
From: Richard Jeffrey
Sent: 04 May 2011 09:46
To: Gregor Roberts
Subject: FW: Feedback from Staff meetings - STRICTLY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL AND FOISA EXEMPT

Fyi – not connected to payments issues

From: Richard Jeffrey
Sent: 28 April 2011 09:51
To: VRE - MobileMe
Cc: Steven Bell
Subject: Feedback from Staff meetings - STRICTLY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL AND FOISA EXEMPT

Vic,

As I mentioned on the phone yesterday I had two very difficult staff meetings yesterday, and I think you should be aware of the issues being raised.

These meetings are part of the regular monthly briefing of my team.

The questions/comments are not verbatim, as I did not take notes at the time. Also I have grouped the comments into themes, this is not how it occurred as some people asked supplementary questions to the answers I gave to other questions. The questions came from 8 or 9 people, so not just one or two disaffected individuals. I have discussed this note with Frank and Steven who were at the briefings, and they confirm this note does reflect the general concerns/comments of the team

Martin Foerder's letter (attached)

Who is Colin Smith?
What is MoV 5? (this is a typo, BSC meant MOV4)
Can BSC just refuse to provide the information requested?
Have schedule part 10 and part 14 been removed, if so, how do we do our job, including the statutory obligations under ROGS and CDM?

Colin Smith

What is Colin's role?
Who does he answer to?
Is he in charge and if so why?

Meeting on 8th April

Who was at the Principals meeting on 8th April?
Was Colin there?
Were you (RJ) there?
Why not?
Why are BBS and CEC staff briefed on the detailed outcomes of these meetings, and we are not even told of their existence?

Role of tie

There is a suspicion that tie is being taken off the job, is this true?
Everything is being agreed with CEC/Colin Smith, is this true?
Is there a role for tie on this project going forward, if so what is our role?
We are told by BBS that quality control is none of our business, is this true?
We are told by BBS that design assurance control is none of our business, is this true?
It seems to us that tie are being marginalised and deliberately ignored wherever possible

What are the rules of engagement? It seems that BSC are working to a new set of rules, which we are not aware of. BBS staff appear fully briefed on what is going on, we are told nothing and told that we cannot be told anything. Do you trust us?

MoV4

What is MoV 4?

If we remove schedule part 10 and schedule part 14 how can we fulfil our obligations under ROGS and CDMC?

Quality control

We understand the concept of self certifying, but we are told by the contractor's staff that BBS are reducing their quality department's independent inspections and leaving it all to the site managers

We have no confidence that BBS care about producing a quality job

Reducing tie's role in quality control could create a situation whereby BSC could cover up defects which are not known to tie (e.g. defective piles cannot be fixed once the building is built) There are specific concerns in relation to Princes Street.

It will be impossible to prove design and construction assurance if we leave it all to the end

Princes Street

What is happening with Princes Street?

The quality of the temporary repairs is leaving hazards and is potentially unsafe

We are concerned that that BBS underestimate the scope of work required to support a closure of Princes Street. (Similar concerns were raised in relation to stakeholder management generally, and lack of responsiveness to stakeholder issues)

My observations/conclusions

There is a clear (and largely successful) drive to marginalise tie

The tie team are very demoralised and feel marginalised.

At site level BBS behaviours have deteriorated since Mar Hall, not improved.

At site level, my team have no confidence that BSS will properly self certify

If this was just the grumpiness of one or two staff members I could ignore it, but at some point the ground swell of opinion becomes so strong that it would be irresponsible to ignore it.

Given the level of interest the board has previously taken in the morale and resilience of the team, I would like to discuss whether or not these issues are raised with the independent non-execs.

The behaviour of BSC is entirely consistent with the demand at mediation for "the immediate removal of tie and all its advisors". Having not achieved this by one route BSC are seeking to achieve it by another.

Steven and his management team have sought to implement the spirit of Mar Hall (as far as can be disclosed) without blind acquiescence to everything that Infracore demand but it is very difficult as a result of the routing of items through Colin Smith and CEC.

Finally at a personal level, this situation is not tenable in the long term and we need to clarify roles and responsibilities going forward.

I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this with you, and in particular how we pass these messages to the shareholder, ensure the right behaviours from BSC and clarify roles as soon as possible.

Regards

Richard

Richard Jeffrey

Chief Executive

Edinburgh Trams

Citypoint

65 Haymarket Terrace

Edinburgh

EH12 5HD

Tel: [REDACTED]
Email: richard.jeffrey@tie.ltd.uk

Find us online (click below):

