

NGT Project Board

Minutes of the Meeting 6 held on 22 October 2007 at Wellington House, Leeds

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Tony Darbyshire	PTA
Alan Gay	LCC
Dave Gilson	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Mike Morrison	Metro
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro
Steve Speak	LCC

Apologies:

Jean Dent	LCC
-----------	-----

Action

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 20 August 2007

- 1.1 These were agreed as correct.

2. Matters Arising

- 2.1 Item 3.12 Mike Morrison queried whether a separate discussion on Project Management issues had been held between Kieran Preston and Jean Dent. Kieran Preston explained that a meeting had taken place between himself Jean Dent and David Outram of LCC however no firm conclusions on project management issues have yet been reached.
- 2.2 Kieran Preston explained that the action arising from the meeting was for himself and Jean Dent to consider several key issues in more detail and report back to the December Project Board meeting. The issues to be considered are as follows:
- What the key tasks/role of the Project Manager would be;
 - What is the necessary skill set for the Project Manager;
 - Identification of whether these skills already exist in-house at Metro/LCC.
- 2.3 Item 6.6: Dave Haskins explained that work had not yet been completed to assess the need for political lobbyists to become involved in the project. In addition he mentioned that Parliamentary Agents have also been in contact and suggested that the role of such agents be considered alongside the work looking at political lobbyists.

3. NGT Progress Update

- 3.1 Dave Haskins summarised the content of the update report and the following issues were discussed in more detail:
- 3.2 It was agreed that NGT should be used as the working name for the project. Kieran Preston explained that the term was necessarily generic at present since we can not yet confirm what the technology will be.
- 3.3 On the issue of technology choice, Kieran Preston suggested that in the Major Scheme Business Case (MSBC) there will be a need to include a tram option for comparative purposes at some level of detail. He explained that, although the DfT had indicated that a bus-based solution should be progressed, a tram scheme should also be presented as a fully worked up option, since it is still the promoters belief that a tram would be the most appropriate solution.
- 3.4 Kieran Preston suggested that as a minimum the idea of developing a case for a tram should be presented to LCC/PTA members in order to obtain a political steer on this issue. Steve Speak also mentioned that the significant housing growth which has been forecast for Leeds may strengthen the case for a higher capacity mode such as tram.
- 3.5 Dave Haskins pointed out that there is likely to be strong resistance from the DfT to reconsider light rail particularly given the difficulties in convincing them that Trolleybus is a viable option. He also pointed out that if a tram option were to be taken forward a minimum 25% local contribution to the scheme would be required.
- 3.6 Kieran Preston suggested that it was necessary to present all these issues to members and to ensure that they understand all the facts before asking them to make a decision on the way forward. It was agreed that Members should be briefed on this subject through a future meeting of the LCC Executive Board / PTA and through other member briefings.

4. Budget/Resources

- 4.1 Dave Haskins summarised the Budget and Resources report. He pointed out that when Programme Entry is achieved the scheme costs which are presented in the Major Scheme Business Case (MSBC) will be capped throughout the life of the project. As such it will be necessary to undertake a greater amount of work prior to the submission of the MSBC to ensure the costs presented are as robust as possible.
- 4.2 Dave Haskins explained that as a result of the extra detail that is required prior to the submission of the MSBC, the Metro budget for consultancy fees in 2007/8 will be exceeded by an estimated

Action

£700,000. Kieran Preston queried whether this extra level of funding would ultimately contribute to the production of a more robust MSBC. Dave Haskins confirmed that this is the case and added that increased work at an early stage will also assist in reducing the level of Optimism Bias that will need to be applied to scheme costs.

- 4.3 Kieran Preston pointed out that it will be necessary to agree the principles on how the development costs for the project will be funded going forward e.g. should there be a 50/50 allocation between Metro and LCC?
- 4.4 Alan Gay mentioned that it would be useful to understand the predicted level of spend on consultancy fees in the context of the NGT project in its entirety. This would help to clarify the level of the local contribution.
- 4.5 Tony Darbyshire suggested that Metro could look at the options for funding the £700,000 shortfall this year through their budget. He added that it would be necessary to bring a more detailed projection of costs to the December Project Board meeting and this could then be used as a basis to identify funding sources and agree the level of contributions from Metro and LCC.
- 4.6 It was also agreed that a separate meeting should be set up between Dave Haskins, Tony Darbyshire and Alan Gay ahead of the December Project Board to consider the scheme cost profile in more detail.

**Dave
Haskins**

5. Project Programme

- 5.1 Dave Haskins summarised the programme and resources report. A discussion on the linear programme versus the 'at risk' programme took place. Kieran Preston suggested that it would be necessary to follow the 'at risk' programme given the long timescales involved in the linear programme.
- 5.2 With regard to the detailed tasks contained within the programme, David Hoggarth questioned whether we could compare these against other similar projects. Dave Haskins explained that in compiling the NGT programme the project team had challenged the advisors on the extent and nature of the tasks and there had also been a level of challenge between the advisors teams.
- 5.3 Dave Gilson mentioned the risk that exists with regard to time taken by the DfT to make key approval decisions. Dave Haskins agreed that this was a key area of risk and added that the DfT have tightened up their approval processes in the new Major Scheme Guidance in order to try to provide greater certainty around the timescales for assessing bids.

Action

- 5.4 Following further discussion on the programme it was agreed that the 'at risk' programme should be followed with key decisions relating to work at risk being reviewed as necessary.

6. Risk Register

- 6.1 Dave Haskins summarised the risk report which set out the approach taken to the management of risks on the NGT project. He also explained that since the Risk Register had not been substantially updated for several months it is intended to hold a risk workshop in the near future to which Project Board members would be invited.

**Dave
Haskins**

- 6.2 Kieran Preston queried how often the Risk Register would be reviewed. Dave Haskins explained that a detailed review would be undertaken every six months however, the Risk Register would be routinely updated and brought to all Project Board meetings and would also be discussed at the monthly Project Team Management Group meetings.

- 6.3 Kieran Preston queried the need for ongoing project management support through Turner and Townsend and questioned whether this type of function could be undertaken internally by Metro/LCC. Dave Haskins explained that Turner and Townsend were currently providing specialist programme and cost management advice which is important to the project.

7. Project Team Management Group Minutes

- 7.1 Dave Haskins explained that the PTMG minutes were provided for information and highlighted the following points:

- Item 11.2 – The DfT visit to Leeds to view the NGT routes has been postponed but will be rescheduled asap. **(post meeting note: this is now arranged for 6/12/07).**
- Item 12.1 – Metro are due to obtain access to an extranet facility in December which, among other things, will be used for exchange of information with the NGT technical advisors.

8. Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board / PTA

- 8.1 It was agreed that the issue of developing a fully worked up tram proposal needed to be presented to Members to obtain a political steer.

9. Any Other Business

- 9.1 No other business was raised.

10. Date of Next Meeting

- 10.1 20th December 2007, 2pm at Wellington House.

NGT Project Board

Minutes of the Meeting 7 held on 20 December 2007 at Wellington House, Leeds

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Tony Darbyshire	PTA
Alan Gay	LCC
Dave Gilson	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Jean Dent	LCC
Mike Morrison	Metro
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro

Apologies:

None

Action

1. Tony Darbyshire introduced Angela Hirst, the Assistant Director of Finance for Metro. He explained that Angela would be taking over his role on the Project Board in the future.
2. **Minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2007**
 - 2.1 These were agreed as correct.
3. **Matters Arising**
 - 3.1 No issues were raised other than those covered by the main agenda.
4. **NGT Progress Update / Treatment of Tram Option**
 - 4.1 Kieran Preston suggested Item 4 (NGT progress update) and Item 5 (treatment of tram option) be taken together since they are clearly linked.
 - 4.2 He also suggested that the NGT project is at a point where it is necessary to take stock of the proposals. He explained that it is intended to hold a high level meeting with Bronwyn Hill at the DfT in January to be followed by a meeting with Ministers. At these meetings it will be necessary to agree a clear way forward.
 - 4.3 Dave Haskins gave a presentation outlining the work that has been undertaken to date to more clearly define the strategic case for the project. He explained that Arup had been commissioned to

undertake this work due to their involvement in preparing the Leeds City Region Transport Vision and the TIF prospectus.

