

---

**From:** Fiona Dunn  
**Sent:** 08 August 2011 09:41  
**To:** Graeme McGinty  
**Subject:** FW: On Street price: Initial review of scope of Infraco enquiry versus tie / CEC Budget & Update on Siemens Pricing  
**Attachments:** 110805 Summary of On Street Quants Difference.xlsx; Siemens price

FYI

---

**From:** Steven Bell  
**Sent:** 05 August 2011 16:54  
**To:** Findlay, John  
**Cc:** Alan Coyle; [csmith@hg-group.co.uk](mailto:csmith@hg-group.co.uk); Willins, Keith; Abel, Ken; Jones, Gareth; Dennis Murray; Fiona Dunn  
**Subject:** On Street price: Initial review of scope of Infraco enquiry versus tie / CEC Budget & Update on Siemens Pricing

**Commercially Confidential and FOI(S)A Exempt**

John

I promised a follow up on the initial analysis of any scope differences between the budget assumptions which support the £22.5m and the prices proposed by Infraco.

**Civils Pricing**

There are two main points to highlight

1. Quantity Issues

BB have asked their sub contractor to assume the worst case scenario with regards to the roads CBR and indicated this may include 700mm of capping below the road make up. In their preparation **tie** / Cost consultant (C S or GHP) assumed a mid point across all the roads on the assumption that some will be higher some lower. This corresponds to type 7 (e.g. Road Type E7). Additional cost estimate from this "worst case" scenario ~ £4m at market rates.

BB measure includes approximately 1500m of additional kerb over and above that measured by **tie** / Cost consultant (C S or GHP). Additional Cost estimate from this additional quantum ~ £360k.

BB measure includes approximately 2000m<sup>2</sup> of additional pavement over and above that measured by **tie** / Cost consultant (C S or GHP). Additional Cost estimate from this additional quantum ~ £200k.

2. Clarification notes

BB Enquiry Clarification Nr.8 states that although it may be possible to reuse various kerbs, paving slabs and setts it should be assumed that this is not the case and that allowance should be made for new materials in all instances. This is however not reflected within the BoQ as there are items for lifting, laying aside and reusing kerbs, slabs and setts.

There will be a reduced cost from avoiding the re-handling costs but additional materials costs associated with new materials if new materials are to be utilised. There may be a discrepancy in the scope comparison £2m to £2.5m depending on the exact quantities involved.

BB Enquiry Clarification Nr.1 contains the comment *"Please note that in respect of Detail 8 "Existing Pavement Retained" it is assumed that the pavement is replaced using the same construction detail as the adjacent details."*

This appears to indicate that existing pavement surfaces are to be replaced in their entirety but the quantities within the BoQ do not appear to reflect this. It has therefore been assumed within the above comparison that no replacement of existing pavement is being carried out. Existing pavement within this section is approx 4,600m<sup>2</sup>.

The clarifications will need to be read very carefully in conjunction with whatever pricing assumptions are agreed by CEC with Infracore as we discussed at length on Wednesday.

### **Systems Pricing**

Please see attached email from Fiona Dunn. In summary as per my note earlier today, still quite a few million (£4m or £5m) to come off the submission. Siemens have undertaken to close out the original questions we asked last week by Monday evening. Traffic signals issues still to be bottomed out.

Please call if you need any further clarification.

Regards

Steven

**Steven Bell**  
*Project Director*

**Edinburgh Trams**  
*Citypoint*  
*65 Haymarket Terrace*  
*Edinburgh*  
*EH12 5HD*

Tel: (+44) [REDACTED]  
Mobile: [REDACTED]  
Email: [steven.bell@tie.ltd.uk](mailto:steven.bell@tie.ltd.uk)

Find us online (click below):



***Moving the capital to a greener future***