

**Note of Meeting**

**Joint Project Forum**

**Edinburgh, 21 March 2012**

**Present:-** Sue Bruce (in the Chair), Lucy Adamson (Transport Scotland), Dave Anderson (CEC), Alfred Brandenburger (Siemens), Alan Coyle (CEC) Ian Craig (Lothian Buses), Vic Emery (CEC), Martin Foerder (Bilfinger Berger), Richard Garner (CAF), Neil Gibson (Big Partnership), Alastair Maclean (CEC), Kelly Murphy (CEC), Colin Smith (CEC), David Steele (CAF), Mark Turley (CEC) and Chris Walton (Lothian Buses)

**Also Present:-** Gavin King (CEC).

| Item No | Subject   | Action Owner |
|---------|---|--------------|
| 1       | <p><b>Previous Minute – 22 February 2012</b></p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>To approve the minute of 22 February 2012 as a correct Record.</p>   |              |
| 2       | <p><b>Consolidate Project Update Highlight Report - Key Points of Progress</b></p>  |              |
| 2.1     | <p><b>Consents and Approvals</b></p> <p>Colin Smith outlined progress on the actions agreed at the previous two meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The action to provide employment numbers for the Project was still outstanding.</li> <li>• Work was ongoing on the OLE poles in Shandwick Place.</li> <li>• A meeting had been arranged with the Airport to discuss locating tram ticketing machines within the terminal.</li> <li>• Forth Ports work had been de-scoped.</li> <li>• The traffic management at Gogar Roundabout</li> </ul> |              |

| Item No    | Subject  | Action Owner |
|------------|--|--------------|
|            | <p>would be removed at the end of March 2012.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An access protocol had been agreed with ScotRail at their depot in Roseburn.</li> <li>• A media alert circle and incident forum had been created to improve the project's reaction time to major incidents.</li> </ul>  |              |
| <b>2.2</b> | <p><b>Network Rail</b></p> <p>Colin Smith stated that the conveyor belt system created to process Network Rail approvals was continuing to work well. The Murrayfield ground improvements were due to commence, as scheduled, in early April 2012. Network Rail had signed off the work packages and had waived the 21 days cooling off period.</p> <p>The subsidence in the railway track at Murrayfield was due to be re-aligned on 22 March 2012. Network Rail could have imposed a speed restriction due to the movement and the slight twisting of the track but they had not done so. They were acting in an open manner, willingly sharing information. Martin Foerder added that BBS had offered to undertake hand tamping prior to the arrival of the tamping machine but Network Rail did not feel this was necessary.</p> |              |
| <b>2.3</b> | <p><b>CEC Approvals</b></p> <p>Colin Smith confirmed that CEC approvals had almost been completed. The installation of the setts and the problem of differing messages arising from the Council had been discussed. Following discussions between Mark Turley and Colin Smith, it had been agreed that an internal forum would be established to ensure that the Council spoke with one voice.</p>   |              |
| <b>2.4</b> | <p><b>Scottish Water</b></p> <p>Colin Smith explained that the drainage/ Scottish Water manholes issue had been problematic since May/June 2011. The issue had developed to the point that there were 33 manholes where Scottish Water asked for different designs to be formulated for their use. This had been treated as a Project wide issue. Following a meeting between the Council, Infracore and Turner and Townsend, 30 design solutions had been identified but there were still 3 manholes where a design solution had</p>  |              |

| Item No | Subject  | Action Owner   |
|---------|--|--|
|         | <p>not been found and a derogation or relaxation was required. Solutions for the 3 outstanding manholes were currently being investigated by Transport Scotland and Turner and Townsend. Colin Smith stressed that there had never been a dispute between the parties and Alastair Maclean added that the process had been about working together to solve a common project problem.</p> <p>Martin Foerder reiterated that all parties had worked jointly to resolve the issue. However, BBS were concerned with the approach taken by Turner and Townsend which did not seem to be in the spirit of the settlement agreement. Turner and Townsend had challenged BBS contractually and had used the term dispute in regard to the issue. BBS did not see this as a dispute and would continue to co-operate with all parties. BBS's relationship with Turner and Townsend was generally good but their approach on the drainage/ Scottish Water manholes issue was not appreciated. Sue Bruce added that it was important that the good relationship continued and this would be re-affirmed to Turner and Townsend.</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>1) That Sue Bruce and Colin Smith meet with Alfred Brandenburger and Martin Foerder to discuss any relationship issues with Turner and Townsend.</p> <p>2) That following the discussion with BBS, Colin Smith would discuss with Turner and Townsend the relationship approach to be undertaken with BBS and CAF.</p> | <p><b>Sue Bruce, Colin Smith, Alfred Brandenburger, Martin Foerder</b></p> <p><b>Colin Smith</b></p> |
| 2.5     | <p><b>New Ingilston Wayleave</b></p> <p>The wayleave between New Ingilston limited and SGN had still not been agreed. Following the impasse Colin Smith had become involved to assist in rectifying the issue. Discussions were at an advanced stage but if an agreement was not reached by Monday 26 March 2012, a meeting had been arranged in the Chief Executive's Board Room to bring the matter to a close. Alastair Maclean added that it was important to ensure that any future issues were resolved promptly and this should be built into the discussions with Turner and Townsend.</p>   |  |