- 4.4 The presentation highlighted the emerging findings from the strategic fit work which show that on the basis of traffic flows there is a strong case for rapid transit interventions on the southern and northern NGT corridors.
- 4.5 The Arup work to date has shown that with regard to the eastern route, unsurprisingly the traffic flows alone do not highlight this route as a priority for Rapid Transit. However with regard to regeneration objectives, the eastern route can be justified and the next stage of the strategic fit work will explore these policy-fit issues in more detail.
- 4.6 Dave Haskins explained that a DfT delegation had recently visited Leeds to see the NGT routes. During this visit John Dowie (who has taken over from Alison Munro) expressed serious doubts over the merits of the eastern route, since it is not primarily addressing congestion issues.
- 4.7 Kieran Preston pointed out that it will be necessary to undertake a reality check of the NGT proposals and to ensure that we have a high-level steer from the DfT on what will be needed in order for the scheme to gain the necessary approvals. He added that it will also be necessary to demonstrate very clearly the specific problems that the scheme is addressing. This will involve making clear links with the relevant government departments e.g. Department of Communities and Local Government.
- 4.8 Kieran Preston also drew attention to the recent media coverage regarding Merseytram where the tram proposals appear to be back on the agenda. He mentioned that, given this development, the proposed high level DfT / Minister meetings in January would be vital. Jean Dent added that it will be necessary to have a very honest and open dialogue with the DfT on these issues.
- 4.9 Kieran Preston proposed an alternative approach that could be considered if the DfT are not prepared to support a rapid transit solution on all corridors. He explained that this could involve spreading the money more thinly by pursuing a partnership with bus operators. This would involve the public sector providing the infrastructure and the operators providing high quality vehicles possibly governed by a partnership agreement. He suggested that this type of partnership approach may be particularly attractive to the DfT.

Action

4.10 A discussion took place around the various scenarios that could be adopted in order to deliver a medium term solution leading onto a more comprehensive scheme in the longer term. This included the discussion of issues such as the initial promotion of a single tram route to the south, enhancement of the existing guided busway routes, potential park and ride schemes and the potential to provide bus priority on the M621 (linking to a bus-based park and ride at Stourton).

4.11 Jean Dent suggested that in order to capture all the ideas debated, a set of Storyboards should be created to set out potential approaches. She added that in parallel to the preparation of these Storyboards it will also be necessary to prepare an outline delivery plan and to compile a list of key questions to be raised with the DfT.

4.12 Since it is proposed to hold meetings with the DfT and ministers in mid January, it was agreed that the Storyboards should be prepared in early January. (Post Meeting Note: DfT officer level meeting is now likely to take place in early February.)

**Dave
Haskins**

5. Project Governance

5.1 Dave Haskins summarised the content of the Project Governance report. The following issues were raised during the subsequent discussion.

5.2 Kieran Preston mentioned that at some point it will be necessary to appoint an individual to lead the project on a full-time basis. However he suggested that further discussions are required to identify exactly when such a resource should be brought in.

5.3 With regard to the recommendation that the Project Board nominate a member of the group to lead strategic communications with the DfT (as recommended as part of the Gateway Review), it was agreed that Dave Haskins should formally take on this role.

5.4 With regard to the widening of Project Board membership the principal of inviting GOYH and Yorkshire Forward was agreed. However, it was suggested that further consideration needed to be given to the most appropriate time to extend these invitations.

5.5 Dave Haskins mentioned that GOYH could be very valuable in helping to champion the NGT scheme as Government Offices in other areas have done with rapid transit schemes. Kieran Preston suggested that it would be worth arranging a meeting with senior GOYH representatives once the Storyboards have been prepared.

**Kieran
Preston**

Action

- 5.6 Dave Haskins also mentioned the issue of establishing an NGT Stakeholder Group as recommended by the Gateway Review. Jean Dent queried whether the Leeds Transport Initiative Partnership Group could undertake this role since it already involves relevant stakeholders. Kieran Preston agreed that this would be a good way forward and added that it would be possible to bring other stakeholders into the group as necessary.

6. Finance Update

- 6.1 Alan Gay suggested that it will be necessary to agree the funding model for the project asap. He mentioned that LCC funds should be in place for the development of the project and that there should be no serious problems in accessing these.

- 6.2 Kieran Preston raised the issue of the Joint Venture and Funding Agreement that was in place for Supertram and suggested that similar agreements would be required for the NGT project.

- 6.3 Kieran Preston also mentioned that KPMG are currently undertaking some wider research for Metro into funding options and emerging funding sources for transportation projects. He explained that they had produced an initial paper on this subject covering issues such as prudential borrowing, Supplementary Business Rates and more effective use of assets etc. He agreed to share this report with Project Board Members.

**Kieran
Preston**

- 6.4 Alan Gay suggested that it will be necessary to look at a package of various funding measures and questioned what a reasonable contribution from the district levy would be. On this issue Kieran Preston recommended that research be undertaken into precedents that have been set for other major schemes in other areas. He suggested that this would be useful in determining a reasonable contribution from the levy and asked Tony Darbyshire to coordinate this research.

**Tony
Darbyshire**

- 6.5 There was some discussion relating to the projected NGT development costs that had been presented as part of the financial report. Tony Darbyshire mentioned that following the proposed meetings with DfT in the New Year, it will be vital to develop greater certainty around these figures. Dave Gilson suggested that for the time being it is appropriate to work on the basis that we may need to find the higher development costs that have been presented.

- 6.6 Following further debate it was agreed that Tony Darbyshire and Alan Gay would hold a separate discussion in January on funding issues.

**Tony
Darbyshire
/ Alan Gay**

Action

7. Risk Management / Risk Register

7.1 Dave Haskins briefly summarised the content of the Risk Management report. He presented the draft Risk Register and explained that this had been compiled following a Risk Workshop held in November 2007. In terms of the next steps, he explained that a Quantified Risk Assessment would be undertaken and this would be fed into the project costs in order to allow a reduced level of Optimism Bias.

7.2 Dave Gilson questioned whether TIF should be shown as a potential area of risk within the register. Dave Haskins explained that it had been included since in order to secure the funding required over and above the regional allocation of £150 million, we will be expected to look at opportunities through TIF.

7.3 Mike Morrison questioned whether DLA should be shown in the register as risk owners since they are not formally appointed to the NGT project, but are held by Metro as legal advisors on a call-off basis. He explained that this call-off contract is to be reviewed in summer 2008 and therefore if they are not retained they will have no further involvement in the NGT project. Kieran Preston suggested that this issue is considered in more detail internally to see if there is any opportunity for an early reappraisal.

**Mike
Morrison**

7.4 Dave Haskins agreed to remove references to DLA and consider how to better present risks in order to ensure that risk owners are from the client side. However he did mention that it is normal practice for risk owners to include advisors.

**Dave
Haskins**

7.5 Dave Gilson raised the issue of the Saturn model review which is currently being undertaken by Mouchel Parkman on behalf of LCC. He explained that if the revised model is not ready on time this would be a serious risk to the NGT programme. Dave Haskins mentioned that Mouchel Parkman have provided the project team with assurances that the model will be ready in time, however if there is any delay the NGT programme would slip. Dave Gilson therefore agreed to liaise with Mouchel Parkman on this issue.

**Dave
Gilson**

8. Project Team Management Group Minutes

8.1 The Project Team Management Group Minutes from the meeting of 30th November 2007 were tabled for information.

9. Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board / PTA

9.1 Once finalised, the NGT Storyboards will need to be presented to the LCC Executive Board and the PTA.

Action

10. Any Other Business

10.1 No other business was raised

11. Date of Next Meeting

11.1 Friday 29th February, 10am at Wellington House

NGT Project Board

Minutes of the Meeting 8 held on 29th February 2008 **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Tony Darbyshire	PTA
Jean Dent	LCC
Alan Gay	LCC
Dave Gilson	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Mike Morrison	Metro
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro

Apologies:

None

Action

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 20 December 2007

- 1.1 These were agreed as correct

2 Matters Arising

- 2.1 Item 6.3 – Dave Haskins questioned whether the KPMG proposals for wider funding research had been circulated to group members. Kieran Preston explained that the action had actually been to pass a copy of the KPMG proposal to Alan Gay prior to his meeting with Tony Darbyshire to discuss NGT funding matters. He confirmed that this had been done.
- 2.2 There was some further discussion around the work that KPMG are proposing to do and a separate piece of work that is being undertaken by PWC, on behalf of the Core Cities, to look at possible funding streams for public sector projects. Alan Gay confirmed that there may be some overlap between the proposed KPMG and PWC studies. It was agreed that David Hoggarth and Kieran Preston should meet with KPMG to discuss their proposal in more detail and then report back to the Project Board on the scope of work in order to minimise any opportunities for overlap with the PWC study.

