**Item No. 2a**



**Notes of Meeting**

**Meeting Roads Authorities and Utilities Committee (Scotland)**

**Place of The Business Centre, Edinburgh City Council, City Chambers, High Meeting: Street, Edinburgh.**

**Date: Wednesday, 6th September, 2017**

**Present:**

Jim Clegg J.C. Glasgow City Council (R.A. Co-Chair)

Alex Rae A.R. SGN (S.U. Co-Chair)

Kevin Abercrombie K.A. Aberdeen City Council

Anthony Black A.B. Transport Scotland

David Capon D.C. JAG UK

Angus Carmichael A.C. Scottish Road Works Commissioner

Duncan Carrick D.C. East Dunbartonshire Council

Gavin Cook G.C. East Renfrewshire Council

Jim Cowan J.Co. SGN

Karyn Davidson K.D. Vodafone

Elizabeth Draper E.D. Openreach

Jane Dunlop J.D. Office of the Scottish Road Works Commissioner

Susan Ewart S.E. Transport Scotland

Stephen Finch S.F. Openreach

Jim Forbes J.F. City Fibre

Stuart Harding S.H. City of Edinburgh Council

Alan Heatley A.H. Midlothian Council

John Henderson J.H. Scottish Borders Council

Robin Jacobs R.Ja. Transport Scotland

Crawford Lindsay C.L. South Lanarkshire Council

Caroline McAdam C.McA. Network Rail

Fiona McInnes F.McI. Scottish Water

Andrew Matheson A.M. Virgin Media

Nigel Myers N.M. Virgin Media / NJUG

Gary Neill G.N. Falkirk Council

Robin Pope R.P. Highland Council

Ruth Scott R.S. SSE Telecom

David Shaw D.S. Ayrshire Roads Alliance

Kevin Skinner K.S. Scottish Water

Fraser Smith F.S. Argyll and Bute

Scott Walker S.W. Clackmannanshire Council

**In Attendance:**

George Borthwick G.B. RAUC(S) Secretary

**Apologies:**

David Armitage D.J.A. Aberdeenshire Council

Ian Cochrane I.C. Angus Council

Roger Culpin R.C. JAG UK

Tom Davy T.D. Transport Scotland

**Apologies Continued:**

Tom Flaherty T.F. City of Edinburgh Council

Bob Gallienne B.G. NJUG

Robert James R.J. Network Rail

Ian Jones I.J. Fife Council

John Lazzari J.L. Openreach

Jerry McConkey J.McC. JAG UK

Robert Mackay R.Mack. East Renfrewshire Council

Craig McQueen C.McQ. Scottish Water

Ewen Milligan E.M. Transport Scotland

Jonathon Moran J.M. Transport Scotland

Chris Nesbitt C.N. Vodafone

Ron Nicol R.N. Virgin Media

Katrina Quane K.Q. South Lanarkshire Council

Iain Ross I.R. Office of the Scottish Road Works Commissioner

Hilary Ryan H.R. Scottish Power Energy Networks

Elaine Stewart E.S. Scottish Power Energy Networks

Gregor Stirton G.S. SSEN

George Wells G.W. South Lanarkshire Council

Sharron Worthington S.W. West Dunbartonshire Council

**1. Introduction and Apologies**

Jim Clegg welcomed everyone to the Meeting.

The apologies were noted as above.

**2. Minutes of Meeting of 7th June 2017**

**a. Accuracy**

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 7th June 2017 were agreed as read.

**b. Matters Arising / Action Tracking Summary**

See the Action Tracking Summary for update along with the following comments: -

7th June 2017

Item No. 4i - RAUC(s) Working Group Reports - Working Group Recruitment

A.R. will pass additional information to the Secretary for inclusion in the Schedule. **Action – A.R. / Secretary**

Anthony Black agreed to be the R.A. Co-Chair on the SROR Working Group.

This Item should be raised again at the next round of Area Meetings in order to get full representation on all the Working Groups. **Action - Secretary**

Item No. 5a Area RAUC(s) Action Reports – WoSRAUC

Review method of recording short term works (Manhole Inspection) on high speed roads.

