

---

**From:** johncasserly [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 07 August 2009 08:37  
**To:** John Casserly  
**Subject:** Fwd: Brief notes On potential transfer of works from CUS to Infraco

-----Original Message-----

**From:** johncasserly [REDACTED]  
**To:** [susan.clark@tie.ltd.uk](mailto:susan.clark@tie.ltd.uk)  
**CC:** [michael.blake@tie.ltd.uk](mailto:michael.blake@tie.ltd.uk); [Graeme.barclay@tie.ltd.uk](mailto:Graeme.barclay@tie.ltd.uk)  
**Sent:** Fri, 7 Aug 2009 8:36  
**Subject:** Brief notes On potential transfer of works from CUS to Infraco

Susan

Further to our discussion re the options with CUS we have had a quick review as an update to the paper produced previously and the following are my current brief thoughts/notes on the issue:

- In addition to Section 1 at Ocean terminal and the remaining side entry manholes, which have already been removed from CUS, we are still of the opinion that the works at Baltic Street and Piccardy/Broughton/York Place are the 2 sections that best suits removing CUS and awarding to another Contractor. The remaining works at Haymarket are considered a viable option as stated in the option paper previously issued.
- Baltic Street – we await the revised design solution for these works which is currently with SDS but we have not received any programme information for delivery dates, due to the programme etc this will be carried out under Infraco by the Contractor appointed for Section 1 or another Infraco Contractor.
- Piccardy/Broughton/York – the IFC design cannot be installed due to a number of unexpected utilities combined with the presence of an existing sewer, little or no space left for utilities and other issues such as the cellars at Conan Doyle pub. The issues regarding the design have resulted in reduced productivity to date by CUS and the majority of the time spent to date carrying out investigative trial holes/route proving etc with a view to TQ's finalising the design rather than waiting for revised IFC's. The issues with changing the delivery Contractor from CUS and delivering under Infraco are as follows:
  1. No Contractor has been appointed yet by Infraco for section 1 and the tender documentation has only just been issued for Section 1 which may result in a period of circa 8 weeks before an alternative contractor is appointed as part of a formal tender submission. In light of the programme implications of waiting for an alternative Contractor to be appointed we consider that the works available be progressed by CUS and tie utilise CUS to ensure as much information/trial holes/investigation etc is carried out for the areas where the IFC design is unachievable to ensure we have proven utility diversions in which we have confidence they can be achieved and the delivery can be undertaken by others under Infraco. The main areas of concern are the water main, gas and 24 way BT crossings over the top of the existing sewer in Elder street – we are arranging a team review meeting on Monday 10/8/09 in conjunction with Infraco representatives to access the best options and the optimum solution in terms of both design, programme and timing for transfer to Infraco.

2. We need to ensure we select an appropriate cut off point for CUS which will have minimum impact on the programme and progress of the works and also reduced or removes as many contractual liability issues as possible.
3. It is imperative that we make the right decision at the right time as it is apparent that CUS are using this area and the issues associated with the utility diversion design etc as a major cause for delay to completion of their works and are not proactive in addressing and assisting in the resolution of the issues encountered to complete the works resulting in potential delays to the current MUDFA completion date of November 2009 which is predicated upon CUS providing a programme for the area by Friday 7/8/09 which maintains the current completion date – I am expecting a programme showing more slippage in the area which is heavily caveated and of little or no practical use, which we will review and challenge.
4. The key factor in the transfer is when Infracore will have a contractor in place who can carry out the works and this will be dependant upon whether an existing Infracore Contractor can take over the works or if we need to wait for a contractor to be appointed as the result of a tender process – this will be discussed and reviewed as part of the meeting on Monday 10/8/09.



Regards

John

John Casserly  
Commercial Manager - MUDFA

**tie** Limited  
MUDFA  
Western Harbour

= A  
Leith Docks  
Edinburgh, EH6 6QF

Tel: [REDACTED]  
Fax: [REDACTED]  
Mob: [REDACTED]  
Email: [john.casserly@tie.ltd.uk](mailto:john.casserly@tie.ltd.uk)

For more information on the Edinburgh Tram Project, visit [www.edinburghtrams.com](http://www.edinburghtrams.com)  
[www.tie.ltd.uk](http://www.tie.ltd.uk)