
From: Jim McEwan
Sent: 10 March 2008 09:11
To: Steven Bell
Subject: FW: Change Instruction - review of SDS design

Steven

This wordy email seems to say that any change by BBS will take more time than may be available in the Programme, do we need to explore the possibility of a fast track approach by the CEC?

Jim

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

From: Chandler, Jason [mailto:ChandlerJ@pbworld.com]
Sent: 09 March 2008 16:32
To: Damian Sharp; Reynolds, Steve
Cc: Steven Bell; Geoff Gilbert; Jim McEwan; Atkins, Chris; Dolan, Alan; Jones, Carla
Subject: RE: Change Instruction - review of SDS design

Damian,

Thanks for the emails and updates of the various documents and I can assure you that we are ploughing through them in order to be able to best assist in the effort to get the outstanding issues resolved in order for us to be able to get the scheme contract docs for novation and appointment of the Infraco and Tramco contractors across the line.

As we all know a significant amount of progress has been made in recent times to align the contractors programme for construction, the scope splits, the SDS design programme for completion of the design and also to obtain the relevant approvals. As promised we are reviewing the summary put through by Tom on Thursday evening relating to programme issues and adding comments where appropriate.

One common thread in all of the documents currently on the table is the level of input and 'buy in' required from CEC. Some of the programme issues were put firmly into their court last week for them to advise on their ability to meet the constrained timescales for CEC review and general handling of the submissions whilst allowing for the statutory approvals for the general public consultations. The programme sessions also allowed us all to gain a clearer understanding of priorities for the review of the prior and technical approvals submissions to allow construction to commence in accordance with BBS's construction programme, although more work is required to finalise this. From the review of the documents so far it is clear that there are numerous areas where further clarification is required in order to secure a clear understanding from CEC as to the scope of the SDS design and the work to go to gain the various approvals. This includes:

*

From the review of the Civils proposal it is obvious that BBS are proposing that amendments be made to the design of several areas of the SDS design, particularly relating to the bridges. We must understand the exact nature of these changes in order to reprogramme the design and understand potential impacts on approvals, particularly where these have already been sought/gained.

*

Whilst we understand that most of these potential changes have already been discussed in outline with the SDS designers, the potential amendments must be taken to CEC for their review. This must be done to understand the risk of abortive design work and potential risk of failure to secure technical or prior approvals of the proposed amendments to the design.

*

The council must formally advise on their acceptance to reduce the timescales for technical and prior approvals that were discussed during the programme meetings last week.

*

Upon completion of the review of the Infracore offers and clarification of the amendments to the SDS design, formal instructions are required from tie for SDS to change the design to accord with the Infracore offer. These also have to be agreed with CEC and any other stakeholders potentially impacted.

*

A very clear understanding of exactly what tie's requirements are for the roads design relating to full depth reconstruction issue is required. This needs to be reviewed by SDS and the impacts on the SDS programme for completion of the design advised to tie. A fundamental part of this is the liaison with CEC and their acceptance of the pavement design and track/road interface.

SDS and tie have spent a considerable amount of time working through the informal and formal consultation process with CEC and this has been a success which is reflected in the securing of the technical and prior approvals to date. This has, however, been a very methodical process which has proven to be very time consuming. We are concerned that to fundamentally change the various designs at this stage will cause significant delay to the overall programme. Any potential changes to the design must be reviewed with CEC and an understanding of the amount of informal consultation required with CEC built into the SDS and Project Programme.

As well as the concerted effort that we are all making to develop a project programme that is constructable in the timescales and costs afforded, we will need to be reassured that CEC also accept the principles of the changes to the design being proposed by BBS before SDS will be in a position to fully commit to the next revision of the design programme. Given the amount of informal consultation already done to get the design to the stage at which it is at present and the length of time that this has taken this is of vital importance and the timescales should not be underestimated.

We will continue to work with you in achieving the common goal.

Regards,

Jason

From: Damian Sharp [mailto:Damian.Sharp@tie.ltd.uk]

Sent: Fri 07/03/2008 16:50

To: Reynolds, Steve

Cc: Chandler, Jason; Steven Bell; Geoff Gilbert; Jim McEwan; Atkins, Chris; Dolan, Alan

Subject: RE: Change Instruction - review of SDS design

Steve

I am about to leave the office for the weekend although I will be contactable throughout and will have the laptop with me.

I am just confirming that I understand you have everything you need to be reviewing the BBS Civils Proposal and the Employer's Requirements. Please confirm that this is so.

We have not concluded a Change Order because we have no estimate for the work needed by SDS but as set out below tie continues to accept the risk of SDS abortive work in the very unlikely event that we couldn't agree on the value of the Change Order.

Damian

From: Reynolds, Steve [mailto:ReynoldsS@pbworld.com]
Sent: 06 March 2008 07:39
To: Damian Sharp
Cc: Chandler, Jason; Steven Bell; Geoff Gilbert; Jim McEwan;
richard.walker@bilfinger.co.uk; flynn.michael@siemens.com; Atkins, Chris; Dolan, Alan
Subject: RE: Change Instruction - review of SDS design

Damian

Our emails crossed. I will call as proposed to review the position on alignment instructions. In advance of that call, and as set out in my earlier email any exercise to review the options for alignment with the BBS Offer is going to require better definition on the outstanding Civils aspects of the BBS Offer as we discussed yesterday. I look forward to receiving an update from tie on the finalisation of the BBS Civils Offer and the integration of the Trackform

Regards - Steve

From: Damian Sharp [mailto:Damian.Sharp@tie.ltd.uk]
Sent: 05 March 2008 21:11
To: Reynolds, Steve
Cc: Chandler, Jason; Steven Bell; Geoff Gilbert; Jim McEwan;
richard.walker@bilfinger.co.uk; flynn.michael@siemens.com
Subject: Change Instruction - review of SDS design

Steve

You were running for a plane after the meeting this afternoon and we agreed to speak as soon as possible - preferably first thing tomorrow morning.

In the meantime you need to get moving on the "review of the SDS design by reference to the Employer's Requirements and the Infracore Proposals". This review would identify the differences and would allow to instruct SDS to take account of the differences that are relevant to the SDS elements of the scope split. The review should highlight where differences are relevant to ongoing SDS design responsibilities.

I will get you a formal signed Change Order as soon as possible for this work. However, I need from you a price for doing the work and we don't have time for the normal process of change notice - estimate - order. So I propose that SDS should start the review immediately in parallel with producing an estimate. tie accepts the risk of SDS abortive work in the very unlikely event that we couldn't agree on the value of the Change Order.

Do you need any further information from me to undertake this review?

Please confirm that you are devoting the necessary SDS resource to the task and the timescale for completion.

Best wishes

Damian

Damian Sharp

Project Manager

tie Limited

Citypoint

65 Haymarket Terrace

Edinburgh EH12 5HD

Tel:



Fax:

www.transforedinburgh.com <<http://www.transforedinburgh.com/>>

www.tie.ltd.uk <<http://www.tie.ltd.uk/>>

size=2 width="100%" align=center>

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.