
From: Jenny Dawe
Sent: 14 October 2010 07:35
To: Gordon Mackenzie; Jenny Dawe; Tom Aitchison
Subject: RE: Tram amendment

Gordon,

My view is we stick with our amendment and your own first gut reaction to Labour's amendment. i.e. We offer access to a fuller Business Case on a limited & confidential basis, as we did with ABM info. That is a concession far enough.

On the 2nd substantive part of Labour's amendment, I cannot accept a factually wrong amendment composited into ours. Labour are just playing silly b-----s on this. They "note", which is all that is asked for, which is fine. No-one is asked to "endorse", so why have the rest of their Clause 5?

We'll discuss later.

Jenny

Sent from my HTC Touch Diamond

-----Original Message-----

From: Gordon Mackenzie <gordon.mackenzie@edinburgh.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 October 2010 22:17
To: Jenny Dawe <Jenny.Dawe@edinburgh.gov.uk>; Tom Aitchison <Tom.Aitchison@edinburgh.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Tram amendment

Latest thinking

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew Burns
Sent: Wed 13/10/2010 21:58
To: Gordon Mackenzie
Subject: RE: Tram amendment

Gordon

I think the latter course of action might be the better part of valour in this case ;-)

If you were able to say that you're accepting the Labour Amendment as an Addendum to the Lib-Dem motion and that the two will simply be combined to form a composite position, then the Clerks can contact us afterwards ... although, to be honest, the easiest solution would be just to tell them to combine the two texts!

Andrew

Andrew Burns
Labour Councillor for Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart Ward Leader, Labour Group, City of Edinburgh Council

Tel: [REDACTED] (w) or: [REDACTED] (m)

From: Gordon Mackenzie
Sent: Wed 13/10/2010 9:20 PM
To: Andrew Burns
Cc: Jenny Dawe
Subject: RE: Tram amendment

I'm never clear what an addendum to an amendment leaves us in terms of the final decision - where there is a conflict, which element prevails (or is it better not to go into that and let the officers pick the bones out of it?)

G

-----Original Message-----
From: Andrew Burns
Sent: Wed 13/10/2010 21:09
To: Gordon Mackenzie
Subject: RE: Tram amendment

Gordon

Thanks for forwarding ... my gut reaction is that if you were able to simply accept our Amendment as an Addendum to a Lib-Dem Motion that was something along the lines of what you outline below; then we'd have a majority position and - as I mentioned verbally - we have no intention whatsoever of extending any debate unnecessarily and would have only a very few, to-the-point contributions to make ...

... please do let me know tomorrow morning if you feel this might be possible?

Many thanks.

Andrew

Andrew Burns
Labour Councillor for Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart Ward Leader, Labour Group, City of Edinburgh Council

Tel: [REDACTED] (w) or: [REDACTED] (m)

From: Gordon Mackenzie
Sent: Wed 13/10/2010 8:55 PM
To: Andrew Burns
Subject: RE: Tram amendment

Andrew,

the latest draft of our motion isn't in my mailbox. However I've amended an earlier draft to reflect the gist of what is now in it (it's not totally accurate).

Motion

To agree the recommendations in the report at 6.1 and add:

1. Agrees that the provision of information of commercially sensitive information on the current and future patronage and profits of Lothian Buses would represent an unnecessary risk to the company irrespective of whether or not there is a combined bus and tram operation in future.
2. Agrees that a more detailed account of the updated Business Case, including further options as requested, will be made available to all members for the Council meeting in December (or earlier if there is a Special Meeting) while protecting the commercial interests of LB but that (x) members of each political group would be provided with access to the full update for scrutiny, subject to written undertakings by those individuals that they will not disclose commercially sensitive detail to any other individual or organisation.
3. Notes that the report(s) to Council on 17th Dec 2009 referred specifically (Item 7.3a - para 2.20) to 'remuneration matters for TEL and all other arms-length Council owned companies' and that the decision that day (8) was to report '(on the remuneration matters for TEL and all arms length Council owned companies)'.
4. Council further notes that that the report before us today does not recommend any changes in remuneration.
5. Council reaffirms the undertaking given in the report, detailed above, that a report will provided on remuneration matters for Council owned arms length companies and agrees to instruct the Chief Executive to ensure that a report is provided to Council on remuneration matters at TEL before there is any change to remuneration for the C Exec or CCO positions at TEL.

Gordon

-----Original Message-----
From: Andrew Burns
Sent: Wed 13/10/2010 19:45
To: Gordon Mackenzie
Subject: RE: Tram amendment

OK - understand!

From: Gordon Mackenzie
Sent: Wed 13/10/2010 7:43 PM
To: Andrew Burns
Subject: RE: Tram amendment

Putting children to bed will phone soon.

-----Original Message-----
From: Andrew Burns
Sent: Wed 13/10/2010 19:27
To: Jenny Dawe; Gordon Mackenzie
Cc: Ian Perry
Subject: Tram amendment

Jenny/Gordon (c.c. Ian)

If at all possible, it would be extremely helpful to know what position you're likely to take on the tram report prior to 9am tomorrow morning?

Andrew

Andrew Burns
Labour Councillor for Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart Ward Leader, Labour Group, City of
Edinburgh Council

Tel: [REDACTED] (w) or: [REDACTED] (m)