From:Morrissey J (Jerry)Sent:28 June 2007 17:45To:Ramsay J (John); Sharp DP (Damian); Spence M (Matthew)Cc:Davis L (Lorna)Subject:RE: Immediate - Edinburgh Trams - release of MUDFA

John,

A good list of questions. Agreed a session is needed asap to formulate our thoughts. Can you pencil in some time tomorrow for the 4 of us.

Thanks

Jerry

Jerry Morrissey Major Projects Team Rail Directorate Transport Scotland 7th Floor, Buchanan House

Ext

-----Original Message-----From: Ramsay J (John) Sent: 28 June 2007 14:03 To: Morrissey J (Jerry); Sharp DP (Damian); Spence M (Matthew) Cc: Davis L (Lorna) Subject: FW: Immediate - Edinburgh Trams - release of MUDFA

Folks

Given that there is a DPD meet scheduled for next week, can we start getting some outline agreements on the way forward - a session to outline our thoughts is necessary sooner rather than later. There appear to be a number of immediate "top o the Head" questions, namely;

a) On budget limits, does yesterday's parliamentary decision mean £375m as indexed already and identified by Tavish Scott in Parliament last March as being between £450m and £500m (in current terms we are quoting £490m) or something else?
b) When we have agreed that - does that change the basis of our finance - do we need new grant agreements. Is it still a grant directly allied to milestones and outputs or is it a steady reducing grant support on measured terms / timelines with retentions and reduced project reference. In other words do we steadily support the project through to critical phases or - " when its done its done"
c)The obvious knock-on for the scheme means that 1b is in current parlance "dead" but does that

mean that the CEC input of £45m is now accounted for against 1a only That was our view before but we need to get CEC signed up to this specific (NB the current periodic reports only show CEC for £33m)?

d) If CEC are in doubt about the likely impact on affordability of the current 1a route, are we prepared to countenance a reduced scope especially given the limited options from the outset - do we know what appetite exists within tie / CEC or are we going to have to force the issue?e) what does this mean for the current procurement esp MUDFa and Tramco?

e) Given Bill's comments about our new role as bankers rather than facilitators, are we facing some kind of due diligence process before moving forward.

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

Tel **mobile**

----Original Message-----From: Duffy F (Frances) Sent: 28 June 2007 13:15 To: Adamson L (Lucy); Sharp DP (Damian); PS/Transport Scotland; McLaughlin AC (Ainslie); Egdell J (Janet) Cc: Reeve W (Bill); Houston G (Guy); Morrissey J (Jerry); Spence M (Matthew); Ramsay J (John); Davis L (Lorna); Press Transport Scotland Subject: Re: Immediate - Edinburgh Trams - release of MUDFA I am assuming Bill leads on tram and delivery of other projects , particularly on governance issues. I will take forward the feasibility work on replacement EARL. And Janet and I are working on how we will manage that , ensuring we build in delivery expertise and pulling together various strands. I expect we will set out our proposals for this on Monday. Similarly We are working up next steps on Forth. I would envisage going back to Minister by end of next week with clear programme of work for summer. This needs to cover all things in statement, so roads as well. Frances Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld -----Original Message-----From: Adamson L (Lucy) To: Sharp DP (Damian); PS/Transport Scotland CC: Reeve W (Bill); Houston G (Guy); Morrissey J (Jerry); Duffy F (Frances); Spence M (Matthew); Ramsay J (John); Davis L (Lorna); Press Transport Scotland; Houston G (Guy) Sent: Thu Jun 28 13:00:58 2007 Subject: RE: Immediate - Edinburgh Trams - release of MUDFA We also need a programme of actions for over the summer to ensure this work is managed and carried out in time to meet Ministers' deadlines across the rail projects programme. Do you know who's taking this forward?

It would be helpful to get Ministerial sign off on the outline work programme remit asap so we're clear we're all going in the same direction and the right messages are being consistently presented to promoters/industry etc as well as internally.

----Original Message-----From: Sharp DP (Damian) Sent: 28 June 2007 10:14 To: PS/Transport Scotland Cc: Reeve W (Bill); Houston G (Guy); Morrissey J (Jerry); Duffy F (Frances); Spence M (Matthew); Ramsay J (John); Davis L (Lorna); Adamson L (Lucy); Press Transport Scotland Subject: Immediate - Edinburgh Trams - release of MUDFA Importance: High

Malcolm

Following last night's announcement tie are keen to press on with MUDFA work as any further delay will add to costs.

It seems to me that it is entirely consistent with last night's Ministerial statement that tie should be allowed to get on with planning and then implementing the MUDFA works.

To that end I think we should seek Ministerial cover for this along the lines of the text below to go in either your or Bill's name.

Damian

Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Climate Change

EDINBURGH TRAMS - UTILITIES DIVERSIONS

Purpose

1. To seek confirmation that you are content for tie ltd to proceed with utilities diversions necessary to manage the risk on the Trams project.

Timing

2. Immediate. Utilities works are on the critical path for the scheme and so delay will increase costs.

Background

3. During the review of alternatives to Edinburgh Tram you required tie ltd to suspend work on utilities diversions to prevent potentially abortive expenditure.

4. Following Mr Swinney's confirmation yesterday that Trams could go ahead provided it remained within affordable within existing committed funding, tie ltd propose to issue notices to affected property owners immediately to allow then to go ahead with planning for and then implementation of utilities diversion work. Work would start in July.

Conclusion

5. It is entirely consistent with sound financial and risk management for tie ltd to press ahead with utilities work that they know is required. This would be paid for out of existing grant offers.

6. I therefore recommend that you agree to tie ltd issuing notices to affected property holders and starting the programme of utilities diversions.