

completed the M80 Cumbernauld to Hogganfield link ahead of programme while the City Council have not managed a project of this size in living memory.

We are particularly interested in:• How you found out about what was happening, and how informed you were throughout the project• What did you think would happen• What actually happened• What were the effects if any, on you (or your organisation) at the time of the project• What if any, were the on-going or longer-term effects on you (or your organisation). Please write your evidence here.

We are particularly interested in:

I am a Chartered Civil Engineer (FICE) My particular comments in respect of the contractor are that they were a member of the successful venture which completed the M80 Cumbernauld to Hogganfield link ahead of programme while the City Council have not managed a project of this size in living memory.

Looking at the works in the Princes Street to Haymarket section they were clearly being carried out by subcontractors with little main contractor input. The work was piecemeal, partly because the City Council foolishly ordered the contractor to change its sequence of working (e.g in respect of Princes Street at Christmas) at the expense of its citizens but also because of inadequate traffic planning and diversions and the release of small sections to the contractor. The formwork used for the concrete track bed was rough timber and plywood when one would have expected system formwork, concrete was transported and placed from an excavator bucket, a technique forbidden in most contracts because it engenders poor results. Poor concrete curing methods. No attempt to duct services for future ease of maintenance. No night or weekend working despite the fact that there are few residents on much of the route. Such working is the norm on most rapid transit projects as it minimises the disruption to citizens and businesses and on balance reduces the contractor's overheads. I am not aware who made the decision not to work extended hours. Failure to install 21st century road drainage systems of in kerb gullies rather than in road gullies which are always subject to early failure.

In broad terms the near £ Billion could have been better spent. It is an unnecessary vanity project in a city which already has a good bus service which could be cheaply improved by 100% smart ticketing and allowing passengers to board and alight simultaneously. These simple steps would more than halve dwell time at bus stops and eliminate the queuing of buses at princes Street Bus Stops. Edinburgh still lacks a transport interchange. If we had to have trams then the bus station should have been moved to Waverley, either on the station roof even if that needed an act of Parliament or off Market Street and the tams should have gone down Leith Street - other traffic could have had to diversion round St Andrew Square. That would have allowed a tram stop at the newly mechanised Waverley Steps

The City Council should have employed one of the many, hands on, hard bitten, Scottish, at least 50 year old civil engineers with rapid transit experience in Hong Kong, Singapore, Taiwan, Dubai etc to be its main person dealing with the contractor and should not have written its own contract because such a contract has no precedent and invariably leads to dispute.

Do you have any documents which you think it would be useful for the Inquiry to see?

No

Details of documents:

Upload documents:

No file was uploaded

Are you content for the Edinburgh Tram Inquiry team to contact you again in relation to this evidence?*

Yes