Fri-Mon. If NR were taking a possession we would certainly drive to align.

I would be very happy to have a call or a catch up at some stage to discuss any further thoughts you have?

Regards

**Mark Gibbens**

Head of Logistics

Drax Power Limited

M: 07809 342226

[mark.gibbens@drax.com](mailto:mark.gibbens@drax.com)

[www.drax.com](http://www.drax.com)



Drax Power Station, Selby, North Yorkshire, YO8 8PH, United Kingdom

If NWR want to work on the Drax Branch itself we tend to like these to take place been April and August away from the peak winter delivery periods.

Hope this helps.

Thanks,  
 Ian.

Ian Broadhead

Logistics Officer – Rail & Optimisation

Drax Power Station,  
 Selby, North Yorkshire

