
From: Shudall, Kate
Sent: 01 December 2006 09:56
To: Wilson, Paul (Edinburgh Tram); Ney, Scott; Jory, Anthony; Jones, Carla; Bloe, Jonathan; Stacy, Mungo; Clement, Gavin; Cox, Eleanor; Dolan, Alan; Chandler, Jason
Subject: FW: Roads Programme
Importance: High

FYI - I will hopefully meet Malcolm early next week, if anyone else needs to speak to him let me know.

Kate

From: Shudall, Kate
Sent: 01 December 2006 09:44
To: Bissett, Malcolm
Cc: Perry, Kevin; Dorrington, Kim (Edinburgh Tram)
Subject: Roads Programme
Importance: High



Delivery of Roads RE: urgent
MX model for... programme issue sec.

Malcolm,

As discussed last week at the IDR meeting I am concerned that Ian does not appear to have the resource available to complete all the tasks on the programme, as per the agreed protocol including the track/roads iteration process. See attached emails and text, highlighted in red below.

Can we meet ASAP to discuss the programme and how we take this forward.

I am also concerned that he is not aware how important the deliverables are for each section, track, stops, etc. He is not just working towards his roads deliverable date.

Can we meet Monday/Tuesday please to discuss this? I can come over to you - I have a meeting with Colin at 1pm on Tuesday at your office, maybe before or after that?

Thanks,

Kate

From: Astbury, Ian [<mailto:AstburyIH@halcrow.com>]
Sent: 01 December 2006 08:45
To: Gillespy, Mike
Cc: Stacy, Mungo; Shudall, Kate; Farrell, Timothy; Bissett, Malcolm; Cook, David
Subject: RE: South Gyle Broadway Junction - Vertical Differences

Mike, sorry you haven't been able to get hold of me I have been away from my home office since Monday, but I'm back today if you want to call me then. The purpose of the email from David Cook was simply to give you the earliest possible warning that we will (probably) require an adjustment to the vertical alignment of the eastbound track at South Gyle Broadway. This informal arrangement using emails has worked well with the Godalming alignment team, a prime example being Section 3A (Roseburn Corridor) track alignment which has undergone numerous iterations on an informal email basis. We would not have been able to fix this alignment by now if we had adopted a rigid approach. However we will now undertake the MX surface modelling of the new road surface you recommend below and get back to you. Having visited the location and knowing that the road has a constant crossfall and almost no longfall, I strongly suspect that the result of this will be a request to adjust the level of the track as per David Cook's previous email. I believe it is possible for the eastbound and westbound tracks to have slightly different vertical profiles, so you should be able to accommodate this request, but please correct me if I'm wrong.

FYI, we are finding working to the numerous Roads release dates in the programme (and the protocol) difficult. This requires Roads to undertake the several release stages. I understand that Malcolm Bissett and Tony Jory are in the process of agreeing a simplified arrangement.

Regards Ian

From: Gillespy, Mike [<mailto:gillespym@pbworld.com>]
Sent: 30 November 2006 12:29
To: Astbury, Ian
Cc: Stacy, Mungo; Shudall, Kate; Farrell, Timothy
Subject: RE: South Gyle Broadway Junction - Vertical Differences

Ian, I've tried to ring you about this but you were unavailable. David Cook's PDFs do illustrate the current relationship between the track design and the existing road's surface and so go some way to illustrate the Roads Team design task at this tram/road intersection. I should say that to get to this stage the track designers have already given a lot of thought to the relationship between the tracks and the road surface! To get the tracks within 150mm of the road surface in a long skew crossing such as this is in my experience pretty good! That said I'm not saying we could not tweak things further but you will appreciate that the track geometry has constraints in terms of gradients at tramstops, interaction between horizontal and vertical geometry, difference between track levels at stops etc which limit what we can do. I would suggest that we **ALL** try to work to our "Process for Integration of Track Alignment Design and Roads Alignment Design" and the Project Design Programme in order to resolve this issue, viz:- David needs to work up first pass Roads Vertical Design (ROV1) in MX and establish a roads design that ties in as far as possible with the PW2REV rail levels (ie the model you have) across the road. The skew angle here will make this a changing piece of work. From experience it is only when you have considered the road channel alignments for the entire length if the road effected by the rail crossing, considered the cross falls between these and the rail head levels and looked at tie-ing back to the existing road profile either side of the crossing that can really understand if the Rail and Roads levels are compatible or not. It is not necessarily simply a case of hugging the existing road profile with the track centrelines. Triangulating the combined channel and track model in MX will enable X-falls to be checked. If having done this it is still necessary to change the VA of the Inbound (Eastbound) track then we can look at the implications of this but the important thing is that any further refinements need to be made against the Roads design levels which are unlikely to be the same as the existing. The Integration Process provides for further refinement of the track alignment to agree with the Roads Vertical Design Model "ROV1" but to do this we need the Roads MX model. The Design Programme reflects this:- For Section 5C (including South Gyle Broadway) Activity Ref SDS 30310 "Roads 1st Pass Vertical Design" is due to finish 6/12/06 you will then issue us with an MX model and where necessary (and feasible) we will adjust the track design to match the roads model. We are due to complete Activity Ref SDS 30300 "Revise Alignment to Match Roads 1st Pass Vertical" on 12/12/06 but obviously this is dependent on us receiving the Roads MX Model in time. I'm sure we will find a solution here but we need to work to our programme and integration process to achieve this. Please feel free to ring me to discuss further if you require. Regards,

