

**MCA COOLMINE IMPAIRED MOBILITY**

Coolmine Impaired Mobility MCA						
Parameter	Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative Qualitative)	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	
1	Economy	1,1	Construction and Land Cost Assessment of cost of construction of option, land costs, acquisition costs and temporary works	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
				No land acquisition is required. Option 1 requires the construction of a pedestrian bridge with staircases and lifts.	No land acquisition is required. Option 2 requires the construction of a pedestrian bridge with staircases and lifts. Option 2 is more advantageous than Option 1 since the existing pedestrian bridge can be maintained during the construction stage, thus facilitating the station operation during the new pedestrian bridge's works.	No land acquisition is required. The construction costs of option 3 would be more limited since it only needs to add the lifts to the Level Crossing structure.
				Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
				Lower maintenance cost since the use of the lifts is limited to railway passengers.	Lower maintenance cost since the use of the lifts is limited to railway passengers.	Higher maintenance cost since the lifts can be used by non-railway passengers.
				Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options
2	Integration	2,1	Transport Integration Impact on scope for and ease of interchange between modes. Impact on the operation of other transport services both during construction and in operation. New interchange nodes and facilities; Reduced walking and wait times associated with interchanges. Modal shift figures during construction and operations. Changes to journey times to transport nodes.	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
				Reduced walking times associated with access to the platforms and connection between them.	Reduced walking times associated with access to the platforms and connection between them.	Longer walking times associated with the connection between platforms
				Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options
				All options are similar in terms of Land Use integration.	All options are similar in terms of Land Use integration.	All options are similar in terms of Land Use integration.
				Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options
3	Environment	3,1	Noise and Vibration Estimated number of people likely to be affected by transport-related noise with the scheme within 50m.	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options
				All options are comparable in terms of noise and vibration. There is likely to be temporary construction impacts on sensitive receptors in this location which will be the subject of further assessment.	All options are comparable in terms of noise and vibration. There is likely to be temporary construction impacts on sensitive receptors in this location which will be the subject of further assessment.	All options are comparable in terms of noise and vibration. There is likely to be temporary construction impacts on sensitive receptors in this location which will be the subject of further assessment.
				Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options
				No significant changes to emission sources. Construction phase impacts are temporary and can be mitigated with appropriate measures	No significant changes to emission sources. Construction phase impacts are temporary and can be mitigated with appropriate measures	No significant changes to emission sources. Construction phase impacts are temporary and can be mitigated with appropriate measures
				Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
3	Environment	3,2	Air Quality and Climate Local air quality effects. Number of receptors within 50m.	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options
				No significant changes to emission sources. Construction phase impacts are temporary and can be mitigated with appropriate measures	No significant changes to emission sources. Construction phase impacts are temporary and can be mitigated with appropriate measures	No significant changes to emission sources. Construction phase impacts are temporary and can be mitigated with appropriate measures
				Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
				Existing planted buffer with Cherry Drive to be retained. No change in existing landscape or visual characteristics.	Existing planted buffer with Cherry Drive to be retained. No change in existing landscape or visual characteristics.	Impact on visual setting of Kirkpatrick bridge (RPS: 697).
3	Environment	3,3	Landscape and Visual (including light) Key landscape characteristics affected; Impact on landscape character; Impacts on landscape features, protected landscapes. Key visual characteristics affected; Impacts on properties, amenities, protected views, key views.	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
				Existing planted buffer with Cherry Drive to be retained. No change in existing landscape or visual characteristics.	Existing planted buffer with Cherry Drive to be retained. No change in existing landscape or visual characteristics.	Impact on visual setting of Kirkpatrick bridge (RPS: 697).
3	Environment	3,4	Biodiversity (flora and fauna) Potential compliance/conflict with biodiversity objectives; Indirect impacts on protected species, designated sites; Overall effect on nature conservation resource.	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options
				Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options