**David
Hoggarth**

3 NGT Progress Update

- 3.1 Dave Haskins summarised the NGT Progress Update Report. The following issues were discussed in more detail:
- 3.2 Dave Haskins reported that a recent meeting had taken place with the DfT to discuss the approach to modelling. He explained that the DfT had raised the issue of undertaking new roadside survey interviews to inform the modelling process, since the data collected for Supertram is fairly dated. At this stage the DfT are not insisting that new data is collected however it is likely that some new surveys will be required in order to satisfy DfT requirements in the longer term.
- 3.3 Dave Haskins explained that the Project Team are currently looking into the cost and programme implications of undertaking new surveys.
- 3.4 Dave Haskins mentioned that a senior level meeting with Bronwyn Hill and other representatives from the DfT has now been set up for 10th March. David Hoggarth explained that the meeting would primarily cover the NGT Strategic fit workstream but would also provide an opportunity to discuss wider issues such as the ongoing Leeds City Region Governance review, TIF and Multi Area Agreements.
- 3.5 With regard to the proposed appointment of Parliamentary Agents, Dave Haskins reported that there would be significant benefit in procuring such services at an early stage in the project. Initially Parliamentary Agents would have a low level of involvement with ad-hoc advice being requested as and when required. Mike Morrison confirmed that there was no particular issue in procuring such services on an 'hourly rate' arrangement. Following further discussion it was agreed that initial steps to procure such services should be taken.
- 3.6 Dave Haskins also highlighted the issue of bus guidance technology and the initial research that had been done by Mott MacDonald in this area. Kieran Preston pointed out that the lack of a suitable 'off the shelf' slot / optical guidance system could rule out vehicles over 18 metres. Jean Dent also mentioned the increased level of risk to the scheme promoters in pursuing an emerging technology that hasn't been fully proven.
- 3.7 With regard to project resources Dave Haskins pointed out that a key risk to the project is the possible loss of experienced staff from the project team. He explained that Stuart Auty is due to commence reduced working hours from April 2008 with the intention to fully retire in March 2009. Dave Gilson confirmed that LCC are aware of the need to replace Stuart Auty from April next year.

Action

3.8 Dave Haskins mentioned the work that is currently underway to draft a Joint Venture Agreement for the NGT project between Metro and LCC. Mike Morrison pointed out that initially an interim Joint Venture agreement would be prepared to cover the period up to Programme Entry.

3.9 Dave Haskins explained the proposed Project Board reporting and approvals procedures for expenditure on the NGT project going forward.

3.10 Dave Haskins presented a proposed approvals and reporting procedure to ensure that the Project Board are fully aware of the level of expenditure on the NGT project. There were several recommendations from the group regarding the manner in which financial data is presented to the Project Board.

3.11 Kieran Preston requested that the actual expenditure is reported to each Project Board meeting rather than just the anticipated expenditure. Tony Darbyshire added that the level of expenditure committed should also be shown.

**Dave
Haskins**

3.12 Following further discussion the Project Board endorsed the proposed approvals process subject to revising the reporting process as per their suggested changes and following more detailed discussion with Angela Hirst.

4. NGT Strategic Fit

4.1 Dave Haskins gave a presentation summarising the emerging findings from the NGT strategic fit work. He explained that this would form the basis of the presentation to be given at the high level DfT meeting scheduled for 10th March. During the presentation the following issues were discussed in more detail:

4.2 Dave Gilson mentioned that he had some nervousness around calling the outcomes from the strategic fit work a 'Leeds Transport Strategy' since this would require sign off by members and a long process of consultation. Kieran Preston agreed that whilst the outcome of the work may not be a full transport strategy it will still be necessary to go through a consultation process to sign off the work.

4.3 Jean Dent pointed out that the work that is being undertaken may not necessarily result in the production of a comprehensive strategy but may more meaningfully be labelled a 'blueprint' or 'prospectus'.

4.4 Dave Haskins added that the DfT will be comfortable as long as the work demonstrates clear evidence for the proposed interventions on each route.

Action

- 4.5 David Hoggarth mentioned that ultimately it will be necessary to develop an updated transport strategy for Leeds, particularly if the TIF pump-priming bid is successful. Jean Dent suggested that further consideration of this is required to understand the timescales for delivering a formal strategy and the process for doing this.
- 4.6 With regard to the proposed presentation to the DfT, several detailed comments were made regarding the content. It was agreed that a separate meeting was required, involving some members of the NGT Project Board and Paul Rogerson (LCC), to discuss the exact format of the presentation and the overall strategy for the DfT meeting. Dave Haskins agreed to arrange this meeting for week commencing 3rd March. **Dave Haskins**
- 4.7 Kieran Preston suggested that the presentation should conclude by asking the DfT for feedback on the storyboard. It was agreed that following the presentation Metro and LCC should write to the DfT reiterating the key messages set out in the presentation and asking them to confirm whether they support the proposed approach. **Dave Haskins**
- 5 Finance Update**
- 5.1 Tony Darbyshire reported that a recent meeting had been held between himself and Alan Gay in order to discuss ongoing NGT funding requirements. Alan Gay confirmed that LCC will in principle be able to fund 50% of the development costs up to 2010/11. He pointed out however that this will clearly need to be subject to ongoing review as the scheme develops.
- 5.2 Angela Hirst also mentioned that more detail regarding estimated costs for 2008/9 is required.
- 6 Merseytram NAO Report**
- 6.1 The report on the NAO report into the Merseytram project was noted. It was agreed that in light of the findings of this report it is necessary to confirm that the governance arrangements for the NGT project are robust.
- 6.2 Dave Gilson pointed out that there is a need to ensure that key decisions are taken to LCC members via the LCC Executive Board. Jean Dent suggested that the role of the NGT Project Board should be formally verified with the LCC Executive Board at a future meeting.
- 6.3 With regard to Governance issues, Kieran Preston mentioned that the Authority was considering establishing formally constituted transport committees for each local authority. Such a committee would consider joint issues between the PTA and individual local

Action

authorities and would provide an arena to discuss strategic issues, major projects, capital spend and service delivery. Jean Dent agreed that such an approach would be extremely useful.

7 Risk Management / Risk Register

7.1 Dave Haskins explained that the NGT Risk Register is continuing to be updated on a monthly basis. He added that the Project Team are currently working towards an initial design freeze at Easter after which point estimated scheme costs will be more robust and a Quantified Risk Assessment will be undertaken.

7.2 Dave Gilson highlighted the fact that the Risk Register currently shows a number of risks which are classified as “possible showstoppers” He suggested that these risks should be categorised differently to show that they are very high risk.

8 Project Team Management Group Minutes

8.1 The PTMG minutes were noted.

9 Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board / PTA

9.1 No issues were raised

10 Any Other Business

10.1 Dave Haskins mentioned that due to clashes with other meetings and planned leave, it will be necessary to rearrange the Project Board meetings currently scheduled for June and August. It is therefore proposed that meetings take place in early July, September and November. Possible dates will be discussed with all parties in the near future.

11 Date of Next Meeting

11.1 23rd April 2008 at 2pm, Wellington House

NGT Project Board

Minutes of the Meeting 9 held on 23rd April 2008 **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Jean Dent	LCC
Dave Gilson	LCC
David Hoggarth	Metro
Dave Haskins	Metro
Mike Morrison	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
Steven Hemingway (Minutes)	Metro

Apologies:

Louise Porter	Metro
Alan Gay	LCC

Action

1.	Minutes of the meeting held on 29 February 2008	
1.1	These were agreed as a correct record of events.	
2	Matters Arising	
2.1	There were no matters arising.	
3	NGT Progress Update	
3.1	Dave Haskins verbally summarised the NGT Progress Update Report. The following issues were discussed in more detail:	
3.2	Dave Haskins confirmed that as previously reported to the Board, there remains a need to undertake Roadside Survey Interviews (RSI's) in order to supplement the work that has been undertaken by Mouchel Parkman to update the Leeds SATURN model.	
3.3	Dave Haskins confirmed that SDG are currently in the process of investigating the cost and practicalities of undertaking these surveys with the intention to implement these in June 2008. This is a relatively tight timescale and it means that a full programme of surveys cannot be undertaken, it is therefore proposed that only the Northern Corridor (Headingley/Otley Road) Survey will be carried out. Dave confirmed that If the Leeds City Region TIF pump priming bid is successful then a further round of RSI's will be required in the Autumn. However, it was considered that the combining of NGT surveys with any potential TIF data collection was not practical in terms of timescale and differing survey requirements. It was also stated that the NGT surveys would not replicate surveys that will be undertaken as part of potential TIF surveys.	

