



**Tram Project – Minutes from Critical Issues Meeting**

**0900 Friday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2007**

**MacAdam Room**

**Present:**

|                   |    |                   |     |                    |    |
|-------------------|----|-------------------|-----|--------------------|----|
| David Crawley     | DC | Andy Conway       | AC  | Alan Dolan - SDS   | AD |
| Lindsay Murphy    | LM | Alastair Richards | AR  | Scott Ney - SDS    | SN |
| Gabrielle Bedwell | GB | Graeme Barclay    | GBA | Bruce Ennion - SDS | BE |
| Steven Bell       | SB | Susan Clark       | SC  | Kate Shudall - SDS | KS |
| Matthew Crosse    | MC | Keith Rimmer      | KR  | Jim Cahill         | JC |
| Ian Spence        | IS | Duncan Fraser     | DF  |                    |    |

Apologies  
Kirsty Wilson           KW                   Gavin Murray       GM

| 1     | Critical Design Locations  | Who   | When | Status |
|-------|--|-------|------|--------|
| 1.1   | <b>Forth Ports Section 1a</b>  |       |      |        |
|       | No issues here assuming outcomes of last weeks meeting hold. Head of terms are effectively agreed. LM to check with Barry Cross.   | LM    |      |        |
| 1.2   | <b>Section 1b</b>  |       |      |        |
| 1.2.1 | <b>Leith Walk footway reinstatement spec.</b>  |       |      |        |
|       | SN to go through drawings with AC. KR asked where CEC are on funding issue with streetscape works. AC stated that the money has been identified but just needs to be confirmed.  | SN/AC |      |        |
| 1.3   | <b>Section 1c</b>  |       |      |        |
| 1.3.1 | <b>Picardy Place</b>   |       |      |        |
|       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BT is critical, the proposed position will pose problems with the design. This will have a huge impact on the programme. SDS are scheduled to finish design at end of October, currently they are 1 week away from completion.</li> <li>- DC suggested a packaged statement on impacts.</li> <li>- DF will make a decision on basis of design. AD and DF to discuss further.</li> <li>- SB highlighted that cable diversions will be a challenge.</li> <li>- AC suggested sticking with current alignment as a solution.</li> <li>- AD to brief DF prior to meeting on Monday morning.</li> </ul> | AD/DF |      |        |

|       |   |                 |  |  |
|-------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| 1.3.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LM to provide GBA with drawing.</li> <li>- SC to instruct Tom Hickman to see how an increase in the programme in this area affects the entire programme.</li> <li>- AR stated for the record that TEL fundamentally opposes T-junction option.</li> <li>- LM to organise meeting for Wednesday.</li> </ul> | SC/TH<br><br>LM |  |  |
|       | <p><b>St Andrew Square</b></p> <p>KR stated he had still not seen the draft order for St. Andrew Square. Now in statutory consultation period for the order. Need order asap in order to prepare report.</p>  | SDS             |  |  |
| 1.4   | <b>Section 2</b>  |                 |  |  |
| 1.4.1 | No issues.  |                 |  |  |
| 1.5   | <b>Section 5a</b>   |                 |  |  |
| 1.5.1 | <p><b>SRU</b></p> <p>Going for the two stage process; move pitches then flood scheme follows. Craig Wallace says wasting an opportunity to do it all in one. DF has copied BC in on all correspondence. Meeting to be held next week</p>  | LM/BC           |  |  |
| 1.5.2 | <b>Balgreen</b>   |                 |  |  |
|       | No issues.  |                 |  |  |
| 1.6   | <b>Section 6</b>  |                 |  |  |
| 1.6.1 | <p><b>Depot</b></p> <p>GBA to provide topographical point of where they plan to start and finish. SDS will then be able to provide the fall. AD will be able to provide a date today of how quickly they can get the design done. AD stressed that allowance needs to be made for future development.</p>   | GBA/AD          |  |  |
| 1.7   | <b>Section 7</b>  |                 |  |  |
| 1.7.1 | Change order has now gone. Next Friday we will have an estimate.  |                 |  |  |
| 1.8   | <b>System Wide</b>  |                 |  |  |
| 1.8.1 | <p><b>Drainage</b></p> <p>AMIS still a risk.</p>  |                 |  |  |
| 1.8.2 | <p><b>Utilities</b></p> <p>Following submission of plate 44, SGN will not provide any further approvals due to commercial situation between SGN and tie. This may affect submissions for 9/11.</p>  |                 |  |  |
| 1.9   | <b>Other Design Issues</b>  |                 |  |  |
|       | 1. Network Rail have asked for CAT3 checks on some structures when previously it was agreed to do only a CAT2 check. Murrayfield stadium retaining wall is one of the structures and there may be another 3 to come. TG has been informed and RL is following up.   | TG/RL           |  |  |
|       | 2. Regarding the contaminated landfill site at Gogar<br>- a report and a letter have been sent to tie. LM/KS is setting up a meeting for next week.   | LM/KS           |  |  |
| 2     | <b>Critical Programme Impacts</b>   |                 |  |  |
| 2.1   | <b>MUDFA</b>  |                 |  |  |
|       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AD Distributed Schedules.</li> <li>- GBA agreed to use the SDS process noting that more effort had to be expended on reducing the final 3 week process element.</li> </ul>   |                 |  |  |

