Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
1	19.10.2018	RBDG-MAN-013-0101	EDZL	The request of derogation for the vertical alignment over the Kārļa Ulmaņa gatve	The purpose of the change is using of the maximum gradient limit is 25‰ for the vertical alignment of main tracks in accordance with Design Guidelines for the passenger trains (RBDG-MAN-013-0101_RailwayAlignment, 6. General vertical characteristics, 6.1. Gradient (p)) and using overlaping of horizontal transitional andvertical curves in order to fit in the accepted corridor. Vertical alignment is overlapping horizontal transition curves in this chainages: km 29+497.429 – km 29+600.429 km 29+972.925 – km 30+075.925 km 30+239.913 – km 30+342.913 km 30+630.367 – km 30+733.367 km 32+265.940 – km 32+305.940	19.10.2018	Overlap of horizontal and vertical curves allowed
2	04.03.2019	RBDG-MAN-012-0101 RBDG-MAN-013-0101	EDZL	Issues of railway alignment and design speed in Riga international airport link	Urban environment in vicinity of Riga international airport (RIX) constraints the possible geometry of railway line, resulting in curves with sharp radius, and accordingly low operational speed on two curves, and non fulfillment of minimum curve radius on other two curves. Curves Nr.1, Nr. 2, Nr.4 and Nr. 5 of RIX design section do not correspond to the current requirements of Design Guidelines. The purpose of the change is the approval of the geometry of railway as designed.	01.04.2019	Curves with reduced radius and operational speed allowed: · curve Nr.1 with R=550, D=150 mm and V=110 km/h, 29,6-29,97 km (3,35 km from RIX station platform with platform start passing speed 60 km/h, speed as per braking curve 249 km/h); · curve Nr.2 with R=550, D=150 mm and V=110 km/h, 30,34-30,63 km (2,61 km from RIX, 235 km/h); · curve Nr.4 with R=3000, D=30 mm and V=120 km/h, 31,74-31,98 km (1,21 km from RIX, 175 km/h); · curve Nr.5 with R=3000, D=30 mm and V=120 km/h, 32,16-32,27 km (0,79 km from RIX, 145 km/h)
3	04.03.2019	RBDG-MAN-013-0101	EDZL	Issues of minimum curve radius on Riga international airport link	Urban environment in vicinity of Riga international airport (RIX) constraints the possible geometry of railway line, resulting in curves with sharp radius and non fulfillment of minimum curve radius for two cuves. Curves Nr.6, Nr. 7 of RIX design section immediately south of station platform do not correspond to the current requirements of Design Guidelines, althought the operational aspects are not affected. The purpose of the change is the approval of the geometry of railway as designed.	01.04.2019	Curves with reduced radius allowed: · curve Nr.6 with R=760, D=65 mm and V=100 km/h, 33,29-33,35 km (0,3 km from RIX platform north end, speed 90 km/h with platform start passing speed 60 km/h); · curve Nr.7 with R=900, D=90 mm and V=120 km/h, 33,49-33,60 km (0,55 km from RIX, 120 km/h)
4	04.10.2019	RBDG-MAN-012-0103	EDZL	Freight train length in RIX freight yard	The RIX station cargo yard is located between K. Ulmaņa gatve street and the airport territory (chainage 30 km +572 till 31 km +312) parallel to the main line. It consists of two tracks for reception of train and stabling of wagons and one for passage of locomotive, and a short dead-end track for locomotive shunting movements as well. The three through tracks in the yard are 431 to 554 m long. The possibilities make them longer are limited by the K. Ulmaņa gatve on the North (up to 29 km +900 to reach 1050 m length) and maximum permittable gradient and airport boundaries on the South. The planned lengths are based on the preliminary design study, which forecated only relatively small amounts of air cargo, which might be delivered by rail.	04.11.2019	Track yards with reduced effective freight train length allowed in RIX freight yard
5	14.11.2019	RBDG-MAN-012-0101	LG	Request of derogation for 1050m length of railway tracks 80 and 81 in Palemonas.	Existing tracks 80 and 81 with length of 784m, will be used for Kaunas Intermodal Terminal (KIT) services only. Trains which arrive and use KIT services will be 700-750m length. It should be noted that new freight track yard will serve as prime Kaunas 1435 mm gauge track yard, which will serve KIT as well, particularly when the freight train lenght will be 1050 m.	09.12.2019	In Palemonas tracks number 80 and 81 with length 784m allowed
6	14.11.2019	RBDG-MAN-015-0102 RBDG-MAN-014-0103	LG	The derogation request for track embankment layers thickness and deformation modulus values route section Kaunas-Palemonas.	Section's Jiesia-Rokai embankment as-built parameters don't comply with DG requirements, but they are enough when passenger train speed is 120km/h, freight train speed - 80km/h. Derogation purpose is to agree already existing Embankment parameters taking into account what train speed is designed.	09.12.2019	On section Kaunas-Palemonas, the following parameters are permitted: · Sub-ballast thickness of 0.3m, deformation modulus Ev2 not less than 100MN/m2 · Ballast shoulder 0.4m
7	26.11.2019	RBDG-MAN-012-0101	EDZL	Derogation request - Modification of the P07 overpass cross section based on clash detection	Contractor applied all geometrical guidelines from Rail Baltica in the cross section of the P07 overpass. The cross section cannot be applied physically given the following clashes, 2 design conflicts: Clash of P07 bridge deck with the existing bus station Clash between bridge decks of P07 and P08. (approximately over a length of 55m)	16.12.2019	Proposed cross-section allowed, including reducing distance between centre of track and maintenance path to 2250mm and reducing space between centre of track and edge of OCL post to 3250mm
8	03.12.2019	RBDG-MAN-030-0103 RBDG-MAN-033-0101 RBDG-MAN-034-0101 RBDG-MAN-035-0101 and BIM templates	EDZL	Design guidelines. Derogation from BIM Requirements for Riga Central Station project	Derogation covers the above mentioned contract execution and includes avoidance of specific BIM requirements of the in-force Design Guidelines version (referring also to the version which is subject for approval on Technical reference Group meeting on 05.12.2019.), following instead the BIM requirements included within the initially signed contractual requirements (RBDG-INF-002-0100 and RBDG-MAN-030-0101). Exception: This Derogation does not cover the As-built stage information deliverables. The BIM requirements for As-built deliverables within Design Guidelines being incomplete at the current point in time are still subject for impact analysis.	16.12.2019	Using RBDG-INF-002-0100 and RBDG-MAN-030-0101 for the RCS design stage permitted. As-built documentation shall still be developed according to up-to-date DG requirements.
9	14.11.2019	RBDG-MAN-012-0103	LG	The derogation request for distance between 1520mm and 1435 mm track centers in section Kaunas-Palemonas.	In technical project the requirement for newly designed 1435mm gauge track was to keep minimum distance from 1520mm track (from track center to track center) accordingly 4.65m in railway stations area and 5.70m in line between stations (5.90m in curves). 3.30m distance designed from 1520mm track axe to the edge of embankment slope and 4.30m from 1435mm gauge track axe to the end of embankment slope. The distance of 4.30m was foreseen for possible catenary structures installations.	16.12.2019	Existing distance between 1435mm and 1520mm track axis in section Kaunas-Palemonas permitted - shortest distance is 7.12m at 33+646.75
10	03.12.2019	RBDG-MAN-012-0103	LG	The derogation request for fence types in Kaunas-Palemonas and Rokai-Palemonas railway section.	Types of fences proposed by Design Guidelines (RBDG-MAN-012-0101_GeneralRequirements, 6.Safety and Security, 6.1. Fences) are: (i) Standart Fences with components of streched mesh reinforcement, metal posts and corner, end and stop posts; (ii) "Sensitive Area" fences with standart fence elements topped with anti-crossing device; (iii) Simplified Fences may be constructed of mesh reinforcement or foir barbed wires on treated wood or metal posts; * alternatives solutions with plastic fences can be proposed for some locations. Types of fences are designed in Technical Project: (i) Metal mesh fence (h=2.2 m) with metal posts every 4m; (ii) Segmental fence (h=3.0m); (iii) Plastic fence 30 cm insert in metal mesh fence; (iv) Plastic fence (h = 2.0m).	16.12.2019	Proposed fences on sections Kaunas-Palemonas and Rokai-Palemonas permitted
11	14.11.2019	RBDG-MAN-012-0103	LG	Derogation request for 1520 mm and 1435 mm gauge crossings in Kaunas-Palemonas section.	Technical design for Kaunas-Palemonas section was prepared and approved on August 2016. Technical design foreseen four gauge crossings in Kaunas-Palemonas section. The decision to implement such solutions was made due to complicated topographical and environmental area, as well as already existing immovable infrastructure objects (Kaunas station, Kaunas tunnel, River Nemunas). Gauge crossing BS3 is installed in Kaunas station area were 1435 mm gauge station track intersects with an 1520 mm gauge access track to Žemutinis track yard at 36+150KM. 1435 mm gauge track is located in stations area. The traffic speed, because of passenger trains full stop in Kaunas station is up to 20 km/h.	16.12.2019	Gauge crossing in Kaunas station at 36+150km permitted
12	04.12.2019	RBDG-MAN-012-0103	LG	The derogation request for Kaunas tunnel 1435/1520 mm dual gauge track in Kaunas-Palemonas railway section.	Technical Project for Kaunas-Palemonas section, which is RB main line, was completed in 2016. An agreement for the construction works was signed on Jun 2018. Construction works are planned to be finished until the end of 2020. 1435/1520 mm dual gauge track was constructed in Kaunas tunnel on Nov 2019. Dual track technical solution was designed and implemented beacause of: (A) the need to operate 1435 mm and 1520 mm gauge tracks in sections Jiesia-Kaunas-Palemonas and Kaunas station as well; (B) insufficient Kaunas tunnel geometrical parameters - width/heigtht/clearence, to install seperate 1520 mm and 1435 mm gauge tracks.	16.12.2019	Gauntleted track in Kaunas tunnel area (including entrance and exit to gauntleted track (gauge crossings)) permitted

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
13	14.11.2019	RBDG-MAN-012-0103	LG	The derogation request for desing speed and railway alignment in Kaunas-Palemonas (27+022km - 36+360km)	Section Jiesia-Kaunas Technical Project (where an object is the Reconstruction of railway infrastructure Rokai-Palemonas-Kaunas railway sub-section Kaunas-Palemonas) was prepared in 2016. Construction works finished in 2018. Desing speed for passenger trains - 120km/h, freight trains - 80km/h. Total length of this sub-section - 9.338km wich includes 10 curves. The longest straight element of this subsection is 827.212m, which is in Kaunas train station area. Different values of horizontal curves radii are followed by other parameters, which are recommended by Design Guidelines (cant (clause 3.6); rate of change of cant (clause 3.7); cant gradient (clause 3.8); rate of change of cant deficiency (clause 3.9)). These basic parameters dindicate impossibility to achieve train speed stated by Design Guidelines. Railway line geometry was chosen as the best alternative to follow an existing infrastructure, urbanization density, Kaunas tunnel.	16.12.2019	The following curves and design speed limitations permitted: 1. 28+600km R=300m Vmax=40km/h; 2. 29+300km R=1050m Vmax=140km/h; 3. 30+300km R=1050m Vmax=140km/h; 4. 31+200km R=1300m Vmax=150km/h; 5. 31+600km R=2095m Vmax=150km/h; 6. 32+500km R=920m Vmax=140km/h; 7. 33+400km R=1115m Vmax=140km/h; 8. 33+800km R=765m Vmax=120km/h; 9. 34+300km R=775m Vmax=100km/h; 10. 35+500km R=930m Vmax=80km/h.
14	14.11.2019	RBDG-MAN-012-0103	LG	Request of derogation to eliminate physical separation between RB network and conventional network (Kaunas Palemonas).	Because of various distances values between 1435mm and 1520mm track axes in most of the line length there is no enough space to install physical separation. Taking into account already constructed, nearly finished contructions and technical specifications of all Kaunas Node sections, it is undoubtedly that in most of the area there are not physical posibilities to install fence between 1435mm and 1520mm tracks. Existing distances between 1435mm and 1520mm track centers confirms restraints for this scope of works. For that reason it can be agreed in other ways ensuring visibility need: confirmed distance from tracks, agreed railway element, which divide infrastructuree, use technologies such as GPS, BIM, etc.	16.12.2019	In Kaunas-Palemonas section not installing physical seperation of 1435mm and 1520mm railway infrastructure permitted. Operational rules should take into account that 2 different systems are together
15	02.04.2020	RBDG-MAN-013-0102	EDZL	Derogation from points 5.9 and 5.12. of the document RBDG-MAN-013-0102 - Rate of change of cant deficiency (dI /dt) and Length of transition curve (L K)	For the mentioned curve the rate of change of cant deficiency exceed the value of 45 mm/s and thus the length of the transition curves is to short. Track 11 - curve R 450 m, LK2 31 m (transition curve on the east side of the curve), 80 km/h: dI /dt = 77.29 mm/s. LK2 according to formula 3 has to be: 53,25 m. This situation is indicated in appendix 1. The value dI/dt of 77.29 mm/s is compliant with the EN 13803:2017 exceptional limit of 100 mm/s.	27.04.2020	For the specific curve the proposed shortened transition curve and increased rate of change of cant deficiency permitted
16	02.04.2020	RBDG-MAN-025-0102	EDZL	Derogation from point 1.1.2 of the document RBDG-MAN-025-0102	The following overlaps can be achieved (see also the appendix): Overlap length between tracks 11 and 12: • 70 m on the West side of the station, • 66.325 m on the East side of the station. Overlap length between tracks 13 and 14: • 60 m on the West side of the station, • 60 m on the East side of the station. In the Riga central station project, important geometry constraints are one of the key risks for the design&build project, which was initially indicated by the Contractor. During the course of the design development, the contractor was instructed to increase the number of tracks within the same project property boundaries, however such solution is not be possible in combination with a full compliance with all contractual and Design Guidelines requirements. The situation mentioned cannot be resolved differently, because a shift towards the south would make it no longer possible to stay in the boundary of the project, while towards the north the distance between the 1435 infrastructure and 1520 infrastructure was reduced to an absolute minimum value of 5.8 m.	27.04.2020	For the specific tracks the proposed overlap lengths are permitted
17	02.04.2020	RBDG-MAN-012-0105	EDZL	Derogation request from RBDG-MAN-012 General Requirements Section 4.12-Minimal distance to maintenance path	In order to facilitate the implementation of the Variation order with increased amount of 1435 tracks, It is proposed to adapt the free space requirement in the guidelines to what is acceptable from technical and safety point of view when considering the real train speeds in the station. Hence the free space needed next to the tracks are proposed to be adjusted as follows : - Reduction of distance between center of track and maintenance path from 2700mm to 2250mm - Reduction of the spacing between center of track and edge of the OCL post from 3800mm to 3250mm As a consequence, the requirements for the cross section as defined in RBR design guidelines: ref. RBDG-MAN-012-0101_GeneralRequirements Section 4.12 are changed as follows(see also illustration in appendix 1): - The minimum distance between center of track and maintenances path becomes 2250mm (<2700mm as per RBR design guidelines) - The nominal distance between center of track and maintenances path becomes 2450mm (<3000mm as per RBR design guidelines) - The available space between center of track and edge of OCL post foundation is 3250mm (<3800mm as derived from RBR design guidelines)	27.04.2020	The proposed distances between center of track and maintenance path permitted.
18	08.06.2020	RBDG-MAN-017-0103	EDZL	Derogation from requirement of section 5 Maintenance - Available space for access around bearings.	Contractor has consulted specialist bearing suppliers to validate the space requirements for access to bearings for inspection and maintenance. Based on the first feedback from 2 bearing suppliers, the above requirement concerning space for access during inspection and maintenance (incl. replacement) could be reconsidered: - In general the replacement of bearings is done from the front-side of the bearing, thus no need for 0,75m of space behind the bearings. - With the evolution of the technology in bearing equipment, this 0,75m of space is not required. - First feedback from bearing suppliers (e.g. FIP, Mageba) is that for the P01 (Lāčplēša street crossing) for example a space of 40 cm around the bearings for P01 would be sufficient. The following clarifications are provided to the request of RB Rail: 1. Clarification to structures that this derogation request is applicable and their technical information: - The derogation request is specifically applicable to structures P01 (Lāčplēša street overpass) and P03 (Dzirnavu street overpass). - For general technical data of the both structures see Annex 4 of this derogation request. 2. Clarification of the type of bearings considered in the structures if they don't conform to DG requirements: - In the above mentioned structures, the applied bearings are elstomeric bearings. There is thus no need to adjust the derogation request. 3. Development of the maintenance strategy: - Maintenance strategy for the bearings has been documented: Annex 2 and 3 of the derogation request. - The maintenance will also be addressed in the Master Design descriptive design notes for the different structures. - In conjunction with the Engineer's additional suggestion for an alternative method to lift the deck: instead of using synchronized multi jack lifting (with number of jacks equal to number of girders – or double), a reduced number of jacks can be used when placed under the end cross girders. The jacks will be larger, but the space under the cross girders can be more generous, which would also make the front face of the bearings available for easier replacement. The Engineer has provided feedback concerning the minimum space required: The space between the abutment back wall and the edge of the girders - to be considered for inspection / maintenance access of the elements, because girder ends areas are prone to water intrusion from the expansion joints placed above. In this regard a minimum of 0.60m (including the expansion joint width) is recommended by the Engineer - to be applied in general for all bridges. TRG is requested to confirm this recommendation from the Engineer can be followed as derogation to the 75cm requirement in the Design Guidelines.	13.07.2020	For the specified structures it is allowed to reduce available space for access to bearings to 0.60m

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
19	13.07.2020	RBDG-MAN-017-0104	RBR	Derogation for new requirements in RBDG-MAN-017	The requirements of RBDG-MAN-017 Chapter 3.6.7 shall not apply for the bridges and overpasses within the scope of Rīga (RCS) (LV), Rīga Airport (RIX) (LV) designs and already completed structures in Lithuania, which already have developed solutions: Structures in RCS (LV): P-01 – Rail Baltica overpass across Lāčplēša street P-03 - Rail Baltica overpass across Dzirnavu street P-05 - Rail Baltica overpass across Timoteja street and station premises P-06 - Rail Baltica overpass across Gogoļa street P-07 - Rail Baltica viaduct in Riga Bus terminal territory P-09 – Rail Baltica bridge across Daugava river P-10 – Rail Baltica bridge across Mazā Daugava river Structures in RIX (LV): VI01 – Rail Baltica overpass across Ulmaņa gatve VI02 – Rail Baltica viaduct in Riga Airport territory North VI03 – Rail Baltica viaduct inside RIX station VI04 – Rail Baltica viaduct in Riga Airport territory South Structures in Lithuania: Kaunas Green Bridge Kaunas HES Bridge Three Jiesia River Bridges at the Jiesia junction Šešupė River Bridge in Marijampolė Šešupė River Bridge in Lakinskai	13.07.2020	Requirements of RBDG-MAN-017 Chapter 3.6.7 shall not apply to the specified structures.
20	16.09.2020	RBDG-MAN-036-0103	EDZL	Derogation of police parking requirement in RCS	Reference is made to: Revised guidelines - security requirements and guidance-RBDG-MAN-036-0103, and in particular to requirement referred to provision of police parking area Requirement 186 states: 'Station design shall provide parking lots for police and security vehicle.' In the current station design, no parking areas are foreseen, this is in line with the contractual requirements. Therefore, there is no space foreseen to provide parking lots for police and security vehicles and the Contractor requests a derogation of this requirement.	05.10.2020	It is permitted not to provide parking lots for police and security vehicles in RCS.
21	16.09.2020	RBDG-MAN-036-0103	EDZL	Derogation of alternative access route requirement in RCS	Reference is made to: Revised guidelines - security requirements and guidance-RBDG-MAN-036-0103, and in particular to requirement referred to provision of alternative access routes for emergency services Requirement 358 states: 'Design shall provide secured alternative access routes for rescuers, shared with other emergency staff (police and fire brigades). These routes are not appropriate for evacuation and are intended for trained personnel only and purely for emergency or service use.' The current design of the Riga Central Station does not allow for secured alternative access routes for rescuers and other emergency staff, as the general accesses to the building are shared and public facilities. Therefore, the Contractor requests a derogation of this requirement.	05.10.2020	It is permitted not to provide secured alternative routes for rescuers, shared with other emergency staff in RCS.
22	10.09.2020	RBDG-MAN-036-0103	EDZL	Derogation on article 4.3.3. "Critical Systems" of the RBDG MAN-036-0103 "Security requirements and guidance for designers of Rail Baltica international stations"	Article 4.3.3 "Critical Systems" of the RBDG-MAN-036-0102 "Security requirements and guidance for designers of Rail Baltica international stations" (Requirement N° 117, 118, 120, 124) contains following requirement: -CRITICAL SYSTEMS OPERATION CONTINUITY : o The critical systems composing the station equipment need to be protected during an attack and their functioning maintained in the emergency and post-emergency phases. Connection of emergency power supply for the systems not mentioned in the explanatory note will cause extra room space requirements, Diesel Generator capacity increasing, Power supply capacity increasing. Therefore the following building and station operation systems are not emergency power supplied: •Ventilation system; •Water supply (interconnection with Fire protections system see our comment regarding Sprinkler system (FSS)); •Heating system.	05.10.2020	It is permitted not to provide emergency power supply to the station ventilation system, water supply system and heating system.
23	10.09.2020	RBDG-MAN-036-0103	EDZL	Derogation of requirements of Article 6.7 "Smoke and heat exhaust ventilation system" of the RBDG-MAN-036-0102 "Security requirements and guidance for designers of Rail Baltica international stations"	Article 6.7 "Smoke and heat exhaust ventilation system" of the RBDG-MAN-036-0102"Security requirements and guidance for designers of Rail Baltica international stations" contains following requirements: -HVAC-SMOKE VENTILATION SYSTEM: Tunnel and access ramps: o Mechanical ventilation system in tunnels and ramps must work independently of the interchange ventilation system. In tunnels and ramps, the smoke free layer to ensure a safe evacuation must be 4.5m. Smoke free 4.5m layer cannot be provide because building geometry does not allowed and as per local code LBN 201-15 is not required For the above reason we propose the following change: "Mechanical ventilation system in tunnels and ramps must work independently of the interchange ventilation system. In tunnels and ramps, the smoke free layer to ensure a safe evacuation must be 3 m." Smoke free layer of 3m comply with the local code LBN 201-15.	05.10.2020	It is permitted to provide 3m (instead of 4.5m) smoke free layer in tunnels and ramps.
24	10.09.2020	RBDG-MAN-036-0103	EDZL	Request for derogation of requirements of Article 6.7 "Smoke and heat exhaust ventilation system - Islands, corridors and halls" of the RBDG-MAN-036-0103 "Security requirements and guidance for designers of Rail Baltica international stations"	Article 6.7 "Smoke and heat exhaust ventilation system - Islands, corridors and halls: " of the RBDG-MAN-036-0103 "Security requirements and guidance for designers of Rail Baltica international stations" (Requirements N° 322, 324 and 325) contains following requirements for: Islands, corridors and halls o The ventilation system shall be designed so that the smoke free layer is higher than 3.5m in all smoke reservoirs o According to building architectural solutions smoke free layer 3.5m is not possible to achive. Based on the Fire Safety Report issued by the specilaist, and in accordance with the local code LBN 201-15 3m smoke free layer is foreseen. o Contractor wants to inform that air renovation grills are the openings for air compensation in case of fire. Our design solution provides that in the case of fire, the smoke extraction compensation air is provided through automatically openable doors directly to the outside and will comply with the Latvian codes in force. o Contractor wants to inform that in the design is foreseen that retail facilities located in the hall are in the same fire compartment as hall and smoke extraction from this facilities is provided by the smoke extraction system and will comply with the Latvian codes in force.	05.10.2020	It is permitted to provide 3m (instead of 3.5m) smoke free layer in the building.
25	29.06.2020	RBDG-MAN-036-0103	EDZL	Request for derogation on RBDG-MAN-036-0103-InternationalStationSecurity - requirement Separation of passenger/services flow inside station building	Requirement to be found in RBDG-MAN-036-0102-InternationalStationSecurity, chapter 4. General principles, subchapter 4.8 Station service area - "Passenger flow in the station area and station building shall be separated from the station service supplies" The requirement to seperate the passenger flow from the station service supplies flow contradicts the already accepted and approved architectural solutions and therefor this requirement cannot be met fully. What is already included in the designed layouts, is seperate restricted areas for most of the stations services, but not for all. Some supplies will need to be transported to the destined areas with a partial circulation route going through the public area. (For example supplies for the ticket office on the concourse level, because this element was designed in the Sketch Design as a seperate space within the large public waiting area.)	05.10.2020	It is permitted not to completely separate passenger flow in the station area and staton building from the station service supplies.

