

---

**From:** Ray Dent  
**Sent:** 29 March 2007 08:40  
**To:** Susan Clark  
**Subject:** FW: SDS - Issues

Susan

Thanks for dinner last night.

I'm blind copying you with a note I sent Graeme yesterday raising some concerns that I have following the Util Tech Liaison mtg.

Ray

---

**From:** Ray Dent  
**Sent:** Wed 28/03/2007 17:40  
**To:** Graeme Barclay  
**Subject:** SDS - Issues

Graeme

This is not intended to be an SDS bashing note, but I am beginning to despair.

Although today's forum (Utilities Technical Liaison Meeting) was/is not intended to cover wider issues, for the last 3 meetings, I have hi-jacked the meeting to cover other issues, eg new way of working, RATS proposals, Change Orders, general progress, etc.

Although the contract arrangements with SDS and MUDFA AMIS are different, I think we need to institute some form of contract progress reporting and meetings.

A number of issues were discussed this morning which are either new or where no/little notice is being taken by SDS.

#### General

Various 'actions' from previous meetings/discussions/correspondence are just simply not progressed. Today Alan Dolan stated that he didn't even accept that he had received certain tabled items/meeting actions because documents had not been submitted through document control, even in some cases where a further copy of such a document had been appended to published minutes together with an action to do something in the minutes. Just prevaricating - smoke screens for non-action.

#### Site Attendance and Design During Construction

There appears to be an SDS tactic of avoiding doing work now and accepting that it will have to be done later where they expect to be paid, rather than use current contract priced resources to do the job properly now. Example, SDS want to do trial pits to discover/confirm service positions/depth (despite the fact that the contract and their own strategy document requires that they 'investigate' where data is thought not to be good). **SDS were going to do hundreds of trial pits, then proposed tens of trial pits, then 3, and now zero.** All a strategy to minimise spend now and to use later opportunity of doing the work with new money. They positively accept their obligation to attend during construction but I believe the need to do so would be significantly reduced if not eliminated by doing what I think they should be doing now as our competent designers.

Another example is given us a diversion design and proposing a course of 'no action' whilst at the same time informing us that the data the design/proposal is based on is inconsistent and without proposing or accepting the task of confirmatory survey/trial work. Alan was trying to suggest that 'proposing' a course of action is not 'recommending' and that it's a risk anyway, so long as SDS have identified a cost effective solution, albeit based on data which is itself inconsistent/doubted.

Despite the clear understanding that they want SDS to de-prioritise Section 3 designs, **they continue to work on it as a priority** on the basis that they have not instructed them otherwise. Immediately it was known to them that we should not

proceed at present with Phase 1b (Section 3), Susan told SDS so and later Ailsa wrote in similar terms to SDS. Alan Dolan is now saying the SDS recognise Ailsa's communication as informing but not instructing them to prioritise other sections. Indeed Alan proudly announced today that they are working hard on Section 3 and would imminently deliver this design (and PB are pushing Halcrow to that end) despite the fact that tie don't need it. They even reported that they were having difficulties getting SU approvals because tie had successfully got the SUs to treat the section as low priority.

#### Design and Work Order Process

Despite accepting that he actually supports the proposals (made and discussed around 22 Feb), he has singularly failed to say so in writing. SDS were sent notes of the meeting where the basis for the 'new way' was discussed, and were asked to sign to indicate acceptance. Alan doesn't even want to recognise it until it is submitted formally (which action will no doubt solicit a more money/time response).

A subsequent development of the proposal, included for some building of AMIS comment (buildability/necessary extra detail) into drawing before sending them out to SUs for comment (intended to increase the chances of SUs not commenting adversely on the drawing quality/sufficiency and the chances of gaining SU approval) is being followed by SDS. I believe this will later be used by SDS to justify some slippage. However, with respect to another aspect of the developed way of working they are less than supportive. We believe that splitting the issuing of drawings to SUs for approval into smaller batches than the Sections now planned will both help SDS deliver timely drops to the SUs (although time will quickly lose the opportunity of any gains) and also help the SUs plan and resource their approval activity. If the batches could be aligned at least to a degree with the work site requirements of AMIS, then tie could potentially issue Work Order instructions in meaningful and earlier packages. SDS have indicated that it would cost more/cause delays to do the extra work of issuing drawing in smaller packages. Except for the minor overhead of printing/issuing more packages, it's difficult to see why the design would cost more. More posturing for more money, I think.

We have written to SDS explaining that tie needs Issued For Construction designs supported by evidence that those designs are approved by the SUs. I expect SDS to reply that they only have to supply a consented design and that the IFC design will follow. I expressed concern that this is a ploy to get paid at the earlier point and concern that tie is at risk if it instructs AMIS construction against IFC drawings which will not have been seen let alone approved by the SUs. We regard the primary deliverable from SDS as an approved design that we can get planned and costed before instructing work.

#### RATS 1A 1/2

SDS do not accept that they have formally been asked to respond to the AMIS RATS proposals and therefore have not responded. Clearly, with the clock ticking, the opportunity of doing early work and using available resources and time is reducing. Although they believe 1A 2 has merit, 1A 1 may not, due to re-alignment issues. Alan predicts completing (only if we formally ask them) the design response by the end of April.

#### Design Progress

It has been the practice at the liaison meeting to review progress although it was usually focussed on technical issues/difficulties. For the last few meetings, SDS have been producing a matrix of design sections and progress towards SU approval. 4 weeks ago they said that would submit it formally (as a tool for John McAloon to update progress) - this has not happened! 2 weeks ago, SDS said that they couldn't table the matrix with the then updated progress because it was being updated overnight and therefore we would receive it the next day. We didn't. Today we were told that the progress matrix was formally coming to tie under cover of a letter. We will now have progress up to 7th March !! A fat lot of good.

#### SU (and Forth Port) Drawings

AMIS have identified that they need SU and other Utility drawing before they can undertake work on site. For Gas, Water, Power and BT they can get drawings themselves. For the Trial Site they want the Forth Port drawings. SDS have reluctantly agreed to supply as AMIS 'threatened' the Trial would not proceed without them. SDS will want an instruction from tie retrospectively (money?) and they put up a good argument as to why the SDS composite designs as offered to tie as the approved design should suffice. Although AMIS believe that it is necessary to have such drawings to meet their procedures (for H&S/CDM), I'm not convinced that additional drawings are necessary or without risk - if the SDS designs are complete, the SU information should be included in so far as it has been established to be correct. I think this situation needs further discussion before leaping to one or other conclusion.

#### SGN Approval

I noted that Roger Fergusson had written on Gas & Utility Technology headed paper on some trial matter but was concerned that as his signature was that offered for SGN approval, we should establish his authority to sign for SGN especially when approval for the Trial Site design came from the GUT address and not SGN. John Low has since established the protocol so hopefully the problem has gone away.

AMIS

We have written to

Despite

Instructions