|            |   |               |  |  |
|------------|---|---------------|--|--|
|            | <p>- DF queried as to how this process would affect traffic management, GBA stated it would allow greater visibility and more time.</p> <p>-On section 7a, GBA will pass on a RATS proposal to AD early next week, AD can return it by the requested date of 29/10.</p> <p>-DF stressed that there is a difference between doing a link and a major junction. Need to look at the traffic management, the more planning that is done, the easier a difficult job will be.</p>                       | <b>GBA/AD</b> |  |  |
| <b>2.2</b> | <b>VE</b>   |               |  |  |
|            | <p>- Meeting was held yesterday with Jim McEwan. From that came the action to engage with preferred bidder as soon as there is one.</p> <p>- 30% of the Infracore bidder's costs are still provisional. MC asked if there was anything SDS could do to decrease this 30% and/or get to a fixed price.</p> <p>- Bidders costs are very different to SDS's, need to engage in discussions with bidders to find out why. GG to give AD numbers to do comparison prior to the meeting with bidders.</p> | <b>GG</b>     |  |  |
| <b>2.3</b> | <b>Not Discussed</b>  |               |  |  |
| <b>2.4</b> | <b>Deliverables Tracker</b>   |               |  |  |
|            | JC will issue tracker by Monday lunchtime.  | <b>JC</b>     |  |  |
| <b>2.5</b> | <b>Not Discussed.</b>   |               |  |  |
| <b>3</b>   | <b>AOB</b>  |               |  |  |
|            | <b>Risk Analysis and Control of Capex.</b>  |               |  |  |
|            | <p>Technical approvals show that only section 1b will be available prior to financial close. This leaves us exposed. DF is worried about changes which will escalate into claims from Infracore for areas not approved prior to financial close.</p> <p>SC suggested investigating into a fast track technical approval process.</p> <p>There will be a meeting to discuss.</p>   |               |  |  |
|            | <b>Betterment</b>   |               |  |  |
|            | <p>Paper has gone through board. MC suggests to issue a raft of change requests. As soon as the board signs off then we can move forward. Need to identify the areas and get the change requests to the board asap. Need an unambiguous way of measuring this. AC and KR to work on this change request.</p>  | <b>AC/KR</b>  |  |  |
|            |   |               |  |  |
|            | <b>Date of Next Meeting: Friday, 26<sup>th</sup> October 2007</b>   |               |  |  |
|            |   |               |  |  |
|            |   |               |  |  |

| <b>Plans or Drawings provided at Meeting</b> |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| <b>1</b>                                     | MUDFA IFC Drawing Production Schedule |
| <b>2</b>                                     | Depot Plans                           |
| <b>3</b>                                     |                                       |
| <b>4</b>                                     |                                       |