
From: Ian Kendall [Ian.Kendall@tie.ltd.uk]
Sent: 07 April 2006 13:20
To: Fitchie, Andrew
Subject: FW:

This is e-mail 2 of 3.

From: Campbell, Bill [mailto:WWCampbell@LothianBuses.co.uk]
Sent: 06 April 2006 13:53
To: Ian Kendall; Renilson, Neil; Campbell, Bill; keith.rimmer@edinburgh.gov.uk
Cc: david_mackay@██████████ Willie Gallagher; Michael Howell; dorothy.gray@edinburgh.gov.uk; Graeme Bissett (external contact); Stewart McGarrity; ewan.kennedy@edinburgh.gov.uk
Subject: RE:

Ian

I understand what you are seeking to achieve, namely, to achieve a run time for tram which is consistent with the aspiration contained in the tram business case (which is a sub-set of the TEL business plan). As an "ideal world" goal, that is fine. However, the process must be different from what you have set out here. If I can paraphrase how you see the process which SDS has to work through, it is as follows:

1. *SDS are charged to do the best they can to achieve the lowest possible tram run time.*
2. *We hope this will deliver a tram run time which is actually less than that projected in the tram business case.*
3. *If SDS do indeed deliver a tram run time less than the aspiration in the tram business case, THEN they will ease off the measures taken to achieve this best possible tram run time in order to improve matters for buses and other road users, but only up to the point at which the tram run time equals the aspiration in the tram business case.*

This does not take account of the impact on the combined tram and bus network and is fundamentally flawed, since it would lead to a particular action which, say, had a saving of £5 to the tram being included, irrespective of that same action being a cost of £50 to bus (i.e. net -£45 to TEL as a whole). Instead, the process must work as follows:

- a) *SDS do the best they can to achieve the lowest possible tram run time, meeting the aspiration in the tram business case, and describe to TEL **at that stage** what impact doing this has on buses (and CEC's obligations re. impact on other traffic).*
- b) *If the proposal is satisfactory to TEL (and CEC), great – we are all happy.*
- c) *If it is not, SDS will be required to make alterations to their proposals to address what is unsatisfactory to TEL (and CEC).*
- d) *If SDS's revised proposals meet the tram run time aspiration and TEL's (and CEC's) requirements for the combined tram and bus network, great – we are all happy.*
- e) *If the revised proposal is not satisfactory to TEL and we are at a point at which SDS cannot deliver a proposal which both meets the run time aspiration for the tram business case and TEL's requirements for the combined tram and bus network – Houston, we have a problem. At that stage, TEL will have to decide to what extent and in what ways 'sacrifices' somewhere in the scheme of things are needed to produce a workable, less than optimal, solution.*

To give clear guidance to SDS at point (a) we need to set out the basic criteria in relation to the volumes of bus movements they need to cater for and TEL's ideal bus stop locations. (These "ideal" locations may, of course, have to be compromised in subsequent iterations.)

I appreciate that this requirement is more iterative than yours and may take a bit longer, but I don't see how we can avoid this if we are to get the right outcome overall – **the correct and workable answer is the objective, not an "on time" proposal that is unacceptable / impractical, and is what the proposal, as currently framed, could well result in.**

CEC01878067_0001

Bill

From: Ian Kendall [mailto:Ian.Kendall@tie.ltd.uk]
Sent: 05 April 2006 09:52
To: Renilson, Neil; Campbell, Bill; keith.rimmer@edinburgh.gov.uk
Cc: david_mackay@██████████ Willie Gallagher; Michael Howell; dorothy.gray@edinburgh.gov.uk; Graeme Bissett (external contact); Stewart McGarrity
Subject: FW:

Gents,

Bringing you on-line with my design process management if you would please review the attached letter in which I set out the basis for SDS preliminary design. This is a for the avoidance of doubt letter and explicitly re-handles capacity and track elevation issues.

I am not attempting to bounce anyone here so I will await your responses before sending.

Thanks.

Ian

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept by MIMESweeper for the presence of computer viruses.

www.mimesweeper.com

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 UK Freedom of Information and 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.