Mike Gillespy

Principal Engineer
Parsons Brinckerhoff
Manchester Technology Centre
Oxford Road
Manchester
M1 7ED
United Kingdom

Tel [REDACTED]
Fax [REDACTED]
Mob [REDACTED]

Confidentiality: This e-mail and its attachments are intended for the above named only and may be privileged and/or confidential. The contents may also be protected by copyright, design right or other intellectual property rights which are and shall remain the property of Parsons Brinckerhoff Limited.

Security Warning: Please note that this e-mail has been created in the knowledge that Internet e-mail is not a 100% secure communications medium. We advise that you understand and observe this lack of security when e-mailing us.

Viruses. Although we have taken steps to ensure that this e-mail and attachments are free from any virus, we advise that in keeping with good computing practice the recipient should ensure they are actually virus free and maintain up to date adequate virus-checking software. We accept no liability for any damage due to virus transmission or infection, however caused.

If you have received this e-mail in error we would be grateful if you could highlight the error to us.
This email is sent by either Parsons Brinckerhoff Limited, company number 2554514 or PB Limited, company number 656314 both companies registered in England and Wales having their registered office at Amber Court, William Armstrong Drive, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE4 7YQ.

From: Astbury, Ian [<mailto:AstburyIH@halcrow.com>]
Sent: 29 November 2006 19:03
To: Gillespy, Mike
Cc: Stacy, Mungo; Shudall, Kate; Farrell, Timothy
Subject: FW: South Gyle Broadway Junction - Vertical Differences

From:
Sent: 29 November 2006 17:46
To: (gillespym@pbworld.com)
Cc: Kate Shudall (shudallk@pbworld.com); Stacy, Mungo; Cook, David; FarrellT@pbworld.com
Subject: FW: South Gyle Broadway Junction - Vertical Differences

Mike

Can you respond to the below please.

Ian

From: Cook, David
Sent: 28 November 2006 08:42
To: Astbury, Ian
Subject: South Gyle Broadway Junction - Vertical Differences

Ian,

Please find attached the following pdf files:

South Gyle Broadway
South Gyle Broadway - Eastbound
South Gyle Broadway - Westbound

The attached pdf files show the junction in plan and longsection with the differences between track and existing road levels indicated.

The plan indicates the westbound track matches the existing road profile very well. Also attached is a long section, see westbound.pdf, this also indicates vertical differences between the track and carriageway levels, the maximum being 60mm.

The eastbound track shows a different picture. The track is below existing road level at approx CH.530599 (-133mm) and above existing road level at approx CH.530649 (+126mm). It appears to pivot about the central reserve, see eastbound.pdf. Could there be scope to adjust the eastbound track independantly of the westbound track to 'hug' the existing road profile?

Regards
David Cook
Senior Engineer

Halcrow Group Limited
Transportation business group
One Kingsway
Cardiff
CF10 3AN

Tel - [REDACTED]
Fax [REDACTED]

www.halcrow.com

<<South Gyle Broadway.PDF>> <<South Gyle Broadway - Eastbound.PDF>> <<South Gyle Broadway - Westbound.PDF>>

Visit our website at <http://www.halcrow.com>

The contents of this email are confidential, for the sole use of the intended recipient at the email address to which it has

been addressed and do not give rise to any binding legal obligation upon Halcrow companies unless subsequently confirmed on headed business notepaper sent by fax, letter or as an email attachment. Whilst reasonable care has been taken to avoid virus transmission, no responsibility for viruses is taken and it is your responsibility to carry out such checks as you feel appropriate. Emails supplied are as found and there's no guarantee that the messages contained within the body of the email have not been edited after receipt. If you receive this email in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete the message from your system.
Thank you.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.