

## Supplementary questions

Alan Coyle

8 August 2017

### ***Final costs - breakdown***

In the Turner & Townsend Infraco cost report (WED00000092\_3), the Infraco costs are split into the Off Street and On Street sections. Costs for the section between Newhaven Road and Haymarket appear in both (£82m in the off street section, and £29m in the on street section).

1) Can you explain why? I cannot recall

In that cost report (again at page 3), the total for Infraco preliminaries is approximately £182m (£160m for the off street, and £22m for the on street).

The figure for Infraco construction preliminaries in schedule part 5 of the Infraco contract (milestones, USB00000073) appears to be £96.3m, including a £45.2m mobilisation payment (see, e.g., page 3).

2) Is our understanding correct? yes

3) What accounts for the difference between the preliminaries figures (i.e., between those originally provided for in the Infraco contract, and those actually incurred)? Primarily prolongation

The costs per section appear to have changed as follows:

<b>Section</b>	<b><i>Infraco schedule part 5 USB00000073 (page references in brackets)</i></b>	<b><i>T&amp;T final cost report WED00000092_3</i></b>
Newhaven Road to Haymarket	£38.3m (_7)	£112m (Off Street element: £82.8m; On Street element: £29.7m)
Haymarket corridor	£5.5m (_48)	£8.8m
Roseburn junction to Gogar	£50.1m (_51)	£84m
Depot	£12.9m (_79)	£20.4m
Gogar to	£11.1m (_83)	£15.4m

Edinburgh Airport		
<p>4) Do you agree? I cannot recall</p> <p>5) In overview, what accounts for the differences? This would likely be design change and prolongation costs</p>		
<p>6) Is it possible to identify, within the final outturn cost for the Infraco contract, amounts which represent:</p> <p>a) The cost of delay, compared to the original Infraco programme; not from the above table</p> <p>b) The cost of change, compared to the original Base Date Design Information. not from the above table</p> <p>7) If so, please provide figures and explain how they have been calculated.</p>		
<p>An estimate report circulated by Turner &amp; Townsend dated 17 January 2013 contained a “probable cost” estimate for the extension of the tram line from York Place to the Foot of the Walk, Ocean Terminal and Newhaven (CEC01930374). The cost of the utility diversions was estimated at £25.1m all the way to Newhaven (paragraph 3.1).</p> <p>8) What is your understanding of the extent of utility diversion work still required in that section? i cannot comment</p> <p>9) Does this report give an indication of the extent to which utility diversion work under the MUDFA contract was not completed? i cannot comment</p>		