Comment was made on this Item as follows: -

* This appears to be an ongoing problem with works being carried out on the verge with no signing.
* The Trunk Road Operating Companies were required through their Contract to request a Network Access application for work on the Trunk network.
* A.R. suggested that a Network Access application was not required by Legislation. They were only required to record the works on the Register in accordance with the Legislation, Codes and Advice Notes.
* In addition, under their Powers as a statuary undertaker they had the right to work in the Road provided the correct notices were raised.
* Transport Scotland indicated that they required to know who was working on their network therefore they required completion of a Network Access Agreement. The view on this was that the Register should contain this information for co-ordination purposes. The Register should also be monitored for conflicts with works on other roads due to Trunk Road works and vice versa.
* The Commissioner indicated that while it was not required by Legislation the requirement was placed on the Operating Companies and not utilities, who were covered under their notice.
* The Commissioner would raise the matter with Transport Scotland and report back to the Community. **Action – The Commissioner**
* S.F. indicated that he would await the response before taking this matter further within Openreach.

Item No. 5a Area RAUC(s) Action Reports – WoSRAUC

Review legislation to deal with applications to install plant in newly adopted roads.

Comment was made on this Item as follows: -

* This relates to occasions where a new road is adopted then an S.U. which does not have a network already in the development decides to install plant in the new road. This results in a track in the new road and the R.A does not have the powers which it would have if the road had been registered under Section 117 of the New Roads and Street Works Act.
* There is no Legislation to prevent the works being carried out.
* If the work had been carried out in the new surface prior to the road being adopted the R.A. would not have adopted the road.
* The Road Construction Consent Legislation does not prevent this work taking place.
* At present, there is no obvious solution and the R.A. has to allow the work to be carried out.
* Close this Item. **Action - Secretary**

Item No. 6a RAUC(s) Business **-** Environmental Recycling - Coal Tar Arisings

* This matter is being dealt with and in the meantime, it should be closed pending a report to RAUC(S) at a later date. **Action - Secretary**

**3. Presentation – SGN Linesearch**

The presentation was cancelled but the slides will be passed to the Secretary for Circulation. **Action – A.R. / Secretary**

**4. RAUC(s) Working Group Reports**

**a. National Coring Programme**

K.S. reported that there appeared to be cores which had not been recorded on the Register therefore there was a problem producing the final report. All results both pass and fail should be recorded. This is not a problem in only one area but appeared to be across the Community.

This problem could be caused by 2015 cores not being taken into the download so this needs to be checked out.

The commissioner indicated that five Telecom Organisations had very poor results. He would be considering the action to be taken but he asked the Telecom Industry to get together and deal with the problem affecting them.

This Programme covered only 2% of the reinstatements therefore depending on the sample the overall situation could be much worse.

CityFibre and Openreach have already made changes to their operation and are looking further at what other steps could be taken to get the required improvement e.g. internal coring programmes. Other Organisations have managed to make improvements so they should possibly be consulted.

The failures covered all types of failure including layer thickness, compaction and material.

If and when another programme is started the management of the project must be looked at as the last one and this one have been dogged by delays etc.

F.McI. can indicate which Scottish Water cores are missing and can pass this information to them. It was agreed that one more week would be allowed for all results to be registered. **Action – R.As.**

All the Telecom Organisations were aware of the urgent need for action and would consider joint meetings to review the situation. K.S. offered to assist with information from the Scottish Water contract management and testing procedures.

Quality Plans may change the methods of operation and management but until they are introduced action is required.

On the material / compaction / voiding problems it may be that the wrong material is being ordered / provided. It may not be the correct material for the purpose of reinstatement. The material may have been in the lorry for too long resulting in it being below the required temperature or having lost the light oils due to being in a hot box too long.

What is next – Quality Plans / Internal Self-coring / Another Coring Programme.

The results are pushing the decision towards another National programme. If S.Us can carry out a satisfactory self-coring programme then their cores could be used for the National Programme. If this was done it would reduce the input from the R.As. The choice of cores would need to be random from the Register for the results to be valid.

D.C. indicated that in England some areas were rigorous with testing but in others the situation was more relaxed.

The Community needs to see evidence of an improving picture across all Organisations.

All self-coring should be carried out to the same standard and the current Advice Note was a good starting point. If there were issues from the current programme needing changes to the Advice Note these should be quickly addressed. The Working Group could be called to deal with them as a matter of urgency.

The Coring Working Group should meet and provide a report with suggestions for the way forward. **Action – Coring W.G. Co-Chairs**

The Quality Plan W.G. and the SROR Working Group should consider working with the Coring W.G. to review what joint solutions could be produced to assist the Community make the required improvements.

The final results should be pulled together and the final report drafted for approval at the RAUC(S) December meeting. The final draft should be circulated to the November Area Meetings for comment.