Action

3.4	<p>Dave Haskins outlined what further tasks are currently in progress to conclude the work that is being undertaken to define the Strategic Fit for the NGT project. It was reported that a more detailed data analysis, covering all Leeds radial corridors, is now underway to ensure that the technical justification for the proposed interventions is robust. Discussions within the Board centred on the development of a document which can be used in consultation with Members and the wider stakeholders on the outcome of the Strategic Fit work. A proposed timetable for delivering and adopting this document had been included in the NGT Project Update Report it can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• June 2008: present the blueprint to the PTA / LCC Executive Board• July – Autumn 2008: consult widely with stakeholders through key meetings and other events as appropriate• Autumn 2008: public consultation (to be undertaken as part of programmed NGT consultation);• Dec 2008: full approval / adoption of blueprint <p>Further debate took place on the degree of consultation as a number of interlinking documents were also likely to be out for consultation within the same time frames proposed (i.e., City Region Vision refresh, TIF Bid, LTP mid-life review). It was agreed that David Hoggarth and Dave Gilson would meet to map out this process. Discussion also took place on the content of the NGT document, it was agreed that this would be included in the arranged meeting.</p>	David Hoggarth & David Gilson
3.5	<p>Dave Haskins reported that progress was being made on developing an Indicative Work Programme that would form the basis of a Scope of Works for the appointment of NGT Parliamentary Agents. It was proposed that Steve Hemingway would develop a Board Report that would be presented to the May PTE Board Meeting. Mike Morrison asked for a copy of the Indicative Work Programme (and report for comment). Dave Haskins explained the benefits to engaging Parliamentary Agents at this specific point of the project. It was considered necessary to get their input at what is a critical stage in the programme as we are now approaching what will be the Design Freeze (Design Freeze 1) on the development of the initial long-list of alignment options from which a framework for taking forward a short-list will be developed and it is at this stage that the Parliamentary Agents can add benefit in defining what would be the appropriate level of work required to safeguard future options, including a possible conversion to tram. It was agreed by the Board that this was important in order to get the early input into the right level of activity/detail at the pre-Programme Entry stage.</p>	Steven Hemingway

Action

3.6	Dave Haskins highlighted the progress made on the 'bus guidance technology' assessment and the initial research that had been done by Mott MacDonald. It was reported that a Network Design Workshop had been hosted by Metro on 14th April and was attended by members of the NGT Project Team and a number of key Leeds Officers including the Civic Architect, Principal Design Engineer, Executive Manager Specialist Projects and Principal Landscape Architect. A consensus view was formed of general acceptance for the introduction of unguided vehicles through public realm areas of the City Centre (such as the Eastgate Quarter and Millennium Square), although further detail would need to be worked through to ensure full compliance with safety and urban realm aspirations.	
3.7	Dave Haskins again drew the Boards attention to the need to consider the appointment of Political Lobbyists (this had been raised at previous meetings and was now a being developed as a task on the NGT Programme). A round table discussion took place on the benefits of briefing the right politicians the discussion ended with a consensus that such a role was very important and further work should be undertaken by the NGT Team to establish a Lobbying Strategy / Specification that includes for the high value benefits of briefing the politicians. Once a Strategy had been developed Kieran Preston and Jean Dent undertook to discuss the proposal.	Dave Haskins
3.8	Dave Haskins confirmed that work was still underway, with DLA leading on drafting up the outline heads of terms for a Joint Venture Agreement (JVA) for the NGT Project between Metro and LCC. Discussion took place on the need for a JVA and it was agreed that the JVA should be put on hold and redeveloped basically as document on land issues between the two parties (LCC and Metro) and letters of comfort between both parties could deal with the agreement on the joint funding arrangements. It was agreed that a separate meeting would be arranged between David Hoggarth, Dave Haskins and Steve Hemingway to discuss the issues on protection of land identified for the NGT Project and how to capture agreements on funding. It was agreed that this would be reported back to next NGT Project Board meeting.	David Hoggarth
3.9	Dave Haskins drew the Boards' attention to the NGT Project finance update report and questioned if the level of detail presented, which included the recently agreed work packages with the advisors was sufficient in detail. The level and representation to the Board was considered sufficient to keep them informed. Questions were asked however, by Board Members on the level of expenditure identified by KPMG up to Programme Entry (Spring 2009). Dave Haskins confirmed that this was KPMG's anticipated ceiling estimate at this stage and was not considered by the Project Team as 'agreed' spend. Dave Gilson raised questions of value for	

Action

	money and what their role was on tasks they had identified. It was confirmed that, what had been presented to the Board was only a flavour of the tasks to be undertaken and more details as to their role were available if requested.	
3.10	Approval was given by the Project Board to the previous minute's recommendation to commence the development of a NGT Project Website. Dave Haskins provided the Board with visual presentation of a website used for the Edinburgh Tram system. It was acknowledged by the Board that the current Metro and LCC coverage was not sufficient for a project of this size and status.	
4.	Scope of Activity	
4.1	Dave Haskins raised the Boards' attention the content of the 'NGT Scope of Activity' Report. Dave explained the difficulties in trying to put a concise Report that covered all the issues being faced by the NGT Team. It was highlighted that the Report contained a number of important issues where Board clarification was being sought. The Report was intended to provide the Board with a level of 'visibility' on what was currently being undertaken by the NGT Project Team. Dave Haskins identified for round-table discussion the considerations necessary for developing a tram option and the extent of vehicle segregation to which the project continues to strive. It was however agreed by the Board that tram has to remain in the overall NGT appraisal mix and that a fully robust cost estimate needs to be developed for the Southern/City Centre Route as a minimum.	
4.2	Dave Haskins confirmed that he had chased feedback relating to the letter to Bronwyn Hill following the recent meeting with the DfT (10 th March 08). It was suggested by DfT that a formal response to the issues raised in the letter would be forthcoming sometime early May (following the local elections).	
4.3	Dave Gilson commenced the debate on what should be the way forward for NGT by suggesting that tram-train should be the overall goal. A selection of route choices were identified as the means to move forward with tram-train. Dave Haskins pointed out to the Board that the recent work to investigate the case for tram-train by Arup's did not support this case in terms of the ideas expressed for the South route but a further review of their report was necessary before any decisions could be considered. It was agreed that the Board needs to be fully informed on Arup's report.	Dave Haskins
4.4	A great deal of discussion centred on the levels of segregation to be afforded to the NGT project. It was broadly agreed that the 'trolley bus solution' / assumptions currently being developed by the NGT Project Team should reflect as much land segregation as would have been applied to the tram system (wherever this was	

Action

	considered technically possible by the Project Team). It was also recognised by the Board that levels of segregation needed to be supported with increased levels of priority. Dave Haskins confirmed that a great deal of effort was being applied to understand what levels of segregation and priority could be achieved.	
4.5	The Board discussed issues relating to issues of capacity of the system and asked for a short report on what capacity was available and could the 'trolley bus solution' meet this capacity? Dave Haskins was asked to provide David Hoggarth with a short report on the levels of capacity relative to different modes (bus & tram) and provide background confirmation on vehicle lengths in the city centre.	Dave Haskins
4.6	The Board discussed at some length the extent of Major Scheme Business Case Submission with regard to the development of a Network and the phasing of the various sections. It was considered appropriate that emphasis should focus on the South Line first but recognition was given to the extent of the segregation to be afforded versus the issues of funding availability. Round table discussions explored possibilities of developing a top of the range bus solution as the first overall phase but aiming for possibly tram-train in the longer term. It was recognised by the Board that tram-train as an option at this stage was unrealistic in terms of deliverability timescales and funding.	
4.7	A debate took place as to the approach to be considered for the Headingley Line and the level of segregation to be afforded to the NGT solution. Discussion centred on exploring what levels of traffic capacity that could be taken out of the existing highways and what levels of Member support this approach might have. It was recognised that removing road space capacity for the NGT would be difficult to 'sell' but the anticipated upsides to this could be a major selling point. It was agreed that further work was necessary to understand what a more highly segregated solution could deliver and it was felt that this should be considered on the Southern/City Route first. Dave Haskins reiterated the point that this does form part of ongoing advisor activity and was reflected in the current programme of work.	
4.8	Discussion was given to the approach to be taken to NGT with the city centre. Dave Haskins confirmed that assumptions by the Project Team in developing the current proposals were based upon an understanding that operation of the city 'loop' would remain as it is now and that a need to rationalise bus stops in the centre along with a re-focus on bus interchanges would be necessary. Dave Gilson advised that a 'status quo' assumption to the operation of the 'loop' was correct at this stage, although it was confirmed that early stage work had commenced to look at choices available in operation of the 'loop'. Further discussion took place on issues	

Action

	relative to the assumptions to be applied to the public realm strategy, it was confirmed that new policies on defining options were in-hand and these have to be considered when looking at opportunities for placing the NGT solution into the overall city aspirations.	
4.9	Dave Haskins confirmed that the NGT Team were no longer focusing on developing the EASEL corridor beyond defining a possible route alignment. The Board confirmed that this was the right approach. Further understanding was necessary as to what opportunities exist on this corridor before more work is carried out. Issues on Park & Ride and how the A64 link work influenced decisions on this corridor were discussed in round terms.	
4.10	Dave Haskins confirmed that the NGT Team were no longer undertaking further work on the Aire Valley at this stage. A discussion took place as to when work on this corridor should be undertaken. The view of the Board was that it was acceptable that no further work should be undertaken at this stage and it should form the basis of a future Phase after Programme Entry Approval for the first Phase.	
4.11	In summing up the views considered by the Board it was agreed that the ongoing activity of work would continue inline with the NGT programme outlined by Dave Haskins.	
5	Risk Management / Risk Register	
5.1	Dave Haskins confirmed that the NGT Risk Register continues to be updated on a regular / monthly basis. It was confirmed by the Project Board that the processes proposed, implemented and the level of detail presented within the Risk Report was satisfactory for the Board to get a clear understanding for the Project Risks.	
5.2	Dave Haskins confirmed that a lot of effort had taken place since the last Board to undertake Dave Gilson's suggestion that risks which are classified as "possible showstoppers" should be categorised differently to show that they are very high risk. Dave Haskins explained that some risks however, must still have the potential to be 'showstoppers' and this had to be reflected in the mitigation plans that now surrounded the majority of risks in the register.	
6	Project Team Management Group Minutes	
6.1	The PTMG minutes were noted.	
7	Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board / PTA	
7.1	No issues were raised.	

