

Ciaran,

I will request that via email now.

Thanks  
Michelle

---

**From:** Doran, Ciaran  
**Sent:** 26 September 2011 17:18  
**To:** Thomson, Michelle  
**Cc:** Orr, David (DRD); McGahan, Barney; Hamill, Fiona; Burke, Brenda; Etchells, Denise  
**Subject:** Re: URGENT - COLERINE DERRY

Ok. It would be good to ensure(ie in writing) that ceo will bring this ea addendum to the nithc board later. Can you let translink know?

This message was sent from my Blackberry device.

---

**From:** Thomson, Michelle  
**To:** Doran, Ciaran  
**Cc:** Orr, David (DRD); McGahan, Barney; Hamill, Fiona; Burke, Brenda; Etchells, Denise; Etchells, Denise  
**Sent:** Mon Sep 26 17:08:23 2011  
**Subject:** URGENT - COLERINE DERRY

Ciaran,

In order to speed the process up I have already forwarded the addendum and the NPCs to Translink who will be forwarding to the CEO today. It is hoped that we should have CEO sign off by tomorrow morning.

Thanks  
Michelle

---

**From:** Doran, Ciaran  
**Sent:** 26 September 2011 17:04  
**To:** Thomson, Michelle  
**Cc:** Orr, David (DRD); McGahan, Barney; Hamill, Fiona; Burke, Brenda; Etchells, Denise; Etchells, Denise  
**Subject:** RE: URGENT - COLERINE DERRY

yes but it is important that at a minimum the CEO approves it and commits to telling nithc board at a later time.

This shouldnt hold anything up.

---

**From:** Thomson, Michelle  
**Sent:** 26 September 2011 16:59  
**To:** Doran, Ciaran  
**Cc:** Orr, David (DRD); McGahan, Barney; Hamill, Fiona; Burke, Brenda; Etchells, Denise  
**Subject:** URGENT - COLERINE DERRY

Ciaran,

In answer to your questions the non-monetary costs and benefits were agreed with a member of Translink staff and the addendum will be presented to the CEO tonight and the Executives tomorrow who I suspect will not make any changes to the weights and scores awarded. As I stated in my earlier email the changes made have simply strengthened the position in respect to the selection of option B. If we had left the non-monetary section as it was within the original EA then, because the NPCs of the options are broadly similar, the decision to select option B would have been difficult as it would have performed worse than option A.

Both the NITHCo board and the Executives signed off on the original addendum which had identified option B as the preferred option - the selection of this option hasn't changed in this version. However, the CEO or the Executives may decide that a further approval is needed from the board, but as the board does not sit again until 12th October the whole delivery of the project would become questionable - the project manager has advised that if approval is not received by 14th October the deadlines will not be met.

Thanks  
Michelle

---

**From:** Doran, Ciaran  
**Sent:** 26 September 2011 16:34  
**To:** McGahan, Barney; Thomson, Michelle  
**Cc:** Orr, David (DRD); Hamill, Fiona; Burke, Brenda; Etchells, Denise  
**Subject:** RE: URGENT - COLERINE DERRY

My only comment is:

1. Who agreed the weightings and scorings in the non quantifiable table. Did this include rail professionals.
2. Can we get written assurance that Translink CEO is content with this document(and that this will or has been brought to attention of NITHC Board).

---

**From:** McGahan, Barney  
**Sent:** 26 September 2011 16:30  
**To:** Thomson, Michelle  
**Cc:** Orr, David (DRD); Doran, Ciaran; Hamill, Fiona; Burke, Brenda  
**Subject:** RE: URGENT - COLERINE DERRY

Michelle, I'm content.  
Thanks.  
Barney

---

**From:** Thomson, Michelle  
**Sent:** 26 September 2011 16:10  
**To:** Orr, David (DRD); McGahan, Barney; Doran, Ciaran; Hamill, Fiona  
**Cc:** Burke, Brenda  
**Subject:** URGENT - COLERINE DERRY

David, Barney, Ciaran, Fiona

Thank you for providing comments on the draft addendum. I have attached a slightly updated addendum for your consideration and provided answers to some of the questions raised below. For information, this version continues to show that, given the objective to provide 8 services during the year of city of culture, option B is the preferred option but Brenda's earlier comments re VFM of this option still remain valid.

In relation to option A, although it is not feasible given current budgetary constraints, it must be included within the addendum as a comparator given it was the original option approved by DFP. I have also obtained confirmation from Translink that they could stop the procurement process today for the safety works without any further repercussions to the company. Therefore, Translink continue to be content that the £7.6 million is included within options B and C, but excluded from option A. We have however reflected the fact that this money is already secured within the PE implications shown on page 20.

In relation to the exclusion of the passing loop under option C this option was included as a 'do minimum option' - i.e. maintaining the line without providing any service enhancements identified within NTT. We felt it was important to include such an option to demonstrate to DFP that the additional cost in providing an 'enhanced service' was negligible - something which is important in the current budget constraints. Translink have confirmed that they are content with this approach and the assumptions applied to the 'do minimum' option.