| Item No | Subject  | Action Owner |
|---------|--|--------------|
| 2.6     | <p><b>Haymarket – Network Rail and Scottish Power</b></p> <p>Colin Smith advised that considerable progress had been made on the wayleave. Agreement was expected to be reached in the near future.</p>  |              |
| 2.7     | <p><b>ScotRail</b></p> <p>Colin Smith explained that the newly implemented protocol for the ScotRail depot in Roseburn was working well.</p> <p>One of the three manholes that required derogation was located at the ScotRail depot and any access would have to be agreed with ScotRail.</p>   |              |
| 3       | <p><b>Governance - Project Team Structures and Behaviours</b></p> <p>Sue Bruce highlighted the achievements of the last year since mediation. The improved relationship was a key factor in what had been achieved. There had been occasions where Turner and Townsend's approach had caused some tension and further discussions would be held with Turner and Townsend to clarify that the Council expected the Project to continue in the spirit of the settlement agreement.</p> |              |
| 3.1     | <p><b>Certification, Working Decisions and Agreements</b></p> <p>Colin Smith noted that there were no issues with certification, all working decisions had been cleared and there were no outstanding agreements.</p>  |              |
| 3.2     | <p><b>Decisions/Instructions Awaited</b></p> <p>A good example of the co-operation and the spirit the Project was conducted was in regard to the cabling to the bus tracker machines. This could have become a difference of opinion to whether it was a utility and solicitors could have been instructed. However, because of the co-operation and close working between the parties it was resolved amicably.</p>   |              |

| Item No | Subject   | Action Owner |
|---------|---|--------------|
| 4       | <p><b>Utilities</b></p> <p>McNicholas had cleared utilities in Shandwick Place and St Andrew Square and were currently clearing utilities in South St Andrew Street. Once completed they had been handed over to Infraco who would allow McNicholas back in to resolve any stray utility issues.</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>To note the update.</p>  |              |
| 5       | <p><b>Cost Engineering instructions</b></p> <p>Colin Smith confirmed that all of the cost engineering instructions had been issued. There was 22 weeks of banked time but it should be noted that some of this time would be used on utility clearance and on areas such as the Scottish Water/drainage manhole issue. The Project team would continue to look for further cost engineering initiatives in line with the suggestion made by Dr Keysberg at the previous meeting.</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>To note the update.</p>  |              |
| 6       | <p><b>Programme</b></p>   |              |
| 6.1     | <p><b>Review of Programme and Rev 5 Review and Discussions</b></p> <p>Colin Smith noted that any review of the programme always recognised that Rev 4 was the contractual programme and was not changing. Rev 4c though had developed as a result of the cost engineering initiatives and there was a wish to create a Rev 5 programme to take account of all the issues and provide an accurate plan with regard to current progress. Discussions had begun on the review and there had been close co-operation between Turner and Townsend, BBS and the Council. There was now a need to obtain and assess the information on the testing and commissioning work to inform the programme in that area. Richard Garner agreed that CAF would provide this information. Colin Smith explained that once the Rev 5 programme had begun to take shape, Lothian Buses would be asked to feed into the process. Ian Craig added that the sooner</p> |              |

| Item No           | Subject  | Action Owner  |
|-------------------|--|---|
|                   | <p>the information was available Lothian Buses could ensure that resources were in place.</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>1) To note that Richard Garner would provide information on the testing and commissioning work to inform the review of the programme.</p> <p>2) To agree that a planning and programming meeting should take place on Wednesday 28 March 2012 and that Gavin King should attend.</p>   | <p><b>Richard Garner</b></p> <p><b>Colin Smith/Gavin King</b></p> |
| <p><b>6.2</b></p> | <p><b>Partial Princes Street Handback</b></p> <p>Alfred Brandenburger advised that there would be cable pulling to be undertaken following the completion of the remedial concrete works on Princes Street. This would be time consuming but would not involve as many staff.</p> <p>Sue Bruce highlighted the importance of ensuring that the public understood the nature of the work being undertaken on Princes Street. This would avoid the perception that a reduced number of staff working meant there was no progress being made.</p> <p>Martin Foerder advised there remained a number of jobs to be completed in Princes Street but they were confident about finishing in June 2012. It was essential though that everything was signed off properly to avoid instances like Scottish Water wishing to revisit the manhole on Princes Street. Sue Bruce enquired whether the site boundary could be reduced when the cable pulling work was being undertaken. Alfred Brandenburger agreed to investigate this.</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>To investigate whether the site boundary on Princes Street could be reduced following the completion of the remedial works.</p> | <p><b>Martin Foerder/Alfred Brandenburger</b></p>                 |
| <p><b>7</b></p>   | <p><b>Matters Requiring Escalation</b></p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>To note that all parties had confirmed that there were no matters requiring escalation.</p>   |   |

