

DRS response 09.10.2019

Hello Tamzin

Apologies for the blank e-mail before, jumped the gun massively there!

1. The alternative sought was to run to Bristol FLT, paths were looked at to run in on the Sunday and back out on the Sunday instead of the usual out on the Saturday back on the Sunday which the Wentloog service usually does and while this appeared to work OK and traincrew could have been given site inductions/briefs for Bristol FLT (as some of our drivers already sign down that way for the Bridgwater flask traffic) I have been advised that this option is not possible now due to short timescales to agree an access contract/method of working for the terminal and the fact that the terminal is mothballed since Freightliner stopped using it a few months ago and sent all their traffic to Wentloog instead. Use of Portbury docks was ruled out due to much the same issues but also most importantly that it would require significant route learning from a traincrew perspective which at this late stage would not have been possible and the fact that no container handling equipment exists down at Portbury that I am aware of.
2. As always, Tesco/Stobart want to promote their message around sustainable railfreight and late notice possessions causing traffic to not be able to run/cause road haulage goes against that message and could obviously impact on any future contract renewals.
4. Not an option due to issues listed above.
5. We have cancelled the traffic the last couple of times this has happened, but that has been known at a much earlier stage in the process and the customer has adjusted their transport plans accordingly to have not road so much of the traffic. For future times, we will either do that again or further push the use of Bristol FLT with more time to draw up agreements/terminal handling operations etc..
7. We are asking for a gap to be made available on Saturday to run the traffic to Wentloog and again on the Sunday to run it back out of Wentloog. Or a gap is given up on Sunday morning/again on Sunday afternoon to allow the service to run out and back on the Sunday if giving up on the Saturday is not an option that NR can do.

Many thanks

Alex Vickers
Train Planner

DBC response 09.10.2019

Tamzin

In response:

1. There is very limited scope to move via alternative transport means due to the late notice of the possession. Puma will not be able to use alternative means as Milford Haven is not connected by a pipeline and the location is not equipped to load road vehicles plus the remote location of Milford Haven it would not be feasible or possible to replace lost rail volumes by road. This means Puma will lose business and therefore money. In regards to Tata Steel they are under huge financial pressure due to Brexit and the difficult global position of steel, any possession which prevents trains operating will cost them huge sums of money. Place this in context if Tata Steel production at its hot strip mill is stopped it costs £1,000 per minute.
2. We are currently discussing contracts with Tata Steel and Puma and any possessions where trains can't run mean there is a risk to any contract.
5. With most normal possessions is it planned further out and allows time for production to be brought forward or to manage stock levels at final delivery point but with this late notice there is not this capability. The late notice possession will cost both Puma and Tata Steel considerable sums of money and lost sales to their customers.
6. We are asking for the possession either to be removed, or amended to allow a through route between Cardiff and Caldicot (possession limits) with access to and from both ends of Llanwern. The duration would be outside the 14 hour all line possession already agreed. We would consider a 27 hour all line possession extended from the 14 hour possession already agreed. Although not ideal as we would still lose 13 trains but would not affect the PUMA flows and is more manageable.

Many Thanks
Graham