

# Safety Incident

Portland Park Embankment – LNE Aug 2017

PBS1 2100 137m 70ch

# Level 1: Preliminary Findings

- Incident occurred at approximately 00:20 on Sunday 8<sup>th</sup> August 2017 during a possession. Underfoot conditions were wet during falling rain. Visibility less than 200 yards and lighting was by Head Lamp and Hand Torch.
- Member of staff was placing protection and turned to change direction. This action caused him to lose balance, tripping over the cess rail and stumbling down the upper part of the embankment approximately three to four yards.
- The member of staff made an abrupt contact with part of the steel protection cover (from an earthworks monitoring instrument). This caused a laceration to the top of his left ankle just above the boot line. Operative taken to A&E where morphine was administered and the laceration required 11 stitches. Hospital advised of 10 days rest.



# Sustained Laceration

I- 2560579 53 0806087] Too far from tracks  
17 Aug 2017, 09:42:45



# Further Information

- Borehole covers installed to protect monitoring hole
- Locations are monitored predominately by manual reading of inclinometer torpedo and data logger (see below)
- Made from steel the top cover plate is held by a welded pin and allows rotation through 360-degrees
- Cover is lockable by using a padlock



- Installed at locations where stability may have been a concern to the RAM Geotech
- Sub-surface well is an asset and needs to be protected even if monitoring is not taking place due to lack of movement
- Standard detail in civil engineering design catalogue, concreted into the ground
- Likely to be in excess of 1000 borehole locations with steel helmet cover

# Discussion Points



- LNE Team have this year been set a Continuous Improvement / Safety objective to "review Geotech sites where there may be a legacy of safety or environmental risk (trip hazards etc), and identify a programme of risk assessment and mitigation."
- If the protection helmet was closed properly would it have been more likely that the laceration was instead a severe scratch or bruise?
- Do / Should RAM Geotech Teams see that the hazard directory is updated with information on where these monitoring wells are in existence?
- Do RAM Geotech teams have clear monitoring plans that detail how these locations should be left after readings have taken place?
- Should all covers be secured (noting that padlocks often rust shut) to prevent exposure to the locking square in slide 2?
- Should modifications be made to the standard detail?
- What should be done where the top cover plate cannot be closed (i.e. a protruding tube?)