

Alan Dolan
Parsons Brinckerhoff,
Edinburgh Tram Network Project,
Citypoint,
65 Haymarket Terrace,
Edinburgh.
EH12 5HD

Our Ref: DEV-COR-81

Date: 7th March 2007

Dear Alan,

# Edinburgh Tram Network System Design Services (SDS): tie Utilities / Mudfa Programme

**tie** confirms receipt of your letter dated 28<sup>th</sup> February 2007, reference ULE90130-SW-LET-00482 regarding the **tie** programme fro Mudfa Implementation.

The content of your letter appears to overlook the key issue, which is that the SDS Utility designs have been issued considerably later than planned, primarily due to design delays and slippages from Halcrow, your sub-consultant. The impact of these delays has generated a necessity to review the overall Mudfa Programme, the prioritisation and the sequencing.

**tie** has requested SDS to prioritise the section 1A trial site. The trial site designs were issued to the SUCs on the 12<sup>th</sup> January and the request therefore is that SDS focus on incorporating the comments received from the Sac's onto the drawings and spreadsheets, for this area.

The Trial areas were due to start on the 19<sup>th</sup> March 2007, however due to the delays to the completion of the designs, this was not possible and the date was moved into April. The following sections were issued late to the SUCs, section 1A Issued 90 days late to SUCs and section 6 issued 10 days late to SUCs. Only section 3B was issued on time to the SUCs.

In addition it is necessary to consider reprioritising the design programme in part to deal with the impact of the initial SDS Utilities design delays and in part to provide continuity, improve efficiency and buildability for the Project.

### Cont'd/

# tie limited



#### Cont'd/

There are potential future developments which may impact on the designs and these are as follows:

Funding for Phase 1a is secured through the Business Case with Phase 1b following on thereafter subject to Ministerial Approvals and Affordability and therefore the Utility diversions associated with this may not be implemented until later in the programme, although the Utility diversion designs, at this stage, will still be required.

Your letter indicates that SDS believes that a 20 day period for SUCs approval is not sufficient, following communications between SDS/ tie and the SUCs. However, this 20 day approval period was generated by SDS in isolation from the SUCs and it was implied to the tie Utilities team that they were achievable. tie understands that it is only some of the SUCs who have indicated that they will not be able to achieve the 20 day approval period in some, but not all of the sections. BT is one of these SUCs, who has indicated that they require 40 days to approve certain sections, rather than the planned 20 days and SDS needs to identify the sections which will be affected. Furthermore tie understands that this is one of the utilities already subject to design delays.

It is a well known fact to all parties that the Utilities design is being developed in advance of and ahead of the Roads, Track and OLE Tram Designs. However this logic was agreed at the outset by all parties and is set out in the SDS Utilities Strategy.

In addition the SUCs, other than Scottish Water, are doing a substantial element of the detail design themselves and it is recognised that the alignment may change and impact on the utility diversions. However SDS could be more proactive and highlight the issues and risk areas to the SUCs and notify tie and the SUCs when the alignments do change, the impact on the Utilities and offer solutions rather than assuming that the SUC will pick this information up on the drawing. The SUCs are not dis-engaged and are actively co-operating and trying to find ways to overcome some of the initial SDS design delays in submission of the information to them to try to meet the overall programme. This inevitably has led to the need to re-sequence and reprioritise works.

It is a further concern that SDS has indicated that the Utility Designs are based on the pre-charette and pre- DAP Preliminary Design Roads design which was not the intention for detail design or issue of information to the SUCs. Particularly since the charettes were agreed between **tie** and SDS in the middle of October 2006.

The essence of the Utilities contract and the ongoing discussions between SDS, tie and AMIS are the pro-active partnering arrangements which are central to the part of the Mudfa contract.

## Cont'd /

tie limited



#### Cont'd /

The SDS P3e programme was issued to the SUCs and **tie** understands that the general comment was that the programme was not aligned with the Construction Programme which had been issued to them by AMIS. The alignment of the SDS design programme with the AMIS construction programme is the essence of the Utilities contract and the ongoing discussions between SDS, **tie** and AMIS are the proactive partnering arrangements which are central to the MUDFA contract.

To achieve the most economically efficient designs and buildability, SDS will need to undertake all necessary utility re-designs as set out in Schedule 1 of the SDS contract and the extent of utilities redesign due to Tram Design development is within SDSs control as the Tram Project Designer, responsible for achieving all Approvals and Consents for the Project.

Yours sincerely



Ailsa McGregor Project Manager Edinburgh Tram Project

CC: Tie- Susan Clark; John Low; Alan Hill, Mathew Crosse; David Crawley, John McAloon; Jim Cahill