

	A	B	C	D	E
1		Infraco Proposal Discussion			
2					
3		Meeting Date:-27th february 2008			
4		Document under Discussion - Infraco Proposal from Scott McFadzen 26-02-08- Civil			
5		Present: T Murray, M Crosse, L Murphy, R Dawson, D Murray, S McFadzen (phone), J Chandler			
6					
7	Ref	by	Comment	Action	Action Holder
8			Introduction		
9	1	tie	General comment, proposal fails to meet expectations. Not precise, opens up opportunity to propose changes in the future.		
10	2		Does not describe the scope of work to allow a commercial baseline to be provided and is therefore unacceptable		
11			Roads - Full Depth Reconstruction		
12	3	BBS	Baseline previously provided now does'nt reflect the offer as for example full depth reconstruction included. Workshop held which baselined pricing assumptions in stage 3 bid.		
13		tie	Reiterate that this is not described in the current document under discussion and will be part of the contract.		
14	4	tie	No sketches, Drawings schedules or Bills to demonstrate the assumptions and therefore could not be presented in any dispute.		
15	5	BBS	27 hand annotated drawings + BBS illustrated cross sections. £2.1m reduction includes pricing based on information and advice from the 27 drgs.	BBS will provide. This will clarify roads assumption	
16	6	SDS	Mismatch and misalignment of offer requires resolution else this could impact price programme and approvals.		
17	7	BBS	Assumption is that simple planing and resurfacing will be carried out		
18	8		Cross fall of Princes Street changes impact and construction depth this was not included by BBS in August submission		
19	9	tie	CEC are willing to accept performance standards		
20	10	note	This will require redesign by SDS		
21	11	SDS	Scope of further Surveys and pavement condition assessments	All to be carried out location by location design driven by track/existing/frontager accomodation works	
22	13	BBS	timing will be longer than contract close		
23	14	BBS	BBS suggest that this should be a provisional price otherwise will be stage three assumption +changes.		
24	15	tie	Impact - what is the worst case scenario on price if use SDS existing design and FD recon?		
25	16	BBS	Programme impact some 50 phases of road works in city centre	BBS to provide schedule describing scale of impact with regard to time and programme	BBS
26	17	tie	What is the SDS issue with regard to blockers to alignment of assumptions		
27	18	SDS	SDS will strive to align the approach with BBS, however as described before some of the existing design is driven by external influences e.g. frontagers, junctions and in some case only limited economies will be possible	SDS/BBS will meet	
28	19			Worst case assume SDS existing. Best case following review. 1 week to complete this review and will allow rebilling to be undertaken	BBS
29	20	BBS	Section 1D difference in pure material scope was approximately double + programme		
30	21	tie	CEC are willing to accept performance standards and departures this will be investigated through the review process		
31	22	BBS	MUDFA impact ? BBS suggest that increased impact from the FD recon.		
32	23	tie	SDS desgn based on FD recon - so if anything should get better by review process		
33			Structures		
34	24	SDS	5 structures mentioned which may require redesign		

