
From: Stewart McGarrity
Sent: 26 May 2010 13:50
To: Richard Jeffrey
Cc: Steven Bell; Alan Coyle - CEC
Subject: FW: Edinburgh Trams: Queries raised against the 2010/11 P1 Progress Report
Attachments: 2010 P1 queries.doc

Richard,

See attached from John Ramsay re the P1 Progress Report provided to them. We are collectively replying to the points in his note. There are a couple of potentially serious issues here for us to think about.

- The TS report is in the format and has the content prescribed by TS. You have been giving the Minister / B Reeve regular briefings on where we are and the uncertainties we face. They have had the Pitchfork Report and the briefing on it. Steve and I have been through to Glasgow and taken Jerry Morrissey and Ramsay through the cost estimates for the Pitchfork Option 3 in great detail. The attached note is written as if none of that has taken place and maybe a marker needs put down that we agreed long ago with them not to speculate on final outturn and programme in the formal periodic report until we had some certainty. Pinpointing the issue – I want to make sure there is little chance TS (or Audit Scotland) can ever claim in the future that we didn't tell TS and therefore Ministers what was going on.
- Should we worry about its weight on the shoulders of our staff when added to the other "tie are rubbish" baggage out there. In particular if TS have an itch to scratch about the level of our resource costs then maybe we should help them scratch it.
- Is Ramsay daft enough or does he have the authority to tell CEC they are in Default of the Grant and issue a Cure notice (it's very like our CI90.1.2 notice)

This is absolutely the wrong time to be addressing this with Carlisle and Notice going on – so understandable if we do nothing for now.

S

From: Alasdair Sim
Sent: 25 May 2010 17:13
To: Robert Bell; Damian Sharp; Steven Bell; Susan Clark
Cc: Tom Hickman; Gregor Roberts
Subject: FW: Edinburgh Trams: Queries raised against the 2010/11 P1 Progress Report

Folks

Just received from CEC/TS in regard to TS reporting – can you please ensure the relevant comments are updated in the P2 submission on

- Programme
- Costs
- Gogar Interchange

Thanks
Alasdair

From: Andy Conway [mailto:Andy.Conway@edinburgh.gov.uk]
Sent: 25 May 2010 17:06
To: Alasdair Sim

TIE00089520_0001

Cc: Alan Coyle - CEC

Subject: FW: Edinburgh Trams: Queries raised against the 2010/11 P1 Progress Report

Ali,

Can we have a chat about this when you get a chance?

Regards

Andy Conway

Tram Co-ordination Manager

City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh Trams

Citypoint

65 Haymarket Terrace

Edinburgh

EH12 5HD

Tel: (+44) (0)131 [REDACTED] (Citypoint) (+44) (0)131 [REDACTED] (City Chambers)

Mobile: (+44) [REDACTED]

Email: andy.conway@edinburgh.gov.uk

From time to time we like to check on the quality of the responses we are providing. We would like to know your views on the response you have just received.

By clicking on this link <http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/CEC/CityDevelopment/CustomerFeedbackForm/Form.html> and completing the feedback form you will be helping us to learn what we need to do better.

From: John.Ramsay@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk [mailto:John.Ramsay@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk]

Sent: 25 May 2010 15:34

To: Alan Coyle; Andy Conway

Subject: Edinburgh Trams: Queries raised against the 2010/11 P1 Progress Report

Alan / Andy

<<2010 P1 queries.doc>>

You will recall that during our recent monthly meeting, I raised a number of queries arising from the P1 progress report. You may wish to note that a similar list of queries sent previously to tie have elicited no response. However, given the fact that I am now setting these out more formally to yourself as the owner of the monthly reports to Transport Scotland, I think it likely that we will see some progress on these so we can use this as a starter for our next meeting.

As I advised at the last meeting, some of the queries are made against the general observation that there are parts of the report that barely change from month to month regardless of developments, Consequently references are often either clearly out of date, continuingly inaccurate or just redundant and I would welcome your views on this. I have also similarly included the queries - that my colleague Kevin Murray has also raised against the P1 report for Gogar. These also appear to suffer similar criticisms so I would ask that while progress should be maintained directly through Kevin, comments on the general observations / queries are referenced back to me.

As ever, I'm happy to discuss etc.

TIE00089520_0002

John Ramsay
Project manager - Edinburgh Trams
Rail Directorate
Transport Scotland
Buchanan House
Glasgow G4 0HF

Tel 0141- [REDACTED]
mobile [REDACTED]

.

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free. Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

This email and files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended for the sole use of the individual or organisation to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this eMail in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it without using, copying, storing, forwarding or disclosing its contents to any other person.

The Council has endeavoured to scan this eMail message and attachments for computer viruses and will not be liable for any losses incurred by the recipient.