		<u>Action</u>
8	Any Other Business	
8.1	Dave Haskins undertook to arrange a meeting to discuss with the DfT what level of clarification would be necessary and what level of support would be given to a southern line submission only.	Dave Haskins
9	Date of Next Meeting	
9.1	16 th June 2008 at 10am, Wellington House	

NGT Project Board

Minutes of the Meeting 10 held on 16th June 2008 **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Jean Dent	LCC
Dave Gilson	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
Mike Morrison	Metro
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro

Apologies:

David Hoggarth	Metro
Alan Gay	LCC

Action

1. Minutes of Meeting held on 23 April 2008

- 1.1 Item 3.3 Dave Gilson pointed out that the reference to the "Leeds City Region TIF pump priming bid" should actually refer to the "Leeds/Metro TIF pump priming bid".

- 1.2 Other than this the minutes were agreed as correct.

2. Matters Arising

- 2.1 All matters arising were dealt with under the main agenda.

3. NGT Progress Update

- 3.1 Dave Haskins summarised the key points covered by the NGT update report. The following issues were discussed in more detail:

- 3.2 With regard to the DfT letter of 13 May 2008, Dave Haskins reported that he is intending to draft a letter of response seeking further clarification on several points raised by the DfT. It was agreed that this response needed to cover a range of issues including:
- Clarification on what is meant by the reference to not investing all available capital in a "single high cost scheme of limited coverage"
 - Expected timescales for delivery of tram-train technology
 - Partnership opportunities

- 3.3 Dave Haskins mentioned that it is intended to hold workshop sessions with First, Arriva and Transdev in order to disseminate the findings from the strategic fit work. The workshop sessions will also provide an initial indication of market appetite for implementing the findings of the work.

- | | | |
|------|--|---------------|
| 3.4 | With regard to budget issues, Dave Haskins agreed to circulate further information to show current levels of expenditure against the approved 2008/9 budget. | Dave Haskins |
| 3.5 | In terms of the NGT Joint Venture Agreement, Mike Morrison confirmed that this is now moving forward. He explained that the most critical element of the agreement relates to funding arrangements and suggested that a funding agreement is set out in the form a letter (as was the case for Supertram). | Mike Morrison |
| 3.6 | A discussion took place on the issues set out in Appendix 2 of the report, concerning the identification of the Promoters' objectives in terms of commercial and policy parameters. Kieran Preston suggested that there is a need to challenge assumptions around the amount of priority afforded to NGT and the impacts upon other road users. In order to take this work forward, Dave Haskins agreed to arrange a separate session involving KPMG, David Hoggarth and Dave Gilson. | Dave Haskins |
| 3.7 | Dave Haskins explained that LCC officers had identified the need to undertake further design and appraisal work on an NGT route into Aire Valley Leeds, to feed into the Area Action Plan process. Jean Dent reinforced the importance of identifying public transport links into the Aire Valley, since this will be key in delivering the vision for an exemplar of sustainable development. It was agreed that work on an Aire Valley NGT route should therefore recommence and Dave Haskins undertook to consider the resource implications of this. | Dave Haskins |
| 3.8 | Dave Haskins also raised the issue of bidding for further NGT funding in autumn 2008 as part of the Regional Funding Allocation (RFA) review. He explained that when the Regional Transport Board (RTB) initially allocated £150 million to the project in June 2007, they also endorsed the full £300 million scheme. Kieran Preston suggested that it is therefore necessary to go back to the RTB and bid for the remaining £150 million as part of the autumn review. | |
| 3.9 | A discussion then took place around the scope of the Major Scheme Business Case (MSBC) to be submitted to the DfT in spring 2009. Dave Haskins explained that if the RFA review results in a further £150 million being allocated to NGT, there would in theory be an opportunity to submit an MSBC for the full £300 million scheme. Dave Gilson added that we may not know the outcome of the RFA review within the timescales for preparation and submission of the MSBC. He also pointed out that the DfT will not accept an MSBC for the full £300 million scheme unless the full funding requirement has been secured. | |
| 3.10 | It was agreed that, subject to further consideration, the most appropriate approach is to submit a bid for the outstanding £150 million in the autumn RFA review. Following this, it is then intended to continue developing an MSBC for the initial £150 million NGT scheme to be followed by a further MSBC to cover the remaining £150 million once this has been allocated to the scheme. | |

4. NGT Work Programme

- 4.1 Dave Haskins summarised the key points outlined in the Work Programme report. He highlighted several issues which had impacted upon timescales including the strategic fit analysis and the delay to completion of the Saturn model update.
- 4.2 With regard to the Saturn model update, Dave Haskins explained that the journey times in the updated model still require some further work. He mentioned that if the TIF pump-priming bid is successful, the DfT could request that the NGT models take account of the TIF data to be collected in the autumn. This would have a serious impact on the work programme, however, the NGT road side interviews (planned for early July), will provide updated data for the NGT models and should therefore reduce the likelihood of this risk.
- 4.3 Dave Haskins explained that a meeting with the DfT is to be set up to discuss modelling issues, ultimately the DfT will decide whether they accept the model in its current form with the road-side interview updates.
- 4.4 Dave Gilson queried the reference in the report to the fact that the South route may not necessarily have the strongest business case following the detailed appraisal work. He suggested that overall the south route is more deliverable than the North route. Dave Haskins explained that there will be a need to consider wider issues such as deliverability when identifying the preferred option.
- 4.5 The summarised Work Programme was discussed, Dave Haskins drew the Board's attention to the fact that the construction period, currently shown as a three years, is based on the construction of a full three-line network. He explained that if the project were taken forward in a phased manner, the construction period could be significantly reduced.

5. NGT Approach to Consultation

- 5.1 Louise Porter summarised the key issues set out in the consultation report. There was some discussion around the potential impact of a TIF engagement strategy on the proposed timescales for NGT consultation.
- 5.2 Jean Dent queried whether, in the event of TIF consultation being delayed, it was also necessary for NGT consultation to be held back. Dave Haskins suggested that if TIF consultation were to be delayed, it would be necessary to make the case to the DfT for continuing with planned NGT consultation activities, given the programme implications of delaying consultation until after the Christmas shopping period.
- 5.3 Kieran Preston suggested that it may be possible to ask some common questions as part of NGT/TIF consultations rather than trying to keep the processes separate. It was agreed that there is some scope for this and Dave Gilson agreed to raise the issue at the next meeting of the TIF Steering Group. Dave Gilson
- 5.4 Louise Porter mentioned that a further consideration for NGT

consultation activities, is how these fit with the proposed Vision Refresh. Jean Dent pointed out that there is no clarity yet on the detail of the proposed vision refresh. It was agreed that there is a need to ensure that messages are complementary.

- 5.5 In terms of moving forward on preparing a programme of consultation for NGT, it was agreed that the following approach should be adopted: Louise Porter
- Identify the consultation questions to be asked for NGT
 - Consider whether there is any scope for combining any elements of TIF/NGT consultations
 - Discuss the proposed approach with the DfT and get their buy-in

6. Risk Management / Risk Register

- 6.1 Dave Haskins mentioned that it is intended to undertake a full review of the Risk Register before the end of July and this will then feed into a Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA). The results of the QRA will be brought back to the September meeting of the Project Board.
- 6.2 Dave Haskins also mentioned that an informal peer review of the NGT Risk Register had been undertaken by officers involved in the Edinburgh TIE scheme. This had resulted in extremely positive feedback.
- 6.3 Jean Dent suggested that it would be useful to highlight any new risks. Dave Haskins agreed to provide this information at the next meeting, following the risk review process.

7. Project Team Management Group

- 7.1 Dave Gilson mentioned item 4.15 of the Project Team Management Group minutes regarding the work KPMG are proposing to undertake on wider funding opportunities. He suggested that there may be some overlap with similar work being undertaken on behalf of the Core Cities group.
- 7.2 Dave Haskins explained that KPMG have proposed several work packages covering NGT and wider funding issues. He mentioned that KPMG were proceeding with the NGT funding work, however on the wider funding issues a meeting has been held with LCC to ensure that there is no overlap with the Core Cities work. Kieran Preston added that KPMG would only proceed with any pieces of work that could add value to what has already been done.

8. Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board / PTA

- 8.1 Dave Gilson circulated a draft copy of an LCC Executive Board report providing an update on NGT and setting out the findings of the strategic fit work. This report is due to go to the July meeting of the LCC Executive Board. He explained that Alan Gay is to provide some further text relating to funding issues before the report can be finalised.
- 8.2 A discussion on the content of the report took place and the following amendments were agreed:
- 3.3 – need to mention that the initial £150m RFA allocation is part

of a wider £300 million scheme;

- 3.4-3.7 – need to add something into this section regarding the DfT's recent letter and their view on the development of a tram option;
- 3.16 – need to highlight the need to progress a route in Aire Valley Leeds;
- 5.2 – change Kieran Preston's title to Director General;
- Appendix 1 – highlight the potential for future improvements to the South-West of Leeds / possible upgrade to the A65 Quality Bus Corridor.

