

## Feedback from DPD – 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2007

1. TRO – Currently programmed assumes a Hearing at an estimated cost of £1m (currently not budgeted for) which would mean making orders in March 2010. The Hearing may not be required if the Scottish Executive proposal is approved by the Minister.
2. Public Realm – Currently information from SDS is inadequate to determine the extent of MUDFA and INFRACO works. An alternative approach is being pursued in the meantime to determine the annual maintenance cost for carriageways and footways along the line of the ongoing section of the Tram. Additionally the cost saving on carriageway costs, because INFRACO will be resurfacing most of the carriageway, could be offset into footway renewal costs as part of the betterment process. Figures are currently being prepared for consideration by the Management Team and for discussion with SFC and the Director of Finance.
3. St Andrews Square – The TRO process is to be accelerated to enable general traffic to be diverted on the west side of the square so as to facilitate all the works on the east side of the square (Public Realm, MUDFA & INFRACO) – CEC to ensure that necessary procedures are put in place to make order to make the programme. Can this be delegated to the Director rather than go to Council?
4. IPR – Potential saving in construction costs if a single black surface used in conjunction with H3's sub-base – this would require approval by DC to this performance base design.
5. NWR – Immunisation costs were originally covered by TS, they appear to have reneged on this which results in unknown additional costs to the Tram. Discussions are required at a senior level between CEC and TS to resolve this issue – in the meantime Graeme Bissett is exploring possible alternative arrangements within the Financial Settlement for the Tram. Request that AH is available to help in these negotiations.
6. EARL – Not future proofing Tram for EARL results in savings of £2m to Tram and further savings to IPR. This position has only been stated verbally and requires to be confirmed in writing as soon as possible as it directly affects the procurement process and the business case. Tie have arranged a meeting next week with TS to clarify this position.
7. TRAMCO – Preferred TRAMCO bidder to be selected at the TPB in September.
8. MUDFA – The financial report has been deferred to September Tram TPB because additional information will be available.
9. SCOPE – The current working assumption is that the contract will be let for 1a only and for an option to be retained for 1b at the end of the contract. It is suggested that this information should be imparted to the Council on 25<sup>th</sup> October. It is recommended that this is agreed in principal with key politicians in advance to ease the passage through Council.
10. Letters of Comfort – This is required by the 15<sup>th</sup> August to confirm to bidders that CEC and TS will provide the current funding package of £545m. CEC (Director of Finance) required to prepare this letter forthwith.

11. Engineering Approvals – It is to be acknowledged that the collaboration by TEL and CEC have enabled SDS to progress with the technical approvals for the design. There is however concern that the current programme assumes a linear progression to the design process and takes no account of possible changes to ensure approval e.g. changes to junctions based on modelling information. Some change is reasonable rather than many changes hence tie should build in some contingency within the programme.
  
12. Mobilisation Costs – It has been indicated that if CEC and TS commit to an early mobilisation in November 2007 that there is a potential saving of £10m against an expenditure of £5m. A further modification of the DPD paper is to be brought to the Tram Project board to assist in arguing the benefits of mobilisation. This would have to be reflected in the Business Case presented on the 25<sup>th</sup> October 2007.