

Cooper A (Andrew) (TRANS)

From: Gair C (Cameron)
Sent: 10 September 2010 11:20
To: Stewart L (Lesley)
Cc: Valentine WH (Bill); McAllister J (Jackie); Duffy F (Frances); [REDACTED]
Fairweather S (Sharon); [REDACTED]
Subject: TRBBJ and FETA Spending Review Templates - CG Comments - 10 September 2010
Attachments: TRBBJ - evidence base programme template for capital programme of spending review - 23 July 2010#2.doc; FETA - evidence base programme template for capital programme of spending review 2010 - 23 July 2010#2.doc
Importance: High

Lesley,

Another point that should be considered in the CSR regarding FETA which I didn't mention during our meeting. If the FRC opens in 2016, then it may be worth asking FETA to review their spending profile as a result of this, assuming they haven't done so already. There may be some schemes that could be delayed until 2016 or dropped altogether, if the existing crossing is only carrying public transport. After 2016 maintenance of parts of the existing crossing will be much simpler and less expensive – daytime contraflow should be possible instead of overnight working. For example the Tower Wind Barriers/ Impact Strengthening should be reviewed in terms of the justification for the Scheme after 2016 if the new crossing is opened; the short/ medium term risks to the structure; and whether other mitigation measures can be provided in the intervening period.

Regards

Cameron

Cameron B Gair

*Bridges Asset Manager
Transport Scotland,
Trunk Roads: Network Management, Concessionary Travel and Integrated Ticketing Directorate
Buchanan House,
58 Port Dundas Road,
Glasgow, G4 0HF*



Strike it Out: [preventing bridge strikes](#)

From: Gair C (Cameron)
Sent: 09 September 2010 14:34

To: Stewart L (Lesley)

Cc: Valentine WH (Bill); McAllister J (Jackie); Duffy F (Frances); [REDACTED] Fairweather S (Sharon); [REDACTED]

Subject: TRBJB and FETA Spending Review Templates - CG Comments - 9 September 2010

Importance: High

Lesley,

As discussed yesterday neither Bill nor I could recommend further savings from the proposed programmes of works, as we do not have detailed knowledge of the structures or the particular programmes of work (*Essentially whoever is setting the budget has to sign up that budget and the risks associated with it.*) However I did suggest some areas where FETA & TRBJB could be asked to explore further.

In the case of FETA you could ask them to review the implications of the following: -

- Delaying the Tower Wind Barriers (*£1.5M?? in 2014/15*) until 2015/16 or later.
- Delaying the Suspended Span Painting (*£6M in 2014/15*) to 2015/16
- Delaying the Resurfacing to the Main Span South (*£2.5M in 2013/14*) until 2015/16

Separating and delaying the Tower Wind Barriers from the Tower Impact Barrier (*which is essential to protect the Towers from possible damage due to HGV's*) would appear possible. FETA has already hinted that the Suspended Span Painting could be delayed in their submission. Delaying the Resurfacing to the Main Span South would likely lead to more pot-holing and the potential development of further cracking of the deck plates leading to more costly repairs, and is probably the least preferred of the 3 schemes to be subject to delay (*a one year delay rather than two years may be more acceptable to the Board*).

In the case of TRBJB there would be appear little scope for further savings (*other than possibly delaying Carriageway Resurfacing in 2014/15 - £0.75M which would again likely lead to more pot-holing and traffic disruption*), as most of the costs are associated with the Pier Collision Protection. Jacobs have carried out a risk assessment together with a cost benefit analysis and a design developed (*taking into account the maximum tolerable risk*) to protect piers 31 to 33 against the risk of collision loading from shipping of a certain size. This is similar to the approach adopted by the FRC Team. Now that the risk is known, the work should be carried out within a reasonable timescale. I would suggest that delaying the work for 4 years would be unacceptable – at best you might ask them to review delaying the work for 6 months but you should bear in mind that any delay leaves the bridge vulnerable to impact collision from shipping which could lead to catastrophic collapse of several spans with serious traffic disruption and loss of life (*therefore I wouldn't suggest any delay*).

As Bill alluded to previously both FETA & TRBJB should probably review their management structures and practices e.g. double-time working on Sundays, etc. I understand you may be carrying out a review of your own, and I indicated some thoughts of my own yesterday's meeting. Therefore it would be worthwhile speaking to Bill and me during this review process. Bill is returning from leave next week, and we could speak further on this subject or the CSR if you wish.

Regards

Cameron

Cameron B Gair

Bridges Asset Manager

Transport Scotland,

Trunk Roads: Network Management, Concessionary Travel and Integrated Ticketing Directorate

Buchanan House,

58 Port Dundas Road,

Glasgow, G4 0HF



Strike it Out: [preventing bridge strikes](#)

From: Stewart L (Lesley)
Sent: 09 September 2010 10:26
To: Gair C (Cameron)
Cc: Valentine WH (Bill); McAllister J (Jackie); Duffy F (Frances); [REDACTED] Fairweather S (Sharon)
Subject: FW: TRBJB and FETA Spending Review Templates

Cameron

We met to discuss these templates yesterday following a request for advice from Sharon Fairweather on any scope for reduction in the capital programme across both bridges. At our meeting yesterday we discussed these in detail and you agreed to provide your views on this.

I attach the SR2010 capital submissions that have gone forward for FETA and Tay.

Many thanks and best regards

Lesley

Lesley Stewart
Trunk Roads Policy Manager
Strategy & Investment



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 July 2010 17:06
To: Fairweather S (Sharon)
Cc: Duffy F (Frances); Valentine WH (Bill); Stewart L (Lesley)
Subject: TRBJB and FETA Spending Review Templates

Sharon,
I attach the Tay Road Bridge Joint Board comprehensive spending review template. (This means we have not had to resort to the extension we initially thought would be required.) I also attach a slightly updated version of the FETA material.