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
26	29.06.2020	RBDG-MAN-036-0103	EDZL	Request for derogation on RBDG-MAN-036-0102-InternationalStationSecurity - requirement Evacuation routes in third party uses	Requirement to be found in RBDG-MAN-036-0102-InternationalStationSecurity, chapter 7. Evacuation route, subchapter 7.2 Evacuation routes - "The evacuations routes in third party uses must be separated from station functions" The requirement to seperate the evacuation routes in third party uses from station functions contradicts the already accepted and approved architectural solutions and therefor this requirement cannot be met. What is already included in the designed layouts, are commercial premises, which will be occupied by third party tenants, which are located on the eastern and western sides of the main gallery/tunnel AB and on the western side of the Multimodal area. To evacuate the commercial premises in case of emergency, the evacuation route is through the main gallery/tunnel AB towards the exits or via the Multimodal area. The main gallery/tunnel AB and the Multimodal area are part of the station functions/circulation area.	05.10.2020	It is permitted not to completely separate evacuation routes in third party uses from station functions.
27	15.10.2020	RBDG-MAN-016-0104	RBR	Derogation request for the minimum ditch slope	The longitudinal slope for ditches is less than 0.002 m/m in some locations due to the vertical alignment configuration. The existing discharge points are governed by the land melioration network and therefore this is limiting strongly the maximum slope to be reached. The section where the longitudinal slope for ditches is less than 0.002 m/m are the following: START END SLOPE (m/m) SPEED (m/s) 0+000 4+100 0.0005 0.3 6+800 8+600 0.001 0.3 9+500 14+700 0.0002 0.3 Also for durability reasons and due to the existing permanent ground water table very close to the surface it is not recommended the use of coated ditches that would be damaged due to the water pressure and ice-deice cycles. Therefore uncoated longitudinal drainage network has been designed in the same way than the existing land melioration network and connecting to it. The ditches dimensions are big, so the access for the maintain labors is warranted. Also the ditches have a internal freeboard that warranted the absorption of the possible sediments. The Consultant will submit final technical solutions for RBR approval and prove that the ditches will not accumulate any sediments.	21.12.2020	Proposed longitudinal scope for ditches is permitted at the indicated locations.
28	15.10.2020	RBDG-MAN-012-0105	RBR	Derogation request for the minimum depth of 0,8 m from soil surface in CO11 DPS1 EE2.	At certain points in the Soodevahe section (CO11), due to interference with drainage, the cable ducts cannot meet the requirement of being at a depth of 0,8 m from the sub-ballast. To avoid this interference, the cable ducts go up and are buried 0,3 m from the sub-ballast. This situation occurs in the PK 6+800, 7+100 to 7+120 and 7+590.	21.12.2020	The proposed depth of cable ducts is permitted at the indicated locations.
29	15.10.2020	RBDG-MAN-025-0103	RBR	Derogation Request from point 1.1.2 of the document RBDG-MAN-025-0103_InfrastructureFacilities	In Soodevahe Station, located between the chainages 7+028* and 8+728* of the main line, during the course of the design development, the contractor was instructed to move the tracks to the west in order to allow the enough space for the Infrastructure Maintenance Facilities landplot within the same project property boundaries and provide access to it from both sides. Other important constraints are: · The location of the Ülemiste Channel Bridge on the south, and the impossibility of locating some turnouts around the bridge expansion joints. · Connection with Ülemiste Branch on the North side. However, such solution is not be possible in combination with a full compliance with all Design Guidelines requirements specifically, with the new version of the document RBDG-MAN-025-0103_InfrastructureFacilities clause 1.1.2. Usable length of station tracks. *Station 0+000.000 fits with the point X = 546790.810 Y = 6587459.817. (Ülemiste international passenger terminal is located at km -1+900) Following the argument described below, the following technical distances are available with the RBR approval: AXIS NUMBER USABLE LENGTH(m) AVAILABLE LENGTH(m) PHYSICAL LENGTH(m) AVAILABLE OVERLAP (on each side (m)) OS050-SIDE-07 1050 1069 1147.053 39.026 OS050-SIDE-09 1050 1069 1149.905 40.452 OS050-SIDE-11 1050 1069 1154.917 42.958 OS050-SIDE-13 1050 1069 1121.108 26.054	21.12.2020	The proposed distances permitted at the indicated locations.
30	15.10.2020	RBDG-MAN-012-0105 RBDG-MAN-013-0103	RBR	Derogation Request for design speed and railway alignment in Tallinn-Rapla Design Priority Section 1	Urban environment in vicinity of Tallinn constraints the possible geometry of railway line. Different values of horizontal curves radii are followed by other parameters, which are recommended by Design Guidelines (cant (clause 4.6 and 5.6); rate of change of cant (clause 4.7 and 5.7); cant gradient (clause 4.8 and 5.8); rate of change of cant deficiency (clause 4.9 and 5.9)). These basic parameters indicate impossibility to achieve train speed stated by Design Guidelines. Railway line geometry was chosen as the best alternative to follow an existing 1520 infrastructure, urbanization density, the crossing under Juhan Smuulli Bridge and Tallinn-Lagedi Road. Due to the causes described above, the following curves and design speed must be reduced: Traffic Des. Speed Start Station End Station Cant (D) Cant Defic.(I) Transit. Length Nº Axis Type (Km/h) (m) (m) Type Length(m) Radius(m) (mm) (mm) (m) 6 MAIN-II Passenger 190.0 0+000.000* 0+080.652* Curve 80.652 14004.5 20 10 80.000 10 MAIN-II Passenger 190.0 0+581.928* 0+684.094* Curve 102.167 3200.0 65 68 80.000 14 MAIN-II Passenger 190.0 1+063.965* 1+234.699* Curve 170.733 2504.5 80 90 110.000 18 MAIN-II Passenger 190.0 1+610.748* 1+715.572* Curve 104.824 3200.0 65 68 80.000 22 MAIN-II Passenger 190.0 3+834.93* 5+613.184* Curve 1778.251 1500.0 160 124 190.000 *Station 0+000.000 fits with the point X = 546790.810 Y = 6587459.817. (Ülemiste international passenger terminal is located at km -1+900 and hence the speed decreases in that section also.)	21.12.2020	The proposed track alignment and design speed parameters are permitted at the indicated locations
31	18.02.2021	RBDG-MAN-012-0105 RBDG-MAN-013-0103	RBR	Design speed (RBDG-MAN-012 0105, Clause 4.5) and curves (RBDG-MAN-013-0103, Clause 5.4) in Riga Central Station	Derogation is requested for all curves in main tracks that have a design speed of 80km/h in Riga Central Station that have radii as little as 347m. Additionally, there are 4 curves with design speed 50km/h for tracks 14 and 12 on the west end of platforms. Due to lack of space and necessity to include 4 Rail Baltica tracks, the alignment has very little possibilities to maneuver due to usable lenght of tracks and required overlaps. Therefore turnouts 300 – 1/9 were implemented reducing speed on diverging tracks to 50 km/h. The track layout has been developed as a compromise solution between EDZL, RBR and BERERIX. Please see annexed track layout drawing for more details.	09.03.2021	The proposed track alignment and design speed parameters are permitted at the indicated locations

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
32	20.01.2021	RBDG-MAN-016-0104	RBR	Derogation request for minimum slope for longitudinal drainage coated ditch and drains, (Ref. RBDG-MAN-016-0104_RailwaySubstructurePart2-HydraulicDrainageAndCulvert)	The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-016 indicates in Paragraph 7.2.1 "The minimum longitudinal slope for earth ditches is 0.004 m/m" and "The minimum longitudinal slope for concrete ditches is 0.002 m/m" and in Paragraph 7.2.2 „The minimum longitudinal slope for longitudinal pipes is 0.002 m/m". The use of 0,001 m/m is just proposed, as exception, in locations where it is faced some of the above comments, without commiting hydraulic and geometrical parameter. The consultant hereby requests the official approval of the solutions described, which is proposed as a technical and operational feasible alternative. The sections where the longitudinal slope for ditches is less than 0.002 m/m are the following in Design Priority Section 2 (Šveicarija-Žeimiai): Start End Slope (m/m) Location 2+312 (SP 28+788) 2+517 (SP 28+583) 0,0014 East 4+924 (SP 26+176) 5+201 (SP 25+899) 0,0017 West 5+019 (SP 26+081) 5+886 (SP 25+214) 0,0012 East 5+201 (SP 25+899) 5+888 (SP 25+212) 0,0012 West 7+782 (SP 23+318) 7+854 (SP 23+246) 0,0018 West In addition, groundwater network was designed in railway cutting section which was also conditioned to geometrical parameters and level of discharge points. The conservative diameter of drain (Ø315 mm) and gravel block will collaborate, as an unified element, in the dewatering of section, supported with inspection manholes every 80 meters for monitoring and maintenance. The sections where the longitudinal slope for pipes is less than 0.002 m/m are the following: Start End Slope (m/m) 5+139 (SP 25+961) 5+860 (SP 25+240) 0,0008 – 0,001 7+705 (SP 23+395) 7+820 (SP 23+280) 0,0017 Longitudinal pipes in railway cutting slopes: Start End Slope (m/m) 9+261 (SP 21+839) 9+457 (SP 21+643) 0,0017 – 0,0019 9+520 (SP 21+580) 9+540 (SP 21+560) 0,0018 9+858 (SP 21+242) 9+908 (SP 21+192) 0,0015	09.03.2021	Proposed longitudinal scope for ditches and pipes is permitted at the indicated locations
33	20.01.2021	RBDG-MAN-016-0104	RBR	Derogation request fordesign plastic pipes in crossings and transitions of railway corridor with equal and smaller diameters of 630 mm	Rail Baltica Design Guidelines. Railway substructure, Part 2. Hydraulic, drainage and culverts (RBDG-MAN-016-0104) section 4.5. Component products, it is mentioned that „Use of plastic pipe (PVC, PEH, PP, etc) for culverts is forbidden". Taking into account the constraints of some of the crossings and the characteristics of the plastic pipes, Consultant request the approval of the use of plastic pipes in some cases. Plastic pipes were proposed, as feasible technical solution, taking into account its mechanical and hydraulic features, durability, termostability, resistance to corrossion without additional requirements (cathodic protection), easy to install, maintain and repair. The Consultat has proposed the solution for diameters equal or smaller than 630 mm of diameter for its implementation in piping (drains, utilities crossings, transitions of longitudinal drainage), including a protection sleeves under railway corridor. The crossings of longitudinal drainage are proposed with mass concrete casting, surrounding the pipe and within boundaries of structural railway layers, as reinforcement of trench. The projected pipes will be defined with the following conditions in DPS2 Šveicarija-Žeimiai: • Achievement of minimum cover, according to Design Guidelines • Achievement of resistance class, mechanically checked with loads conditions. • Minimum resistance class o GRP o PVC SN8 o PE100 PN10 o PP SN 16 • Plastic pipes will not be used for transversal drainage at waterbodies. • Sleeves >1,5 projected pipeline. Quantity Crossing Location Diameters 10 Land melioration drains (Sta. 0+215 (SP30+885) to 6+630 (SP 24+470)) - "GRP Sleeve Ø315 - 500 mm; PP Pipe Ø 110 - 315 mm" 7 West Passing loop drains (Sta. 3+281 (SP 27+819) to 4+598 (SP 26+502)) - "PE Sleeves Ø 630 mm; PP Pipes Ø 315 mm" 7 East Passing loop drains (Sta. 3+599 (SP 27+819) to 4+794 (SP 26+306)) - "PE Sleeves Ø 630 mm; PP Pipes Ø 315 mm" 1 Connection of west ditch to regulation tank Sta. 4+598 (SP 26+502)) - "PE Sleeves Ø 630 mm; PP Pipes Ø 400 mm" 1 Crossing of drain at cutting Sta. 5+235 (SP 25+865) - "PE Sleeves Ø 630 mm; PP Pipes Ø 315 mm"	09.03.2021	Proposed materials of pipes allowed at the indicated locations
34	20.01.2021	RBDG-MAN-012-0105	RBR	Specific characteristics for Fences and Access Points included in chapters 6.1. and 6.3 of document RBDG-MAN-012-0105_GeneralRequirements, Chapter 6.1. 'Fences' and chapter 6.3 'Access points'.	Chapter 6.1. Fences 6.1.2 Standard fences. 1. The proposed fence is calculated with withstand horizontal stress of 23Kg applied at 1,40m above ground level without cracks/permanent deformation. DG apply 120 kg height 6.1.4 Simplified Fences. This type of fence will not be implemented. Chapter 6.3 Access points Chapter 6.3.1 Portals. According to the DG general requirements, portals must be 1,80m tall. A 2m height is proposed (extra 0,20cm). Chapter 6.3.2 Safety Gates. According to the DG safety gates must be 1,80m tall. A 2m height is proposed (extra 0,20cm).	09.03.2021	Proposed fence solutions are permitted for this section

