

## ADEPT ENGINEERING BOARD

### NATIONAL BRIDGES GROUP

#### MEETING NOTES

**Venue:** Online – MS Teams

**Date and Time:** 10:30 on Wednesday 06 March 2024

**Present:**

Name	Present	Init.	Representing
Keith Harwood	✓	KH	Chair
Helen Rowe	✓	HR	Secretary
Osian Richards		OR	CSS Wales, Chair
Bob Humphreys		BH	CSS Wales
Caroline Haycock	✓	CH	East Mids
Abul Tarafder	✓	AT	East Mids, Chair
Clive Woodruff	✓	CWo	East, Chair
Callum Gillett	✓	CG	East, Sec
Colin Ferris		CF	Infrastructure NI
Kevin McCarron		KM	Infrastructure NI
Aidan McCusker		AMcc	Isle of Man
Alex Holden		AH	Isle of Man
Stuart Molyneux	✓	SM	North West, Chair
Colin Jenkins	✓	CJ	North West, Sec
Alastair Swan		AS	North, Chair
Nigel Burn		NB	North, Sec
Donald MacPherson	✓	DM	SCOTS, Chair
Maria Lucey		ML	SCOTS
Alan Mclean	✓	AMcl	South East, Chair
Scott Gregory	✓	SGr	South East, Sec
Rob Causton	✓	RC	South West, Chair
John BurrIDGE	✓	JB	South West, Sec
Maureen Robson		MR	TfL
Philip Gray		PG	TfL
Sharan Gill		SGi	TfL
Chris Wright	✓	CWr	West Mids, Chair
Chris Plant	✓	CP	West Mids, Sec
Mark Watson	✓	MW	Yorks/Humber, Chair
Claire Richardson	✓	CRi	Yorks/Humber, Sec
Kevin Dentith	✓	KD	Independent, Ex Chair of ADEPT NBG
Marisa Hayes	✓	MH	National Underground Asset Register
Alistair Dore	✓	AD	Historical Railways Estate
Gary Kemp	✓	GK	Department for Transport
Edward Rees	✓	ER	CSS Wales, Deputy Chair

ITEM		ACTION
1.	<b>Introductions</b>	
1.1	<b>New Members</b> Callum Gillett – New East Secretary Edward Rees – Sitting in for CSS Wales today, Deputy Chair for CSS Wales	
	<b>PRESENTATIONS</b>	
2.	<b>Marisa Hayes – National Underground Asset Register (NUAR)</b>	
2.1	Presentation summary – Slides appended for further information. Introduction to NUAR and why it has been developed. NUAR more than happy to attend regional group sessions to present too, please get in touch with MH to organise.	
	<u>Questions:</u>	
2.2	RC - What shape files can you accept?	
	MH - Polygon shape files or lines, must be 2D shape files.	
2.3	HR - How do people access? Is it free? What is the liability situation for accuracy of data?	
	MH - Currently it is free, but I can't guarantee it will be free to use forever but if it is charged it will be a minimal charge – legislation is going through at the moment on this. Liability position is same as current data provision, provided to best of asset owner knowledge but doesn't override safe dig procedures.	
2.4	JB - What sort of Metadata would you like attached to the shape files for these assets?	
	MH - Its all helpful potentially. I'm not sure what other authorities have provided so far; I'll try and find an example and share with you all.	MH
2.5	CJ - Is there a way to put a warning/constraint on an asset? E.g. can we restrict people digging up new surfacing for a set period of time?	
	MH - I believe you can still put in restrictions on surfacing for example, but I would need to check and come back to you on that for certain.	
2.6	HR - What about data security? Are we introducing a terrorism threat by making all this structural data accessible to all and sundry?	
	MH - The platform is protected by 2 factor authentication and every authority and utility has an assigned administrator who allocates users within their organisation. This has been a flagship government project in terms of security.	
2.7	KH - How long will we need to keep updating other service enquiry platforms? How successful have you been in getting local authority data?	
	MH - The aim is for NUAR to be up to date by end of next year. I can send out a list of all the authorities and what has been provided if that is helpful.	MH
2.8	RC - Does it include government pipelines/telecommunications lines etc?	
	MH - Yes, the intention is that it will cover everything.	
2.9	CH - How many users will each organisation have? Will there be a limit?	
	MH - Currently its around 25 users per organisations but it can go up if needed.	
2.10	CJ - What's the timescales on data turnaround? Seems tight to get enquiries back in half a day if we find something unexpected.	
	MH - The platform only reports back what is currently recorded in system. You won't be able to use NUAR to find out unexpected services found on site. Single source of truth where reported – its purely for viewing not works coordination/permitting.	