Coolmine Impaired Mobility MCA						
Parameter	Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative Qualitative)	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	
	3,5	<b>Cultural, Archaeological and Architectural Heritage</b>	Overall effect on cultural, archaeological and architecture heritage resource. Likely effects on RPS, National Monuments, SMRs, Conservation areas, etc. Number of designated sites/structures (by level of designation) directly impacted by scheme (land take)	Works proposed in proximity to the Royal Canal pNHA. There is potential for water quality, noise and lighting impacts within the pNHA	Works proposed in proximity to the Royal Canal pNHA. There is potential for water quality, noise and lighting impacts within the pNHA	Works proposed in proximity to the Royal Canal pNHA. There is potential for water quality, noise and lighting impacts within the pNHA
				<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>
				There is no foreseen advantage or disadvantage of this option with regard to archaeological, architectural or cultural heritage	There is no foreseen advantage or disadvantage of this option with regard to archaeological, architectural or cultural heritage	No direct impact on Kirkpatrick bridge (RPS: 697). There is no foreseen advantage or disadvantage of this option with regard to archaeological, architectural or cultural heritage
				<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>
				No indication of significant flood risk at this location. Potential water quality impacts during construction. There is no foreseen advantage or disadvantage of this option with regard to Water Resources.	No indication of significant flood risk at this location. Potential water quality impacts during construction. There is no foreseen advantage or disadvantage of this option with regard to Water Resources.	No indication of significant flood risk at this location. Potential water quality impacts during construction. There is no foreseen advantage or disadvantage of this option with regard to Water Resources.
				All options are located on CIE property and no landtake will be required	All options are located on CIE property and no landtake will be required	All options are located on CIE property and no landtake will be required
	3,6	<b>Water Resources</b>	Overall potential significant effects on water resource attribute likely to be affected during construction and operation.	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>
				All options are comparable from a geology and soils perspective	All options are comparable from a geology and soils perspective	All options are comparable from a geology and soils perspective
	3,7	<b>Agriculture and Non-Agricultural</b>	Overall impact on land take & property. Number of properties to be impacted/acquired. Likely temporary or permanent severance effects, etc.	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>
				All options are comparable from a geology and soils perspective	All options are comparable from a geology and soils perspective	All options are comparable from a geology and soils perspective
	3,8	<b>Geology and Soils (including Waste)</b>	Soils and Geology and likely impact on geological resources based on preliminary/likely construction details. % of soil resources to be developed/removed. Existing information relating to potential to encounter contaminated land. High-level assessment based on the likely structures/ works required and the potential for ground contamination due to historic landfills, pits and quarries.	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>
				All options are comparable from an EMI perspective.	All options are comparable from an EMI perspective.	All options are comparable from an EMI perspective.
	3,9	<b>Radiation and Stray Current</b>	Overall likely impact on existing sources of electromagnetic radiation.	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>
				All options are comparable from a social inclusion perspective.	All options are comparable from a social inclusion perspective.	All options are comparable from a social inclusion perspective.
4	4,1	<b>Impact on Vulnerable Groups</b>	Impacts on low-income groups, non-car owners, people with a disability. Quantification of increased service levels to these groups; Quantification of infrastructure and rolling stock improvements aimed at these groups; distribution of consumers surplus	<b>Some comparative disadvantage over other options</b>	<b>Some comparative disadvantage over other options</b>	<b>Some comparative advantage over other options</b>
				Option 1 provides a good solution for vulnerable groups to access the station platforms. However, it does not provide a good solution for non-station users to cross the railway line from one side to the other.	Option 1 provides a good solution for vulnerable groups to access the station platforms. However, it does not provide a good solution for non-station users to cross the railway line from one side to the other.	Option 1 provides a good solution for vulnerable groups to access the station platforms. It also provides a good solution for non station users to cross the railway line from one side to the other.
				<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>
	4,2	<b>Stations Accessibility</b>	Quantification of increased service levels to the vulnerable groups.	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>
				All options provide similar station accessibility.	All options provide similar station accessibility.	All options provide similar station accessibility.
	4,3	<b>Social Inclusion</b>	Quantification of service levels impacts including severance to all groups	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>
				All options are comparable from a pedestrian and cyclist safety perspective.	All options are comparable from a pedestrian and cyclist safety perspective.	All options are comparable from a pedestrian and cyclist safety perspective.
5	5,1	<b>Rail Safety</b>	Safety for Rail users	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>
				All options are comparable from a rail safety perspective.	All options are comparable from a rail safety perspective.	All options are comparable from a rail safety perspective.
				<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>
	5,2	<b>Vehicular Traffic Safety</b>	Quality of Access for these road users, lengths of diversions, removal of interface with rail and other modes of transport	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>
				All options are comparable from a vehicular traffic safety perspective.	All options are comparable from a vehicular traffic safety perspective.	All options are comparable from a vehicular traffic safety perspective.
	5,3	<b>Pedestrian, Cyclist and Vulnerable Road user Safety</b>	Quality of Access for these road users. removal of interfaces	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>
				All options are comparable from a pedestrian and cyclist safety perspective.	All options are comparable from a pedestrian and cyclist safety perspective.	All options are comparable from a pedestrian and cyclist safety perspective.
6	6,1	<b>Connectivity to adjoining cycling facilities</b>	Analysis of the extent that the scheme connects with cycle tracks.	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>
				All options are comparable from a cyclist connectivity perspective.	All options are comparable from a cyclist connectivity perspective.	All options are comparable from a cyclist connectivity perspective.
	6,2	<b>Permeability and local connectivity opportunity</b>	Journey Time and lengths of diversions for active modes and numbers affected. Analysis of the connectivity with green areas/key attractions related to active mode	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>	<b>Comparable to other options</b>
				All options are comparable from a permeability and local connectivity perspective.	All options are comparable from a permeability and local connectivity perspective.	All options are comparable from a permeability and local connectivity perspective.

MCA SUMMARY COOLMINE STATION						
	Parameter			Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
1	Economy		No land acquisition is required for any of the options. The construction costs of Option 3 would be more limited since it only requires the addition of the lifts to the Level Crossing structure, while the other two options need to provide the whole pedestrian connections that include the bridge, the staircases and the lifts. The maintenance cost of Option 3 would be higher as the use of the lifts is not limited to railway users. Option 2 is more advantageous than Option 1 since the existing pedestrian bridge can be maintained during the construction stage, thus facilitating the station operation during the new pedestrian bridge's works.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
2	Integration		Options 1 and 2 provides more reduced walking times between platforms than Option 3.	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
3	Environment		All options are comparable in N&V, Biodiversity and Water Resources sections. Option 3 shows some comparative disadvantage over other options in Landscape and Visual section	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
4	Accessibility & Social inclusion		All options provide accessibility to the station for persons with reduced mobility. However, Option 3 also provides a connection between both sides of the station for non-railway users with reduced mobility.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
5	Safety		All options are comparable from a safety point of view.	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options
6	Physical Activity		All options are comparable from a physical activity point of view.	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options
<b>Preferred options</b>				<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>