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
35	30.04.2021	RBDG-MAN-012-0105	RBR	Derogation request for maintenance roads in LT DS1 DPS2	A. Derrogation request for the maximum longitudinal slope indicated in RBDG-MAN-012-0105 paragraph 5.3.1 "Maximum longitudinal slope ≤8,0%". This slope was chosen to avoid bigger cutting and to avoid smaller angle of entrance. B. Derrogation request for the maximum longitudinal slope indicated in RBDG-MAN-012-0105 paragraph 5.3.1 "Minimum longitudinal slope ≥0,5%". Longitudinal slope of the road ORJ55LGM02 from Sta 0+170 to Sta 0+270 is 0.22%. C. Derrogation request for the minimum crest radius in RBDG-MAN-012-0105 paragraph 5.3.1 "Minimum crest R 1400m". Curves are designed with smaller R bacause of the limit of the landplot. D. Derrogation request for the minimum sag curve in RBDG-MAN-012-0105 paragraph 5.3.1 "Minimum sag R 500m". Curves are designed with smaller R bacause of the limit of the landplot. E. Derrogation request for the super elevation and transition length in RBDG-MAN-012-0105 paragraph 5.3.1 "Super elevation of 5,5% (+/-0,5%) if R≤150,0m" and "Minimum super elevation transition length 6m per 1%". From Sta 0+020 to Sta 0+280 (by the railway form STA 9+820 to STA 10+080) the road ORJ55M02 is designed on the railway berm, which goes on railway cutting in one section and between railway concrete ditch and retaining wall in another section. Because of that, the slope is adjusted to the berm and remains constant +-3%. In the roads sections were it is not possible to design entrance to another road without curve, because of the landplot limit, the super elevation and transition cannot be designed as it is requested in the Design Guidelines. The slope is variable and depends on two roads slopes that are joining. F. Derrogation request for the widening in RBDG-MAN-012-0105 paragraph 5.3.6 "Pavement widening shall be foreseen for curvatures with R≤200m". From Sta 0+020 to Sta 0+280 the road ORJ55M02 is designed on railway berm, which goes on railway cutting in one section and between railway concrete ditch an retaining wall in another section. Because of that, the width of the road remains constant, without widening in order to avoid bigger cutting. In the roads sections where one road connects to another road with a curve (the curve is installed within the boundaries of entrance or just before the entrance), the widening cannot be designed as it is requested in the Design Guideline because of the landplot limit. G. Derrogation request for the turnaround loop parameters indicated in RBDG-MAN-012-0105 paragraph 5.3.8 turnaroud loop (parameters by the figure 5). The turnaround loops are designed as maximum as possible. From one side, there is railway line contruction elements (bridge elements, retaining walls) from the other side - boundary of the landplot (blue line). H. Derrogation request for the entrances intersection angle indicated in RBDG-MAN-012-0105 paragraph 5.3.9 "Designed intersection angle shall be 72°-108°". The entrance from the road ORJ55LG to the road ORJ55LGM02 (railway STA 9+820) is designed with the angle 38-142°. If the angle would be designed as it is described in the Design Guidelines the slope of the road would be bigger, but in this case, longitudinual slope of the road is 8,7 % (see Annex1 figure 1). Otherwise, it is necessary to move road ORJ55LG which requires extra landplot. I. Derrogation request for the entrances slope length indicated in RBDG-MAN-012-0105 paragraph 5.3.9 "Maximum longitudinal gradient of adjacent road shall not exceed 2,5% for at least 25m long section". The road ORJ55LGM02 from STA 0+015 to STA 0+175 (by the railway from STA 9+820 to STA 9+980) is designed on the railway berm, there is no land plot in order to design entrance acording this requirement. J. Derrogation request for the horizontal curve in RBDG-MAN-012-0105 paragraph 5.3.6 Table 4 R40 "Minimum crest R 1400m". The horizontal curve can not be designed as it is requested in the Design Guidelines because of the landplot limit.	07.06.2021	Proposed maintenance roads solutions are permitted for this section.
36	05.03.2021	RBDG-MAN-026-0102	EDZL	Derogation request for station Master Room location in Riga Central Station	RBDG-MAN-026-0102,p. 10.12. sets up a requirement for the Station Master Room (location) in Riga Central Station. It is not possible to locate the Station Master Room at platform level, due to space constraints. From architectural side, Station Master Room is integrated at ground level, inside Rail Baltica area, in a location close to stairs leading to platform level.	07.06.2021	Proposed location for the Station Master Room in Riga Central Station is permitted.
37	29.04.2021	RBDG-MAN-013-0104	RBR	Derogation request for the design speed allowed by the distance between track centres in LV DS1 DPS2	To be allowed a speed of 249 Km/h from CH. 10+263.945 to CH. 10+642.577, where the distance between track centres transitions from 4,5m to 4,126m (the 4,0m distance between track centres is achieved at CH. 10+852.577). - And to be allowed a speed of 220 Km/h from CH. 10+642.577 to CH. 12+993.640, where the distance between track centres is a minimum of 4,0m. This request is in conflict with Paragraph 5.10 of The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-013-0104, that indicates "On passenger only and light freight traffic section with 249km/h maximum design speed, the minimum distance between track centres is 4,5m." and "On only passenger traffic section with 200km/h maximum design speed, the minimum distance between track centres is 3,80 m with a preferred value of 4,00 m."	26.07.2021	Proposed design speed request is permitted for this section.
38	17.05.2021	RBDG-MAN-013-0104 Cl 3.4 (Minimum radius of horizontal curve) RBDG-MAN-012-0106 Cl 4.5 (Design speed for passengers´ trains)	RBR	Derogation request for the design speed and minimum radius of horizontal curve in LV DS2 DPS2	Proposed changes in RBDTD-LV-DS2 -DPS2 at Ch 4+033.117: 1. Horizontal curve of R=2500m at Ch 4+033.117 is provided in Riga-Misa Mainline which is less than the minimum radius requirements as per Design Guidelines RBDG-MAN-013-0104 Cl 3.4 (i.e 3600m). 2. As consequence of the above, proposed Design speed shall be: • 199km/h Limiting Design parameters and; • 203km/h as per Exceptional Parameters. Both speeds are less than design speed requirements as per RBDG-MAN-012-0106 Cl 4.5. 3. Vertical Curve starting at CH 4+097.202 and ending at Ch 4+287.600 interferes with Transition Curve starting at Ch 4+033.117 and ending at Ch 4+219.117. As per RBDG-MAN-013-0104 Ch 2: " the overlapping of vertical curves with horizontal transition curves is permissible given the radius of vertical curve shall be recommended value or higher" . As such , derogation is proposed while considering Design speed as per RBDG-MAN-012-0106 Cl 4.5, however, derogation is not required as per RBDG-MAN-013-0104 Ch 2 when design speed is considered as per the maximum permissible speed of Curve as per radius. Proposed changes in RBDTD-LV-DS2 -DP2 at Ch 8+100.466: 1. Horizontal curve of R=2392.25m at Ch 8+100.466 is provided in Vangazi-Riga Mainline which is less than the minimum radius requirements as per Design Guidelines RBDG-MAN-013-0104 Cl 3.4 (i.e Rmin= 3600m.) 2. As consequence of the above, proposed Design speed shall be: • 233km/h Limiting Design parameters and; • 248km/h as per Exceptional Parameters. Both speeds are less than design speed requirements as per RBDG-MAN-012-0106 Cl 4.5.	11.10.2021	Proposed design speed and minimum radius of horizontal curve request is permitted for this section.
39	18.05.2021	RBDG-MAN-013-0104 Cl 4.1 (The maximum gradient limit in station area)	RBR	Derogation request for the maximum gradient limit in LV DS2 DPS1	Proposed changes in RBDTD-LV-DS2 -DPS1 at Ch 0+034.9256 to Ch 0+622.342: 1. Vertical gradient of 5 per mille from Ch 0+000 to Ch 0+622.342 is provided in mainline, whereas, Design Guidelines RBDG-MAN-013-0104 Cl 4.1 specifies Maximum gradient limit in station area as 1.5 per mille. 2. The Station area is defined in the same clause of Design Guidelines, RBDG-MAN-013-0104 Cl 4.1 as it includes all tracks upto the exernal cross overs. 3. Hence, the Vangazi station area is considered starting from Ch 0+034.9256 i.e begin of external cross over. Now, the vertical gradient of 5 per mille in this area is more than the maximum permissible gradient in station area as defined above. However, no impact in speed is envisaged in this area as the same gradient is allowed in Station approach. Overall Value which is being derogated to: As per Design Guidelines RBDG-MAN-013-0104 Cl 4.1, the maximum permissible limit for vertical gradient in station is 1.5 per mille. The derogated value which is being applied in this case is 5 per mille. Overall Chainage being impacted by this derogation: Ch 0+034.9256 to Ch 0+622.342	11.10.2021	Proposed maximum gradient limit in station area request is permitted for this section.
40	07.06.2021	RBDG-MAN-016-0105	RBR	Derogation request minimum slope for longitudinal drainage coated ditch and drains in LT DS1 DPS3	The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-016 indicates in Paragraph 7.2.1 "The minimum longitudinal slope for earth ditches is 0.004 m/m" and "The minimum longitudinal slope for concrete ditches is 0.002 m/m" and in Paragraph 7.2.2 „The minimum longitudinal slope for longitudinal pipes is 0.002 m/m". The use of minimum 0,001 m/m is proposed between Sta. 6+985 to 7+367 where it is faced some of the above comments, without commiting hydraulic, geometrical parameter and interferences with existing or projected infrastructure. The lack of available landplot at western was solved, implementing U ditch instead of trapezoidal, between Sta. 6+985 to 7+367. The projected ponds and slopes of ditches might mitigate the risk of flooding at crop fields, by the storage regulation and downstream diversion of runoff through the longitudinal drainage.	11.10.2021	Proposed minimum slope for longitudinal drainage request is permitted for this section.
41	20.07.2021	RBDG-MAN-013-105	RBR	Derogation request to use reduced radius curves in LT DS1 DPS1	Request is to use reduced radius curves in DS1-DPS1, less than 3600 metres in radius as set out in RBDG-MAN-013-105_RailwayAlignment. Is is therefore requested to use of 3 100 m radius curves in the following areas: -from 15+848,101 to 16+503,006 -from 17+701,058 to 18+130,690 On the basis of the above, it also requires a speed reduction from 249 km/h to 220 km/h.	11.10.2021	Proposed reduced curve radius with speed reduction is permitted for this section.

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
42	06.08.2021	RBDG-MAN-014-0105	RBR	Derogation request for guardrail parameter change in LT DS2 DPS2	According to Rail Baltica Design Guidelines RBDG-MAN-014-0105 Railway Superstructure - Track, Section 5.4 - in case of a) Crossing of a significant river, railway or road; b) Bridges or viaducts longer than 30 meters, the guard rails shall be installed in these locations and 40 meters after each end. Change in RBDTD-LT-DS2-DPS2 – the Viaduct OP22 located in 102+606/32+800 is 76 meters long (Preliminary Design / Value Engineering chainage). The proposed length of the guard rails from each side of the viaduct is 5.00 m. Purpose – to provide required funtionality for the Panevėžys station in terms of location of crossovers and connection tracks towards Klaipėda.	11.10.2021	Proposed change of guardrail parameter is permitted for this section.
43	31.08.2021	RBDG-MAN-012-0106	RBR	Derogation request of changing maintenance road category from Category I to Category II, for roads into Assaku cutting	Category II roads have been designed into the enclosed area inside Assaku cutting between sta 10+500 and 11+100. This decision is based on common practice world wide where operations to carry out huge loads as turnouts/ crossovers isntalation and replacing are usually performed from the railway tracks not from paralell maintenance roads. Therefore there is no need to design inside the Assaku cutting paralell access roads category I, and the overcost of extra excavation, pavements and land acquisition can be avoided.	11.10.2021	Proposed change of maintenance road category is permitted for this section.
44	04.10.2021	RBDG-MAN-014-0105	RBR	Derogation request of specific characteristics for ballast tank sides LT DS1	Chapter 4. description of track cross section "Sleeper bottom on bridges shall be submerged in ballast 15 cm below the top of ballast tank sides". Proposed solution is to design these side walls (tank sides) adopting a fixed height of 50 cm irrespective of the height of this in relation to the bottom of the sleeper.	06.12.2021	Proposed change of designing side walls is permitted for this section.
45	13.10.2021	RBDG-MAN-013-0105	RBR	Derogation request of cant value higher than 70 mm at KUN stop platforms in LT DS1 DPS1	To use a cant value higher than 70 mm in KUN stop platforms (between 15+880 and 16+000 aprox), since in this area there is a curve of 3100 m and to reach the maximum feasible speed (220km/h) it is needed to increase the cant of the curve up to 90 mm.	06.12.2021	Proposed change of cant is permitted for this section.
46	18.10.2021	RBDG-MAN-012-0107 RBDG-DWG-001-A6 RBDG-DWG-003-A5	RBR	Derogation request for LT-DS1 DPS1 subballast shoulder width of 3,8 m for sections with cant up to D= 105 mm.	To keep the subballast shoulder width of 3,8 m for sections with cant up to D=105mm, with the result of a maintenance path slightly narrower (few cm) than 0,8 m as it is stated in all design guideline drawings (RBDG-DWG-001-A6 and RBDG-DWG-003-A5). This request affects to section LT-DS1-DPS1 from 6+616.94 to 10+340.59 (105 mm).	06.12.2021	Proposed change of maintenance path width is permitted for this section.
47	28.10.2021	RBDG-MAN-012-0107	RBR	Derogation request for LT-DS1 DPS3 maintenance roads	A. The maintenance roads ORJ59LGM01, ORJ15SM01 at the beginning of the works has to connect an existing local road but the widening cannot be designed as it is requested in the Design Guideline paragraph 5.3.6 because of the landplot limits and the width of the existing road. B. Derogation request for the turnaround loop paragraph 5.3.8. The turnaround loops (ORJ15SM01, ORJ59LGM01 and ORJ60LGM02) are limited by railway ditches and SP boundaries. C. Derogation request for the minimum crest radius paragraph 5.3.1. The crest curve R-500m has been designed in a maintenance road ORJ38M02 within the boundary of the access to the road ORJ38. D. Derrogation request for the accessibility to the adjacent railway infrastructure paragraph 5 for different structures in this section.	06.12.2021	Proposed changes of maintenance roads are permitted for this section.
48	06.10.2021	RBDG-MAN-015-0105	RBR	Derogation request for perm of the embankments higher than 12m LV DS1 DPS3	Not implementing the berm in embankments where height is between 12m and 13m and length is less than 100m taking into account that the embankment is stable without berm up to a height of 13m (DG paragraph 6.1.4). Conditional approval - If full geotechnical investigation report will show that this solution is not suitable then TRG decision is terminated.	06.12.2021	Proposed change of berm is permitted for this section.
49	21.10.2021	RBDG-MAN-013-0105	RBR	Derogation request for LV DS2 DPS4 of design speed for passenger trains	To use design speed of 100 km/h for passengers trains LV DS2 DPS4_West Junction (DG paragraph 4.5).	06.12.2021	Proposed change of design speed is permitted for this section.
50	16.11.2021	RBDG-MAN-013-0105	RBR	Derogation request for LT DS2 DPS4 of radius nad cant	Change in RBDTD-LT-DS2-DPS4 – 2 (two) horizontal curves with R = 3000 m and R = 3100 m, located accordingly in 161+800/6+755 km and 166+600/1+875 km (Preliminary Design / Value Engineering chainage). For these curves the values for cant and cant deficiency shall be applied as follows: a) Cant: The value for cant to be 120 mm for both R3000 m and R3100 m; b) Cant deficiency for R3000 m: The value for cant deficiency to be 123.9 mm; c) Cant deficiency for R3100 m: The value for cant deficiency to be 116.0 mm. (DG requirements 013-0105 paragraph 3.1 and 3.4)	06.12.2021	Proposed change of required parameters are permitted for this section.
51	15.10.2021	RBDG-MAN-013-0105	RBE	Derogation request for EE Ülemiste station platform curve radius than R1000	The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-013-0105, chapter 5.5 Station characteristics states that "If curve cannot be avoided at platforms due to geometrical constraints, minimum radius of 1000m shall be respected". In the west end of Ülemiste station a radius R300 has been used on track 1 and for the future 4th track a radius R500 has been used.	06.12.2021	Proposed change of curve radiuses are permitted for this section.
52	13.01.2022	RBDG-MAN-012-0108	RBR	Derogation request for LT-DS1 DPS1 maintenance roads	A. Paragraph 5.3.1 "Maximum longitudinal slope ≤8,0%" B. Paragraph 5.3.1 "Minimum longitudinal slope ≥0,5%." C. Paragraph 5.3.1 "Minimum crest R 750m" D. Paragraph 5.3.1 "Super elevation of 5,5% (+/-0,5%) if R≤150,0m" and "Minimum super elevation transition length 6m per 1%" E. Paragraph 5.3.6 "Pavement widening shall be foreseen for curvatures with R≤200m" F. Paragraph 5.3.8 Turnaroud loop G. Paragraph 5.3.9 "Maximum longitudinal gradient of adjacent road shall not exceed 2,5% for at least 25m long section" H. Paragraph 5.3.6 Table 4 R40 I. Paragraph 5 the accessibility to the adjacent railway infrastructure "...the designer shall consider improving..." J. Paragraph 5.4.7 "Typical cross sections"	11.02.2022	Proposed maintenance roads solutions are permitted for this section.
53	12.01.2022	RBDG-MAN-012-0108	RBE	Derogation request for LT-DS1 DPS4 maintenance roads	A. Paragraph 5 the accessibility to the adjacent railway infrastructure "...the designer shall consider improving..." B. Paragraph 5.3.1 "Minimum longitudinal slope ≥0,5%." C. Paragraph 5.3.1 "Minimum crest R 750m" D. Paragraph 5.3.1 "Super elevation of 5,5% (+/-0,5%) if R≤150,0m" and "Minimum super elevation transition length 6m per 1%" E. Paragraph 5.3.8 Turnaroud loop (parameters by the figure 5) F. Paragraph 5.3.6 Table 4 R40 G. Paragraph 5.4.7 "Typical cross sections"	11.02.2022	Proposed maintenance roads solutions are permitted for this section.
54	15.12.2021	RBDG-MAN-017-0108	RBE	Derogation request for existing Kantsi pedestrian viaduct concrete class	The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-017, chapter 4.1.1 Mechanical characteristics states that "The structural class of bridges S5 according to EN-1990 durability classes" and chapter 4.1.2 Concrete cover states that "In order to achieve the required working life of the structure (100 years), it is necessary to re-evaluate the structural class in accordance with EN 1992-1-1 table 4.3 N." As this viaduct will be demolished in few years, decreased structural class for one pier can be used.	11.02.2022	Proposed structural class are permitted for this structure.
55	24.03.2022	RBDG-MAN-012-0108	RBR	Derogation Request at DPS1 CO 1-3 Minimum distance cable ducts in Railway alignment	According to the section 10.3.1 of the Document "RBDG-MAN-012-0108 General Requirements ", the minimum distance is defined according to the following limit values: -"Cable ducts shall be designed at a horizontal distance more than 30 cm from catenary mast foundations, 1m from drainage manhole and more than 3,1 meters from railway track axis. Exceptional cable duct distance value of 2,8m from track axis and 0,5m from drainage manhole may be applied in case of limited installation space condition for cable ducts, which do not allow to implement the nominal distance of 3,1m". This request affects to section LT-DS1-DPS1 CO 1-3 from 0+965 to 1+370 (405 mm)	28.03.2022	Proposed derogation is accepted with following remarks- cable maintenance should not impact railway operation and vibration impact on cables needs to be analysed

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
56	31.05.2022	RBDG-MAN-033-0102	RBR	Derogation request from BIM Manual in LV-DS4	LV-DS4 Misa to LT Border, derogation request for: 1) Allow generic detalisation for land plot access points for MD phase (derogations from EIR 18.6 and BIM Manual 3.3.4, 4.9, 8.3.3, 15.2 requirements), 2) Allow not to model Road safety, signaling or other auxiliary equipments for MD phase (derogations from EIR 18.6 and BIM Manual 3.3.4, 4.9, 8.3.3, 15.2 requirements) 3) Allow not to model Technical blocks (20m before/after structure) for MD phase (derogations from EIR 18.5 and 18.6 requirements), 4) Allow not to model culvert bedding slabs, large road culverts backfill material model elements and mass concrete slab between wingwalls for MD phase (derogations from EIR 18.5 and 18.7 requirements), 5) Allow not to model conceptual model: RW CSS reservation zones and overhead catenary model for MD phase (derogations from EIR 18.5 requirements), 6) Accept reasonable clashes for clash sets / elements in question: EW_VS_STR (Coordination of rail earthworks with abutments and Culverts), STR_VS_RTI & STR_VS_RTI_Fill (Coordination of Road earthworks with abutments and Culverts), STR_VS_DR (Manholes coordination with PVC pipe). EW_Excavation_VS_EW_Excavation, EW_Fill_VS_EW_Fill, DR_VS_FC (derogations from EIR 14 requirements), 7) Allow not to model strata profiles for MD phase (derogation from EIR 18.3), 8) Allow not to model bridge / overpass drainage elements, slope protection and stairs for MD phase (derogations from EIR 18.7 and BIM Manual 3.3.4, 4.9, 8.3.3, 15.2 requirements). Purpose and description of change: 1) Possible changes in road alignment might affect the design and location of each Exit & Entrance modelled causing a large amount of abortive work. Moreover, constant modifications in these models would affect other elements (fences, ditches).Exit & Entrance to land plots model construction elements to be submitted at DTD stage once the alignment is fixed and no changes are expected. Conceptual models for Exit & Entrance to landplots will be included in MD visualizations and drawings. 2) Horizontal and vertical road element drawings are not extracted from models. High level coordination can be performed in 2D. Quantities will be obtained from drawings. Barriers will be modelled only for Visualisations in MD, which means that LoG should be enough for this purpose. Elements will be modelled for DTD as per EIR. 3) Geometric volumes will not be affected during MD and will be represented as part of roads/railways earthworks model. Subdivision of materials that compose technical blocks will be modelled in DTD. In order to keep the quantities unchanged, material subdivision of the technical block shall be included in the Qex extracted from the models during MD. 4)These elements related to culverts to be submitted at DTD Stage, just like railway culverts, backfill for large road culverts will be modelled at DTD once road and railway alignment is fixed and no changes(vertical and horizontal) are expected, in order to avoid abortive work. 5) Quantities are not affected as they can be obtained without the model. Coordination to be performed with 2D. Models will be present for DTD as per EIR. 6) In order to reduce production times while maintaining tolerances, It is proposed to accept these clashes in MD that would take a large number of hours to solve and that do not represent a significant percentage of the quantities. For DTD EIR 14 tolerances to be followed. 7) The strata profile is not being used in technical decisionmaking yet takes time to be modelled. It will be present for DTD. 8) Quantifications will be estimated based on 2D drawings. The elements will be modelled for DTD.	20.06.2022	Proposed derogation accepted to allow to speed up design works by delaying BIM element delivery as mentioned in request of derogation
57	31.05.2022	RBDG-MAN-027-0105	RBR	Derogation from noise corective factor	RBDG-MAN-027-0105 Cl 8.2.1.Noise (Application of corrective factor + 2 dBA in order to be aligned with CNOSSOS-EU) Proposed change in RBDTD-LV-DS2 -DPS3: Removal of the requirement of additional +2dB used in noise modeling as this is not required by Latvian legistlation and creates additional impact on Daugava bridge territory. • Affetced section: DPS3 Daugava bridge • Affected chainages: 00+000 - 08+455	20.06.2022	Derogation helps save significant amount of CAPEX
58	31.05.2022	RBDG-MAN-016-0108	RBR	Deviation for minimum slope of longitudinal ditche	The following Design Guidelines are subject to change: • RBDG-MAN-016-0108 Cl 7.2.1 (Open drainage - minimum slope of longitudinal ditches). Proposed change in RBDTD-LV-DS2 -DPS4: • The DPS4 BP3 section Track I Riga Bypass right side (for approx. 500 m) and the left side (for approx. 700 m) longitudinal drainage Coated ditches will have a longitudinal slope of 0.1% (1‰). • Affected chainages: 1. Left ditch: start Ch. 11+370 – end Ch. 12+047 2. Right ditch: start Ch. 11+621 – end Ch. 12+039	20.06.2022	Derogation is for exceptional place with high groundwaters
59	12.07.2022	RBDG-MAN-012-0109	RBR	Derogation at DPS1-RW400 Maintenance Path width narrower than 0.8 metres	In all design guideline drawings (RBDG-DWG-001-A6 and RBDG-DWG-003-A5 are mentioned as examples) the width of the Maintenance Path (or "Path & Systems space" as stated on drawings) is of 0.8m from the track axle. In RBDG-MAN-012-0109_GeneralRequirements section 4.12. Maintenance Path the following is indicated: "Maintenance path of 0.8m width is required on both side of the main line. The maintenance path shall not be closer than 2.70m from the track centre on the main line (exceptional value) and shall not be interrupted by catenary masts. The nominal distance is 3.0m and this value shall be applied in all locations without right of way constraints." Along the RW400 we have the following sections with a reduced maintenance path: - Section 1: KM 0+000 to KM 0+550 and KM 1+795 to KM 3+645. The reduced width of the maintenance path mentioned is from 0.8m to 0.74m. - Section 2: KM 1+610 to KM 1+795 and KM 3+645 to KM 3+730. The reduced width of the maintenance path mentioned is from 0.8m to 0.57m. - Section 3: KM 4+380 to KM 4+600 and 4+750 to KM 4+800. The maintenance path is totally removed, but the ditch covered is kept so is walkable. - Section 4: KM 4+600 to KM 4+750 and KM 4+800 to KM 4+870. The reduced width of the maintenance path mentioned is from 0.8m to 0.30m. - Section 5: KM 6+290 to KM 6+600. The reduced width of the maintenance path mentioned is from 0.8m to 0.68m. As a mitigation for the reduced width, for sections 1,2, 3, 4 and 5 explained above, there is a wide path (1.2 metres) between the boundary fence and the catenary mast, which can be used perfectly in the particular spot where the maintenance path is narrower than 0.8 metres (see photo below). Also, the slight difference in Section 1 is due to the updating of the DG on January 2021 (document RBDG-MAN-014B-0100_TS_SleepersUSPsFastenings) with the increase in sleeper length from 2.5m to 2.6m, which makes the ballast entering a few cm into the path and system space due to the new sleeper length. Besides, due to all constraints in the tight area, the design speed is reduced to 190 km/h up to the chainage 5+809.	15.08.2022	Derogation from maintenance path values
60	12.07.2022	BDG-MAN-025-0106	EDZL	RCS project - Track layout - RBDG-MAN-025-0106 - item 1.1.2 Usable length of station tracks	Request for a derogation concerning point 1.1.2 "Usable length of station tracks" of the RBDG-MAN-025-0106: Designer shall secure that the usable track length of 1050 m for freight trains is achieved considering required reserves for operations and signaling.	15.08.2022	Derogation in RCS, usable length of station tracks reduced duet to local constraints