2.11	MH - Final plug – National Streetworks Gazetteer HAUK app “scan my area” feature replicates the NSG data. On site facility on tablet or phone for anyone to use.	
3.	<p><b>Helen Rowe - Management of Utilities on Bridges</b></p> <p>Presentation summary – HR explained scenario of bridge over rail requiring replacement which has had a fibre link to Europe installed over it. The utility diversion costs are now the same as the cost of the bridge itself and the fibre link has a service level agreement on it which only allows one disconnection in a year, which makes replacement of a structure very challenging as we can't meet these service level agreement terms easily and weren't party to this agreement when the utility was installed. We are aware we can ask the utility to consider feasibility of alternative routes but as far as we are aware we have no right to outright refuse. We are now looking at the authority having to install and subsequently maintain a dedicated Under Track Crossing (UTX) purely for this cable, which seems completely disproportionate for a local authority when it is not their service. Has anyone else had similar experiences and found any ways around this? Is there merit in raising the issue higher given the scale of the diversion costs are very different now to when NRSWA was introduced? Do we think there is a need for utilities to contribute to the bridge in some fashion or to sign a legal agreement that they will waive diversion costs in future if we know the bridge has limited remaining lifespan?</p> <p><u>Questions/Discussion:</u></p> <p>3.1 RC – Can you suspend it and demolish around the service and reconstruct? We had to do that on one of our sites [RC shared photo of temporary supports for services] because the diversion costs were astronomical. HR – Sadly not in this case, there isn't enough flex in the utility to enable us to do that and general reluctance to risk damaging a cable of this nature from contractors and insurance alike.</p> <p>3.2 CR – The constraints feel very tying, is this a streetworks legislation problem? HR – I believe that's part of it because we can't refuse a route.</p> <p>3.3 CWo – I haven't got a solution, but we have had the same issue – we are trying to decommission a bridge and the demolition costs are a quarter of the utility diversion costs. It seems completely disproportionate and like the utilities have the upper hand. I'm also sure the utilities often undertake betterment with our funds when they charge us. HR – I wonder if we could even be able to stipulate jointing pits either side of the structure because sometimes the length of the cable that needs replacing is a large part of the issue, say 300m of cable for a 6m span bridge.</p> <p>3.4 CJ – This sounds like the utility installed is special engineering works? How can the council be held to a service agreement they weren't party to? It sounds like you need to look to a legal vehicle to resolve. KH – I'm wondering if we should escalate to Engineering Board. MH – Maybe take it to the joint authorities' group and try the streetworks angle too, it sounds like there is a problem. Collect up these examples from around your authorities and present them. CP – We've had similar issues too; I think it does need escalating because our individual voices aren't getting anywhere fast. KH – Lets start by writing an expanded note – HR to collect up the</p>	HR/ RC/