	A	B	C	D	E
1		Infraco Proposal Discussion			
2					
3		Meeting Date:-27th february 2008			
4		Document under Discussion - Infraco Proposal from Scott McFadzen 26-02-08- Civil			
5		Present: T Murray, M Crosse, L Murphy, R Dawson, D Murray, S McFadzen (phone), J Chandler			
6					
7	Ref	by	Comment	Action	Action Holder
35	25	BBS	Assess feasibility of potential VE with regard to both time and programme		
36	26	BBS	Provisional sum proposed and gateway review to delivery		
37	27	tie	No demonstration of what is proposed and discussed within the proposal	BBS to revise to be more specific	
38	28	SDS	SDS can give greater understanding of impact on design and approvals programme		
39	29	SDS	Concern over mention of additional surveys generally these will take considerable time		
40	30	BBS	GPR survey already being procured	BBS to provide timescale for procurement 28-02-08 and expected duration	
41	31	tie	Does price include acceptance of emerging current design? With exception of VE		
42	32	BBS	Price based on design at 25th November		
43	33	tie	Para 2 of introduction intimates that the baseline of 25th Nov is not complete and therefore qualifies the final statement regarding price based on Design information produced up to 25th November 2007.		
44	34	tie	Is priced based on Design information up to 25th Nov 2007 except where assumptions are qualified by previous 27 drgs plus cross sections previously discussed/		
45			Line by Line review		
46	35		Introduction		
47	36	tie	Para 1	BBS should expand to include "and the design management plan"	
48	37	tie	Para 2	Section by section required	
49	38	tie	Contract Programme no contract programme provided therefore	should be provided or refer to Project Programme assumptions	BBS
50	39	tie	Para 4 Tram stops. Restricting works to discipline of the drawing		
51	40	BBS	example Shandwick Place footway relocated inside crescent shown Setted rather than existing asphalt or slabbed		
52	41	SDS	SDS replacement required in order to gain approval confirm that new footpath position was shown however not sure if finish was shown		
53	42	SDS	SDS / tie has resisted wherever possible "betterment/improvement"		
54	43	tie	This appears to further caveat to the final para regarding 25th November design Information		
55	44	BBS	This should have been therefore shown on Kerbs footpaths drawing		
56	45	tie	Utilities - BBS should have given some comment on proposal for how this would be delivered. This does not comply with ER's		
57	46	tie	This appears to say that Infraco is unwilling to carry out Utility works requires acknowledgement that schedule 21 will be done but notes that price is not included.		
58			Surveys		
59	47	BBS	Requires clarification who will carry out and pay for		
60	48	tie	Scenario - alignment of existing design with proposal GPRs who pays. BBS position is tie pays		
61	49	tie	Requires defenition of what surveys are required if this is a qualification it should be referred to in schedule 4		
62	50	tie	Who will "confirm" as part of BBS proposal BBS should state who they propose should carry out works and who they propose should pay and why		
63			Land Made Available		
64	51		Requires confirmation that LOD / LLAU represented on drawing is coincident with tie's understanding		tie

	A	B	C	D	E
1		Infraco Proposal Discussion			
2					
3		Meeting Date:-27th february 2008			
4		Document under Discussion - Infraco Proposal from Scott McFadzen 26-02-08- Civil			
5		Present: T Murray, M Crosse, L Murphy, R Dawson, D Murray, S McFadzen (phone), J Chandler			
6					
7	Ref	by	Comment	Action	Action Holder
65			Risks		
66	52	tie	what is the relevance of the statement?		
67	53		BBS should be explicit as to what they expect to be done by whom to finalise		
68			Trackform		
69		BBS	As discussed 26th		
70	54	tie	No reference to Siemens part of the proposal and how it will be constructed.		
71	55	tie	Who pays for any design change to align proposal with SDS design		
72	56	BBS	BBS position that BBS does not pay		
73	57	BBS	If siemens /BBS supplied equipment or infrastructure does not fit into the gaps left by SDS then BBS will pay if design has been hanging out for information then SDS will pay.		
74			Depot		
75	58	tie	BAA requires 30 minutes notice to drop crane what is impact of redesign who pays?	BBS will confirm	
76			Site Clearance		
77	59		"Statement of Requirement for development and Finalisation of SDS Design" not a proposal or baseline assumption		
78			Earthworks		
79	60		"Statement of Requirement for development and Finalisation of SDS Design" not a proposal or baseline assumption		
80			Roads		
81	61		as discussed		
82			Drainage		
83	62	tie	further definition required if this is a qualification this should be included in Schedule 4		
84			Lindsay Road		
85	63	tie	What will be the basis under which this will be priced?		
86			Haymarket Viaduct		
87	64	tie	issue not clear		
88			Russell Road		
89	65	tie	Who does redesign?		
90	66	BBS	BBS would pay SDS to carry out and would take approval risk		BBS
91			General		
92	67		Most of his document is a "Statement of Requirement for development and Finalisation of SDS Design" not a proposal or schedule of baseline assumptions		
93	68		Also provided was BBS due diligence report there is no referenc to the status or relationship of these documents to the Contract.		
94	69		Note further comments will be provided as mark up to document under discussion.		