
From: Reynolds, Steve [ReynoldsS@pbworld.com]
Sent: 06 March 2008 07:25
To: Damian Sharp
Cc: Chandler, Jason; Atkins, Chris; Dolan, Alan
Subject: FW: Track Section - tie Employers Requirements v3.1
Attachments: Proposed revisions (25 Jan 08) to Track Alignment Criteria V2.doc

Importance: High

Damian

As discussed late yesterday I will call this morning - I should be able to do so around 1030 - to review the **tie** proposals for issuance of instructions re alignment to PB. This email from Matthew needs to be considered, clearly, in the wording of any instructions concerned with Employer's Requirements.

On the subject of alignment with the BBS Offer my view remains that until we have a definite offer from BBS re civils, notably Roads and the method of integration of the Trackform, it is going to be difficult to agree a position on what design changes would be required to achieve alignment. I firmly believe that more effort needs to be applied by **tie** to complete the clarification of BBS's proposals. As I suggested at our meeting yesterday the level of detail debate on fundamental components of the BBS proposal and the obvious absence of an agreed way forward gave me cause for concern. The alarm bells on tender clarification were sounding as long ago as late October last year immediately after declaration of BBS as the Preferred Bidder and many of the topics on yesterday's agenda should have been addressed much earlier. This is also of concern re programme definition since either of the two available options - SDS Changing the Design and BBS agreeing to build the SDS Design - may incur significant time requirements.

I look forward to discussing these topics later

Regards - Steve

From: Matthew Crosse [mailto:Matthew.Crosse@tie.ltd.uk]
Sent: 05 March 2008 15:32
To: Chandler, Jason
Cc: Reynolds, Steve; Ennion, Bruce; Dolan, Alan; Damian Sharp; Andy Steel - TSS; Roger Jones - Transdev; Steven Bell
Subject: RE: Track Section - tie Employers Requirements v3.1
Importance: High

Jason

As per my previous mail, we need to close out this Section 26 of the ERs ASAP – the last remaining Section.

As you suggest, we can easily make the ERs consistent with TAC v2, but your attached note (with track changes) and recent discussions suggests that we need to go further. Also, unless we do it, the new ER's to TAC v2 will still not be consistent with your current emerging design. Another complication noted is that the text at the top of your document is qualified with the following:

*Proposed revisions to the Track Alignment Criteria (ULE90130-SW-SPN-00001 V2) are highlighted below as 'tracked changes' (additions in **pale** green text; deletions in the right hand margin). **NB: IMPORTANT: THESE REVISIONS HAVE NOT BEEN CHECKED.***

This begs three questions:

- When to the changes get checked/ agreed and signed off?
- If your design is based on an issued TAC other than v2, if so which one?
- How should the ERs change to remain to remain consistent with SDS design, CAF vehicle DKE?
- What should we be saying to BBS and CAF when the ERs change? (i.e it is all no impact stuff)?

Please can we discuss soonest?

Matthew

tie Limited
Citypoint
65 Haymarket Terrace
Edinburgh EH12 5HD

Tel: +44 [REDACTED]
Fax: +44 [REDACTED]
Mob: +44 [REDACTED]
Email: matthew.crosse@tie.ltd.uk

www.tramsforedinburgh.com
www.tie.ltd.uk

From: Chandler, Jason [mailto:ChandlerJ@pbworld.com]
Sent: 30 January 2008 18:18
To: Matthew Crosse
Cc: Reynolds, Steve; Ennion, Bruce; Dolan, Alan
Subject: Track Section - tie Employers Requirements v3.1
Importance: High

Matthew,

We have reviewed the track section of the Ers v 3.1.

The main issue that we have identified is that the ER update is based upon V1 of the SDS issue of the Track Alignment Criteria document which was superseded 21 Feb 2007. This has resulted in numerous misalignments between the SDS design criteria and the Ers v 3.1.

Rather than list the differences between V1 and V2, which essentially are the discrepancies between the Employer's Reqts and the currently issued TAC, it would seem more appropriate to suggest that the Ers be amended to reflect V2 of the SDS Track Alignment Criteria.

In respect of the proposed re-publication of the TAC, this is subject to further development in respect of aligning it with SDS's clear understanding of the vehicle to ensure compatibility of the TramCo vehicle with the alignment design. SDS are preparing a further update of the track alignment criteria report and ideally we would prefer the content of this to be incorporated into the Ers, realising however that the ER document is needed to be issued before the revised TAC will be published, we have tried to assist you by producing an extract version with 'tracked changes' indicating the proposed revisions to the TAC V2, and attach a copy of the same below.

<<Proposed revisions (25 Jan 08) to Track Alignment Criteria V2.doc>>
I hope that this is of assistance and if you require any further clarification please let me know.

Regards

Jason

SDS Project Manager Edinburgh Tram

PB
Citypoint
1st Floor
65 Haymarket Terrace
Edinburgh
Midlothian
EH12 5HD

 email: chandlerj@pbworld.com
 tel: 
 tel: 
 fax: 

The information transmitted is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail please notify the sender immediately at the email address above, and then delete it.

E-mails sent to and by our staff are monitored for operational and lawful business purposes including assessing compliance with our company rules and system performance. TIE reserves the right to monitor emails sent to or from addresses under its control.

No liability is accepted for any harm that may be caused to your systems or data by this e-mail. It is the recipient's responsibility to scan this e-mail and any attachments for computer viruses.

Senders and recipients of e-mail should be aware that under Scottish Freedom of Information legislation and the Data Protection legislation these contents may have to be disclosed to third parties in response to a request.

tie Limited registered in Scotland No. SC230949. Registered office - City Chambers, High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1YT.

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.