

MetroLink Independent Engineering Expert Services

TII Update meeting – Summary 07/12/2021

• Virtual tours and site visits

- Collins Avenue to Charlemont (virtual tour: 27/10; site visit: 8/11)
- Collins Avenue to Estuary (virtual tour: 27/10; site visit: 9/11)

• First round of stakeholder meetings

- Participants: Hampstead Res., Prospect ACA, Griffith Avenue and DRA, Wadelei and Hillcrest DRA, Ballymun Road and Albert College DRA, R132 groups - Ashley Avenue Res., Estuary Res., Seatown Res. (separately)
- Main issues raised: (basic environmental questions N&V, Traffic Management, Dust, Water Table and flooding, Settlement issues and compensation zone, why are TII not building the MN project instead? were common to all.)
 - R132 Groups – linear park concept very strongly opposed, total amenity loss during construction, flooding risks (Estuary part), siting of construction compounds, location of stations (updated alignment drgs.), local parking issues in operation, N&V and why isn't the alignment in cut and cover in the middle of the R132? Founding concerns and buried watercourses.
 - BR&ACDRA – position of Collins Avenue Station contested, suggestion to return to MN configuration instead of PR which would better support DCU and surrounding lands developments, Scepticism about Bus Connects interchange being significant, highly sensitive receptors, unconvinced about the need for large station entrance with Signature Architecture, traffic mgt planning
 - Wadelei and Hillcrest DRA – support PR Collins Avenue location, concerns about impact of IS on ACP – smaller footprint?, Environmental impacts ACP and facing residential, traffic mgt., access for special school St Michaels House access to ACP, worried that siting station next to ACP would lead to antisocial behaviours (also at Collins Avenue station).
 - Hampstead RA – positioning of CA station and the IS in ACP. Mainly pressing for an extra station between Griffith and Collins or 'what's in it for us?' to suffer years of disruption for effectively no benefit to them. Several points about scale of developments at DCU and Marlets and point about MN station having had 2 entrances proposed (the only one on the line). ACP as construction compound strongly opposed. Difference in real costs between the IS and at least a station box? IS proposals sub optimal proposed use of space – taking up too much of the park.
 - GADRA – relative positioning of Stations (CP/GP) etc. and IS, high proportion of over 80s in their area (much overlap with Hampstead RA issues), raised an interesting issue about what would happen if project was 'put on hold' when under construction (e.g. economic downturn) – how would the worksites be appropriately mitigated and not left as huge open holes with rusty rebar sticking up for a decade or two?
 - Prospect ACA – Foundations and settlement was a grave concern for the old housing stock around Glasnevin Cemetery etc., TII compensation scheme limits, N&V from construction directly under their houses, lost watercourses and groundwaters, Glasnevin Station issues – local community needs being addressed as part of station development, appropriate architecture (nothing too modern), station area security, functional allocation of spaces. Dalcassian residents to be 'bought out' by TII?
 - Charlemont Residents – not addressed at this time
- Main future actions:
 - Collect and collate RA question sets (and supporting documents) and pass these onto TII for the appropriate level of technical reply (ideally by the end of January/beginning Feb 2022.)
 - Holding meetings on average every 2 months with most RAs (GADRA monthly) –next meetings by Teams

MetroLink Independent Engineering Expert Services

Update meeting - Summary

- **Draft Report of «Review of Published EPR and PR documents»**
 - 3 team IEE members are reviewing the EPR and PR documents and are about 50-60% of the way through the process. Specialisms include Tunnelling and Geotechnics, Transport Planning and Demand Forecasting, Environmental Issues and Rail Operational Planning and Safety/Risk Management.
 - ARUP EPR work has been reviewed by half of the team and seems logical in structure and uses accepted practice in such studies to reach the overall conclusions.
 - Subject to further IEE analysis and internal discussion relating to demand forecasting and costing assumptions as there appear to be some questions we would like to delve into in some more detail.
 - Likewise on assumptions surrounding operational parameters of the system.
 - Relates particularly to Stakeholder questions relating to ‘why aren’t TII just building MetroNorth?’.
 - Station number and positioning is a matter of some interest also to Stakeholders.
 - Jacobs/Idom PR review is further advanced with all team members having had a chance to review the documentation that has been made available to us.
 - The PR work seems to be reasonably logical in structure and possibly the outcomes however
 - IEE keen to review some of the supporting background reports by the PR team – we have requested lists of these from TII
 - It will be necessary to speak to the PR team to understand their assessment process in more detail before we draw any definitive conclusions
- **First Findings of the Stage 1 Review**
 - Reluctant to draw definitive conclusions at this stage (especially without more detail from PR team)
 - PR Design Report is a ‘summary document’ with appendices – seems to lack some important details (which must be contained in other reports or working notes within the Team)
 - PR decision making process somewhat unclear at present
 - Geotechnical details need fleshing out – particularly the issues around settlement and hydrogeology
 - Vertical Alignment details also sought (long sections including details of depth of overburden and rockhead)
 - Approach to operational safety in design and overall risk assessment not yet clear
 - Evidence of the basis of Requirements for MetroLink is also of interest

MetroLink Independent Engineering Expert Services

First round of Stakeholder Meetings



Date	Stakeholder	Location	Minutes (*)
10/11/2021	Hampstead Residents	Teams	Final (C5)
10/11/2021	Prospect ACA	Teams	Draft for comments
11/11/2021	Griffith Avenue and DRA	Teams	Draft for comments
11/11/2021	Wadelei and Hillcrest DRA	Teams	Final (C6)
12/11/2021	Ballymun Road and Albert College DRA	Teams	Final (C7)
13/11/2021	Ashley Avenue Residents	In person	Final (C8)
13/11/2021	Estuary Residents	In person	Draft for comments
13/11/2021	Seatown Residents	In person	Draft for comments

(*) = the available final minutes (C#) have been issued and sent by e-mail; the official submission (with TII sharepoint details) will be sent when all final MoMs are available, which will be very shortly we hope

MetroLink Independent Engineering Expert Services

Draft Report Structure of «Review of Published EPR and PR documents»

1. Introduction

- Authors, Purpose and Structure

2. Published EPR and PR documents

- List of documents
- Important terms and concepts used in the available documents (source, pathway, receptors, baseline studies, impact prediction and assessment)

3. General transport planning principles

- The metro background
- The system options
- The alignment options
- The station options
- The depot options

4. The design process for construction works

- How tunnels and underground stations

are constructed

- Design for operational safety and risk management

5. Consideration of key environmental impacts relevant to the project

- Airborne noise from surface construction works and operation
- Vibration and ground borne noise from metro construction and operation
- Influence of proposed works on surface water
- Influence of proposed works on ground water
- Settlement of ground around tunnels and excavations
- Construction and permanent traffic management

Each impact type includes:

- Concepts and terminology
- Reference to relevant section of the EIS
- Assumption and methodology
- Summary of the results of the assessment
- Comments