

Billy,

For info

Seamus

---

**From:** Chris Caves [<mailto:Chris.Caves@arup.com>]  
**Sent:** 07 June 2010 08:02  
**To:** [mic2410@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:mic2410@hotmail.co.uk); [peter.moore@translink.co.uk](mailto:peter.moore@translink.co.uk); Fay, Seamus  
**Cc:** O'Hare, Seamus; [Ruairi.Savage@Translink.co.uk](mailto:Ruairi.Savage@Translink.co.uk); David McShane  
**Subject:** Re: Track Renewals - Updated EA with Economist Comments Addressed

Peter

Noted. Please advise of Arup actions.

Regards

Chris

---

**From:** michelle thomson <[mic2410@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:mic2410@hotmail.co.uk)>  
**To:** [peter.moore@translink.co.uk](mailto:peter.moore@translink.co.uk) <[peter.moore@translink.co.uk](mailto:peter.moore@translink.co.uk)>; [seamus.fay@drdni.gov.uk](mailto:seamus.fay@drdni.gov.uk) <[seamus.fay@drdni.gov.uk](mailto:seamus.fay@drdni.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** [seamus.o'hare@drdni.gov.uk](mailto:seamus.o'hare@drdni.gov.uk) <[seamus.o'hare@drdni.gov.uk](mailto:seamus.o'hare@drdni.gov.uk)>; Chris Caves; [ruairi.savage@translink.co.uk](mailto:ruairi.savage@translink.co.uk) <[ruairi.savage@translink.co.uk](mailto:ruairi.savage@translink.co.uk)>; David McShane  
**Sent:** Sun Jun 06 19:25:04 2010  
**Subject:** RE: Track Renewals - Updated EA with Economist Comments Addressed

Peter/Seamus,

I have now had a look over the updated EA and while I feel that most of my comments have been addressed there are a few issues which I feel will need considered before submitting the EA to DFP for approval.

- In terms of the bridges I would remove any mention of the cost from the need section – it would be best to discuss this within the monetary costs and benefits section, particularly that surrounding why the bridge costs are so much more expensive when completed separately. Furthermore, because the EA states that the bridge replacement could range over 5-10 years and the essential maintenance over 3-7 years from the completion of the renewals project, then it would be useful if this scheduling is used to derive the options or, at the very least, either a suitable explanation is provided as to why this scheduling has not been taken forward or the impact of changing the scheduling is considered within the sensitivity analysis to determine if it impacts on option ranking.
- Care should be taken with the definition given to the new options as they do not 'exclude bridge works', but simply 'defers them' to be completed when necessary.
- In terms of the monetary costs and benefits section it is important that the following responses are included within the bulk of the EA:
  - How the effect on disruption to services is not included within the EA;
  - The phasing of the works is over a 4 year period;
  - That the maintenance costs of the new halt are assumed to be same as existing;
  - That Arup provided the capital costs for option 2 in terms of the full relay in year 12 and
  - Those justifying the allocations in terms of the % applied to preparation and supervision.
- Furthermore, I don't believe that the response in terms of why no residual value is provided within option 2 is correct. That is, because a full relay is included in year 12, and assuming

that the design life of the full relay would be a minimum of 30 years, then some residual value would be expected at the end of appraisal period.

- Finally, it is important that section 10 includes a budget statement phased over time and provides details that the project is included within the corporate plan and will be funded by the Department.

Happy to discuss further.

Thanks  
Michelle

---

Subject: FW: Track Renewals - Updated EA with Economist Comments Addressed  
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 2010 11:32:27 +0100  
From: [Peter.Moore@Translink.co.uk](mailto:Peter.Moore@Translink.co.uk)  
To: [mic2410@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:mic2410@hotmail.co.uk); [Seamus.Fay@drdni.gov.uk](mailto:Seamus.Fay@drdni.gov.uk);  
[Ruairi.Savage@Translink.co.uk](mailto:Ruairi.Savage@Translink.co.uk); [Chris.Caves@arup.com](mailto:Chris.Caves@arup.com); [David.McShane@arup.com](mailto:David.McShane@arup.com)

Attached is the latest draft from KPMG. I have yet to review it and will do so over the weekend. If anyone has any comments can I have them on Monday morning

Peter

---

**From:** O'Neill, Jacqui [<mailto:jacqui.oneill@kpmg.ie>]  
**Sent:** 04 June 2010 11:10  
**To:** Peter Moore  
**Cc:** Doherty, Kathryn  
**Subject:** Track Renewals - Updated EA with Economist Comments Addressed

Peter,

Please find attached the updated report (with track changes), the appendices and annotated comments.

Have a look through the attached and let me know if there are any issues/further changes you would like put through before the EA is re-submitted to the economist this afternoon.

Many thanks,  
*Kind Regards,*  
*Jacqui O'Neill*  
*Corporate Finance*  
KPMG  
Stokes House  
17-25 College Square East  
Belfast  
BT1 6DH

*Direct: +44 28 9089 3740*  
*Fax: +44 28 9089 3893*  
*E-Mail: [jacqui.oneill@kpmg.ie](mailto:jacqui.oneill@kpmg.ie)*

---

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.

For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

---

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.  
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

---

+ KPMG is Ireland's first professional services firm to become Carbon Neutral.

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

-----

Email Disclaimer

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. When addressed to our clients any opinions or advice contained in this email are subject to the terms and conditions expressed in the governing KPMG client engagement letter.

**Translink – Let's go together**

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

This email and any attachments are strictly confidential and intended solely for the addressee. They may contain information which is covered by legal, professional or other privilege. If you are not the intended addressee, you must not copy the email or the attachments, or use them for any purpose or disclose their contents to any other person. To do so may be unlawful. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender as soon as possible and delete the message and attachments from all places in you computer where they are stored.

Please be aware that email is not a secure form of communication. Messages sent via this medium may be subject to delays, non-delivery and unauthorized access. Although we have scanned this email and any attachments for viruses, it is your responsibility to secure that they are actually virus free.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

---

Get a new e-mail account with Hotmail – Free. [Sign-up now.](#)

---

Electronic mail messages entering and leaving Arup business systems are scanned for acceptability of content and viruses