

From: [hs2](#)
To: hs2@jimconboy.com
Subject: Fw: FOI 18-2188; No response to FOI-19-3090-R
Date: 28 May 2019 21:56:20
Attachments: [FOI18-2188 - Response.pdf](#)
[FOI-19-3090-R.pdf](#)
[FOI18-2018 ResponseReply.pdf](#)

From: hs2
Sent: 07 May 2019 22:43
To: hs2enquiries@hs2.org.uk
Cc: casework@ico.org.uk
Subject: FOI 18-2188; No response to FOI-19-3090-R

Dear HS2 FOI team

On 11-Dec-2018, you declined to respond to our FOI 18-2188 (Concerning the safety of the Chiltern Tunnel) on grounds of safety, among others. I have attached your response document FOI18-2188-Response for the benefit of the Information Commissioner .

On 3rd Feb 2019, we submitted a new request for specific information regarding the train evacuation procedure, again under the FOI act, and on 8th Feb we submitted a complaint regarding the handling of 18-2188. On the same day, we received an Email assigning FOI-19-3090-R to an internal review of the handling of 18-2188, but apparently referring to our request of 3rd Feb.

On 31st March, I enquired about the lack of any response to the review 19-3090-R, which was acknowledged, but no further response has been forthcoming. These Emails can be found in the attachment FOI-19-3090-R.

To summarise, we are currently awaiting

1. A response to our FOI request of 3rd Feb regarding the train evacuation procedures (in the Chiltern Tunnels)
2. A review of our complaint of 8th Feb regarding your handling of our initial FOI 18-2188 ; see attachment FOI18-2018-ResponseReply for our grounds for requesting this review.

Both of these are clearly overdue. It would be helpful if you could indicate which one is covered by FOI-19-3090-R, and assign an FOI number to the other, for future reference, and then respond to both.

Regards,

Dr James Conboy
(for the Chiltern Society HS2 group)