The Commissioner indicated that he wanted progress to be made on all issues before December in order that the situation could be reported and discussed further.

**b. Inspection Fees**

The following comments were made: -

* The returns have been reviewed.
* Some of the data is poor so the relevant R.As have been asked to reconsider the data they provided.
* The Inspectors rates appear to be wrong in some cases.
* There is good data in the submissions.
* The results will be compared with the data south of the Border.

**c. Fees and Amounts**

# **This Item is ongoing.**

# **d. Quality Plans**

# **The previously circulated Briefing Paper was summarised by J.C.: -**

# **The Group has met on 4 occasions so far reviewing the following issues.**

* Work in Progress – Management of Signing, Lighting and Guarding.
* Reinstatement in Progress – How can Statutory Undertakers assure Roads Authorities that reinstatements have been completed in accordance with the SROR.
* Completed Reinstatements – what assurances can be put in place, what information can be shared that minimises the need for National coring or eliminates it altogether
* Considerate Contractor Scheme
* KPI’s – What performance measures can be put in place that prove compliance.

# **The following recommendations have been produced: -**

# Work In Progress – SU’s to inspect SLG utilising a standard form.

* Reinstatement in progress – SUs need to provide assurance to the RA’s which demonstrates compliance with SROR. This could be provided in the form of photographic evidence covering a the following stages as a minimum:
* Prior to commencement of work
* Completed excavation
* Pipe / Cable bedding
* Sub base in each layer
* Base
* Binder
* Surface Course including confirmation of surface profile
* Priming of the vertical joint faces

These photographs must be held within the SRWR within the notice.

Additionally test results / records must also be held within the register which give confirmation of compaction of sub base materials and material records including design certificates and delivery and rolling temperatures to allow traceability and confirmation of compliance with the specification.

* Completed reinstatements – it was agreed that: -
* where SU’s are performing reinstatement to the specification then it would be wasteful to carry out coring of these reinstatements.
* Coring results from SU’s should be available to RA’s and that and should be open transparent and available within the SRWR.
* If this is technically possible then coring should then be directed at those undertakers who are not complying with the specification.

The table below outlines a sample national coring regime based on SU’s own coring programmes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Pass Rate | Sample Size |
| 100 – 90% | Undertaker to continue with own coring regime |
| >90 – 80% | 0.5% Permanent Reinstatements per undertake minimum of 2 per undertaker |
| >80 – 70% | 1% Permanent Reinstatements per undertake minimum of 3 per undertaker |
| >70 – 60% | 2% Permanent Reinstatements per undertake minimum of 5 per undertaker |
| >60 – 50% | 3% Permanent Reinstatements per undertake minimum of 6 per undertaker |
| >50% | 5% Permanent Reinstatements per undertake minimum of 15 per undertaker |

To allow confidence in this change of practice it would be wise to carry out some sampling per SU to ensure that coring is being undertaken and that the results are being recorded properly.

It was discussed briefly although no agreement could be reached as to whether poor performing SU’s would incur increased sample inspections.

* Considerate contractor scheme – the group were of the opinion that due to the short nature of the vast majority of works that a considerate contractor scheme would not have the same impact of large construction sites carried out over a long time period.

The group were also of the opinion that the development of standard signage beyond the courtesy board would be useful to explain to travelling public why there is a Signing, Lighting and Guarding on site but no work ongoing for example (Reinstatements Cooling). Although not directly within the remit of this group it was felt that any influence that could be brought about in this area would be welcome.

**The Committee commented on the paper as follows: -**

* **The recording of Supervisor / Accreditation Number etc may be a way of monitoring standards and spotting where action is required.**
* **It is important that the process is easy to operate and does not require too much form filling.**
* **Comments should be passed to J.C. by the end of September.**

# **e. SROR**

# **This Item is ongoing.**

# **f. Inspections**

# **This Item is ongoing and is awaiting the outcome of the Quality Plans Working Group.**

# **g. Co-ordination**

# **This Item is ongoing and is awaiting the outcome of the Quality Plans Working Group.**

# **Core and Vac**

# **S.H. reported that the Working Group would meet again on Monday 11th September when the final version of the Advice Note would be agreed. It would then be passed to the Commissioner’s Office for publishing.**

1. Working Group Recruitment

The updated Schedule had been circulated. There were still some vacancies on the Groups and all should try to find volunteers with suitable experience to assist the work of the Community.

**5. Area RAUC(s) Action Reports**

1. NoSRAUC Area

No issues remitted to the meeting.