	<p>examples from HR, RC, CWo, CP. AD – I’ve had similar issues before in my previous role at Wakefield (6 off the top of my head).</p>	CWo/ CP
<b>4.</b>	<b>Alistair Dore - Historic Railways Estate</b>	
4.1	<p>Presentation summary – Slides appended for further information. Introduction to HRE and what they do, looking at ecology and heritage at the end.</p>	
4.2	<p><u>Questions:</u> RC – How do you deal with statutory undertakers using your bridges for carrying services? AD – We are fortunate in that most of our bridges don’t carry highways so aren’t subject to NRSWA. Where they do, we are in the same position, we can’t stop them from installing them. We have one bridge which HS2 want to put a watermain across which we have agreed to, but because it doesn’t take highway, we have been able to put a lift and shift legal agreement on it.</p>	
4.3	<p>CG – Obviously infilling is controversial and presumably needs robust justification, could you give us more insight into the LENS review process and what is considered? Is it more qualitative or quantitative? Could it be used by other authorities? AD – The LENS focusses mainly on heritage and ecology concerns as well as the local community. We do a rapid heritage assessment on the structure and look at what ecology is present and what mitigations we need to put in place for loss of habitat etc. We engage with local district and parish councils and also look at whether there is any scope for the site to bring rail back into use, or adoption by a heritage railway, if they have appropriate funds to take on the asset. CG – I presume the crux is the assessment of the capacity of the structure though, which is more subjective, more based on engineering judgement? AD – Yes, that’s why we have the LENS review process to make sure everyone has the chance to hear the evidence and be consulted in the final decision.</p>	
4.4	KH – The SAF meetings I attend as an ADEPT representative seem like they don’t consider local authorities very much.	
4.5	<p>KH – You mentioned examinations rather than inspections, are you a highways group or a rail group in terms of standards? AD – We use rail standards because we are an ex-rail body.</p>	
4.6	<p>KD – I do some work with a heritage railway and we have a huge structure that is going to need repainting, is that something HRE would support? AD – Not funding no if its not a HRE asset. You could approach the Railway Heritage Trust but they aren’t likely to have access to millions of pounds to fund that sort of thing.</p>	
4.7	<p>RC – You mention that you use rail standards, how do you deal with HRE structures that still support the highway, are they just BE4 or are you meeting bridgeguard 3? AD – HRE have to go to the Transport Act, so BE4. Anything above BE4 is the highways authority responsibility, that said if a bridge fails BE4, we will do what we can to bring it up to standard but we also need to be realistic about the age and condition of our bridge stock. We often need to work with local authorities to impose a weight limit on a bridge but if they don’t, that liability is with the local authority to manage.</p>	

<p>4.8</p> <p>4.9</p> <p>4.10</p> <p>4.11</p>	<p>RC – How many bridges do you have that have failed BE4 that are still taking highway loading and are you strengthening those to CS 454? AD – Not sure off the top of my head, but I wouldn't imagine we would only strengthen to BE4 not CS 454. AT – We were asked to contribute to bring a bridge up to highway loading standard that is being infilled so it doesn't seem very consistent in the approach. We refused to contribute obviously but we were disappointed to not be included in the SAF. AD – I know the bridge you are talking about AD, I will feed that back. AT – Do you inspect bridges after you have infilled them? AD – Yes, unless we have removed the bridge entirely. The main things we would look for are deformation of the carriageway which would indicate failure of the infill in some sense. Parapets that remain would be used to delineate where the structure was and would be inspected also. HR – If bridges were strengthened under Bridgeguard 3 and then became HRE assets, presumably you would have to continue to maintain them to Bridgeguard 3 standards, not let them drop to BE4? AD – I believe we would have to continue to meet Bridgeguard 3 yes. I'd have to check that but I believe that's true. KH – I think the SAF process takes account of a lot of stakeholders, but I do think they could include local authorities more. AT – Yes, it would be good if any reports on the bridge are passed to the local authority to check for accuracy before issue. CJ – When you infill, are you taking account of drainage issues and land transfers? AD – Probably one to take outside of this session.</p>	
<p>5.</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p>	<p><b>Gary Kemp – Department for Transport</b> Presentation summary –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Plea for responses to the survey issued by DfT on what local authorities were planning to spend the cancelled HS2 money on. Deadline for responses is 15<sup>th</sup> March 2024. Ministers want to know what additional maintenance work has been completed with the money this year and what additional work is being contemplated for next year with the money, what innovation is being used and how are you working with utilities to ensure roads aren't being constantly dug up.</li> <li>2) Not aware of any further funding likely to come through the budget announcement.</li> <li>3) Decarbonisation – DfT looking to produce guidance to local authorities on how to save carbon and how to measure it. Working with ADEPT (£30 million over 3 years). Looking at how to decarbonise highway in its entirety. 7 projects so far, split into themes – materials, corridor of works, grass verges, street lighting/lit signs. 5 year evaluation and monitoring project to ensure we can measure the success or otherwise of the schemes. 7 projects all have blogs they put online through ADEPT.</li> </ol> <p><u>Questions:</u> RC – Why have you written to the chief execs not the highway manager – 15<sup>th</sup> March seems very short for responses! GK – Apologies, it was decided that this was the best way of getting the information down the food chain. The idea of coming here and flagging it is to make sure the right people hear about it and contribute.</p>	<p>ALL</p>