I have also liaised with Translink on the non-monetary costs and benefits section. They have confirmed that they are content with the changes made and the weights and scores allocated (though we have identified a slight error in the totals awarded - Option B now reduces to an overall score of 700). I appreciate that these have changed substantially from the original EA and the original draft addendum, but our changes have strengthened the position in respect to the selection of option B - the NPCs of the options are broadly similar, so it is ultimately the non-monetary scores which help the selection of option B.

Finally, I have updated the works duration OB and can confirm that the external project manager has already been procured under a letter of prior approval (the costs of this are reflected within the NPCs), and this is why the name is already known.

Assuming everyone is content with the details above and the slightly revised version attached, I propose to send the draft to Translink/NITHCo this afternoon and if they are content, which they largely seem to be from my discussions with them this morning, I can then forward to DFP. As Brenda noted, DFP are aware the addendum is coming and have agreed to consider it as a priority.

Thanks  
Michelle

---

**From:** Orr, David (DRD)  
**Sent:** 23 September 2011 15:07  
**To:** Burke, Brenda  
**Cc:** Hamill, Fiona; Doran, Ciaran; McGahan, Barney; Thomson, Michelle  
**Subject:** FW: [ACTION 26/9] FW: URGENT - COLERINE DERRY

Brenda

Two quick comments:

- Option A is no longer feasible, but is included as a comparator. Is that entirely fair? If it is not feasible why is it not ruled out? Does it have a £7.6m advantage on the other 2 options (representing the sunk cost of the £7.6m track safety works - i.e. middle section re-rail

which is already committed). Perhaps this sunk cost should be deducted from options 2 and 3.

- Option B is the option recently proposed by Translink. It is more expensive than option C (which is the current proposal - prior to option B emerging, but without the passing loop). This understandably makes Option C cheaper. C is essentially the current plan (before Translink's recent option emerged) but without the passing loop.

Surely if we're comparing like for like the passing loop has to be in or out in both options B and C. I would have thought it should be in both, as this was approved in the current approved business case.

David

David Orr

Deputy Secretary - Finance, Resources and Water Policy  
Department for Regional Development  
Clarence Court, 10-18 Adelaide Street, Belfast, BT2 8GB

Tel: 028 9054 1180

---

**From:** Burke, Brenda  
**Sent:** 23 September 2011 10:10  
**To:** Orr, David (DRD); McGahan, Barney; Doran, Ciaran; Hamill, Fiona  
**Cc:** Thomson, Michelle  
**Subject:** [ACTION 26/9] FW: URGENT - COLERINE DERRY

David, Barney, Ciaran, Fiona

I have attached the draft addendum for your consideration. There have been a number of significant changes to the original Translink addendum that was approved by the NITHC board last week (in particular the addition of option C and the non-quantifiable section has changed considerably). Therefore, before submitting to DFP, I will need to ensure that Translink/NITHCo are content with the changes. Peter Moore, who I have been liaising with is currently off on leave but will return on Monday. Assuming everyone is content, we can send the revised draft to Translink/NITHCo on Monday and if they are content we can then forward to DFP. DFP are aware the addendum is coming and have agreed to consider it as a priority.

You should note that the addendum has been written to justify the decision to proceed with the relay on the 2 end sections of the line so as to ensure that there are 8 services each way per day during most of 2013 (from March onwards), i.e. services will not reduce to 5 per day which is what Translink say will happen in the absence of the relay. The signalling and passing loop in 2014/15 will then facilitate an hourly service. I do, however, have some concerns around the VFM of this option. My main concern is that until the whole line is re-laid in 2021, it would appear that current speed restrictions of 60mph cannot be removed and therefore passenger time savings (around 9/10 minutes) will not materialise – this obviously has implications for passenger demand/revenue. In addition, while the Net Present Costs for the full relay option (A) and phased option (B) are broadly similar, the **real** capital cost of option B is approximately £10 million more. Given that none of the spend to date on the rail safety project would be nugatory (it is my understanding that the materials procured to date can be used for a relay project), it is my view that if there is any chance at all of

getting the Executive to Commit to funding a fully relay to start after the 2013 City of Culture, then this option should be considered further.

I appreciate that going with this option would mean that services would be reduced to 5 each way per day on the Derry line during 2013 but this could be partially dealt with through bus substitution. This option would also mean giving up some of the £7.6m that has been secured for the rail safety project (i.e. re-rail) and would also mean that we would be looking at securing £55 million (2011/12 prices) in the next budget round (there is already £20m secured for 2014/15 that could be used to start the relay).

I appreciate that politicians and the public do not want a reduced train service during 2013 but I feel that there is a risk that we may be going for a half-baked solution to satisfy public opinion and also because of affordability. Also, under the current timetable, phase 1 is estimated to be completed in March 2013, 3 months into the start of City of Culture. There is a potential risk (and this needs to be explored further) that delays could result in either a longer blockade or a longer lead in period and the objective, which is used to justify the works, would not be met.

I would be grateful for your views. As I am on leave Monday and Tuesday, could you send any comments to Michelle Thomson and she will liaise with Peter Moor on Monday and hopefully get an agreed draft which she will forward to DFP. Thanks

Brenda Burke