1. South East Area RAUC

There had been concern raised about Defects which were not being repaired and required repeat inspections for road safety.

The R.A. required to keep the road safe and if they were aware of a defect, even if they had passed it to the S.U. for action, they had to carry out repeat inspections to ensure that it had not become an emergency issue. This all took Inspectors time and there was no recovery of the costs.

The R.A. could in an emergency situation carry out the repair and recharge the costs but this tended to lead to further problems with administration e.g. need for a job number, disagreement on costs etc.

The R.A. could issue a two hour notice but there is still the need to possibly remain on site pending action being taken by the S.U. or a return visit to site to check it was repaired / made safe.

F.McI. responded that in the case of a defect not deteriorating but needing attention it should be raised with Scottish Water out with the Register.

There was a need for the Defect Inspection requirements to be reviewed and the timescales in the Code / Advice Notes to be adhered to. **Action – Inspections Code Working Group**

F.McI. had asked the R.As at all Area Meetings, over at least the last two cycles, for a list of Defects in their areas which were outstanding. Only two R.As had responded. The request is still standing and if any R.A. has outstanding Defects they should contact her. **Action – R.A.**

c. South West Area RAUC

No issues remitted to the meeting.

d. TayForth Area RAUC

No issues remitted to the meeting.

e. WOS Area RAUC

No issues remitted to the meeting.

**6. RAUC(s) Business**

**a. Environmental Recycling**

Coal Tar Arisings

This issue is being discussed in other forums so the Secretary was asked to take it off the Agenda for the present. **Action - Secretary**

**b. Safety – Issues for Consideration**

Manhole Covers – Skid Resistance

This Item is ongoing awaiting a report from K.S. **Action – K.S.**

**c. Improvement Notices**

The previously circulated schedule had been updated and was taken as read.

**d. FPN Hearings**

No new Hearings reported.

**e. Remits from SRWR Steering Group**

# No issues had been remitted from the SRWR Steering Group.

# **7. HAUC (UK) and Associated Sub Group Reports**

**a. Report**

The Committee noted that the next HAUC UK meeting will be held on 20th September 2017. The last meeting held in May agreed that Sub Committees would be dropped and replaced by Working Groups with a specific remit which they would deal with then disband. This is in an effort to be more focussed on the topic. There will be efforts to bring forward and introduce innovation.

**ai. Convention Update**

The 2018 Convention will be held in Manchester at the Emirates Old Trafford on the 17th May 2018. The Commissioner will be Chairing one of the sessions. An appeal was made for more Scottish Representatives to attend especially as the Convention had been moved north to make it attractive to the north of England and Scotland.

**aii. The Street Manager Project**

The project is moving forward with a planned delivery for 2019.

**b. HAUC (UK) Advice Notes**

Advice Notes were discussed as follows: -

**bi. Draft National Guidance on Street Works and Archaeology**

There may be a need to make some modifications to the document to deal with Uk wide issues since at present it may be more focussed on London. Other major cities may have their own document and it would be advisable to pull them together as one version.

All were asked to pass any comments or suggestions to D.C. **Action – All**

**bii. Specification and Operational Requirements for Footway Boards, Driveway Boards,   
Footway Ramps and Road Plates**

This Advice Note is a supplement to the “Red Book” giving greater detail on specification etc.

The draft will be submitted to HAUC UK for approval or revision on 20th September.

The Advice Note should be submitted to the RAUC(S) Meeting in December for acceptance for use in Scotland. **Action – Secretary**

**c. Training and Accreditation**

The Committee noted that there was a report of counterfeit Accreditation Cards being in circulation. This is being investigation but should there be any suspicion about cards these should be reported.

Reports on TAGs will be submitted to RAUC(S) to keep the Community updated on discussions.

S.E. indicated that there was no Scottish representation on the Group. This would be drawn to the attention of George Wells, John Scougall and Gregor Stirton who were the named persons on the HAUC UK Representation Schedule. **Action – Co-Chairs / Secretary**

**d. Diversionary Works**

No issues were raised.

**e. Reinstatements**

No issues were raised.

**f. Safety at Road Works**

No issues raised.

**g. Records**

No issues raised.

**h. Representation on HAUC UK Sub Groups**

No issues raised.