| Item No | Subject   | Action Owner |
|---------|---|--------------|
| 8       | <p><b>Milestones (Project/Concerns/Threats)</b></p> <p>Colin Smith advised of three main strands of current threats which were reputation, logistics and the corporate position.</p> <p>Health and safety was the main threat in regard to the corporate position. There had been a number of incidents across a range of sub-contractors. Turner and Townsend had been instructed to commence a 'think before you act' initiative to improve health and safety on the Project. A health and safety workshop was being organised involving all parties, and including a keynote speaker, which aimed to improve the health and safety culture and instil good practice and to raise the level above the "bar" required by legislation. Sue Bruce agreed that the initiative was necessary as it was essential that those heading the Project took steps to improve the health and safety culture.</p> <p>Colin Smith advised that legacy issues from <i>tie</i> were the principal threat in regard to logistics. Issues had also arisen at the Airport in regard to the canopy and the kiosk. The kiosk had been removed as part of the cost engineering exercise and a discussion would be held with Turner and Townsend to clarify the Project costs and the scope of work the Airport would be undertaking.</p> <p>The final strand was the reputational damage that the Baird Drive soil issue could cause. Martin Foerder advised that BB had been closely working with the Client's communications team and that the issue had been blown out of proportion. There was no threat to public health or the environment and BB had fulfilled their duty of care and taken all appropriate steps. They were disappointed with the reaction of Neil Findlay MSP but he had been invited to the site to see the actual situation for himself. Sue Bruce added that it would be important to make as big a media play when the record had been set straight.</p> <p>Neil Gibson advised that the Daily Record were continuing to ask questions and the only way to bring the story to a close was to reach a resolution. It would also be helpful if the senior management of SEPA could be spoken to about how they handled the issue.</p> |              |

| Item No                             | Subject   | Action Owner                                      |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
|                                     | <p>Richard Garner confirmed there were no current threats to the testing and commissioning work or depot handover and steady progress was being made.</p> <p>Sue Bruce stated that the depot provided an excellent opportunity to accommodate high profile visits, such as the Edinburgh Business Forum, and improve the profile of the Project. Ian Craig advised that a depot visit protocol was being discussed at control meetings to ensure that depot visits were resourced properly and the best possible image was portrayed.</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) To discuss with Turner and Townsend the scope of works at the Airport.</li> <li>2) To discuss the soil issue at Baird Drive with the senior management of SEPA and how it could have been handled better.</li> </ol> | <p><b>Colin Smith</b></p> <p><b>Sue Bruce</b></p> |
| <p><b>9</b></p>                     | <p><b>Edinburgh Gateway</b></p> <p><b>Access – Red Line Boundary and Collateral Warranty</b></p> <p>Colin Smith advised that there was positive news with the Edinburgh Gateway with the slope option having been instructed. However, there was a need to clarify the red and blue line boundaries and investigate whether any collateral warranties should be handed over to Transport Scotland. These issues would be discussed further with Transport Scotland.</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>To note the update.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>10</b></p> <p><b>10.1</b></p> | <p><b>Communications</b></p> <p><b>Strategy</b></p> <p>Kelly Murphy confirmed that a communication strategy for the next 12 months was being developed. A set of key milestones had been identified, and a set of key messages were being developed, and these would be brought back to the Communications Control meeting.</p>   |   |



| Item No    | Subject  | Action Owner |
|------------|--|--------------|
| 10.2       | <p><b>Communications Control Meeting and Media Alert Circle/Incident Forum</b></p> <p>The Communications Control meeting, media alert circle and incident forum had proved very useful. Co-operation between all parties had been improved and should result in an improvement in any communications reaction to any incidents.</p>  |              |
| 10.3       | <p><b>Stakeholders Support</b></p> <p>The West End Focus Group had met and there seemed to be goodwill within the members to be involved. The Tram Information Centre in Shandwick Place would also improve communication with stakeholders in the West End. A focus group and stakeholder support would be replicated in the east end, in particular when the York Place works had begun.</p> <p>Dave Anderson advised that a series of events were being explored but with the proviso that they did not have any impact on the construction works.</p> <p>Sue Bruce stated that it was important to ensure that signage in the City was aimed at the appropriate level of visitors including the elderly and tourists. Mark Turley agreed to investigate this issue.</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>To examine whether the signage in the City was aimed at the appropriate level of visitors in the City including the elderly and tourists</p> | Mark Turley  |
| 11<br>11.1 | <p><b>Lothian Buses</b></p> <p><b>Snagging</b></p> <p>Colin Smith confirmed that the Council would continue to act as the gatekeeper for snagging issues at the depot. Ian Craig thanked the Council's Project Team for their efforts and confirmed that the snagging issues were now being cleared.</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>To note the update.</p>   |              |

| <b>Item No</b> | <b>Subject</b>  | <b>Action Owner</b> |
|----------------|---|---------------------|
| <b>11.2</b>    | <b>Operational Requirements</b><br>Colin Smith advised that preliminary discussions had taken place with Lothian Buses and they were on course for the handover of the depot.<br><br><b>Decision</b><br><br>To note the update. |                     |