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
61	12.07.2022	RBDG-MAN-013-0105	EDZL	RCS project - Track layout - RBDG-MAN-013-0105 - item 6.1 Gradient	Request for a derogation concerning point 6.1 of the RBDG-MAN-013-0105: For the purpose of gradient definition, 3 distinct areas are defined - The Station area, which includes all tracks up to the external crossovers, - The Station Approach area, which includes tracks from the limit of the Station area up to 2000 m in the direction of the Open Line, - The Open Line area, which includes tracks between 2 Station Approach areas, Station - The nominal gradient limit is 0‰. - The maximum gradient limit is 1,5‰. - The exceptional gradient limit is 2,5‰ (for exceptional values use, refer to chapter 1). - For dead-end parking tracks, it is recommended to apply a gradient of 1 ‰ with the low point located on the buffer stop side. Station Approach - The nominal gradient limit is 8‰. - The exceptional gradient limit is 25‰.	15.08.2022	Derogation in RCS from gradient values in Station Approach area
62	22.11.2022	RBDG-MAN-012-0109	RBR	Derogation request for the maximum longitudinal slope (LT1 DPS1 CO1-1)	The longitudinal slope of the road ORJ10M01 from Sta 0+000 to Sta 0+006 (by the railway from STA 9+611 to 9+617) is 8.40% (see Annex 1, figure 2). The road section is designed on steep slope of existing terrain. Design slope of 8.40% was chosen to avoid bigger cutting which would go out of a land plot. (We fulfill requirements which are applicable for access roads in Lithuanian regulation. The slope for IIIv cat. roads (access roads) according to the STR 2.06.04:2014 table 2 is 9 %) In order to fulfill Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0109 requirements, extra land plot is needed. Thus, it is necessary to prepare a new territorial planning document (special plan) and to carry out land acquisition procedures for public needs, which may take up to 1.5-2 years.	28.11.2022	Derogation request from maximum longitudinal slope values accepted
63	22.11.2022	RBDG-MAN-012-0109	RBR	Derogation request for the super elevation and transition lenght (LT1 DPS1 CO1-1)	1. In the roads sections were it is not possible to design entrance to another road or connection with existing road without curve, because of the landplot limit, the super elevation and transition cannot be designed as it is requested in the Design Guidelines. The slope is variable and depends on two roads slopes that are joining. 1.1. Road ORJ70LG (see Annex1 figure 1) - from STA 0+000 to Sta 0+030 it is an entrance and the road is designed with variable slope in order to join the road ORJ19 and the curve from Sta 0+005 to Sta 0+031 is designed with lower slope (3%) in order to join the road ORJ19. 1.2. Road ORJ18M01 (see Annex1 figure 2) - from STA 0+367 to Sta 0+412 it is an entrance and the road is designed with variable slope in order to join the road ORJ18. 1.3. Road ORJ67LG (see Annex1 figure 3) - from STA 0+006 to Sta 0+047 it is the connection with existing road and it is designed with lower slope (3%) in order to join the existing road. 1.4. Road ORJ17M01 (see Annex1 figure 4) - from STA 0+013 to Sta 0+367 it is an entrance and the road is designed with lower slope (3%) in order to join the road ORJ17. (We fulfill requirements which are applicable for access roads in Lithuanian regulation. The superelevation is from 3 to 4 % for gravel roads (access roads) by the KTR 1.01:2008, point 55, transition is calculated acording to the KTR 1.01:2008, point 59-61) In order to fulfill Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0109 requirements, extra land plot is needed. Thus, it is necessary to prepare a new territorial planning document (special plan) and to carry out land acquisition procedures for public needs, which may take up to 1.5-2 years.	28.11.2022	Derogation from values stated in RBDG-MAN-012-0109 accepted
64	22.11.2022	RBDG-MAN-012-0109	RBR	Derogation request for the entrances intersection angle (LT1 DPS1 CO1-1)	1. Entrance of the road OR69LG to the road ORJ20 at STA 0+003 (by the railway at STA 0+535) is designed not according to this requirement, because cross slope of the road ORJ20 was extended to make a smooth connection of the entrance and to maintain required filling height of the culvert. (see Annex1, figure 1 and figure 2). 2. Entrance of the road OR64LG to the existing local road at STA 0+115 (by the railway at STA 8+115) is designed not according to this requirement due to steep connection to the existing local road. In order to fulfill Design Guideline requirements, extra land plot is needed for increased embankment. (see Annex1, figure 3). 3. Adjacent section of the road OR10MT01 from STA 0+063 to STA 0+077 (by the railway from STA 9+674 to STA 9+688) is designed not according to this requirement, because of steep slopes of existing terrain. In order to fulfill Design Guideline requirements, extra land plot is needed for increased embankment. (see Annex1, figure 4 and figure 5). In order to fulfill Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0109 requirements, extra land plots are needed. Thus, it is necessary to prepare a new territorial planning document (special plan) and to carry out land acquisition procedures for public needs, which may take up to 1.5-2 years.	28.11.2022	Derogation from values stated in RBDG-MAN-012-0109 accepted
65	22.11.2022	RBDG-MAN-012-0109	RBR	Derogation request for the widening (LT1 DPS1 CO1-1)	The horizontal curve can not be designed as it is requested in the Design Guidelines because of the land plot limit. 1. Road ORJ69LG (see Annex1 figure 1) - form Sta 0+008 to Sta 0+029 (by the railway from STA 0+535 to STA 0+546) it is an entrance to the road ORJ20 and the road is designed with R20. 2. Road ORJ70LG (see Annex1 figure 2) - from Sta 0+005 to Sta 0+031 (by the railway from STA 0+288 to STA 0+307) it is the entrance to the road ORJ19 the road is designed with R20. 3. ORJ17M01 (see Annex1 figure 3) - from Sta 0+012 to Sta 0+038 (by the railway from STA 2+873 to STA 2+893) it is the entrance to the road ORJ17 the road is designed with R20. 4. ORJ15M01 (see Annex1 figure 4) - from Sta 0+792 to Sta 0+820 (by the railway from STA 5+616 to STA 5+635) it is the entrance to the road ORJ15 the road is designed with R20. 5. ORJ10M02 (see Annex1 figure 5) - from Sta 0+013 to Sta 0+028 (by the railway from STA 9+713 to STA 9+727) it is the entrance to the road ORJ10 the road is designed with R20. These roads are located in the intersection zone and connect with the accsess roads, thus smaller curves are drawn in order to fit within the railway boundaries and to design the entrance to the road. Widening is installed on all the roads in accordance with the requirements. (We fulfill requirements which are applicable for access roads in Lithuanian regulations. The speed at the entrances is about 10 km/h, thus the curves with radius R20 are designed as such radius is applicaple for the speed up to 20 km/h in accordance with the STR 2.06.04:2014 table 2.) In order to fulfill Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0109 requirements, extra land plot is needed. Thus, it is necessary to prepare a new territorial planning document (special plan) and to carry out land acquisition procedures for public needs, which may take up to 1.5-2 years.	28.11.2022	Derogation from values stated in RBDG-MAN-012-0109 accepted
66	22.11.2022	RBDG-MAN-012-0109	RBR	Request for the approval of Design Guidelines Derogation at DPS1-RW400 Maintenance Path width narrower than 0.8 metres.	The Consultant requests approval to keep the Maintenance Path width narrower than 0.8m in particular sections, as it is stated in Design Guideline "RBDG-MAN-012-0109_GeneralRequirements" and drawings (RBDG-DWG-001-A6 and RBDG-DWG-003-A5). The Consultant determines that the resulting path at the other side of the catenary mast is also walkable and the width is always wider than 1m, therefore, in the particular spots where there is a catenary mast (bear in mind that this will only every 50-60 metres), and the maintenance path is narrower than 0.8m , still will be enough space on the other side as the ditch is covered so it is walkable. Varying the platform width will increase the complexity of the section and its construction, since the area is very constraint because of the proximity of the 1520 railway line.	19.12.2022	Derogations form Maintenance path with accepted

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
67	22.11.2022	RBDG-MAN-013-0105	RBR	Derogation Request for railway alignment in Tallinn-Rapla Design Priority Section 1	Urban environment in vicinity of Tallinn constraints the possible geometry of railway line. Different values of horizontal curves radii are followed by other parameters, which are recommended by Design Guidelines (cant (clause 4.6 and 5.6); rate of change of cant (clause 4.7 and 5.7); cant gradient (clause 4.8 and 5.8); rate of change of cant deficiency (clause 4.9 and 5.9)). Railway line geometry was chosen as the best alternative according to constraints. These constrains are given by the space reserved for the layout by the special plan, the implementation of Soodevahe station and its turnouts, crossing with Ülemiste channel and implementation of Assaku Station with its turnouts.	19.12.2022	Derogation from railway alignment accepted
68	22.11.2022	RBDG-MAN-014-0105	RBR	Derogation Request of specific characteristics for ballast tank sides included in chapter 4 of document RBDG-MAN-014-0105_Railway Superstructure - Track.	Chapter 4. Description of Track cross section 'Sleeper bottom on bridges shall be submerged in ballast 15 cm below the top of ballast tank sides.´ The Consultant has been designing these side walls (tank sides) adopting a fixed height of 50cm irrespective of the height of this in relation to the bottom of the sleeper.	19.12.2022	Proposed change of designing side walls is permitted for this section.
69	12.12.2022	RBDG-MAN-012-0109	RBR	Derogation request for the turnaround loop parameters indicated in the document RBDG-MAN-012-0109_GeneralRequirements (LT1 DPS1 CO1-1)	The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0109 indicates Paragraph 5.3.8 Turnaroud loop (parameters by the figure 5). This requirement have not been always fulfilled, lower width and radius has been considered in the design.	19.12.2022	Derogation from turnaround loop accepted
70	12.12.2022	RBDG-MAN-012-0109	RBR	Derrogation requarements for pavement design in the document RBDG-MAN-012-0109_GeneralRequirements (LT1 DPS1 CO1-1)	The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0109 indicates Paragraph 5.4.7 "Typical cross sections". This requirement have not been always fulfilled, lower lenght has been considered in the design.	19.12.2022	Derogation for slope design accepted
71	12.12.2022	RBDG-MAN-016-0107	RBR	Derogation Request for P point level on Green Bridge BR0685 in Tallinn-Rapla Design Priority Section 1	The Consultant requests approval to derogate the application of the RBDG-MAN-016-0107 point 7.1.5 "Level of drainage", on the distance between the called P-point and the higher ditches water table. The railway corridor RW0500 runs in a cutting in rock when crossing below this structure and the railway cross section does not require of a anti-frost layer, so the distance between the top of subballast layer and the ditches water table is highly strict and in this case under the 1.5 m stated in that point of the Design Guidelines. Railway cut under green bridge BR0685 is mostly in limestone (rock). Only the upper part has presence of morraine. As a result of that there is no stable water table under the railway superstructure. Therefore the real situation is represented by "dry cut" instead of "wet cut" according to Design Guidelines drawings and therefore the distance of 1.37 m from bottom of the longitudinal drainage (+0,10m) to point P instead of 1.50m is acceptable.Even though the Consultant's standpoint is as mention above, the aim of this derogation is to avoid misunderstandings and clearly derogate the application of that DG requirement to this structure.	19.12.2022	Drainage solution accepted
72	12.12.2022	RBDG-MAN-012-0105	RBR	Changes in specific characteristics for Fences and Access Points included in chapter 6.1. of document RBDG-MAN-012-0105_GeneralRequirements, Chapter 6.1.	6.1.2 Standard fences 1. The anti-crossing device of this type of fence will consist an arm with three strong ordinary wires inclined at 45° toward the exterior, extending the overall height to 2.50 m. 2. The Consultant propose to replace the three barbed wires at different levels in the main body of the fence with three tension wires 6.1.3 "Sensitive Area" Fences. 1. The anti-crossing device of this type of fence will consist an arm with three strong ordinary wires inclined at 45° toward the exterior, extending the overall height to 2.50 m. 2. The Consultant propose to replace the three barbed wires at different levels in the main body of the fence with three tension wires 6.3.1 Portals 1. 50 cm tall studs with strong ordinary wires aligned with those on the fences in sensitive areas.	19.12.2022	Accepted barbed wire exchange in EE DS1 section
73	10.01.2023	RBDG-MAN-016-0109	RBR	LV-DS4 Misa to LT Border, derogation request for: - minimum self-cleaning speed of 0.5 m/s for minor structures (culverts) without reconstition of natural bed.	Consultant kindly request Client's acceptance to validate the drainage design even when a minimum self-cleaning speed of 0.5 m/s is not achieved for a quarter of the design flow rate, in case of pipes without reconstruction of natural bed. This is stated in section 4.4.2. Minor structures, subsection "pipes and box culverts" of Design Guideline "RBDG-MAN-016-0109". This will allow to move forward with the detailed design in this section in which due to the natural conditions of the terrain the minimum value is impossible to achieve.	02.02.2023	Accepted deviations in LV-DS4 from drainage minimum self-cleaning speed of 0,5m/s.
74	21.02.2023	RBDG-MAN-013-105	RBR	Derogation Request at LT DS1 DPS1 CO 1-2 Exceptional gradient value at the Palemonas station area.	The Consultant requests approval to use a gradient value higher than 2,5 ‰ at station area, as set out in RBDG-MAN-013-105_RailwayAlignment Chapter 4.1 Gradient. The Consultant determines that it is necessary to use a gradient of +-7,78 ‰ (from 16+750 km to the end of Master Design and Conceptual Design) in the Palemonas Station Area.	16.03.2023	Gradient values of -7,78 ‰ (from 16+750 km to the end of Master Design and Conceptual Design) in the Palemonas Station Area approved
75	21.02.2023	RBDG-MAN-016-0109	RBR	Derrogarion request for the minimum ditch slope in some specific sections of EE2 DPS1 RW400	The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-016 indicates in Paragraph 7.2.1 "Recommended longitudinal slope for open drainage is 0.004 m/m. Minimum longitudinal slope for open drainage is 0.002 m/m, and exceptional – 0.001 m/m".. This requirement has not been fully compliant along specific sections of the longitudinal drainage where lower slope has been considered into the design. In this Derogation Form we justify the adoption of these lower values according to specific grounds and criteria.	16.03.2023	Lower ditch slope values in EE2 DPS1 permited: from 4+066 till 4+380, from 5+208 till 6+388 and from 6+525 till 6+873
76	18.04.2023	RBDG-MAN-031B-0105 RBDG-MAN-026-0104	RBR	Derogation in the width of the platforms foreseen in EE-DS1-DPS3, Rapla Station	The purpose of this derogation is to fix the dimensions of the platforms to be located above the future Rapla station at EE-DS1-DPS3. These platforms have different measurements from those that can be deduced from the currently valid standards provided by Rail Balitica, which are mainly: RBDG-MAN-031B-0105 RBDG-MAN-026-0104 The change will consist of fixing the width of the Rapla platforms as follows: -For the right side, an island type platform with total width of 9.2 m. -For the left side,a lateral platform with a total width of 6 m.	29.05.2023	Accept fixing the width of the Rapla platforms as follows: -For the right side, an island type platform with total width of 9.2 m. -For the left side,a lateral platform with a total width of 6 m.
77	18.04.2023	RBDG-MAN-031B-0105 RBDG-MAN-026-0104	RBR	Derogation in the width of the platforms foreseen in EE-DS1-DPS4, Jarvakandi Station.	The purpose of this derogation is to fix the dimensions of the platforms to be located above the future Jarvakandi station at EE-DS1-DPS4. These platforms have different measurements from those that can be deduced from the currently valid standards provided by Rail Balitica, which are mainly: RBDG-MAN-031B-0105 RBDG-MAN-026-0104 The change will consist of fixing the width of the Jarvakandi platforms as follows: -For the right side and left side, platforms with a width 6 m.	29.05.2023	Accept fixing the width of the Jarvakandi platforms as follows: -For the right side and left side, platforms with a width 6 m.
78	18.04.2023	RBDG-MAN-012-0109	RBR	Derogation at EE DS2 DPS1-RW400 Particular sections where there are designed turnouts between RB main line and tracks of other developments	According to RBDG-MAN-012-0109_GeneralRequirements section 10.4.1.3. Cable duct crossings under the railway track, it is indicated that under railway track crossings composed by 10 cable ducts with OD of 110mm shall be designed at both sides of the turnout area, but not closer than 2m to the turnout: measuring from the turnout toes or the shunting limit."Along the RW0400 we have the following sections where there are designed turnouts between the main line and other development tracks which do not allow the continuity of CD size 1 section and it is not possible to locate the under track crossing further than 2m as it is actually crossing the turnout:The solution has been coordinated with the consultant of the adjoining depot and there ir no space for another solution.- KP 1+450- KP 3+400The turnout 400The turnout will be installed in the future, it is not part of the project. For the configuration of the layout it is considered the best solution.- KP 5+800	29.05.2023	In EE DS2 DPS1,accept solution on the installation of under track crossings under the turnouts as there is no other option to locate the cableducts in parallel to the main line. The under track crossing (UTC-2) is reinforced in concrete on site for maintaining a good quality when the railway pass over the switch.