9. Any Other Business

9.1 No other business was raised.

10. Date of Next Meeting

10.1 4th September 2008, 2pm, Wellington House

NGT Project Board

Minutes of the Meeting 11 held on 4th September 2008 at Wellington House, Leeds

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Jean Dent	LCC
Alan Gay	LCC
Dave Gilson	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro

Apologies:

Mike Morrison	Metro
---------------	-------

Action

1. Minutes of Meeting held on 16 June 2008

- 1.1 These were agreed as correct.

2. Matters Arising

- 2.1 All matters arising were dealt with under the main agenda.

3. Design Freeze 1

- 3.1 Dave Haskins summarised the content of the Design Freeze 1 report and explained that the Design Freeze process is an important milestone in the NGT programme. A discussion took place on some of the key issues arising from the report.
- 3.2 David Hoggarth pointed out that the purpose of the Design Freeze 1 exercise is to identify a reference case for the modelling work. This is a fundamental point, since the reference case is not the final case and can therefore be changed as necessary.
- 3.3 Kieran Preston mentioned that more detail on strengths and weaknesses is required for each option prior to any decisions on route options being taken. Jean Dent added that cost information for each option is also required. Dave Haskins explained that an analysis of strengths and weaknesses had been undertaken for each option and capital costs are currently in preparation.
- 3.4 Dave Gilson raised the issue of operating diesel vehicles through Millennium square and whether this would be acceptable to LCC. David Hoggarth suggested that it may be more appropriate for LCC to define air quality standards to be met in Millennium Square, rather than specify

a vehicle type to be used.

- 3.5 Kieran Preston also mentioned the issue of how the DfT economic appraisal process takes account of issues such as increasing oil prices and suggested that they should be challenged on this point.
- 3.6 David Hoggarth highlighted the issues relating to different options in Headingley which had been raised through the Design Freeze 1 process. This includes the potential for four lane operation on Headingley Lane and options for the routes behind the Arndale Centre. He suggested that artists impressions may be of use to assist in briefing politicians on these options. Dave Haskins confirmed that artists impressions were already in preparation to demonstrate these options and agreed to provide these to the Project Board on completion.
- 3.7 Jean Dent suggested that further work is required to understand the feasibility of the various options for Headingley, in order to avoid presenting options to politicians that are ultimately not feasible.
- 3.8 Dave Haskins suggested that a meeting be held outside of the Project Board involving David Hoggarth and Dave Gilson to discuss the detailed issues arising out of Design Freeze 1. He explained that this could be combined with a proposed meeting to discuss procurement issues that is to be scheduled for the near future. Dave Haskins

4. Progress Update

- 4.1 Dave Haskins summarised the key points contained in the progress update report and the following issues were discussed.
- 4.2 Kieran Preston reported that at the recent meeting with DfT, they had confirmed that they wouldn't unnecessarily delay NGT modelling work to fit in with TIF modelling timescales, unless there was a fundamental problem with the NGT models themselves. However, Dave Haskins pointed out that, since there are significant validation problems with the Leeds SATURN model, there is a real probability that NGT proposals will have to be re-tested under the TIF models - perhaps following Major Scheme Business Case submission.
- 4.3 Dave Haskins mentioned the proposal to present the findings of the strategic fit work to the DfT. David Hoggarth suggested that further work is required to refine the work before this presentation takes place. He also suggested that the draft technical strategic fit report be sent to the DfT prior to the presentation. Dave Haskins
- 4.4 Dave Haskins reported that a brochure/leaflet is currently in preparation to summarise the findings of the strategic fit work and this will be used in disseminating the findings to stakeholders. He asked for Project Board views on the approvals process for this document. Dave Gilson mentioned that in terms of LCC the document will need to be approved by LMT. Kieran Preston suggested that the Leeds Transport Strategy group may be the most appropriate group to approve this document.
- 4.5 With regard to the preparation of a re-submission to the Regional

Transport Board for NGT phase 1, Dave Haskins advised that Steer Davies Gleave had been asked to provide advice on the level of detail required for this submission. He also mentioned that in relation to making a submission for NGT phase 2, it will be necessary to quickly clarify the total funding requirement in the absence of detailed capital costs.

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------|
| 4.6 | Kieran Preston suggested that an outline cost figure is required from Mott MacDonald in order to understand whether the figures shown in the Initial Business Case are still relevant. Dave Haskins agreed to obtain this information from Mott MacDonald. | Dave Haskins |
| 4.7 | Kieran Preston suggested that it may be necessary to provide the Regional Transport Board with an outline cost based on the figure in the Initial Business Case and explain that there is still more work to do before this cost can be finalised. | |
| 4.8 | Dave Gilson also raised the issue over sources of funding for the local contribution to the scheme. There was some discussion over alternative sources of funding including the potential to top slice funds from the Local Transport Plan and possible use of Supplementary Business Rates. Dave Haskins advised that KPMG are currently undertaking work to identify potential sources for the local contribution. | |
| 4.9 | Dave Haskins mentioned that a meeting is to be set up to consider policy and commercial parameters for the NGT project. This is to involve David Hoggarth and Dave Gilson. Kieran Preston commented that there are some key mode priority options which will need to be challenged as part of this work. | Dave Haskins |
| 4.10 | With regard to the development of a Joint Venture Agreement for the NGT project, it was agreed that the draft document should be circulated to Project Board members and LCC Legal for comment. | Dave Haskins |
| 4.11 | Dave Haskins reported that a review of NGT resources has been undertaken. He explained that, whilst some of these issues would need to be resolved in the near future, details of longer term resourcing issues will be brought back to the next Project Board meeting. | |
| 5. NGT Engagement | | |
| 5.1 | Louise Porter summarised the content of the NGT Engagement report. She explained that an initial stage of public engagement is planned to take place in October - November 2009 and this will involve holding joint NGT/TIF exhibitions under the banner of "Transport For Leeds". | |
| 5.2 | Kieran Preston suggested that in terms of venues for joint NGT/TIF exhibitions central areas which attract high levels of footfall should be considered. | |
| 5.3 | Louise Porter explained that the key focus of this initial period of engagement is on presenting the potential route and mode options at a high level of detail. She added that consultation materials and | |

discussions will make it clear that a range of options are under consideration.

- 5.4 It was agreed that prior to the commencement of public engagement activities, it will be necessary to brief Councillor Carter on the nature of the issues to be presented to the public. In addition it was agreed that draft content for the exhibition boards and leaflet/questionnaire will be tabled at the Leeds Transport Strategy group meeting on 1 October. Louise Porter

6. Risk Management / Risk Register

- 6.1 Dave Haskins reported that a full review of NGT risks has been undertaken through a risk workshop. This had involved closing out several risks and ensuring that mitigation actions are in place.
- 6.2 Dave Gilson questioned why “failure to secure TIF approval” is currently listed as a risk. Dave Haskins explained that this only becomes a risk if the necessary RFA funding for the project is not provided and therefore it becomes necessary to consider TIF as a funding source.
- 6.3 Kieran Preston suggested that it would be useful for the risk register to be updated to show how the risk scores change following completion of mitigation actions. Dave Haskins agreed to arrange for this information to be included in the register for the next Project Board meeting Dave Haskins

7. PTMG Minutes

- 7.1 The minutes of the August PTMG meeting were noted.

8. Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board / PTA

- 8.1 It was agreed that the following items should be referred to the Leeds Transport Strategy Group at their meeting of 1 October:
- NGT update report
 - Strategic Fit findings
 - Draft content for the NGT public consultation materials
- 8.2 It was also agreed that an NGT update should be provided to the next meeting of the PTA.

9. Any Other Business

- 9.1 No other business was raised.

10. Date of Next Meeting

- 10.1 The next meeting is scheduled for 24th November 2008, 11am at Wellington House.

NGT Project Board

Minutes of the Meeting 12 held on 18th December 2008 **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Jean Dent	LCC
Dave Gilson (part)	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
David Hoggarth (part)	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
Mike Morrison	Metro
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro

Apologies:

Alan Gay	LCC
----------	-----

Action

1. Minutes of Meeting held on 4th September 2008

- 1.1 These were agreed as correct.

2. Matters Arising

- 2.1 All matters arising were dealt with under the main agenda.

3. Progress Update

- 3.1 Dave Haskins provided a summary of the key issues arising from a recent meeting with the DfT. He explained that the meeting had been extremely positive and had provided a clear steer on several key issues. He stated that it is intended to finalise the notes from the meeting and then forward these to the DfT requesting that they respond in writing to confirm their agreement.

