

**CHILTERN RAILWAYS (BICESTER TO OXFORD IMPROVEMENTS)
TWA ORDER RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS OF CLARIFICATION**

Objector Name and Reference: Mr Ian Salisbury OBJ5/2

Date submitted: 15 October 2010

Date of Response: 22 October 2010

Response: Responses from CRCL are provided to the further questions submitted on the responses given to the Questions of clarifications CRCL/CR/OBJ5/A. The Inspector ruled that these were submitted after the deadline and did not qualify as Questions of Clarification. Chiltern Railways is, however, happy to respond to these in turn.

Question Number	Response
-----------------	----------

6	<i>Answer to Ian Salisbury's questions 3.14 and 3.18</i>
---	--

Part of your reply appears to have been redacted. Please provide in explanation of Mr Nelson's evidence paragraph 42:

- *the "Upper" and "Lower" "Numbers" for the entire range A to M and the entire range 1 to 13;*
- *the "individual risk" that the letters refer to which have only been partially provided. For instance, in the information you have already provided for the "Individual Risk Ranking" value B giving an "Upper number" of 1 in 5,000, please say whether 1 in 5,000 refers to the chance of a fatality arising from a train striking any one pedestrian in any one year; or if that is not the descriptor, please provide it.*
- *Please provide the same for "Lower Number";*
- *The "collective" risk that the numbers refer to, none of which you have yet provided, giving the relevant descriptors against which the values are set;*

Alternatively, please place a full copy of the ALCRM User Guide in the Core Documents.

A further copy of the table originally provided in response to question 3.14 has been provided in an accessible form .

A copy of the ALCRM User Guide has been provided.

7	<i>Answer to Ian Salisbury's question 3.19, he would respectfully suggest that you have not answered his question because you make no reference to the methodology described in the ALCRM User Guide.</i>
---	---

Please answer the question with reference to the ALCRM risk ranking outputs that you refer to.

Alternatively, please place a full copy of the ALCRM User Guide in the Core Documents.

A copy of the ALCRM User Guide has been provided.

Question Number	Response
8	<p><i>Arising from the statement made in the answer to Ian Salisbury's question 3.19 that the Order Scheme proposes "a viable alternative route across the railway". Please explain what you mean by "viable".</i></p> <p>Viable means that the alternative route proposed in the Order scheme is a reasonably practicable alternative. Given that there are no exceptional circumstances justifying the provision of the new level crossing, the existing Aristotle Lane level crossing will be redundant and closed because a viable alternative route across the railway is to be provided within the Order scheme.</p>
9	<p>Answer to question 3.26, the document CD3/35 is not the document you refer to.</p> <p>Please provide a copy of the full report rather than the Overview within the Core Documents.</p> <p>A full copy of the RSSB 2009/10 Annual Safety Performance Report is appended to this document.</p>