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
79	18.04.2023	RBDG-MAN-012-0109	RBR	Derogation at EE DS2 DPS1-RW400 Particular sections where cable ducts are close to drainage manholes	According RBDG-MAN-012-0109_GeneralRequirements section 10.3.1.1. Cableducts in relation to the distance requirements, it is indicated: "Cable ducts shall be designed at a horizontal distance more than 30 cm from catenary mast foundations, 1m from drainage manhole and more than 3,1 meters from railway track axis. Exceptional cable duct distance value of 2,8m from track axis and 0,5m from drainage manhole may be applied in case of limited installation space condition for cable ducts, which do not allow to implement the nominal distance of 3,1m.."Along the RW0400 we have the following sections where due to lack of space it is not possible to meet the excepcional distance from the cableduct to the drainge manholes which is 50 cm:- Section 1: KP 0+000 to KP 0+100 (right side) Section 2: KP 0+100 to KP 0+550 (right side)- Section 3: KP 0+550 to KP 0+720 (right side)- Section 4: KP 0+720 to KP 0+760 (right side)- Section 6: KP 0+960 to KP 0+995 (right side)- Section 8: KP 1+040 to KP 1+160 (right side)- Section 23: KP 4+380 to KP 4+440 (both sides)- Section 24: KP 4+440 to KP 4+600 (both sides)- Section 25: KP 4+600 to KP 4+750 (right side)- Section 26: KP 4+750 to KP 4+800 (both sides)- Section 27: KP 4+800 to KP 4+870 (right side)- Section 28: KP 4+870 to KP 4+980 right side - Section 31: KP 5+590 to KP 5+780 (left si- Section 32: KP 5+780 to KP 5+840 (left side)- Section 33: KP 5+840 to KP 6+200 (left side)- Section 34: KP 6+200 to KP 6+290 (left side)- Section 35: KP 6+290 to KP 6+440 (Track 5 right side)	29.05.2023	In EE DS2 accept to locate cable ducts close to the drainage manholes, in a particular part of the section, as this is the best possible solution for laying the cable without interfering with other disciplines involved. The design meet the rest of the distance requirements.
80	18.04.2023	RBDG-MAN-031F-0103	RBR	Derogation for the design of noise barriers in accordance with RBDG-MAN-031F-0103 Network Elements.	The requirements regarding architecture of noise barriers are included in section 2.3.4 of RBDG-MAN-031-0107 Architectural and Landscaping, Visual Design Requirements, where the following statement is included: "The visual aspect of the Noise Barriers shall be according to RBDG-MAN-031F. Alternative materials and dimensions to those specified in RBDG-MAN-031F with at least same technical features can be used, if functionally and economically justified." According to RBDG-MAN-031F-0103 Network Elements, section F4.3 (page 51), "Rural – Light for buildings" scenario, transparent barriers should be used for the following cases within RB-LV-DS3-DPS1: - Ch. 0+551 to 0+950, Right (West) side. - Ch. 1+557 to 1+922, Left (East) side. - Ch. 9+645 to 9+961, Right (West) side. - Ch. 9+961 to 10+595, Right (West) side. - Ch. 24+739 to 25+388, Right (West) side. - Ch. 25+719 to 25+800, Left (East) side. However, the closest building is located more than 50m away from the railway line, so no light issues would be caused by noise barriers and therefore absorbing barriers (metallic) are proposed (best option considering the MCA analysis made at VE stage in accordance with the document "Noise MCA Concept", which was provided by RBR and required to be used for this purpose; refer to RBDTD-LV-DS3-DPS1_INA_ZZZZZZ-ZZ_ZZZZ_RP_NB-VAP_VE_00001 P02 Noise Barriers Report). On the contrary, transparent barriers got the lowest score in the multi-criteria analysis carried out at VE stage.	29.05.2023	Accept usage of absorbing (metallic) noise barriers in LV DS3 DPS1 as stated in request for derogation
81	18.04.2023	RBDG-MAN-013-105	RBR	Derogation Request at LT DS1 DPS1 CO 1-3 Exceptional gradient value at the Palemonas station area.	This request is due to the new track diagram established in the CO 1-2 MD and CO 1-3 MD stage, which includes an additional crossover before the start of the RRT branch. This track diagram approved by the Client implies considering as station area at least up to the indicated crossover, located at STA 16+750 approximately (Master Design chainage of DPS1 CO1-2). The previous paragraph implies an incompatibility between the implementation of the gradient value of +7,43‰ for the RRT Branch railway axis and what is stated in Design Guidelines, since chapter 4.1 of document RBDG-MAN-013-105_RailwayAlignment indicates that in station areas the following máximum gradients shall be implemented: The Station area, which includes all tracks up to the external crossovers. - The nominal gradient limit is 0 ‰. - The maximum gradient limit is 1,5 ‰. - The exceptional gradient limit is 2,5 ‰. - For dead-end parking tracks, it is recommended to apply a gradient of 1 ‰ with the low point located on the buffer stop side. It is important to highlight why gradient +7,43‰ has been used in this section, main reasons are: - Recover the elevation difference between RBR main line (beginning of RRT Branch) and Palemonas station tracks - Optimization of RRT branch railway earthworks - To minimise the affection to existing railway tracks 23 and 2, which run parallel to RRT branch from an early point - Road overpass A1 crossing with RRT branch and relocated track 2, implying that crossing underneath this point shall de done at the current elevation or at least a similar one. The Consultant hereby requests the Clients approval of defining a higher gradient (+7,43‰) than the one stablished in Design Guidelines for Palemonas Station area between MD chainages STA 0+236.231 and STA 0+619.514 of RRT Branch.	29.05.2023	Gradient values o +7,43‰between MD chainages STA 0+236.231 and STA 0+619.514 of RRT Branch approved
82	18.04.2023	RBDG-MAN-012-0109	RBR	Derogation request for the accessibility to the adjacent railway infrastructure indicated in the document RBDG-MAN-012-0109_GeneralRequirements (LT1 DPS1 CO1-2)	The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0109 indicates Paragraph 5. "...the designer shall consider improving existing roads instead of constructing new ones. As far as it is reasonable, the design solutions (particularly plan solutions) for access roads shall be designed to provide suitable accessibility to the adjacent railway infrastructure in way to cover functions of maintenance roads". This requirement has not been always fulfilled, green paths are provided in the sections where it is impossible to provide maintenance roads in the SP boundaries. In order to fulfil Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0109 requirements, extra land plot is needed. Thus, it is necessary to prepare a new territorial planning document (special plan) and to carry out land acquisition procedures for public needs, which may take up to 1.5-2 years.	29.05.2023	Derogation request approved untill additional land is aquired.
83	21.04.2023	RBDG-MAN-012-0109	RBR	Derrogation request for the super elevation and transition lenght indicated in the document RBDG-MAN-012-0109_GeneralRequirements (LT1 DPS4 CO1-2)	1. In the roads sections were it is not possible to design entrance to another road without curve, because of the landplot limit, the super elevation and transition can not be designed as it is requested in the Design Guidelines. The slope is variable and depends on two roads slopes that are joining. 1.1. ORPN05-M09 (Sta 8+924) (see Annex1 figure 1) - from Sta 0+002 to Sta 0+032 it is the entrance and the road is designed with variable slope in order to join the road ORPN05 and the curve from Sta 0+012 to Sta 0+032 is designed with lower slope (3%) in order to join the road ORPN05 1.2. ORKD16-M04 (Sta2+965) (see Annex1 figure 2) - from Sta 0+002 to Sta 0+020 it is the entrance and the road is designed with variable slope in order to join the road ORPN16 and the curve from Sta 0+002 to Sta 0+020 is designed with lower slope (3%) in order to join the road ORPN16 (We fulfill requirements which are applicable for access roads in Lithuanian regulations. The superelevation is from 3 to 4 % for gravel roads (access roads) by the KTR 1.01:2008, point 55, transition is calculated acording to the KTR 1.01:2008, point 59-61) In order to fulfill Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0109 requirements, extra land plot is needed. Thus, it is necessary to prepare a new territorial planning document (special plan) and to carry out land acquisition procedures for public needs, which may take up to 1.5-2 years.	31.07.2023	Derogation from super elenvation requirement approved for submited sections.

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
84	27.06.2023	RBDG-MAN-012-0109	RBR	EE-DS2 Derogation at DPS1-RW400 Particular sections where cable ducts are close to catenary mast foundations	According RBDG-MAN-012-0109_GeneralRequirements section 10.3.1.1. Cableducts in relation to the distance requirements, it is indicated: "Cable ducts shall be designed at a horizontal distance more than 30 cm from catenary mast foundations, 1m from drainage manhole and more than 3,1 meters from railway track axis. Exceptional cable duct distance value of 2,8m from track axis and 0,5m from drainage manhole may be applied in case of limited installation space condition for cable ducts, which do not allow to implement the nominal distance of 3,1m.."Along the RW0400 we have the following sections where due to lack of space it is not possible to meet the excepcional distance from the cableduct to the catenary mast foundations which is 30 cm:- Section 1 to Section 6: KP 0+000 to KP 0+995 (left side)- Section 8: KP 1+040 to KP 1+160 (left side)- Section 9 to section 10: KP 1+160 to KP 1+610 (both side)- Section 11: KP 1+610 to KP 1+730 (left side)- Section 12 to Section 22: KP 1+730 to KP 4+380 (both side)- Section 25: KP 4+600 to KP 4+750 (left side)- Section 27: KP 4+800 to KP 4+870 (left side)- Section 28: KP 4+870 to KP 4+980 (left side)- Section 29 to section 30: KP 4+980 to KP 5+590 (both side)- Section 31 to section 32: KP 5+590 to KP 5+840 (right side)- Section 33:KP 5+840 to KP 6+200 (Both side)- Section 34: KP 6+200 to 6+290 (right side)- Sction 35 to section 37: KP 6+290 to 6+600 (both side)	31.07.2023	Approved decreased distance between cable duct and catenary mast in submited chainages in EE-DS2
85	27.06.2023	RBDG-MAN-012	RBR	Change of maintenance road maximum longitudinal slope for roads into Assaku cutting.	According to document RBDG-MAN-012-0106_GeneralRequirements, Chapter 5.3.1 "Geometrical parameters", the slope to be considered for maintenance roads should be ≤8,00%. However, Consultant is proposing to change maximum allowed longitudinal slope in the case of the maintenance road OR029003, in Assaku cutting . As railway is in very deep cutting near Assaku station and there is a need to design maintenance roads to enter into the cutting. Proposal is to allow maximum longitudinal slope 9.5% for this maintenance road OR029003.	31.07.2023	Steeper slope permited in Assaku cuting
86	27.06.2023	RBDG-MAN-014	RBR	EE-DS1-DPS3 derogation from Guard rail lenght requirement	The Viaduct BR1073 located in 2+296.3 - 2+332.2 is 35.9 meters long. The proposed length of the guard rails from each side of the viaduct is as follows: North: 10 m guard rail transition zone starts right after turnouts 9 and 11 South: Full 40m of guard rails (including 10m of transition zone) are prolonged to the other side of the bridge. Based on the above, the guardrails for BR1073 will be located between 2+293.6 and 2+372.2.	31.07.2023	Approved shortened Guard rail on northrn side due to turnout location
87	29.08.2023	RBDG-MAN-016	RBR	Derogarion request for the absence of maintenance access ramp at sedimentary ponds in RW0500 section, close to Kurna stream, required in the document RBDG-MAN-016 HydraulicDrainageAndCulvert chapter 8.2.1	The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-016-0109 indicates in section 8.2.1 that a basin consists, amongst others, of "A maintenance trail around the basin and an access ramp at the bottom of the basin allowing access to the basin , inlet and outlet devices for maintenance ". This requirement has not been fully compliant at the sedimentary basins designed close to the Kurna stream.Two sedimentary basins are designed at RW0500 section, Northern to Kurna stream, between chainages 16+150 and 15+440 approximately, close to the Western side of the railway embankment. Those ponds collect the inflow from the land melioration and the rainfall from the Southern section of the Assaku cutting, which is a maximum 10-m-deep and 5-km-long section. The main purpose of those basin is to sediment all solid material before dischanging into the Kurna Stream. This stream feeds the Ülemiste lake, that provides Tallinn city with water for Human purposes. As a consequence, the quality of water must be considered.	23.10.2023	Approved absence of maintenance access ramp next to sediment ponds
88	30.08.2023	RBDG-MAN-014	RBR	Derogation Request of continuity of guard rails according to the Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-014-0106	According to the Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-014-0106 for Railway Superstructure - Track, guard rails are placed inside the track, near the right or left rail depending on the layout of the line. To be able to install the turnout 23 at Ülemiste water channel bridge, it is proposed to interrupt and shorten the continuity of the guard rails at the track III in DPS1 RW0500. In addition it is proposed to not implement guard rails on tracks 17 and 19 because their design speeds are lower than 120 km/h according to the requirement in chapter 4.1 in IG90201.	23.10.2023	Approved derogation from guard rail requirements and implementation can be done after AsBo assessment
89	25.09.2023	RBDG-MAN-016	RBR	LT-DS1 Kaunas to Ramygala, DPS2 Šveicarija-Žeimiai derogation request for: - Overlook the compliance of a minimum self-cleaning speed of 0.5 m/s for minor structures (culverts) without reconstition of natural bed for culverts BR6170 and CU6790.	Consultant kindly request Client's acceptance to validate the drainage design even when a minimum self-cleaning speed of 0.5 m/s is not achieved for a quarter of the design flow rate, in case of pipes without reconstruction of natural bed. This is stated in section 4.4.2. Minor structures, subsection "pipes and box culverts" of Design Guideline "RBDG-MAN-016-0109". This will allow to move forward with the detailed design in this section in which due to the natural conditions of the terrain the minimum value is impossible to achieve.	23.10.2023	Approved derogation from drainage minimum self-cleaning speed requirement
90	05.07.2023	RBDG-MAN-016	RBR	LT-DS1-DPS2 Kaunas to Ramygala, derogation request for: - Overlook the compliance of lateral drains are forbidden under ditch.	Drains under railway ditches were designed to support the drawdown, control of water table and increase the unsaturated zone at cuttings, conditioned by the limitation of available land plot: • Sta. 5+200 to 6+462 • Sta. 7+100 to 7+780 • Sta. 7+780 to 10+060 Groundwater pipes are defined by PPØ315mm, wrapped in gravel and geotextile. The invert level of pipelines is laid 65 cm below the foundation level of ditch. The ditches at cutting are defined by reinforced rectangular section with internal width between 1,00 – 3,00 m, which is wider than trench of drains. Thus, superficial and groundwater will have separate systems by rectangular (runoff) and drains (infiltrations) respectivelly, excepting discharge point of drains at the end of cutting where the water is merged in ditches, as main collector of flow. Designed solution keeps similitude with typical section 10.3.1 of lithuanian regulation "275K apsauginio sankasos sluoksnio irengimas" to collect surface and groundwater.	23.10.2023	Drains under ditches approved for LT-DS1-DPS: • Sta. 5+200 to 6+462 • Sta. 7+100 to 7+780 • Sta. 7+780 to 10+060
91	21.04.2023	RBDG-MAN-012-0109	RBR	Derrogation request for the turnaround loop parameters indicated in the document RBDG-MAN-012-0109_GeneralRequirements (LT1 DPS4 CO1-2)	The turnaround loops are designed as maximum as possible. From one side, there are railway line contruction elements (bridge elements, retaining walls) from the other side - boundary of the landplot (blue line) which parameters are lower than it is described in Design Guidelines: 1. Turnaround loop on the maintenance road ORPN22M01 width - 12.0 m, radius R20/8 (Sta 0+960) 2. Turnaround loop on the maintenance road ORPN05M09 width - 10.5 m radius R20/8 (Sta 9+053) 3. Turnaround loop on the maintenance road ORKD82M01 - didint done because of landplot limite (Sta 2+322) In order to fulfill Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0109 requirements, extra land plot is needed. Thus, it is necessary to prepare a new territorial planning document (special plan) and to carry out land acquisition procedures for public needs, which may take up to 1.5-2 years.	23.10.2023	Derogations from turnaround loop requirements approved
92	26.05.2023	RBDG-MAN-017	RBR	LV-DS4 Misa to LT Border, derogation request for: - Noise barrier gap in structures.	RBDG-MAN-017-0109 chapter 3.6.3. states that "No gap shall be permited between the bottom of the sound wall and the structure deck, nor any vertical gaps between the sound wall panels." The section of the railway viaduct has an inclination of 2% from the inner part to the outer part of the path and system area. So, the rainwater of the path and system area naturally runs from the inner to the outer part. The typical section to be used in this project was aproved long time ago. In case there are no gaps in the bottom part of the noise barrier, the water would be accumulated and it will run into the cablechannel of the structures. The gap will enable the runoff pass through preserving the mitigation efficency of the noise barrier. In case the inclination is from the outer part to the inner part of the path and system area, the water will run directly into the cablechannel. The proposed solution will consist on a 10 x 6 x 5 cm steel prism and a steel plate which will be welded to the base plate of the noise barrier and to the HEB profiles and a galvanized steel sheet which would be conected to the edge beam. The location of the 25 x 5 cm gap can vary depending on the vertical alignment of the railway in the structure in order to avoid water accumulation next to the base plate and to runoff the water between edge beam modules.	23.10.2023	Gap for water drainage in noise panels approved

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
93	11.09.2023	RBDG-MAN-012-0109	RBR	Derogation from Access and Maintenance Roads requirements in EE-DS1-DPS3	Maintenance Roads 1. RBDG-MAN-012-0109 General Requirements, Section 5.1 Access and Maintenance Road - Maintenance roads shall be designed to provide access to the following railway infrastructure: Each side of the high-speed line adjacent to all structures (Category II) among other railway infrastructures Green paths used for maintenance purpose shall not be located in flooded area. Culverts: 2.-RBDG-MAN-016-0109_RailwaySubstructurePart2-HydraulicDrainageAndCulvert , Section 4.3.1. Major structures- This concerns structures whose aperture is two meters and larger than two meters. Major structures can be definite: - any drainage crossing with dimension 300mm and more Green paths: Green path may be used by maintenance vehicles (weight up to 3.5t, length up to 6,0m) to provide maintenance services only for culverts, noise barriers, fences and railway ditches. Usage of green path for maintenance purposes for prior mentioned structures is allowed only in exceptional cases with Client's approval and relevant National Implementig Body's approval Change in RBDTD-EE-DS1-DPS3: The access to some culverts located is provided by a green path instead of a maintenance road. The following stretches present green paths intead of maintenance roads for maintenance proposes: - 6+060 to 6+120 - 9+900 to 10+950 - 11+500 to 12+020 - 13+280 to 13+730 - 14+100 to 14+780 - 14+920 to 15+540	23.10.2023	Green paths approved for provided locations
94	11.09.2023	RBDG-MAN-012-0109	RBR	Derogation from Access and Maintenance Roads requirements in EE-DS1-DPS5	Maintenance Roads 1. RBDG-MAN-012-0109 General Requirements, Section 5.1 Access and Maintenance Road - Maintenance roads shall be designed to provide access to the following railway infrastructure: Each side of the high-speed line adjacent to all structures (Category II) among other railway infrastructures Green paths used for maintenance purpose shall not be located in flooded area. Culverts: 2.-RBDG-MAN-016-0109_RailwaySubstructurePart2-HydraulicDrainageAndCulvert , Section 4.3.1. Major structures- This concerns structures whose aperture is two meters and larger than two meters. Major structures can be definite: - any drainage crossing with dimension 300mm and more Green paths: Green path may be used by maintenance vehicles (weight up to 3.5t, length up to 6,0m) to provide maintenance services only for culverts, noise barriers, fences and railway ditches. Usage of green path for maintenance purposes for prior mentioned structures is allowed only in exceptional cases with Client's approval and relevant National Implementig Body's approval Change in RBDTD-EE-DS1-DPS5: The access to some culverts located is provided by a green path instead of a maintenance road. The following stretches present green paths intead of maintenance roads for maintenance proposes: • 3+900 - 5+200 • 10+300 - 13+100 • 15+170 - 15+824	23.10.2023	Green paths approved for provided locations
95	12.12.2023	RBDG-MAN-019-0103	RBR	Derogation from catenary pole distance on bridge in EE-DS2-DPS2	The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-019-0103_RailwayEnergyPart2-Catenar indicates in section 4.9.2 Installation / Location that "the location of supports in bridges and viaducts shall be avoided. When supports are to be installed in bridges and viaducts, the span length shall take into consideration an overexposure to the wind and shall be limited at a maximum value of 54 m". However the Männiku bog piled viaduct has structural expansion joints each 28m and therefore the catenary modulation has been designed with spans about 2x28m instead of 2x27m. We ask RBR for derogation of the maximum distance of 54m to provide in this specific case modullation coordinated with the infrastructure of 2x28m=56m.	29.12.2023	Approve 2m bigger distance between catenary poles on bridge in EE-DS2-DPS2
96	12.12.2023	RBDG-MAN-030-0107	RBR	Derogation from requirement to make BIM 3D models for existing utilities LV-DS4	RBR BIM team evaluated this situation and comparing to time spent on design and cost of claimed works to the use case for existing utilities in the BIM it is not critical to be designed in 3D, quantities and all other drawings of existing utilities will be provided according to local law.The Client agrees to receive existing utilities within the rail and road corridor to be delivered as a 3D polylines, connection points of existing utilities to new utilities should be designed in BIM models. Only existing utilties which will not be reconstructed/relocated will be delivered as 3D polylines. Existing utilities which will be relocated/reconstructed and new utilties will be delivered as BIM models in DTD stage.	29.12.2023	Approved to postpone BIM 3D model delivery for later stages in LV-DS4
97	12.12.2023	RBDG-DWG-001-A6	RBR	Derogation from distance between fence and railway ditch LV-DS4	After the analysis of the drawing "RBDG-DWG-001-A6", the Client suggests to permit to keep the distance between the fence and the railway ditch lower than 4 meters, with a minimum of 0.5 meter. The general approach of the design is to follow the typical section set out in "RBDG-DWG-001-A6". However, as a typical solution, it needs to be balanced with the aim of minimising the impact on the adajcent landplots and bringing the solution closer to that proposed in the EIA. Once the railways, roads and drainage have been designed in accordance with Design Guidelines and third party technical conditions, where the compromise between the two factors is not met, a middle-ground solution is required. Especially in sections with large embankments, noise barriers or deep ditches due to the flat terrain, the overall width of the infrastructure would be increased, unless other functional areas are minimised. Since access for maintenance of the infrastructure is ensured along the entire route by parallel maintenance roads or public access roads, the width of the greenpath can be reduced. To continue with this option, a risk analysis was carried out. The Hazard Analysis analyses the risk of the reduction of the width between Railway ditch and fence, as defined in drawing "RBDG-DWG-001-A6", up to a minimum of 0.5m, where external constraints are in the area, which commonly are: (i) The minimum 0.8 m maintenance path is always guaranteed on all tracks over the subballast layer; (ii) The minimum of 0.5 m width for the green path since the ditch till the fence is guaranteed, in a similar manner to the typical sections RBDG-DWG-050-A2 and RBDG-DWG-052-A2; (iii) There are situations, such as bridges and combined culverts + animal crossings, where the fence needs to come closer to the railway to overcome the culvert exit. In these situations the distance will always be less than 4m. In addition, the continuity of the green path is not possible in these common cases; (iv) The need to have a Right of Way (RoW) boundary as straight as possible (130m straight lines if possible). Since the fence most of the time follows the RoW, and the existing ground is irregular, is impossible to have a straight line always at the same exact distance. This is looking for minimizing the cost of the project, just changing the earth ditch to a U ditch to get this unnecesary 4m, and also to reduce the acquisition lands; (v) Apart from the main risk highlighted in the risk analysis about vehicle intrusion, other risks were identified: Risk of OCS wire falling on persons or on metallic fence; Risks exist like blowing effect on persons. These risks are mitigated with the designed width between the tracks and the fence, that is not less than 15 m (approx 11 m from OCS masts), even in cases with green paths are less than 4 m width.	29.12.2023	Approved derogation from 4m distance between fence and railway ditch requrement in LV-DS4