5.3	<p>CJ – There was a draft update to CG300 which talked a lot about carbon calculation but it hasn't ever been released as a formal version, is there any way that can be released formally so we have guidance on how to measure carbon?</p> <p>GK – The carbon measurement tool being developed is only in its first year of three years so its still too early for introducing to CG300.</p> <p>KH – Gary can you take an action away to check who is updating CG 300 and can it include a requirement for carbon calcs?</p>	GK
<b>STANDING ITEMS</b>		
<b>6.</b>	<b>UK Bridges Board/Bridge Owners Forum</b>	
6.1	<p>Bridge Owners Forum met on 6<sup>th</sup> February 2024.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CROSS now have more funding and profile and are launching a campaign to increase reporting on bridge collapses/incidents. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o In the US they have National Transportation Safety Board – can we do something similar here?</li> <li>o Wales similar, CSS Wales working with Welsh government.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Bridge collapses or other safety critical issues discussed, BOF very interested in learning more on specific examples. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Worcestershire scour problem? Hougham partial collapse.</li> <li>o Eastham Bridge over River Teen also in Worcester and very difficult to get information.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Grand challenges document – about to be republished at Bridges 2024. It lays out the challenge to bridge engineers and policy makers to understand the issues faced in bridges and how big a challenge we have on our hands.</li> <li>- Suicide prevention now “distressed persons intervention” – new guidance being drafted by BOF. National Highways are also consulting on similar guidance. There hopefully won't be too much overlap.</li> <li>- Presentations from SSE, Scottish and Southern Electric – similar issues with maintaining bridge stocks but with the added complication of dual purpose, with some being a highway and a dam.</li> <li>- Graham Cole gave a presentation on the Heritage Railway Association and some of their work on load testing and monitoring.</li> </ul>	ALL
6.2	<p>UKBB met last week.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Precast concrete beams problem in Hertfordshire, how do we address the problem? Cross industry forum through CBDG. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o RC - Addition of silica dust to concrete mix is not prevented in standards but it is an active ingredient and causes fast curing of concrete mix which is causing early cure and low quality. The update to BS 8500 should address this.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- TfL raised post tensioned structures. Lack of expertise in industry at post tensioned special inspections. Very conservative approach to assessments. National Highways representative agreed that CS 465 is impossible to fully comply with – over onerous on testing and investigation requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o SM – Network Rail and National Highways seem to be replacing post tensioned bridges (3 and 33 respectively).</li> <li>o KH – do we want this to be a future meeting topic?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<p>Presentation by National Highways on these replacements would be interesting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National Highways say inspection manual is now due in August 2024 – KD said should be out in for consultation in January 2024 – comments back in April. 2 volumes in it. Volume 1 10 chapters, various structures and defects. Volume 2, photos of defects – seems very poor, photos all from strategic network assets, need photos from ADEPT members for local authorities with suggestion for repair methods. KD to check why it hasn't been issued for comment yet. KD asked if people would be happy to contribute, KD to provide requirements and HR to circulate.</li> <li>- Colin George gave update on MCHW updates, all expected by March 2025. HR said except moveable bridges – the current 7000 series will be withdrawn in April 2025 and is programmed to be updated in RIS 3 (2025-2030).</li> </ul>	KD
<p>7. 7.1          7.2</p>	<p><b>Chris Plant, Stuart Molyneux – Liaison with Network Rail</b></p> <p>SM – not heard from Network Rail working group on BE4 loading for a while, Colin Hall from NR and Jim Hall from ADEPT have moved on so it seems to have disbanded somewhat.</p> <p>SM has drafted a note but the group disbanded so not sure what the credence of the note is. When they analysed the BD21 fail but pass BE4 data provided by NR – 280 bridges in the 50% of bridges NR shared failed BD21 but passed BE4. Double it to take it to 100% of bridges, assume £3million intervention per asset and you get £1.74billion overall. Assume not all local authorities will want to upgrade them all so drop by 50% again and you end up with £840million to bring up to standard as a very rough ready reckoner of value of assets in that position.</p> <p>KH – Cost Sharing Protocol update – cost sharing principles aren't changing in essence. Fred Hartley from Canal and River Trust leading and is trying to take everyone's views.</p> <p>Sticking point 1 – can NR and Canal and River Trust let it degrade to BE4 standards if it accidentally passes BD21, and yes is the legal answer but they recognise that isn't going to go down very well with local authorities.</p> <p>Sticking point 2 – who is technical approval authority? Is it the owner of the bridge or is it the highway authority? General view of CRT and NH was if the owner is competent then it is the owner. KH disagreed – ADEPT pushing for joint TAA on such schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HR – raised issues over TAA for VRS installation on KCC network on M2 bridges owned by NH – departures and ownership of the VRS is a challenge when installed on our network by NH to protect substandard NH asset.</li> <li>- CG – have had a better interaction around TAA on a DCO scheme at A12 widening. At consultation stage they were well informed, later though Jacobs on behalf of NH tried to push it through their own TAA team not consulting Essex and their TAA team said they needed Essex approval too. Noted additional issue of no commuted sums for de-trunked assets.</li> <li>- CP – What about RSAs? Can we use that as a challenge? Can we refuse permits to undertake work on our network that we haven't approved?</li> <li>- KH – Joint TAA issues an item for another meeting? Escalation to Engineering Board? What happens with SM's work and the</li> </ul>	ALL

