
From: Geoff Gilbert
Sent: 23 October 2006 15:10
To: Bob Dawson
Subject: FW: Edinburgh Tram Network - 14 point commentary on tender documents (technical) to date.

Response on the 14 issues mentioned in our meeting.

Geoff Gilbert - Project Commercial Director
TRAM Project

tie limited
Verity House
19 Haymarket Yards
Edinburgh
EH12 5BH

tel [REDACTED]
mo [REDACTED]

From: Roland Halliday [mailto:Roland.Halliday@bilfinger.de]
Sent: 23 October 2006 14:58
To: Geoff Gilbert
Cc: Richard Walker; Gary Dalton; Scott McFadzen
Subject: Re: Edinburgh Tram Network - 14 point commentary on tender documents (technical) to date.

FAO: Geoff Gilbert
TIE Ltd

Dear Sir

EDINBURGH TRAM NETWORK

Gary Dalton, our Commercial Director, has asked me to set out and e-mail the 14 points mentioned to you in relation to our initial inspection of the Technical Tender Documentation for the Edinburgh Tram Network.

Please find the 14 points set out below:

1. It would appear that a substantial proportion of the "Planning Requirements", related to the required Planning Permissions, have not yet been established. These will not be finalised until a date beyond the tender date in the documents. Such requirements may have a significant influence on the final design.
2. By the same token, 3rd Parties also still have a significant "say" in the scheme and, again, could appreciably influence the final design.
3. On a preliminary inspection of the documents, the conceptual design seems reasonably valid.
4. The supplied drawings and documents reflect a very early stage design, for instance the individual structures drawings are almost exclusively a single drawing to "Approval In Principle" requirements only.
5. Point 4 raises valid questions as to whether the design, reflected in the drawings supplied thus far, is sufficiently advanced to enable a robust and credible price to be prepared.
6. Whilst recognising that there are further drawings to be issued, there are definite and significant gaps in the supplied drawings, in that a major proportion of the structures listed in the employer's requirements have no drawing/s

at all. Furthermore there are inferred omissions from the drawings, evidenced by the fact that some of the series of drawings are incomplete, e.g. we may have say drawings 1 to 6 of 24 and 8 to 14 of 24 but no more than that. Even further, if a complete series of drawings has not been listed nor supplied we do not know of it's existence. A list of inconsistencies between the hard copy drawings supplied, the electronically supplied drawings and the tender drawing schedule is being prepared.

7. Our inspection of the supplied drawings has failed to find any details of the proposed track bed/slab.

8. The drawings, as a whole, though appropriate in quantity and presentation do not, under closer inspection, contain the level of information they appear to.

9. We should, via the Client, seek an indication from the Client's designers as to the current status of the design.

10. From all our experiences there are some questionable proposals relating particularly to bridges. For instance drawings ULE90130-05-BRG-00281 and 00341 show ballasted construction on existing bridge decks. We know, from experience, that increasing the load on an existing bridge, by even a very small amount, can require the strengthening of the bridge, in many cases significantly. In fairness, note 5 on both of the drawings recognises this but in the absence of any information how do we price for it?

11. Further issues arise, in that the majority of the structures proposals do not seem to sufficiently recognise containment issues. The existing structures may need extensive modification to comply with containment requirements and these modifications are not apparent on the drawings. Also, new structures may need considerably modified containment provisions from those shown on the drawings, which are seemingly based upon the containment requirements of road bridges.

12. With regards to the Programme/s required to be submitted with the tender. The limited tender period available to us, in itself, dictates the level of detail that can be incorporated into the programme. We will only be able to submit a programme(s) in such detail as the information and the time available allows.

13. In order to facilitate as detailed a programme as possible we propose submitting our programme using "Suretrack" programming software. Whilst recognising the request for a P3E programme, "Suretrack" offers us the best opportunity to submit as comprehensive a programme as possible. At a later stage "Suretrack" can be quickly and easily converted to a P3E programme.

14. The "deliverables" listed for return with the tender are formidable both in number and content. At this stage we have concerns that there may be insufficient time available to complete them all, particularly as some of them are dependant upon other relevant work being completed up to a certain stage, thus informing the preparation of the "deliverable".

Please note these points were intended as internal comments and are written as such. They reflect some of our concerns, following an initial appraisal of the main technical documents and do not purport to be exhaustive.

I trust this is satisfactory for your requirements.

Best regards

Roland Halliday
Chief Estimator
Bilfinger Berger UK Limited Civil
3000 Manchester Business Park
Aviator Way
Manchester
M22 5TG
United Kingdom
Tel. +44 [REDACTED]
Direct Line Tel. +44 [REDACTED]
Fax +44 (0)161 266 1448
Registered Office: 150 Aldersgate Street, London EC1A 4EJ
Registered in England & Wales No. 2418086