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
98	12.12.2023	RBDG-MAN-016	RBR	LT-DS1 DPS4 CO1-2, derogation request for diversion of a watercourse placed downstream of the HSR line, crossing the RW line at chainage 7+824.	The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-016 indicates in Paragraph 4.4.2 Minor structures "diversion of the watercourse shall form part of the design, placed downstream of the HSR line". and in Paragraph 5. Stream courses diversions "Permanent diversions that should only be used when no other solution is possible. In this case, downstream diversions should be preferred" The diversion at Sta. 7+824 of DS1 DPS4 CO1-2 has been defined by: • The skew of the watercourse is greater than 126 degres. • Flow less than 50m3/s. The design of diversion is mainly conditioned by the following: • Available landplot • Interface with railway and roads. • The cross profile of new channel has to be similar to the kanalas diverted. The proposed diversion was defined taking into account the available landplot, 32,89 meters at the left side. On the other hand the solution was validated by Environmental Protection Agency on 11 October 2020.	29.12.2023	Approved derogation for diversion from water course in LT-DS1- DPS4
99	12.12.2023	RBDG-MAN-015-0105	RBR	LT-DS1 Kaunas to Ramygala, derogation request for: - LT1 DPS2 CO1-1 Exemption of intermediate berms in high embankments between chainages 1+620 and 1+820	The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-015-0105 indicates in Paragraph 6.1.4 High embankments that "to ensure stability and accessibility for maintenance, berms of 5 m width are to be systematically created" in embankment with a height of ≥ 12 metres, despite the fact that current design does not include these embankment berms in the mentioned location. As per point 6.1.4. of the design guidelines RBDG-MAN-015-0105, the berms installed in high embankments serve 2 purposes: to ensure stability and to ensure accessibility for maintenance. According to the embankment GDR, calculations are performed for 3 embankment heights around the area of interest ((1) chainage: 1+600, embankment height = 11.50m, FoS = 1.000; (2) chainage: 1+670, embankment height = 13.65m, FoS = 1.212; (3) chainage: 1+985, embankment height = 11.10m, FoS = 1.163). It can therefore be concluded that the embankment structure can fulfill the stability requirements without the need for berms. Stability analysis of this embankment has been done and included in the deliverable refer to GDR document RBDTD-LT-DS1-DPS2_IDO_RW6610-ZZ_ZZZZ_RP_RW-SGK_ DTD _00012 It must be pointed out that limited corridor width and short stretch of high embankment connecting two structures (BR6166 & BR6168) is a limiting factor affecting the current solution, introduction of berms might appear to be unreasonably CAPEX heavy an uneffective.	29.12.2023	Approved derogation from requirement to make berm in embankment in LT1 DPS2 CO1-1 between chainages 1+620 and 1+820
100	12.12.2023	RBDG-MAN-017-0109	RBR	LT-DS1 Kaunas to Ramygala, DPS4 CO 1-2 BR6120 derogation request for: - Noise barrier gap in structures	RBDG-MAN-017-0109 chapter 3.6.3. states that "No gap shall be permited between the bottom of the sound wall and the structure deck, nor any vertical gaps between the sound wall panels." The section of the railway viaduct has an inclination of 2% from the inner part to the outer part of the path and system area. So, the rainwater of the path and system area naturally runs from the inner to the outer part. The typical section to be used in this project was aproved long time ago. In case there are no gaps in the bottom part of the noise barrier, the water would be accumulated and it will run into the cablechannel of the structures. The gap will enable the runoff pass through preserving the mitigation efficency of the noise barrier. In case the inclination is from the outer part to the inner part of the path and system area, the water will run directly into the cablechannel. The proposed solution will consist on a gap in the aluminum sheet which is a covering plate (no structural plate). Considering that the leveling mortar has a height around 20-25 mm, and the thickness of the base plate is 25-30 mm, the gap will be 25 cm wide and 5 cm high as minimum. The location of the 25 x 5 cm gap can vary depending on the vertical alignment of the railway in the structure in order to avoid water accumulation next to the base plate and to avoid the runoff of the water between edge beam modules.	29.12.2023	Approved water drainage gap in noise wall in LT-DS1, DPS4
101	31.10.2023	RBDG-MAN-012-0105 RBDG-MAN-013-0103 RBDG-MAN-014-0104 RBDG-MAN-015-0103 RBDG-MAN-016-0103 RBDG-MAN-017-0104 RBDG-MAN-018-0101 RBDG-MAN-019-0102 RBDG-MAN-020-0101 RBDG-MAN-021-0101 RBDG-MAN-022-0102 RBDG-MAN-023-0101 RBDG-MAN-024-0101 RBDG-MAN-025-0103 RBDG-MAN-026-0102 RBDG-MAN-027-0101 RBDG-MAN-028-0101 RBDG-MAN-029-0102 RBDG-MAN-030-0104 RBDG-MAN-031-0104	EDzL	Derogation package for succeeding versions of Design Guidelines in RCS	The Riga Central Station design & build project is at an advanced stage where all of the design is completed and the construction is well underway, therefore implementation of changes in the project is disruptive from a progress and cost point of view as well as introducing financial eligibility risk. The fixed list of applicable document versions and additional clauses will help all parties to ensure that the eligibility requirements are followed therefore avoiding expensive and unnecessary impact assessments, redesigns or abortive work during the construction process. In case new specific requirements are added in the Design Guidelines which are imperative to be implemented in Riga Central Station, a special derogation procedure should be followed to add a new requirement on the list, however the list of applicable Design Guidelines versions remains the same. With exemptions as follows:RBDG-MAN-012-0109 - Chapter 11 - Design life of cable chanels and manholes - 50 years; Chapter 4.2 Structure gauge dimensions. RBDG-MAN-014B: New document specifying requirements for sleepers, USPs and Fastenings (requirements partially copied/extracted from RBDG-MAN-014). RBDG-MAN-014C: New document specifying requirements for ballast (requirements partially copied/extracted from RBDG-MAN-014). RBDG-MAN-015-0105 - Chapter 4 - When connected with a different structure such as viaduct, bridge etc., the retaining structure shall use the same alpha factor as the connected structure (see RBDG-MAN-017); For geotechnical design, load situation according to TSI INF 4.2.7.2 must be applied. RBDG-MAN-017-0109 - Chapter 3.6.4 - The railway structures, such as bridges, viaducts, overbridges and ecoduct will have their own earthing and bonding system. The earthing and bonding principle consists in the interconnection of all the metallic elements such as the reinforcements of the piers, the walls and the abutments. The electrical continuity shall be done connecting all the reinforcements and bonded with the foundation's reinforcement which shall be connected to the ground using earth conductor of fifty square millimeters (50 mm2) minimum cross-section area. The earth conductor shall be connected to earth rod installed in an earth manhole pit. Earthing terminals for the connection of the reinforcement of the structures to the rails/poles shall be designed by structural designer.The connections of structural earthbars to rails/poles will be designed by System designer. RBDG-MAN-025-0106 - Chapter 1.1 - Height and width: UIC741 point 2.1 and INF TSI 4.2.9.2. states that "the platforms' characteristics shall be compatible with the boarding arrangements of the interoperable rolling stock and two values are allowed for platform height: 550 and 760 mm". 760 mm shall be used for Rail Baltica line; Chapter 7 - New chapter - Numbering principles for tracks, platforms, turnouts etc. RBDG-MAN-026-0104 - Chapter 10.6 - The Security room shall have a dedicated entrance from the public area. These requirements shall be checked also by the police authorities of the respective country.	29.12.2023	Derogation package approved for RCS allowing derogation from succeding Design Guidelines revisions with some exceptional requirements.
102	31.10.2023	RBDG-MAN-031A-0101 RBDG-MAN-031B-0101 RBDG-MAN-031C-0101 RBDG-MAN-031D-0101 RBDG-MAN-031E-0101 RBDG-MAN-031F-0101 RBDG-MAN-031G-0101 RBDG-MAN-032-0101 RBDG-MAN-033-0101 RBDG-MAN-034-0101 RBDG-MAN-035-0101 RBDG-MAN-036-0101	EDzL	Derogation package for succeeding versions of Design Guidelines in RCS	The Riga Central Station design & build project is at an advanced stage where all of the design is completed and the construction is well underway, therefore implementation of changes in the project is disruptive from a progress and cost point of view as well as introducing financial eligibility risk. The fixed list of applicable document versions and additional clauses will help all parties to ensure that the eligibility requirements are followed therefore avoiding expensive and unnecessary impact assessments, redesigns or abortive work during the construction process. In case new specific requirements are added in the Design Guidelines which are imperative to be implemented in Riga Central Station, a special derogation procedure should be followed to add a new requirement on the list, however the list of applicable Design Guidelines versions remains the same.	29.12.2023	Derogation package approved for RCS allowing derogation from succeding Design Guidelines revisions with some exceptional requirements.
103	27.02.2024	RBDG-MAN-016-0109	RBE	Derogation from minimum ditch depth requirement in EE-DS1	The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-016-0109 indicates in Paragraph 7.2.1 Open drainage " Ditches have minimum width of 0.50 m and minimum depth of 0.50 m." Grass ditches have been considered that lower the water level in areas of spring flooding or wet sessions. This type of ditches are considered to promote infiltration properties. The following sections have a minimum ditch depth of 0.3m: • Sta. 2+020 to 2+050 • Sta. 7+960 to 8+000	25.03.2024	Shalower ditch permited in EE-DS1 section with chainage: • Sta. 2+020 to 2+050 • Sta. 7+960 to 8+000

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
104	16.04.2024	RBDG-MAN-016	RBE	Derogarion request for the minimum distance between P point and HWL in Central Concrete U ditch of the drainage system	Due to the restricted longitudinal slope available between STA 0+000 and STA 4+050, it has been designed the longitudinal drainage system based on concrete U ditches with big evacuation capacity by gravity. The central concrete U ditch designed is highly demanded hydraulically from Sta. 1+000 to Sta. 4+000 due to the constraint of fixed water level for Q1% at the connection the Culvert CU0370 (Land Melioration system K-ditch). The existing land melioration is constraining the discharge of the longitudinal drainage system causing backwater upstream. With this scenario the distance between HWL inside concrete U-ditch and P point would be less than 1.5m from STA 1+000 up to 3+500 (2500m) with enough freeboard inside, except the Sta 1+000 up 1+500 being cero cm of freebord in the worst section. The analysis of the design solution developed and the compliance/noncompliance with the applicable sections of the Design Guidelines on the matter. 1. Design check with RBDG-DWG-004-A5 (drawings): fully compliant except between STA 1+000-1+500	13.05.2024	Approved derogation from RBDG-MAN-016 chapter 7.1.5. requirements in EE-DS2 between sections Sta. 2+200 to Sta. 4+000 of EE02 DS1 RW0400
105	16.04.2024	RBDG-MAN-016	RBR	LT-DS1 DPS1 CO1-2 Derogation request for minimum distance for ponds	The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-016 indicates in Paragraph 8.2.1 "The minimum distance from track at the toe of embankment shall be 4,50m". The railway drainage has been optimized to fit in landplot limits and fulfill minimum requirements for longitudinal drainage.	13.05.2024	Approved deviation from requirements stated in Paragraph 8.2.1 in RBDG-MAN-016
106	16.04.2024	RBDG-MAN-016-0109	RBR	LT-DS1 DPS1 CO1-2 Derogation request for minimum self-cleaning speed for transversal drainage	The condition of natural hydrogeomorphology in Lithuania is the subcritical regime of streams, due to the predominant low riverbed gradient and riverbank vegetation. Even in natural conditions is not reached water velocity of 0.5 m/s for some streams. The crossing infrastructures are adjusted to riverbed to mitigate the impact over the hydrological regime. The reinforced concrete and linings will increase the velocity as the roughness decreases, and the sedimentation rate will not be as high as in the natural stream. Also, as part of the maintenance works, this sediments shall be removed periodically, and it is easier to clean them from the rigid concrete surface. Acccording technical regulation TR 2.01:2019 "Design of automobile roads and railway bridges and tunnels" defines that the size of the opening for small bridges and culverts is determined by the average allowable water flow velocity, which depends on the soil of the riverbed (at the points of water inflow and outflow), the riverbed and the reinforcement of the embankment slope. The culverts were designed with natural slope of waterbody in order to mitigate the affection to the hydrological regime and riverbed. Therefore, it is understood by the Consultant that self-cleaning process cannot be achieved due to physical and natural conditions (low gradient and velocity for some cases). Also, various of these crossing infrastructures have minimum required dimenssions. These are designed in ditches or watercourses with low discharge, it is also understood by the Consultant that as the self-cleaning speed is not achieved, they will not be working at full capacity. However, given that these conditions are present in small streams with low flow/velocity rate, there is less erosion risk (main generator of sediments). In any case, appropiate inspection and maintenance works shall be carried out.	13.05.2024	Lower self cleaning speed for drainage is approved for LT-DS1 DPS1 CO1-2
107	16.04.2024	RBDG-MAN-015-0105	RBR	Derogation Request of embankments height and berm requirement included in chapters 6.1.4 of document RBDG-MAN-015-0105 Railway substructure, Part 1 embankments and earthworks	According to "Railway substructure, Part 1 embankments and earthworks. (RBDG-MAN-012-0110), Chapter 6.1.4 High embankments", for embankments over 12m high a 5m berm shall be installed to ensure the stability of the embakment. In railway design for DPS1 there is a stretch where the height is over 12m. This stretch is around 27m caused by a local depression of the existing ground at STA 1+700. Due to the restriction of the Special Plan boundary, there is not sufficient space to implement the required berm (5m). Additionally, a stability calculation has been carried out as part of the "Geotechnical Design Report (GDR), Earthworks, Embankments And Cuttings" document (refer to the "Annex 1 – Section Analysis" for the stability study of the 1+700 section). As a summary, the conclusion of the calculation is that the embankment is stable.	13.05.2024	Absence of intermediate berm is approved
108	28.05.2024	RBDG-DWG-073	RBE	Derogation request for the cable channel position into the evacuation walkways in BR0060 tunnel	The Design Guidelines drawing RBDG-DWG-073 includes the typical section for tunnel or cut and cover section. The position of the cable channel into the walkways is intefering with the evacuation path that shall be free of obstacles in accordance to the TSI Safety in Railway tunnels TSI Safety in Railway Tunnels (subsystems Infrastructure and Energy) (2014/1303/EU amended by 2016/912/EU and 2019/772/EU). For that purpose the Consultant has relocated the cable channel position to keep an evacuation path free of obstacles.	27.06.2024	Cable chanel relocation closer to platform edge permitted
109	28.05.2024	RBDG-MAN-016-0109	RBE	Derogation request for the BR0060 Soodevahe Tunnel water tank solution	Design Guidelines foresee runoff watter drainage pumping stations at enterance of tunnel, therefore need of two pumping stations, by evaluation of possible watter flows it is suggested to derogate from this requirement and instal only one pumping station in the lowest point of tunnel and save aproximatelly 190 000 EUR of CAPEX.	27.06.2024	One pumping station at lowest point in Soodevahe tunnel permitted.
110	28.05.2024	RBDG-MAN-013-0105	RBE	Derogation request for vertical slope values in Soodevahe tunnel	The applicants request approval to allow a slope of 7.29 ‰ on DS2 DPS3 section Soodevahe-Muuga line section in the area of the Soodevahe tunnel, despite the requirements in RBDG 013-0105 "Railway Alignment" chapter 4.1 (rules for mixed traffic apply for this section with Freight only traffic). The 7.29 ‰ vertical gradient extends between KM10+526 and KM11+864 in Soodevahe Tunnel. Along this slope, at KM10+940 there is a crossover signifying the beginning of Soodevahe station along which the exceptional gradient limit according to RBDG 013-0105 is 2.5‰. The area 2000m before the crossover is defined as station approach area, where the nominal gradient limit is 5‰ and the exceptional gradient limit is 8‰	27.06.2024	Vertical slope of 7.29 ‰ permitted in Soodevahe tunnel
111	28.05.2024	RBDG-MAN-041-0100	RBR	Derogatin package for new Guideline applicability	As new Design Guideline requirements overlaps with technical requirements from previous design procurement documentation and finalized or ongoing design works are too mature to revise site investigation requirements, it is advised to grant automatic derogation from new requirements to all design projects and sections were agreements was reached before issuance of new Design Guideline.	02.07.2024	Derogation from new Design Guideline for all design Agreements that was signed before 2024 2nd of July.
112	23.07.2024	RBDG-MAN-030-0107	RBR	Descoping of the development of BIM models for local and access roads in Vangaži-Salaspils-Misa section, DPS1, DPS2, DPS3, DPS4.	The following Design Guidelines are subject to change: •RBDG-MAN-030-0107, 18.6 chapter on level of definition. Proposed change: Removal of the requirement of development of BIM models for local and access roads that will be owned by STate forrests and local municipalities. • Affected section: DPS1, DPS2, DPS3, DPS4	01.10.2024	Approved descope from BIM models of local and access roads that will be owned by State forests and local municipalities in LV DS2
113	16.07.2024	All Guidelines	EDzL	Applicable Design Guidelines versions to Salaspils Intermodal Logistic Center	AS Salaspils Intermodal Logistic Center design works are in final phase, it is requested that applicable revisions for design are as follows: RBDG-INF-001-0137; RBDG-INF-003-0116; RBDG-INF-004-0120; RBDG-MAN-011-0104; RBDG-MAN-012-0109; RBDG-MAN-013-0105; RBDG-MAN-014-0106; RBDG-MAN-014A-0101; RBDG-MAN-014B-0102; RBDG-MAN-014C-0100; RBDG-MAN-014D-0101; RBDG-MAN-015-0105; RBDG-MAN-016-0109; RBDG-MAN-017-0110; RBDG-MAN-018-0102; RBDG-MAN-019-0103; RBDG-MAN-020-0102; RBDG-MAN-021-0101; RBDG-MAN-022-0102; RBDG-MAN-023-0101; RBDG-MAN-024-0102; RBDG-MAN-025-0107; RBDG-MAN-026-0104; RBDG-MAN-027-0105; RBDG-MAN-028-0101; RBDG-MAN-029-0102; RBDG-MAN-030-0106; RBDG-MAN-031-0108; RBDG-MAN-031A-0102; RBDG-MAN-031B-0107; RBDG-MAN-031C-0101; RBDG-MAN-031D-0102; RBDG-MAN-031E-0101; RBDG-MAN-031F-0103; RBDG-MAN-031G-0102; RBDG-MAN-032-0100; RBDG-MAN-033-0103; RBDG-MAN-034-0102; RBDG-MAN-035-0102; RBDG-MAN-036-0103; RBDG-MAN-037-0100; RBDG-MAN-038-0100; RBDG-MAN-039-0100; RBDG-MAN-040-0100; RBDG-MAN-0310-0101	01.10.2024	Fixed applicable Design Guideline revisions for Salaspils Intermodal Logistic Center
114	07.10.2024	RBDG-MAN-012	EDzL	Derogation request from RBDG-MAN-012, Chapter 4.12 - Required reduction of distance between centre-of-track and maintenance path due to track layout and access ramp 1	In RBDG-MAN-012, Chapter 4.12 the exceptional distance from track axis center is defined as 2700mm, however it is not possible to achieve this in several locations in the Riga Central Station. This derogation request is related to two similar subjects within the same design package, the structural design of P07 (bridge from Prāgas iela to Maskavas iela in Riga): 1.The reduction of the distance between centre-of-track and maintenance path on the P07 overpass along the bus station building 2.The reduction of the distance between centre-of-track and maintenance path on the Embankment 20500 retaining wall structure This reduction is necessary due to the location of the available land plots and surrounding city infrastructure in the vicinity of Rail Baltica infrastructure. The distance from track axis centre and the maintenance path is reduced to 2010mm. For additional information please refer to Version 0 of this report and for locations please refer to Annex3 and Annex4. This issue was raised originally in 2019 when it was decided to split the original request in two parts based on the distances. One part where the distance between track axis center and the maintenance was bigger was approved in 2019 (see derogation #7 in RBDG-INF-004) while this derogation was in principle accepted, but further formal approvals were requested (Annex 1). Based on this request, safety assessment was performed and corresponding hazards included in the RCS project Hazard Log and relevant measures identified (SR0234, SR0235, SR0236, SR0237 - Annex3). The Hazard Log and other safety documentation for RCS was reviewed by AsBo and and intermediate AsBo assessment report has been prepared for the design stage (Annex2), meaning that the hazards are controlled at an acceptable level.	21.11.2024	Approval of narower maintenance path for indicated locations at RCS.

