

## **Current Opinion on Feasibility Study**

Authors: Paul Riley, Michael Strohn

**Subject: Brno Railway Node Feasibility Study**

**Ref: 2014 091 CZ AMT RAL**

**Docs received and reviewed:** Feasibility Study Draft from June 2017, update of operational simulation

Based on the request of Mr. Mojmir Nejezchleb from 5.9.2017, we would like to confirm JASPERS current opinion on this study :

1. **SŽDC project management approach :** Based on what we have been able to observe, the approach of the project management team of this project in SŽDC has generally been objective with a desire to present and follow the evidence arising from the study while being unbiased towards specific options or stakeholders. The project management team has also been open towards the numerous stakeholders interested in this very complex, controversial project and co-operation with JASPERS has generally been constructive and fruitful.
2. **Technical solutions and operating programme :**
  - The development and assessment of options and sub-options has been a complex exercise, which in our view has enriched the process of looking for an optimal technical and operational concept.
  - The operational simulation assessment is now acceptable though not yet perfect from a methodology perspective and – except for freight trains in options A and Aa - indicates a generally good operational performance of the proposed node solution. There are however a number of rail lines which still do not show an optimal performance. Although it is not at this stage an essential issue with significant impact on costs, benefits or options decisions, at the next stage of development, the technical design and operational concepts should be reviewed to ensure that the whole node will work sufficiently reliably in normal operational conditions.
  - The forecast passenger utilisation of proposed rail lines is generally sufficient in our view, however the demand performance of planned rail line S37 is very poor and should be considered for dropping from the operating concept, the more so as the operating quality according to simulation results for this line is unsatisfactory for all tested options.
  - There is no evidence in the study for the tracks 600, 602 and 604 being needed on a regular basis and we would not considered investment in them or related to them eligible for EU funding.
3. **Passenger transport model :** since the beginning of the project, JASPERS has spent considerable time and effort supporting and assessing the passenger model development (including passenger behaviour surveys) and we can confirm that the basic internal model structure and parameters are now generally sound, realistic and fit for purpose with an aim to primarily assess the impact of railway infrastructure and operational measures in the context of the regional and urban catchment area of Brno.
4. **Economic analysis and risk assessment :** the economic and risk assessment of options is generally well prepared in line with the currently valid national CBA methodology, taking into account the most significant costs, benefits and risks and based on a sound passenger transport

model. It is a good basis for comparison of the economic effectiveness and risks of the various project options.

5. **Differential impacts of the project options on the potential for urban development** are understood to be a separate issue/decision criterion which has been deliberately (and correctly in our view) left out of the CBA assumptions due to the extreme difficulty of assessing this factor in the transport model or with CBA. This issue should be taken into account separately in the final summary report.
6. **Treatment of High Speed Rail issues** : the recent decision to isolate out the costs and benefits of fitting the project to a potential future high speed rail solution is the correct one at this point in our view. There is too much uncertainty about the fate of Czech high speed rail plans or possible technical solutions for this within the Brno node (although an initial inspection indicates that technical solutions to integrate the future high speed rail within the main station may be possible with a similar cost level for both A and B type options).
7. **The transport and economic analysis of the potential of new rail stops proposed for Brno rail node** should be considered in the decision making process as the case is not strong for all the proposed stops and differs between A and B type options for Brno main station. Exclusion of some new stops from the project concept should be seriously considered depending on the main station location option preferred. Tuřany Airport stop performs very poorly in all options.
8. **Next steps** : JASPERS final support for the study is still conditional on resolving all the key issues raised in our guidance note from June 13<sup>th</sup> 2017 (and previous related notes). Particular focus will be placed on the quality and coherence of the summary report (report A), which will form the main basis for any decision making process and is still being redrafted. Review of the revised specialist B reports is ongoing.

<p>Disclaimer: JASPERS assistance is provided in good faith and with reasonable care and due diligence (diligentia quam in suis), drawing on the experience and business practices of its partners, the EIB and EBRD; however, the beneficiaries acknowledge that EIB in its role as JASPERS will not be responsible for any loss or damage resulting from any advice provided by JASPERS.</p>
--