<p>7.3</p>	<p>protocol? Can everyone send examples to HR to collate and we will share with Engineering board.</p> <p>CP – Possession Access Planning Group. CP presented results of meeting with NR in London.</p> <p>Please can we get responses from possessions survey? We've only had 6/200 responses from local authorities. Do we want to keep doing the survey if the response rate is so low?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CJ – Do repeat the questionnaire and it will be circulated to North West meeting next Feb/March.</li> <li>- CP – deadline for responses every 3 months (11<sup>th</sup> April).</li> <li>- HR – Suggestion – maybe send to wider Highways teams as in KCC streetlighting and signage teams have both had possession issues.</li> <li>- KH – Remember it also includes details of successful possessions!</li> </ul> <p>What is the concern around safety issues of inspections not happening on their assets? NR flagged that they were also getting kicked off their possessions by their own PWay and electrification teams.</p> <p>Do we add it to the RAC FOI questionnaire?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- KD – It can go in the RAC, but not until next year. FOI could be the best route as it seems the best way to get better response rate.</li> </ul> <p>KH – Can we include a more general question, we can't even get possessions cancelled because we can't get dates at all.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HR – Can we send to supply chain to complete too because we don't hold the data requested directly and it's a little difficult to get out of our supply chain?</li> <li>- CP – The more data the better, so agree these would be useful.</li> </ul> <p>CP – Compensation was also flagged with Amanda Hoyland. Seems very one sided on insurance etc. NR are looking to do a new customer charter which should clarify the process so they can iron out the administration type issues that seem to be common cause. Not been issued yet. Also flagged access to their database would be helpful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CJ – We have access to their database.</li> <li>- KH – Hertfordshire have access to their database.</li> </ul>	<p>ALL</p>
<p><b>8.</b> 8.1 8.2 8.3 8.4 8.5</p>	<p><b>Liaison with other groups</b></p> <p>CSS – not here</p> <p>SCOTS – not here</p> <p>HRESAF – KH covered this as ADEPT representative.</p> <p>ALLG – Stuart Heald is trying to resurrect the ALLG. Focussing on the abnormal loads grid and government policy rather than enforcement. CJ sent KH an email with lots of good points on this.</p> <p>BSPG – Nothing happened in ages now.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HR – KCC is trying to resurrect it through NR and their signage asset manager. Seems to be getting some traction, will keep the group updated on progress.</li> <li>- KH - Chris Rook at Devon used to be the ADEPT BSPG contact if that is helpful. KD confirmed Chris is still at Devon.</li> </ul>	