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
115	26.11.2024	RBDG-MAN-016	RBR	Derogation request for the drainage manhole position between DPS3-BR0060 tunnel and DPS1-RW0400 doubel track	Along the area corresponding to the DPS1-RW0400 STA 5+620 and 6+420, the double track for international gauge designed in DPS1-RW0400 and the DPS3 tunnel BR0060 run paralell each other. Due to the lack of space avaliable and because of all the constraints considered into the design existing at this specific location, the space avaliable for the drainage manholes is limited to 2.09 (Closest RW axis to Manhole edge), less than the minimum of 2.8 m in RBDG-DWG-009 (page 09) . This occurs also in DPS3 BR0060 tunnel and other locations as ecoducts, where the distance Manhole-track is also limited. In those locations maintenance is performed outside operation hours frame (As per RBDG-MAN-016 chapter 7.2.3 the manhole shall be located outside of the "danger zone" which is the area under the influence of trains). These Manholes cannot be in other location. One fo the reasons is that the RW0400 is designed with a double slope to drain water from the double track center to both edges (east and west), mainly to keep the longitudinal drainage as high as possible along this strech to connect with enough room to the land melioration network, which is quite shallow. Other solutions (See picture below in red) create a deeper longitudinal drainage network unfeasible to connect to the land melioration. It should be also noticed that a bypass system to avoid the barrier effect thrught the tunnel is designed and therefore there are also manholes for this system. Both, rainfall drainage evacuation system and tunnel bypass overlap along this narrow band and need manholes for maintenance. Due to the vicinity between buried shafts (manholes) and railway tracks along this area, the DTD Contractor will have to consider horizontal pressures generated by the closer railway according to the Boussinesq model and calculate considering non linear (elastoplastic) soil behaviour. This model shall consider that the railway load spreads out inside the semiinfinite media from the line of application, reducing in intensity with depth and distance from the load point. The DTD contractor shall ensure that the material used for the buried shaft can withstand the calculated stresses according to the surrounding environment. This includes ULS and SLS checking for ultimate strength and serviceable conditions (crack width, deflections and stresses).	16.12.2024	Approval of reduced distance from tracks to drainage maintenance manholes in EE-DS2-DPS3
116	26.11.2024	RBDG-MAN-033-0103	RBR	Descoping of the development of BIM boreholes models in Vangaži-Salaspils-Misa section, DPS1, DPS2, DPS3, DPS4.	The ground investigation data file (for 238 points) will be available in Excel format, but the BIM model (boreholes model) will not be included. Instead, the 2D geological longitudinal profile will be utilized to generate a 3D representation of the subsoil layers. This will involve creating a drape along the railway alignment with a small extrusion in the transverse direction. To be noted that RBR BIM and Geotechnical teams don't have objection on this Derogation (BIM team opinion: Boreholes model is not critical part of geotechnical survey and descoping is possible, if The ground investigation data file will be delivered. Geotechnical team opinion: 3D models can be descoped if 2D drawings provided and data sheets submitted).	16.12.2024	Approval to revoqe requirement to submitt BIM models for doreholes in LV-DS2
117	29.09.2025	RBDG-MAN-025-0107	RBR	Derogation request for the overlap nominal value in accordance with RBDG-MAN-025-0107 Infrastructure Facilites	When calculating the corresponding physical lengths required, it was assumed that the lower protection length value in the corresponding table should be applied between one specific track gradient integer value and the following one in the table. After discussion with the RBR Track team, this interpretation turned out not to be correct, as values in the table should have been interpolated. Considering the above and the revised shunting limits, there are some side tracks within DS3 that would not meet the physical length requirements. It is assumed that lengths required for train stretching, braking inaccuracy and signal view cannot be reduced, but there should be some allowance to reduce the overlap distance, as 70 m is a nominal value on the safe side, but not the minimum/exceptional value (not defined in RBDG). In addition, this nominal value shall be revised for the specific release speed, to be defined in the future by the RB Infrastructure Management Organisation, and the gradient of each specific track. Ultimately, the tracks with overlap values below 70 m (nominal value according to RBDG) and their resulting overlap values (following the correct approach), would be as follows: Track 04: Overlap = 69,6 m (at both ends of the track) Track 06: Overlap = 69,2 m (at both ends of the track) Track 04: Overlap = 69,2 m (at both ends of the track) Track 06: Overlap = 68,5 m (at both ends of the track) Given all this, and considering that the differences between the resulting values and the nominal value (70 m) is minimal, a derogation for the overlap value is requested for the mentioned tracks, in order to ensure compliance with the requirements for usable lengths, as well as train stretching, braking inaccuracy and signal view minimum lengths	06.10.2025	Approved reduced overlap value for Tracks 04 and 06 in Skulte and Salacgr'iva at both ends of the track
118	25.09.2025	RBDG-MAN-017-0112	RBE	Derogation request for reducing the internal height of tunnels in EE-DS2-DPS3 Soodevahe-Muuga section	The traffic on the Soodevahe-Muuga line is freight-only, with operating speeds not exceeding 120 km/h. The Soodevahe railway tunnel (BR0060) in the Soodevahe-Muuga section was designed by IDOM with an internal vertical clearance of 7.05 m from the top of rail (TOR). The proposed design for the Kroodi railway tunnel (BR0030) follows the same approach. Both tunnels are located below groundwater level and in areas of the RW0200 main line with steep longitudinal gradients. The longitudinal gradient of the RW0200 main line from the Soodevahe railway tunnel towards Muuga is 4.5 ‰, and from the tunnel towards Pärnu is 7.29 ‰. The Technical Reference Group approved the use of the exceptional 7.29 ‰ gradient within the Soodevahe railway tunnel on 27.06.2024. The first half of the Kroodi railway tunnel has a vertical gradient of 1.5‰, and the second half has a gradient of 7.5‰ towards Muuga (and is thus ascending towards Soodevahe). Gradients of up to 7.5 ‰ are the limiting parameters of the corridor for heavier freight train operations. These conditions significantly affect excavation and tunnel construction methods, volumes and groundwater regime. Therefore, a derogation is proposed to reduce the internal tunnel clearance to 6.20 m above TOR for both railway tunnels, which is 0.23 m lower than required in the Design Guidelines RBDG-MAN-017-0112 chapter 2.1.3 (see drawing in Appendix 1). This reduction will decrease excavation and tunnel construction volumes and construction by decreasing CAPEX. There is also a small OPEX decrease. A lower tunnel will reduce the tunnel's impact on the groundwater regime. In addition, the reduced tunnel height (based on the required minimum clearance gauge) allows an adjustment of the RW0200 longitudinal profile and reduce gradients, which lowers operational restrictions.	10.11.2025	Tunnel clearance reduction to 6,20m approved for Soodevahe railway tunnel (BR0060) and for the Kroodi railway tunnel (BR0030)
119	25.09.2025	RBDG-MAN-016	RBE	Derogatin request for EE DS1 DPS1 RW400 Drainage system	During detailed design following constraints were identified: • It is not possible to increase the drop of the pipeline, because the upstream land melioration ditch determines the height of the pipeline. • Providing the longitudinal railway pipes with steeper slope would generate a submerged discharge into the land melioration system which could generate backwater into the railway ditch. • The areas exceeding the freeboard are short, isolated, and do not coincide with areas affected by water level or capillary issues. • Cross-drainage pipes and permeable soils help mitigate the impact, and the water level in the redesigned drainage pipe system is lower than in the original U-ditch design. • The draining characteristics of designed embankment layers are very good to enable sufficient draining of the rainwater [5,1 m/d for sample 1 (test protocol 2025/181) and 7,5 m/d for sample 2 (test protocol 2025/189); the sand quarry declares a guaranteed filtration modulus of 2 m/d; test protocols are added as Appendix 4 and 5]. The use of granular materials in the substructure ensures stability even under temporary water table fluctuations. • Surface runoff with U-ditches is not significantly better than with the pipes solution, because U-ditches were supposed to be with concrete covers. • As can be seen, although the sections are not exactly identical, the slopes and flow rates are better in case of a drainage pipe solution compared with U-ditches. As the water flow rate is bigger, the water self-cleaning capability is also better. To increase the flow rate and improve self-cleaning, drain pipes perforated at a 240-degree angle (smooth bottom without holes) will be used instead of full-circle perforated ones. • Railway embankment layers are not affected by the runoff water along the longitudinal drainage network on these sections listed above. The reason is that high water level (HWL) obtained for rainfall events with return period between 10 and 100 years is compliant with the maximum limits established in Design Guidelines RBDG-MAN-015 and RBDG-MAN-016. • Those longitudinal drainage pipes are located between railway tracks, therefore it is not expected any relevant sediment contribution due to erosion. Also, this confined location avoids the contribution of water flows and potential sediments coming from other external sources to the catchment area inside these railway tracks. • Maintenance costs of U-ditches are higher than buried drainage pipes, as U-ditches are more exposed to weather conditions. Flushing buried drainage pipes is very easy using specialized pipe flushing equipment, which cannot be used for cleaning U-ditches. Therefore, U-ditches would generally have to be cleaned manually with a pressure washer, which is significantly more time-consuming. • The functionality of those longitudinal drainage pipes has been verified for 10 and 100 years return period, The results show that they have enough capacity to accommodate the water flows without affecting embankment railway layers and the entire drainage system.	10.11.2025	Optimised EE DS1 DPS1 RW400 Drainage system solutions approved

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
120	04.11.2025	RBDG-MAN-012-0110	RBR	Derogation request for the widening indicated in the document RBDG-MAN-012-0110 General Requirements (LT2 DPS1 CO-01_01)	The horizontal curve can not be designed as it is requested in the Design Guidelines because of the land plot limit. 1. Road ORPN93M01 (from STA 0+001,81 to STA 0+018,61) (See Annex Figure 1) - The connection to the OR6082 road is made through a curve of less than the minimum radius, and the road is designed with R20. 2. ORPN67M01 (from STA 0+010,40 to STA 0+042,68) (See Annex Figure 2) - The connection to the ORPN51 road is made through a curve of less than the minimum radius, the road is designed with R20. 3. ORPN68M01 (from STA 0+011,55 to STA 0+036,14) (See Annex Figure 3) - The connection to the ORPN47 road is made through a curve of less than the minimum radius, the road is designed with R30. 4. ORPN91M01 (from STA 0+010,70 to STA 0+041,40) (See Annex Figure 4) - The connection to the ORPN34 road is made through a curve of less than the minimum radius, the road is designed with R20. 5. ORPN31M01 (from STA 0+000,75 to STA 0+014,24) (See Annex Figure 5) - The connection to the ORPN31 road is made through a curve of less than the minimum radius, the road is designed with R30. These roads are located in the intersection zone and connect with the access roads, thus smaller curves are drawn in order to fit within the railway boundaries and to design the entrance to the road. Distribution is installed on all the roads in accordance with the requirements. We fulfil requirements which are applicable for access roads in Lithuanian regulations. The speed at the entrances is about 10 km/h, thus the curves with radius R20 are designed as such radius is applicable for the speed up to 20 km/h in accordance with the STR 2.06.04:2014 table 2). In order to fulfil Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0110 requirements, extra land plot is needed. Thus, it is necessary to prepare a new territorial planning document (special plan) and to carry out land acquisition procedures for public needs, which may take up to 1.5-2 years.	01.12.2025	Reduced horizontal curves for roads approved in LT DS2 DPS1 as per application. Subject for future improvement if new special planing will be done and additional land aquired.
121	04.11.2025	RBDG-MAN-012-0110	RBR	Derogation request for the turnaround loop parameters indicated in the document RBDG-MAN-012-0110 General Requirements (LT2 DPS1 CO-01)	The turnarounds loops are designed at all locations where enough space is available. Two main constrains exist when designing this turnoround loopes, on the one hand the railway elements (embankments, structures, drainage elements...) and, on the other hand, the landplot available to fit the design. There are three different situations where the Design Guidelines requireements have not been fulfilled: Turnaround loops with slight physical constrain: a modification of the Design Guidelines requirement has been applied in the following turnaround loops: 1. Turnaround loop on the maintenance road ORPN52M01 width - 13,50 m radius R20/8 (Sta 0+000) 2. Turnaround loop on the maintenance road ORPN57-1 width - 18 m radius R8/8 (Sta 0+040) 3. Turnaround loop on the maintenance road ORPN58LG width - 16,45 m radius R20/8 (Sta 0+064) 4. Turnaround loop on the maintenance road ORPN65LGM01 width - 12 m radius R20/8 (Sta 0+000) 5. Turnaround loop on the maintenance road ORPN89M01 width - 11 m radius R20/8 (Sta 0+375) Turnaround loops with severe physical constrain: Slight widening of the road lanes has been proposed in the following roads: 1. Widening of extra 4m width on the maintenance road ORPN93M01 (Sta 0+202) 2. Widening of extra 2,75m width on the access road ORPN52M01 (Sta 0+595) 3. Widening of extra 3m width on the access road ORPN65LG (Sta 1+141) 4. Widening of extra 4.5m width on the maintenance road ORPN67M01 (Sta 0+489) 5. Widening of extra 3.5m width on the maintenance road ORPN88M01 (Sta 0+000) 6. Widening of extra 3m width on the maintenance road ORPN31M01 (Sta 0+093) Turnaround loops with extreme physical constrain: No turnaround/widdening of the road has been proposed in the following roads: 1. ORPN63G (Sta 0+240) 2. ORPN54G (Sta 0+112) 3. ORPN66M01 (Sta 0+000 and Sta 0+268) 4. ORPN68M01 (Sta 0+251) 5. ORPN39M01 (Sta 0+0+135) 6. ORPN88M01 (Sta 0+266) In order to fulfil Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0110 requirements, extra land plot is needed. Thus, it is necessary to prepare a new territorial planning document (special plan) and to carry out land acquisition procedures for public needs, which may take up to 1.5-2 years.	01.12.2025	Deviation from turnaround loop requirement approved in LT DS2 DPS1 as per application. Subject for future improvement if new special planing will be done and additional land aquired.
122	04.11.2025	RBDG-MAN-012-0110	RBR	Derogation request for the Accesssibility to the adjacent railway infrastructure indicated in the document RBDG-MAN-012-0110 General Requirements (LT2 DPS1 CO-01_01)	The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0110 indicates Paragraph 5. "...the designer shall consider improving existing roads instead of constructing new ones. As far as it is reasonable, the design solutions (particularly plan solutions) for Accesss roads shall be designed to provide suitable Accesssibility to the adjacent railway infrastructure in way to cover functions of maintenance roads". This requirement has not been always fulfilled, green paths are provided in the sections where it is impossible to provide maintenance roads in the SP boundaries. In order to fulfil Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0110 requirements, extra land plot is needed. Thus, it is necessary to prepare a new territorial planning document (special plan) and to carry out land acquisition procedures for public needs, which may take up to 1.5-2 years.	01.12.2025	Deviation from accesibility in accordance requirements approved in LT DS2 DPS1 as per application. Subject for future improvement if new special planing will be done and additional land aquired.
123	04.11.2025	RBDG-MAN-012-0110	RBR	Derogation request for the super elevation and transition length indicated in the document RBDG-MAN-012-0110 General Requirements (LT2 DPS2 CO-01_02)	1. From STA 0+002 to STA 0+018, the curve R=20 of the road ORPN93M01 is designed with a lower transversal slope (3%) due to its proximity to the municipality road OR6082. As it is situated on the railway berm, the slope is adjusted to the berm, remaining constant at approximately ±3% (See Annex Figure 1). 2. From STA 0+070 to STA 0+085, the curve R=100 of the road ORPN52M01 is designed with a lower transversal slope (3%) due to its proximity to the road ORPN52. In the roads sections were it is not possible to design entrance to another road without curve, because of the land plot limit, the super elevation and transition cannot be designed as in the Design Guidelines. The slope is variable and depends on two joining roads slopes. (See Annex Figure 2). 3. From STA 0+012 to STA 0+036, the curve R=30 of the road ORPN68M01 is designed with a lower transversal slope (3%). In the roads sections were it is not possible to design entrance to another road without curve, because of the land plot limit, the super elevation and transition cannot be designed as in the Design Guidelines. The slope is variable and depends on two joining roads slopes. (See Annex Figure 3). 4. From STA 0+002 to STA 0+020, the curve R=40 of the road ORPN40M01 is designed with a lower transversal slope (3%) due to its proximity to the road ORPN40. In the roads sections were it is not possible to design entrance to another road without curve, because of the land plot limit, the super elevation and transition cannot be designed as in the Design Guidelines. The slope is variable and depends on two joining roads slopes. (See Annex Figure 4). 5. From STA 0+100 to STA 0+105, the curve R=50 of the road ORPN39M01 is designed with a lower transversal slope (3%) due to its proximity to the road ORPN39. Additionally, it is designed on the railway berm, and the slope is adjusted to the berm, remaining constant at approximately ±3% (See Annex Figure 5). 6. From STA 0+022 to STA 0+088, the curve R=50 of the road ORPN89M01 is designed with a lower transversal slope (3%) due to its proximity to the road ORPN36 and the existing road. In the roads sections were it is not possible to design entrance to another road without curve, because of the land plot limit, the super elevation and transition cannot be designed as in the Design Guidelines. The slope is variable and depends on two joining roads slopes. (See Annex Figure 6). 7. From STA 0+010 to STA 0+042, the curve R=20 of the road ORPN91M01 is designed with a lower transversal slope (3%) due to its proximity to the road ORPN34. In the roads sections were it is not possible to design entrance to another road without curve, because of the land plot limit, the super elevation and transition cannot be designed as in the Design Guidelines. The slope is variable and depends on two joining roads slopes. (See Annex Figure 7). 8. From STA 0+002 to STA 0+014, the curve R=30 of the road ORPN31M01 is designed with a lower transversal slope (3%) due to its proximity to the road ORPN31. Additionally, it is designed on the railway berm, and the slope is adjusted to the berm, remaining constant at approximately ±3% (See Annex Figure 8). In the roads sections were it is not possible to design entrance to another road without curve, because of the land plot limit, the super elevation and transition cannot be designed as in the Design Guidelines. The slope is variable and depends on two joining roads slopes. (We fulfil requirements which are applicable for access roads in Lithuanian regulations. The superelevation is from 3 to 4 % for gravel roads (access roads) by the KTR 1.01:2008, point 55, transition is calculated according to the KTR 1.01:2008, point 59-61) In order to fulfil Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0110 requirements, extra land plot is needed. Thus, it is necessary to prepare a new territorial planning document (special plan) and to carry out land acquisition procedures for public needs, which may take up to 1.5-2 years.	01.12.2025	Deviation from super elevation and transition lenght requirement approved in LT DS2 DPS1 as per application. Subject for future improvement if new special planing will be done and additional land aquired.

