

### Comments on Neil Renilson`s witness statement

#### CERT (City of Edinburgh Rapid Transit) (paras14-18)

This was a proposal for a mostly segregated busway serving the Airport to City Centre route . The funding came from the the Scottish Executive via a complex PFI structure overseen by Partnerships UK. Prior to the bidding period I had a number of informal meetings with Lothian Buses emphasising our desire to see CERT as part of the City network and urging them to become involved. Lothian Buses were one of the tenderers but submitted a very poor non-compliant bid. Several other companies tendered and First Group were selected as preferred bidder. After some time in project development it became clear that they were going to face hostile reaction from Lothian Buses and withdrew.

Around the same time a group of development interests had commissioned a short study into the viability of a tram network that would serve the development areas in the west and north of Edinburgh and sought wider public and private sector support for the project. This coincided with the Councils own assessments of transport need against growth forecasts and led to the subsequent project development. This was not, as claimed due to the existence of a transport corridor from CERT but in the earlier phases was focussed on Leith and Granton and North Edinburgh.

I believe this was the genesis for the Wendy Alexander decision on making funding available. The involvement of an “arms length” body was less a dissatisfaction with CEC than the desire to see some form of private sector engagement and Partnerships UK was heavily involved at the start.

#### Comment re Tie Board members

These were selected after extensive open public advertisement making clear the nature of the projects Tie was expected to undertake. All were experienced in non-executive roles but no candidates with related construction backgrounds put themselves forward.

#### Comments on “agenda” (para 31)

I was not aware of any extensive recent unemployment amongst Tie staff or a fear of job loss. The issue that emerged seemed to be their ability to obtain alternative employment and move on.

I do not recognise any of the comments on myself or Keith Rimmer suppressing information.

#### Comments on CEC staff attitudes,(para 41)(para 106)

There were differences in salaries, a factor which was causing staff losses generally at that time. Where I felt it appropriate I agreed modest temporary enhancements in pay to recognise the additional workload and responsibilities. There were no recognisable grievances nor can I imagine staff voicing these to Mr Renilson.

In terms of wider animosities the Council staff promoted a large number of measures to improve bus travel. This included a city wide programme of Bus priority, complete replacement of all bus shelters, live bus information at all major stops, Bus recognition at traffic signals, improved disabled access at stops etc. Improving movement of buses was for a decade the principal activity of the CEC traffic section. This necessitated operational staff of both organisations developing good working relationships.

#### Comments on integration (para109)

An integrated network was seen as essential by CEC form the genesis of the project and it is inconceivable that any transport planner would see otherwise. I had wanted TEL set up at the initial stages of the project with clear oversight f integration and route development. Regrettably this did not happen, in part due to the negativity of Lothian Buses.

#### Comments on Architecture (para190)

The individual designer is Marini not Martini. His role was as an adviser on design. He had no role in prior approvals as set up prior to my departure but was concerned with design principles and was part of the preparation of the Tram Design Manual.

Comments on myself and staff (para 330 et seq)

As said above much of the workload of the Transport section of my department was made up of different forms of bus priority and passenger assistance and this had been a continuous feature. For example Barry Cross, who is cited as a "tram enthusiast" was the lead on the whole City bus priority programme for a considerable period and for 2-3 years this was a full-time project for him. I recall glowing tributes to him from LB management.

The remarks about myself I find offensive. The views attributed to Donald Anderson regarding myself are contrary to Para 9 in Mr Anderson's statement.

I have confined my brief remarks to where there are factual issues around my own or my staff's role. I do not endorse any other comments by Mr Renilson.

Andrew Holmes

27 November 2018