<p><b>9.</b> 9.1</p>	<p><b>Knowledge Sharing and Discussion</b> Commuted Sums – CP - New road over rail with connection to new industrial area. Do we apply the commuted sum for situation currently or in the future if we know usage is going to change? Do you accept the rural route = 60 year design allocation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RC – Two things: The CSS spreadsheet needs updating to the new SAVI figures; The discount rate makes massive difference - 0.5% huge, 2% significant drop.</li> <li>- CWo – Agreed, the discount rate has massive effect.</li> <li>- KH – Hertfordshire just charge 20% of construction costs.</li> <li>- RC – Cornwall charge 15% construction costs.</li> <li>- KH – Treasury green book says discount rate of 3%.</li> <li>- All agreed we apply 120 years to all bridges.</li> <li>- AM – ADEPT Commuted Sum update - no further update from Andrew on this. No feedback requested as yet on draft.</li> <li>- CJ – Do we know if there has ever been a comparison between SAVI and the CSS Commuted Sum calculator?</li> <li>- KH – I’m not sure there has – do we need to do a SAVI comparison to CSS commuted sum? SAVI doesn’t include replacement costs remember. KH will try to do comparison spreadsheet at some point.</li> </ul>	<p>KH</p>
<p>9.2</p>	<p>KD – Bridge Inspector Competency Workshop</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Portfolio too onerous. 3000-5000 words suggested by Graham Cole.</li> <li>- Inspectors have to fund the assessments and time.</li> <li>- Continuous review issue, why do they need continuous review?</li> <li>- Steering group considering alternative scheme – looking for examples – there are 5 alternative schemes I believe?</li> </ul> <p>KH – reminded group that regional schemes were supposed to be sent through so can we please get those sent through to HR to share with Sara Subtil at National Highways, and for publication on the ADEPT website.</p> <p>CP – Flagged who pays for ongoing Lantra fees? Its possible to lose the Lantra accreditation too if you don’t do enough inspections.</p> <p>CJ – ADEPT schemes are robust enough to satisfy us that inspectors are competent. Thinks its odd that Lantra refuse to support local schemes.</p>	<p>ALL</p>
<p><b>10.</b> 10.1 10.2 10.2.1</p>	<p><b>Minutes of last meeting – 20<sup>th</sup> September 2023</b></p> <p>Minutes agreed.</p> <p>Actions</p> <p>Smaller authorities – concern over who is looking after them? Please can regions collate who are in your region and contact info for them or missing authorities.</p>	<p>ALL</p>
<p><b>11.</b> 11.1 11.2</p>	<p><b>Future events</b></p> <p>Bridges conference next week</p> <p>BOF website has future bridges events on it. <a href="http://www.bridgeforum.org">www.bridgeforum.org</a></p>	
<p><b>12.</b> 12.1 12.2</p>	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>HR - NCE Bridges awards – entry deadline 8<sup>th</sup> March 2024.</p> <p>CG - Schemes not covered by permitted development rights now have to meet 10% biodiversity net gain targets – very difficult to meet those on bridge schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CJ – EA rep to come and explain their logic to us on this stuff would be good.</li> </ul>	

12.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CWr – their ecologist advised it only applies to new development not maintenance.</li> <li>- RC – Highways Act allows Highways Authority to do work without planning, except if it needs conservation area or listed consents.</li> </ul> <p>Vice Chair nominations needed still.</p>	ALL
<b>13.</b>	<b>Future Meetings/ Date of Next Meeting</b>	
13.1	<p>Online vs in person?            HR – Hybrid?            CH – In person better if people attend.            CWo – Used to have a meeting the day before the Bridges Conference in person.            CWr – Where would it be held? Westminster is not convenient.            KH – potentially in a Consultant’s office            CR – In person preference once a year but very tricky with geography.            KH – next meeting online.</p>	
13.2	<p>Next meeting:            Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> July 2024 – MS Teams 10:30-15:00</p>	