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
124	04.11.2025	RBDG-MAN-012-0110	RBR	Derrogation request for the minimum longitudinal slope indicated in the document RBDG-MAN-012-0110 General Requirements	The longitudinal slope of road ORPN87LGM01 from Sta 0+182 to Sta 0+218 is 0.30%; from Sta 0+302 to Sta 0+375 is 0.40%; and from Sta 0+419 to Sta 0+455 is 0.35%. Minimum longitudinal slope of 0,5% is not possible to be achieved due to the culverts accomodation, the existing ground elevation and the requiered maximum slope for the land plot access in the area. The road section is designed on railway berm. (See Annex Figure 1).	01.12.2025	Deviation from minimum longitudinal slope requirement approved in LT DS2 DPS1 as per application.
125	04.11.2025	RBDG-MAN-012-0110	RBR	Derogation request for the widening indicated in the document RBDG-MAN-012-0110 General Requirements (LT2 DPS2 CO-01_02)	The horizontal curve can not be designed as it is requested in the Design Guidelines because of the land plot limit. 1. Road ORPN74M01 (from STA 0+000 to STA 0+026.61) (see Annex Figure 1) - The connection to the ORPN74 road is made through a curve of less than the minimum radius, and the road is designed with R15. 2. Road ORPN74M02 (from STA 0+025.28 - STA 0+043.10) (see Annex Figure 2) - The connection to the ORPN74 road is made through a curve of less than the minimum radius, and the road is designed with R40. 3. ORPN75M01 (from STA 0+000 to STA 0+028.40) (see Annex Figure 3) - The connection to the ORPN75 road is made through a curve of less than the minimum radius, the road is designed with R20. 4. ORPN70M01 (from STA 0+000 to STA 0+014.72) (see Annex Figure 4) - The connection to the ORPN70-1 road is made through a curve of less than the minimum radius, the road is designed with R15. 5. ORPN67M01 (from STA 0+000 to STA 0+023.05) (see Annex Figure 5) - The connection to the ORPN67M01 road is made through a curve of less than the minimum radius, the road is designed with R40. These roads are located in the intersection zone and connect with the access roads, thus smaller curves are drawn in order to fit within the railway boundaries and to design the entrance to the road. Distribution is installed on all the roads in accordance with the requirements. We fulfil requirements which are applicable for access roads in Lithuanian regulations. The speed at the entrances is about 10 km/h, thus the curves with radius R20 are designed as such radius is applicable for the speed up to 20 km/h in accordance with the STR 2.06.04:2014 table 2). In order to fulfil Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0110 requirements, extra land plot is needed. Thus, it is necessary to prepare a new territorial planning document (special plan) and to carry out land acquisition procedures for public needs, which may take up to 1.5-2 years.	01.12.2025	Reduced horizontal curves for roads approved in LT DS2 DPS2 as per application. Subject for future improvement if new special planing will be done and additional land aquired.
126	04.11.2025	RBDG-MAN-012-0110	RBR	Derogation request for the minimum crest radius indicated in the document RBDG-MAN-012-0110 General Requirements (LT2 DPS2 CO-01_02)	The crests with smaller R are designed on the following maintenance road: 1.ORPN70M01 (STA 0+012,47) - R250 (Road not long, land plot limit, entrance to the access road speed close to 0 km/h) In order to fulfil Design GuidelineRBDG-MAN-012-0110 requirements, extra land plot is needed. Thus, it is necessary to prepare a new territorial planning document (special plan) and to carry out land acquisition procedures for public needs, which may take up to 1.5-2 years.	01.12.2025	Reduced minimum crest radius approved in LT DS2 DPS2 as per application. Subject for future improvement if new special planing will be done and additional land aquired
127	04.11.2025	RBDG-MAN-012-0110	RBR	Derogation request for the minimum sag curve indicated in the document RBDG-MAN-012-0110_GeneralRequirements (LT2 DPS2 CO-01_02)	The Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0110 indicates Paragraph 5.3.1 "Minimum sag R 250m". This requirement has not been always fulfilled and smaller sag R has been considered in the design. The sag with smaller R are designed on maintenance road: 1. ORPN72LGM01 (Sta 0+009) - R150 Curve is designed with smaller R due to the limit of the land plot.	01.12.2025	Reduced sag curve approved in LT DS2 DPS2 as per application. Subject for future improvement if new special planing will be done and additional land aquired
128	04.11.2025	RBDG-MAN-012-0110	RBR	Derogation request for the turnaround loop parameters indicated in the document RBDG-MAN-012-0110 General Requirements (LT2 DPS2 CO-01_02)	The turnarounds loops are designed at all locations where enough space is available. Two main constrains exist when designing this turnoround loopes, on the one hand the railway elements (embankments, structures, drainage elements...) and, on the other hand, the landplot available to fit the design. There are three different situations where the Design Guidelines requireements have not been fulfilled: Turnaround loops with slight physical constrain: a modification of the Design Guidelines requirement has been applied in the following turnaround loop: 1. Turnaround loop on the maintenance road ORPN75M01 width - 10 m radius R20/8 (Sta 0+116) (see Annex 1 figure 1) Turnaround loops with severe physical constrain: Slight widening of the road lanes has been proposed in the following roads: 1. Widening of extra 4.5m width on the maintenance road ORPN67M01 - 8 m radius R20/8 (Sta 0+305) (see Annex 2 figure 1) 2. Widening of extra 2m width on the access road ORPN67-1 (Sta 0+000) (See Annex 2 figure 2) Turnaround loops with extreme physical constrain: No turnaround/widdening of the road has been proposed in the following road: 1. ORPN70M01 (Sta 0+208) In order to fulfil Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0110 requirements, extra land plot is needed. Thus, it is necessary to prepare a new territorial planning document (special plan) and to carry out land acquisition procedures for public needs, which may take up to 1.5-2 years.	01.12.2025	Deviation from turnaround loop requirement approved in LT DS2 DPS2 as per application. Subject for future improvement if new special planing will be done and additional land aquired.
129	04.11.2025	RBDG-MAN-012-0110	RBR	Derogation request for the accessibility to the adjacent railway infrastructure indicated in the document RBDG-MAN-012-0110 General Requirements (LT2 DPS2 CO-01_02)	Within the scope of this project, the installation of a maintenance road or a green path is not feasible due to the constraints imposed by the land plot boundaries. Specifically: 1. Access has not been provided to the culvert CU6329, on the right side of the railway at STA 24+400. Access is provided only on the left side by ORPN95M01. 2. Access has not been provided to the structure BR6268 from all of its sides, STA 24+950. Access is provided on all the sides except one on the right side of railway by ORPN73LG, ORPN72LGM01 and ORPN72. 3. Access has not been provided to the culvert BR6070 on the left side of the railway at STA 28+160. Access is provided on the right side by ORPN70. 4. Access has not been provided to the ponds located on the left side of the railway at STA 28+120 and STA 28+190. Access is provided on the right side by ORPN70. 5. Access has not been provided to the structure BR6274 from all of its sides, STA 31+680. Access is provided on all the sides except one on the right side of railway by ORPN69, ORPN68 and ORPN70-2. 6. Access has not been provided to the retaining wall LS6366, STA 32+100. Nearest access is provided on the left side of the railway by ORPN68 7. Access has not been provided to the culvert BR6077, on the right side of the railway at STA 32+200. Access is provided only on the left side by ORPN68	01.12.2025	Deviation from accesibility in accordance requirements approved in LT DS2 DPS2 as per application. Subject for future improvement if new special planing will be done and additional land aquired.
130	04.11.2025	RBDG-MAN-012-0110	RBR	Derogation request for the super elevation and transition length indicated in the document RBDG-MAN-012-0110 General Requirements (LT2 DPS2 CO-01_02)	In the roads sections were it is not possible to design entrance to another road without curve, because of the land plot limit, the super elevation and transition cannot be designed as in the Design Guidelines. The slope is variable and depends on two joining roads slopes 1. Road ORPN74M01 - From Sta 0+00 to Sta 0+010 it is the entrance and the road is designed with variable slope in order to join the road ORPN74. - From Sta 0+000 to Sta 0+030 the curve of R=15m is designed with lower slope (3%) in order to join the road ORPN74. 2. Road ORPN74M02 - From Sta 0+00 to Sta 0+010 it is the entrance and the road is designed with variable slope in order to join the road ORPN74. - From Sta 0+00 to Sta 0+036 the curve of R=40m is designed with lower slope (3%) in order to join the road ORPN74. - Due to the land plot limit it is designed on the railway berm and the slope is adjusted to it, remaining constant at approximately ±3%. 3. Road ORPN75M01 - From Sta 0+00 to Sta 0+010 it is the entrance and the road is designed with variable slope in order to join the road ORPN75. - From Sta 0+00 to Sta 0+026 the curve of R=20m is designed with lower slope (3%) in order to join the road ORPN75. - Due to the land plot limit it is designed on the railway berm and the slope is adjusted to it, remaining constant at approximately ±3%. 4. Road ORPN72LGM01 - From Sta 0+00 to Sta 0+010 it is the entrance and the road is designed with variable slope in order to join the road ORPN72LG. - From Sta 0+00 to Sta 0+060 the curve of R=150m is designed with lower slope (3%) in order to join the road ORPN72LG. 5. Road ORPN67M01 - From Sta 0+00 to Sta 0+010 it is the entrance and the road is designed with variable slope in order to join the road ORPN67. - From Sta 0+10 to Sta 0+030 the curve of R=40m is designed with lower slope (3%) in order to join the road ORPN67. (We fulfil requirements which are applicable for access roads in Lithuanian regulations. The superelevation is from 3 to 4 % for gravel roads (access roads) by the KTR 1.01:2008, point 55, transition is calculated according to the KTR 1.01:2008, point 59-61) In order to fulfil Design Guideline RBDG-MAN-012-0110 requirements, extra land plot is needed. Thus, it is necessary to prepare a new territorial planning document (special plan) and to carry out land acquisition procedures for public needs, which may take up to 1.5-2 years.	01.12.2025	Deviation from super elevation and transition lenght requirement approved in LT DS2 DPS2 as per application. Subject for future improvement if new special planing will be done and additional land aquired.

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
131	26.01.2026	RBDG-MAN-012	RBE	Derogation request for changing CCS ducts height in the railway embankment on the limestone base	Design Guideline RBDG-MAN012 ch. 10.3.1.1 states the minimal installation depth for cable ducts along the railway in the railway embankment and also allows some exceptions where installation depth can be decreased in small extent (Annex 2). In Estonia there are long sections where the railway is on limestone (approximate areas - DS2DPS1, RW0500 STA 9+650 - 11+700; DS1DPS2, RW1200 STA 2+950 - 3+800, 6+550 - 7+000, 10+050 - 10+500). In these sections there is no granular frost protection layer (Annex 3 - embankment design). Baserock (limestone) provides a strong base for the railway embankment and has no frost heave risk. This solution decreases earthworks volumes and CAPEX costs. This railway embankment solution was designed by IDOM and approved by RBR (and also agreed with RBE). The same approach will be taken for DS2DPS3, RW0200 (here sections cannot yet be defined because there is no approved MD). Design Guideline systems' cable channel rules do not foresee this kind of embankment, and therefore a different technical solution has to be created (this was not designed in detail by IDOM in MD). RW0500 and RW1200 contractors with their consultant have proposed a solution where cable ducts have been raised into prepared subgrade (Annex 1), following the exceptional rules that can be applied for small sections according to Design Guideline. The proposed technical solution has the following positive effects: 1. Will not increase excavation and fill amounts. 2. Eliminates the risk that the cable channel trench in limestone, which is filled with granular backfill, will be saturated with water in the frost protection layer depth. 3. Excavating a duct trench next to the railway ditch is also questionable in limestone (risk of limestone cracking). With this solution this risk is also eliminated. The proposed technical solution has no effect on railway safety, cable installation to the ducts or railway operations. RBE proposes using the same approach everywhere in Estonia, where there is limestone instead of a granular frost protection layer.	23.03.2026	In areas - DS2DPS1, RW0500 STA 9+650 - 11+700; DS1DPS2, RW1200 STA 2+950 - 3+800, 6+550 - 7+000, 10+050 - 10+500 Instead of "On the length of maximum 10 m." use following requirement: "On the length of maximum 10 m or in the sections where there is bedrock instead of a frost protection layer in the embankment."
132	26.01.2026	RBDG-MAN-030-0107	EDzL	Derogation Request for the 3D Modelling of Road Signage in LV DS3 DPS1	The derogation from 3D modelling requirements for road signage has no negative impact on the project's design, construction, or cost. All physical elements are accounted for in the construction documentation and procurement processes, while maintaining modelling efficiency: · Design Integrity: The absence of 3D signage models does not indicate design flaws; the design remains complete, compliant, and constructible using conventional documentation. · Level of Constructive Detail: The level of detail and functionality of the design elements is unchanged. · Construction Documentation: Detailed 2D drawings provide all necessary information for safe and accurate execution, consistent with industry practice. · Bill of Quantities: Material estimates and cost planning remain accurate. · Stakeholder Requirements: Road external stakeholders do not require 3D BIM models.	23.03.2026	Approval of a derogation from the requirement for 3D modelling of road signage for third-party roads within LV DS3 DPS1. The requirement for 3D modelling shall remain applicable to Rail Baltica maintenance roads.
133	26.01.2026	RBDG-MAN-030-0107	EDzL	Derogation Request for the Clash Check Tolerances of Road Safety Barriers vs Culverts for LV DS3 DPS1	The derogation of clash check tolerances of road safety barriers vs culverts has no negative impact on the project's design, construction, or cost. All physical elements are accounted for in the construction documentation and procurement processes, while maintaining modelling efficiency: · Clash Nature: Apparent clashes in the model are due to limitations in representing culvert crossings; In practice, appropriate engineering solutions will be implemented to ensure proper installation of safety barriers in such cases. · Design Integrity: These clashes do not indicate errors or affect constructability; the design remains complete, compliant, and constructible using the provided documentation. · Level of Constructive Detail: The level of detail and functionality of the design elements remains unchanged. · Construction Documentation: All necessary information for safe and accurate execution is provided, consistent with industry practice. · Quality Assurance: All clashes will be documented with resolutions in DTD to ensure transparency and avoid misinterpretation. · Bill of Quantities: Material quantities and cost estimates remain accurate and unaffected.	23.03.2026	Approval of derogation from Clash Check Tolerances of Road Safety Barriers vs Culverts for LV DS3 DPS1
134	26.01.2026	RBDG-MAN-030-0107	EDzL	Derogation Request for the Clash Check Tolerances of Road Earthworks vs Culverts for LV DS3 DPS1	The derogation of clash check tolerances of road earthworks vs culverts has no negative impact on the project's design, construction, or cost. All physical elements are accounted for in the construction documentation and procurement processes, while maintaining modelling efficiency: · Clash Nature: The spatial clashes identified between road earthworks and culverts do not represent actual physical interferences or design deficiencies. · Design Integrity: These clashes do not indicate errors or affect constructability; the design remains complete, compliant, and constructible using the provided documentation. · Level of Constructive Detail: The level of detail and functionality of the design elements remains unchanged. · Construction Documentation: Detailed 2D drawings provides all necessary information for safe and accurate execution, consistent with industry practice. · Quality Assurance: All clashes will be documented with resolutions in DTD to ensure transparency and avoid misinterpretation. · Bill of Quantities: The impact on quantities and cost is negligible, with deviations under 2%, within acceptable tolerances. This ensures no adverse effect on cost estimation, procurement, or overall budgeting.	23.03.2026	Approval of derogation from Clash Check Tolerances of Road Earthworks vs Culverts for LV DS3 DPS1
135	26.01.2026	RBDG-MAN-030-0107	EDzL	Derogation Request for the 3D Modelling of Stone-pitching Protection of Embankment Slopes behind Abutments for LV DS3 DPS1	The derogation of 3D models of Stone-pitching Protection of Embankment Slopes behind Abutments has no negative impact on the project's design, construction, or cost. All physical elements are accounted for in the construction documentation and procurement processes, while maintaining modelling efficiency: · Design Integrity: The absence of 3D Modelling of Stone-pitching Protection of Embankment Slopes behind Abutments does not indicate design flaws; the design remains complete, compliant, and constructible using conventional documentation. · Level of Constructive Detail: The level of detail and functionality of the design elements is unchanged. · Construction Documentation: The 2D information (top view layout and cross sections) of these stone-pitchings added to the drawings provides all necessary information for safe and accurate execution, consistent with industry practice. · Bill of Quantities: Material estimates and cost planning remain accurate. · Stakeholder Requirements: Road external stakeholders do not require 3D BIM models.	23.03.2026	Approval of derogation from 3D Modelling of Stone-pitching Protection of Embankment Slopes behind Abutments for LV DS3 DPS1
136	26.01.2026	RBDG-MAN-030-0107	EDzL	Derogation Request for the 3D Modelling of Some Backfills at Structures for LV DS3 DPS1	The derogation of 3D models of Backfills at Structures has no negative impact on the project's design, construction, or cost. All physical elements are accounted for in the construction documentation and procurement processes, while maintaining modelling efficiency: · Design Integrity: The partial absence of 3D Modelling of backfills does not indicate design flaws; the design remains complete, compliant, and constructible using conventional documentation. · Level of Constructive Detail: The level of detail and functionality of the design elements is unchanged. · Construction Documentation: The missing models have no impact while the earthworks and particular elements (like the technical blocks) are fully defined in the projetc documentation (reports, drawings, etc). · Bill of Quantities: Material estimates and cost planning remain accurate. · Stakeholder Requirements: External stakeholders do not require 3D BIM models.	23.03.2026	Approval of derogation from 3D Modelling of Some Backfills at Structures for LV DS3 DPS1
137	26.01.2026	RBDG-MAN-030-0107	EDzL	Derogation Request for Topsoil Modelling on Embankments of Maintenance Roads along At-Grade Sections for LV DS3 DPS1	The derogation from 3D modelling requirements for topsoil on embankments of maintenance roads along at grade sections has no negative impact on the project's design, construction, or cost. All physical elements are accounted for in the construction documentation and procurement processes, while maintaining modelling efficiency: · Design Integrity: The absence of topsoil coverage in 3D models at the mentioned locations does not indicate design flaws; the design remains complete, compliant, and constructible using conventional documentation. · Level of Constructive Detail: The level of detail and functionality of the design elements is unchanged. · Construction Documentation: Detailed 2D drawings provide all necessary information for safe and accurate execution, consistent with industry practice. · Bill of Quantities: The impact on quantities and cost is insignificant, with deviations under 0,1% of overall topsoil quantities. Nevertheless, estimated volumes of the missing material will be included in the BoQ, so that material estimates and cost planning remain accurate.	23.03.2026	Approval of derogation from Topsoil Modelling on Embankments of Maintenance Roads along At-Grade Sections for LV DS3 DPS1

Design Guidelines Derogations

No.	Date	Document	Author	Title	Request for derogation (summary)	Date of decision	Derogation decision
138	26.01.2026	RBDG-MAN-030-0107	EDzL	Derogation Request for the 3D Modelling of Culverts in Crossings of Ditches with Private Accesses to Land Plots for LV DS3 DPS1	The derogation of 3D models of Culverts in Crossings of Ditches with Private Accesses to Land Plots has no negative impact on the project's design, construction, or cost. All physical elements are accounted for in the construction documentation and procurement processes, while maintaining modelling efficiency: · Design Integrity: These culverts, generally pipes providing continuity to the longitudinal drainage ditch disrupted by the accessses to land plots, have been hydraulically considered and coordinated in height between the drainage and roads team, defined in position on 2D drawings and included in the BoQ. The absence of their 3D modelling does not indicate design flaws; the design remains complete, compliant, and constructible using conventional documentation. · Level of Constructive Detail: The level of detail and functionality of the design elements is unchanged. · Construction Documentation: 2D drawings identifying the elements position and geometrical features, as well as their hydraulic and geometric definition in the WDR reports, provide all necessary information for safe and accurate execution, consistent with industry practice. · Bill of Quantities: Material estimates and cost planning remain accurate. · Stakeholder Requirements: These culverts are located under private small branch roads, which do not belong to stakeholders requiring BIM 3D models.	23.03.2026	Approval of derogation from 3D Modelling of Culverts in Crossings of Ditches with Private Accesses to Land Plots for LV DS3 DPS1
139	26.01.2026	RBDG-MAN-030-0107	EDzL	Derogation Request for the 4D Modelling for LV DS3 DPS1	The derogation from 4D modelling requirements has no negative impact on the project's design or construction. All the detailed information regarding construction phasing and sequencing is included in the construction documentation: · Design Integrity: The absence of 4D modelling does not affect design quality, constructability, or compliance with standards. · Level of Constructive Detail: The level of detail and functionality of the design elements is unchanged. · Construction Documentation: The construction schedule, phase-specific drawings and relevant explanatory notes included in the Work Organisation Plan give contractors all necessary data to assess resource allocation, task duration, coordination requirements, environmental and spatial constraints, and the implementation of temporary works. · Limited Value of 4D at Design Stage: 4D modelling is generic at this stage due to unknown contractor resources and site conditions; its real benefit occurs during construction.	23.03.2026	Approval of derogation from 4D Modelling for LV DS3 DPS1
140	24.03.2026	RBDG-MAN-036	RBE	Derogation request for fire suppression system in transformer rooms of the Ülemiste joint terminal	RBDG-MAN-036 „Security requirements and guidance for designers of Rail Baltica international stations", section 6.6, sets out minimum requirements for the fire and smoke suppression and extinguishing system of the station. It requires installation of a gas suppression system in technical rooms with a special electric risk (transformer rooms, electrical panel rooms, power generator room and rack rooms). The Ülemiste joint terminal has three transformer rooms designed: 053, 054 and 055, all on the floor B01. Having consulted with the Contracor's designers and taking into account the experts' opinion, RBE proposes to make an exception in using a gas suppression system in the transformer rooms. 1) The transformers used are dry-type transformers. They are without combustible insulating oil, resulting in significantly reduced fire load. The solid insulation used is often self-extinguishing and designed to withstand high temperatures without catching fire easily. The possible causes of a dry-type transformer failure are generally an internal short circuit in the transformer winding and a failure of the internal insulation in the medium-voltage cable termination. In case of failure, medium voltage switch-gear will almost instantly turn off power to transformer. 2) The national safety regulations do not require the use of gas suppression for transformer rooms with dry-type transformers. Neither do the NFPA 130 and the European standards. 3) As a risk reduction measure in the context of fire hazard, the transformer room is constructed as a dedicated fire compartment and applicable national safety regulations and standards are followed. 4) A gas extinguishing system would require the room to be made airtight which results in a technically more complex, but not justified design solution and maintenance procedures. Legal regulations impose requirements for the quarterly and annual inspection of gas supression system equipment, increasing the OPEX. 5) In accordance with IEC-60076-11 and ANSI/IEEE standards, dry-type transformers are designed to be self-extinguishing (fire-resistant) therefore they do not require specialized fire suppression systems	20.04.2026	Approval of derogation from requirement to instal fire and smoke suppresion and estinguishing system for transformer rooms Ülemiste joint terminal in case of use of dry-type transformers
141	24.03.2026	RBDG-MAN-041-0100	RBE	Derogation– Spacing of Ground Investigation Points	Spacing of investigation points The Rail Baltica Guidelines refer to Eurocode 7 as the overarching document that the design shall need to comply with. In relation to Ground Investigation, Annex B of Eurocode 7, Part 2, specifically clause B.3 recommends 'for linear structures (roads, railways, channels, pipelines , dikes, tunnels, retaining walls) a spacing of 20 to 200m'. The designer would propose relaxation in the requirement such that spacing is restricted to a maximum spacing of 200m as per Eurocode 7 part 2, between existing and proposed ground investigation points, or where no existing ground investigation points are present for embankment heights less than 4m. These areas are considered low risk. This will allow the designer to target the ground investigation such that the ground risk can be managed sufficiently as well as the managing the economic and environmental impact on the project. Investigation Points at Culverts The designer will propose investigation points along the alignment of the proposed railway. The culvert will be located within the embankments and the culvert will settle with the embankment. The designer views the boreholes to inform the design and settlement of the embankment can be used to inform the design of the culvert too. Targeting culverts with additional boreholes is deemed excessive. Therefore Alliance 2 propose the use of Geophysical Testing in combination with the track boreholes to develop a ground profile. Where the geophysics suggest unexpected ground conditions or an anomloy, then Boreholes or other investigation points shall be proposed in Phase 2 of the incvestigations.	20.04.2026	Approval of extending ground investigation spacing increase to 200m as per EN-1997-2 standard in Estonian section Parnu - Latvian/Estonian state border