**8. Standing Reports**

**a. The Scottish Road Works Commissioner’s Report**

The previously circulated Bulletin was taken as read with the following comments: -

* Where there was poor performance recorded in the Quarterly Stats Report the relevant Organisation should send comment to the Commissioner’s office indicating mitigating factors / the action being taken.
* In future Stat Reports more of the individual Reports will have the Traffic Signal indicators used.
* The Dash Board is now in use replacing the Textual Reports.
* If there are any issues with the Quarterly Reports they should be raised and discussed with N.B.
* The Commissioner’s News Letter will be issued next week.
* Fees and Amounts – All should note that the Accounts will not be chased up next year and payment will be expected within the 40 day period.
* The Performance Reviews have been issued to the R.As and are about to be sent out to the S.Us. They were being sent to the Chief Executive and the Primary Contact.
* At all meetings the Representatives who are unable to attend should notify the Chair or Secretary and record their apologies.
* A press release was issued for the appointment of Symology to provide and maintain the Register for the next 4 years with an option to extend it for a further three years reviewable on a yearly basis.
* The new Training and Accreditation Legislation came into effect on the 4th September. All Organisations should review their operative’s current qualifications and note that when their cards expire they will require to be reassessed.

A Question & Answer seminar was held recently at Victoria Quay. Although there was a satisfactory attendance the questions were limited. Consideration is being given to running another event once the Legislation is being used.

* **The Commissioner’s Office has arranged a Seminar entitled “Road Works Performance Matters: Influencing Your Organisation” to be held in Edinburgh on 4th October and in Glasgow on 11th October. If you have not booked a place you can do so by contacting J.D. at the Commissioner’s Office.**
* **Tim Masters has been appointed to a 2day a week temporary contract to observe road works sites. So far based on his records to date it is apparent that S.Us T.M. is better than that provided by R.As.**

**b. Policy Development Group**

The following Items had been discussed at the last meeting: -

* Laying plant in newly adopted roads. See in Minutes above.
* The “Raising Standards and Improving the Quality of Road Works in Scotland” Consultation closes on 12th October. All Organisations are urged to submit a response. Only 11 received so far.

If there are any issues to be discussed contact Ewan Milligan.

J.C. informed the Committee that Susan was due to retire and this would her last RAUC(S) meeting. He asked for the thanks of the Community to be recorded in the Minutes.

**c.** **Management and Operation of the S.R.W.R.**

**ci) Quarterly Management Report (Includes Vault Update Report and  
 Gazetteer Update Report)**

The previously circulated reports including the Commissioner’s Bulletin were taken as read with the following comment: -

* The Road Works on Line site has been changed to indicate the Actual Start Date and estimated duration of the works. The actual start date and the duration should be the best estimate if actual is not known. This information should be more understandable for members of the public.
* The training programme for October is as follows: -

Date Course Title

3 October SRWR for Roads Authorities

4 October SRWR for Promoters

5 October SRWR Fixed Penalty Notices

* If help is required with supplying data to Vault contact I.R.
* If you are not updating VAULT please contact J.D. and discuss the matter. All should be supplying any data they have as the system is being used as a first source of data while responses to PIR are awaited. The desire is to get all available information on VAULT so that it will mirror the online sources and can be used as the prime data source.

cii) Gazetteer Upload Report and the Highlight Report

The previously circulated reports were taken as read.

The one R.A. which is in the red is in discussion about the problem.

**d. SCOTS Report**

Since J.C. had not been able to attend the last SCOTS meeting there was no report.

**9. A.O.C.B.**

1. **RAUC(S) Meeting Dates for 2018**

The dates for the meetings in 2018 were agreed as tabled.

The SE Area dates should be checked. **Action – Secretary**

1. **City Deal Projects - Glasgow**

J.C. informed the Committee that the City Deal Projects needed to be discussed with the S.Us to agree where diversionary work could be required. On that basis he asked for the S.Us to inform his Department of the contacts within their Organisations which deal with Diversionary Works. **Action – S.Us**

**10. Dates of Next Meetings:**

**AGENDA MEETING (Edinburgh City RAUC(s) Meeting (Edinburgh**

**City Chambers) City Chambers)**

**Wednesday 15th November 2017 Wednesday 6th December 2017**

**Future Meeting Dates:-**

RAUC(s) Agenda RAUC(S)

Setting Meetings Meetings

Wednesday 21st February 2018 Wednesday 7th March 2018

Wednesday 16th May 2018 Wednesday 6th June 2018

Wednesday 15th August 2018 Wednesday 5th September 2018

Wednesday 21st November 2018 Wednesday 5th December 2018

The meeting Closed at 14.00