**Dave
Haskins**

- 3.2 With regard to the Strategic Fit work, Dave Haskins reported that the DfT stated that they are satisfied that our responsibility to undertake this work has now been discharged. He also reported that the DfT gave a clear steer that the NGT work should be disembroiled from the TIF work and confirmed that the DfT do not intend to delay any decisions on NGT until after the TIF models have been completed.

- 3.3 With regard to the recent RFA funding submission for NGT Phase 2, Dave Haskins explained that the DfT are keen to understand the level of funding that would be required to deliver a core 3 line network (i.e. North, South and East as far as St James's Hospital). He added that the

DfT had indicated their strong support for focussing on the development of this core network.

- 3.4 Following the DfT meeting Dave Haskins explained that further work has been undertaken to estimate the costs of the core network as referred to by the DfT. This work has shown that such a network would require approximately £100m through the RFA (in addition to the £150m already secured. This compares to a figure of £220m which was requested through the recent RFA bid for a more comprehensive scheme including an Aire Valley Leeds route. The total project value for all components of the NGT scheme is an estimated £280m based on outturn prices and a 10% local contribution. Dave Haskins agreed to send the revised costs for a reduced core network through to Steer Davies Gleave who are appraising the RFA submissions.

**Dave
Haskins**

- 3.5 With regard to the proposal for an NGT route to serve Aire Valley Leeds, Dave Haskins mentioned that the DfT have made it clear that they are unlikely to financially support this route. The DfT consider this to be a regeneration led scheme which should be funded by CLG. He explained that following the DfT meeting discussions have been held with LCC officers involved in the Aire Valley project to consider funding options. As a result of these discussions it has been agreed that a joint DfT / CLG meeting be set up in early 2009 to discuss Aire Valley issues in more detail.

- 3.6 Dave Haskins mentioned that the estimated capital cost of an NGT route through Aire Valley is £50m and the development costs needed to bring the proposals to an acceptable level for a Major Scheme Business Case are estimated at £0.5m. Jean Dent mentioned that LCC have recently made a submission to CLG for the development of an Eco-growth point in the Aire Valley. She explained that a total of four bids have been made and the outcome will be known in February. If LCC are successful in this bid, some initial funding will be provided which could potentially be used to develop the NGT proposals for the Aire Valley.

- 3.7 Dave Haskins mentioned that the NGT Strategic Fit technical work has now been completed and in order to disseminate this to key stakeholders a summary document is currently being finalised. He added that this is due to be reported to LCC's Leader Management Team on 8th January 2009.

- 3.8 Kieran Preston pointed out that the figures presented in the financial update suggest that there is still approximately £1m in NGT development costs to be spent this financial year and he queried whether this is accurate. Dave Haskins explained that the figures presented only include invoices issued up to a certain date and as such do not show the full spend to date. He added that current forecasts suggest that spend this financial year is likely to be just under approved budgets.

- 3.9 With regard to procurement issues, Kieran Preston questioned when we will be in a position to identify the preferred NGT mode since this will dictate the procurement route. Dave Haskins explained that at present the aim is to identify the preferred NGT mode option by the end of February 2009. However he did point out that there are some complex modelling issues to be addressed in order to get to this point. He also mentioned that it will be necessary to develop procurement packages for both the preferred and next best options.

4. Stakeholder Engagement

- 4.1 Louise Porter explained that the first phase of consultation on NGT is now underway and commenced with a series of public exhibitions held in Leeds City Centre in November which was attended by over 1,000 people and has so far resulted in approximately 1,100 questionnaires being completed. She also mentioned that an NGT website has also been launched and this contains an online version of the NGT questionnaire.
- 4.2 Louise Porter circulated copies of an interim report that has been prepared to set out the findings from the NGT questionnaires that have been completed to date. This will be updated following the closing date for the return of questionnaire responses which is 9th January 2009. With regard to the interim report, Louise Porter highlighted the following key findings:
- Respondents were from a range of age groups – not dominated by a particular group;
 - Over 60% of respondents owned at least one car;
 - 67% of respondents travel into Leeds city centre three or more times per week;
 - The most frequently requested public transport improvements were: increased reliability, cheaper fares and increased frequency;
 - The most frequently requested improvements to public transport vehicles were: more on-board information, cleaner vehicles and more environmentally friendly vehicles; and
 - People were generally supportive of the NGT proposals, common issues raised included requests for a tram system and requests for further routes – particularly for west Leeds.
- 4.3 Following the public exhibitions, Louise Porter reported that further activities are now underway in order to reach as wide an audience as possible prior to the consultation closing date in early January. This has included circulation of the weblink to the NGT questionnaire to a number of organisations including businesses who are members of the Leeds Travel Plan Network. In addition remaining hard copies of the questionnaire will be circulated by promotions staff in Leeds city centre between 18th-19th December.
- 4.4 Louise Porter mentioned that following their appointment as Parliamentary Agents to the project, Bircham Dyson Bell have

undertaken an initial analysis of the consultation undertaken to date. They have provided initial advice on the next stage of more detailed consultation that will be required in order to progress through a Transport and Works Act Order.

5. Risk Management / Risk Register

- 5.1 Dave Haskins reported that, as requested by the Project Board, the Risk Management report now shows the likely impact of each risk event following the implementation of mitigation measures. He pointed out that of the 23 existing red risks currently shown on the register, only 8 of these are expected to remain red following mitigation measures.
- 5.2 Dave Gilson mentioned the potential risk relating to the level of local contribution requested by the DfT and whether this would exceed 10% if the trolleybus option is progressed. Dave Haskins explained that KPMG have advised that a local contribution of 10% should be assumed.

6. Project Team Management Group Minutes

- 6.1 The minutes of the PTMG meetings held in September, October and November were noted.

7. Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board / PTA

- 7.1 No items for referral were identified.

8. Any Other Business

- 8.1 No other business was raised.

9. Date of Next Meeting

- 9.1 As a result of the November 2008 Project Board meeting being rescheduled to December 2008, subsequent meetings in 2009 are currently in the process of being rescheduled. Dates for meetings in February, April and June 2009 are to be identified in the near future.

NGT Project Board

Minutes of Meeting 13 held on 6th March 2009 **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Jean Dent	LCC
Alan Gay	LCC
Dave Gilson	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro

Apologies:

Mike Morrison	Metro
---------------	-------

Action

1. Minutes of Meeting held on 18th December 2008

- 1.1 These were agreed as correct.

2. Matters Arising

- 2.1 Item 3.1 Dave Haskins reported that DfT have been sent a copy of the minutes from the December meeting and their comments/approval are now awaited.

3. Progress Update

- 3.1 Dave Haskins summarised the main issues covered by the progress update report. He highlighted the fact that a series of NGT Working Groups have now been established to focus activity up to Major Scheme Business Case (MSBC) submission and explained that this has significantly intensified workloads.

- 3.2 Dave Haskins mentioned that a meeting had recently taken place with the DfT to discuss project management procedures and this had been extremely positive. At the meeting the DfT had stressed the pre-requisite of having a Joint Venture Agreement (JVA) in place for the project prior to MSBC submission. Dave Haskins reported that the draft JVA is in development and is currently with LCC awaiting authority to proceed in terms of asset management issues. Jean Dent agreed to investigate this further with a view to minimising any delay.

Jean
Dent

- 3.3 With regard to the land element of the JVA, Kieran Preston requested clarification on whether land already held by the scheme promoters has been included in scheme costs to date. Dave Haskins agreed to seek further clarification on this and report back. Dave Haskins
- 3.4 Kieran Preston also asked how far discussions had progressed on how the 10% local contribution to the scheme will be funded. Dave Haskins explained that a Financial Modelling and Funding Working Group has been established and will consider this issue in detail. Alan Gay requested that a member of his team be involved in this group and agreed to supply an appropriate contact name to Dave Haskins. Alan Gay
- 3.5 Dave Haskins mentioned that at the DfT recent meeting to discuss project management, the DfT had made it clear that they were keen to see membership of the NGT Project Board widened. It was agreed that at this stage there would be value in inviting a GOYH representative to join the Board. Dave Haskins agreed to action this. Dave Haskins
- 3.6 A discussion took place around the various NGT route options in Headingley as set out in the update report. Dave Haskins explained the reasons behind the recommendation that Option A (i.e. 2 traffic lanes plus a northbound NGT lane), be taken forward. David Hoggarth mentioned that more detailed work will be required in order to give further reassurances that this option will be workable. It was agreed that Option A be taken forward at this stage, subject to more detailed work, (potentially including microsimulation modelling) at a later point in the process.
- 3.7 Dave Haskins reported that a Working Group has also been set up to identify a solution for NGT in the City Centre to be led by David Hoggarth. He pointed out that there is a real risk to the project programme if NGT becomes embroiled in wider city centre issues. David Hoggarth added that the aim is to identify a short term solution for the NGT system, whilst being mindful of longer term aspirations for the city centre through the Transport for Leeds project.
- 3.8 With regard to procurement issues Dave Haskins explained that the project team is currently seeking legal advice on how and when to involve bus operators in the process. He mentioned that one option is to hold an open session for all interested operators. In terms of taking the procurement work forward, Dave Haskins suggested holding a meeting to involve key Project Board members in the near future. Kieran Preston and Jean Dent confirmed that they would wish to be involved in this process. Dave Haskins
- 3.9 Louise Porter summarised the proposed approach to a second stage of public consultation on the NGT project which is planned for June-August 2009. She explained that it is intended to hold a series of public exhibitions in the city centre and on each of the NGT routes. The purpose of this exercise will be to present the preferred scheme option

to the public and other stakeholders and seek their feedback on this.

- 3.10 With regard to the proposal to brief LCC Area Committees on the NGT proposals, Jean Dent pointed out that it will first be necessary to brief senior LCC members and obtain their buy-in to this approach.

4. NGT Programme and Resources

- 4.1 Dave Haskins summarised the key points relating to the current position on the NGT project programme and resource issues. In terms of key milestones he reported that it is currently expected to complete Design Freeze 2 on 21st May 2009 and this will be the point at which the preferred route and vehicle option for the MSBC is confirmed. He added that it is intended to involve David Hoggarth and Dave Gilson in this workshop.
- 4.2 Dave Haskins also drew the Project Board's attention to a number of third party risks which could adversely impact upon overall project timescales. These include difficulties in adequately resolving city centre issues, adverse public reaction following the public consultation exercise, extended period required by the DfT to assess the MSBC and wider political issues.
- 4.3 David Hoggarth mentioned that the overview project programme currently shows construction commencing in 2013 and questioned whether this should be 2012 in line with previous information. Dave Haskins explained that 2013 is the most realistic timescale for start of full construction, however some enabling works could potentially commence prior to this.
- 4.4 Kieran Preston pointed out that the 30 week period currently shown in the programme for the procurement process, appears to be optimistic. He suggested that once the mode option is known, initial advice should be taken from operators in order to gather their views and undertake soft market testing.
- 4.5 With regard to NGT budget issues, Dave Haskins pointed out that the wording in 2.19 of the report is incorrect and that this should state that Metro capital approvals for NGT have not yet been fully approved. Angela Hirst reported that she is liaising with Alan Gay's team in terms of the LCC funding requirements.

5. Options Appraisal

- 5.1 Dave Haskins outlined the NGT options appraisal process which is currently in progress. He explained that to date a 'base case' has been used for the design work with several options still to be narrowed down within that base case. At present Trolleybus is being considered as the base case in terms of mode.

- 5.2 David Hoggarth asked when the initial BCR information will be provided by Steer Davies Gleave. Dave Haskins explained that the modelling work is in progress and although results so far are not robust, intuitively the baseline case for a trolleybus scheme appears to be good (e.g. revenue does exceed operating costs). He explained that robust results will be available for internal purposes in approximately one month from now and these will be brought to the May meeting of the Project Board. Dave Haskins
- 5.3 Dave Gilson raised the issue of the difference in benefits between a trolleybus and a conventional bus and asked if the scale of difference is likely to be sufficient to justify the more expensive option. Dave Haskins explained that wider arguments relating to each mode will need to be developed in addition to the economic appraisal. He added that the Options Appraisal Working Group will need to consider how to construct these arguments. Kieran Preston suggested that in terms of capturing wider benefits such as response of different modes to fluctuating fuel prices, it may be beneficial to develop a further BCR calculation to be presented in parallel to the conventional approach to economic assessment. Dave Haskins agreed to investigate the potential for this type of approach. Dave Haskins
- 5.4 With regard to scheme costs, Dave Haskins reported that the recent Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) exercise, has provided reassurance that the scheme costs are of a similar level to RFA availability. Kieran Preston requested clarification on the level of Optimism Bias that is likely to be required by the DfT at MSBC submission. Dave Haskins reported that due to the level of work undertaken and in view of the QRA exercises that are in progress, it is hoped that the level of Optimism Bias required could be reduced to 20-25%. Jean Dent confirmed that a level of 20% had been specified on other comparable LCC schemes.
- 5.5 Kieran Preston also mentioned the issue of identifying the wider economic benefits of the NGT scheme and the importance of developing these arguments at an early stage in the process. Dave Haskins explained that the Urban Dynamic Model currently being developed for the Transport for Leeds project will be important in helping to identify these issues.
- 6. Risk Management / Risk Register**
- 6.1 Dave Haskins reported that there are now two Risk Registers for the NGT project, one containing overarching strategic risks and the other for specific project risks. He explained that activity is currently focussed upon identifying and implementing mitigation measures.
- 6.2 Dave Haskins also mentioned that at a recent meeting to discuss Project Management issues, the DfT had indicated that they were impressed by the level of risk management that has been undertaken to date.

7. Project Team Management Group Minutes

7.1 The Project Team Management Group papers were noted

8. Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board / PTA

8.1 Dave Haskins confirmed that the Project Team would identify what is necessary, in terms of briefing key LCC members on the NGT proposals prior to public consultation. Dave Haskins

9. Any Other Business

9.1 Dave Haskins mentioned a recent Freedom of Information request regarding the project that had been received and suggested that LCC and Metro work together to coordinate responses to this. Dave Haskins / Dave Gilson

10. Date of Next Meeting

10.1 8th May 2009, 2pm at Wellington House.

NGT Project Board

Minutes of Meeting 14 held on 8th May 2009 **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Gary Bartlett	LCC
Jean Dent	LCC
Alan Gay	LCC
Dave Gilson	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Phil Jones	GOYH
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro

Apologies:

Mike Morrison	Metro
---------------	-------

Action

Kieran Preston welcomed new members of the Project Board, Gary Bartlett (LCC) and Phil Jones (GOYH), to the meeting

1. Minutes of Meeting held on 6th March 2009

- 1.1 These were agreed as correct.

2. Matters Arising

- 2.1 Item 3.3 - Dave Haskins confirmed that the project costs presented to the meeting of 6th March did include land costs.
- 2.2 Item 5.5 – Kieran Preston asked how much work had been done to date on calculating the wider economic benefits of NGT. Dave Haskins explained that the current focus is on generating key headlines on wider economic benefits, to be used in communications with businesses and other stakeholders.

3. Progress Update

- 3.1 Dave Haskins gave a presentation highlighting the key areas of work currently in progress. The main issues covered can be summarised as follows:
- 3.2 A Design Freeze 2 workshop has been set up for 21st May 2009 to be

attended by the NGT advisors and a wide range of Metro and LCC officers. The purpose of this workshop is to agree the preferred route and mode options to be taken forward.

- 3.3 In terms of mode choice, Steer Davies Gleave (SDG) are not yet able to provide a full set of economic outputs, however these will be available in the next few weeks.
- 3.4 The DfT have raised concerns over the quality of the Highway model and have indicated that remedial measures may be required, this could significantly delay the programme. Dave Haskins explained that SDG are currently preparing a note setting out the implications of the DfT 's position. Dave Haskins agreed to brief Kieran Preston on SDG's findings in order that he can speak directly to the DfT on this matter. Dave Haskins
- 3.5 With regard to the project programme, Dave Haskins explained that MSBC submission is scheduled for Autumn 2009, to be followed by Programme Entry by the end of 2009 and Transport and Works Act Order (TWA0) submission in March 2010.
- 3.6 Phil Jones pointed out that the timescales for the DfT granting Programme Entry appear fairly tight. Dave Haskins explained that the DfT have indicated that these timescales are achievable, since they will be sent the majority of the MSBC document in advance of formal submission. Jean Dent suggested that this commitment from the DfT should be sought in writing. Dave Haskins agreed to draft a letter to the DfT from Kieran Preston on this matter. Dave Haskins
- 3.7 In terms of the necessary LCC and Metro approvals for the submission of the MSBC, Dave Haskins presented two alternative options. The group agreed that the later approval route, which would result in gaining approvals by the end of October 2009, was the most feasible approach.
- 3.8 Kieran Preston suggested that approval to submit the MSBC should also be sought at the ITA meeting of 25th September. Dave Gilson also mentioned that the LCC LMT meeting date in September needed to be included in the schedule. Dave Haskins suggested that it would be prudent to review the proposed approvals process at the next Project Board meeting, following the conclusion of Design Freeze 2 and commencement of public consultation. Dave Haskins
- 3.9 David Hoggarth gave an update on the findings to date of the NGT City Centre Working Group. He explained that Design Freeze 2 would recommend a city centre loop as the preferred option, since the creation of a loop has a neutral impact on the overall Business Case. Jean Dent also mentioned that it would be necessary to review the status of the Eastgate development at key points. David Hoggarth added that the city centre loop does not necessarily have to be provided at the outset, but could follow construction of the Eastgate development.

4. Procurement Issues

- 4.1 Richard Threlfall from KPMG joined the meeting to give a presentation on NGT procurement issues. The presentation set out two potential procurement approaches: Vision A being the lower investment option and Vision B a higher investment option
- 4.2 A discussion around these options took place and the Group agreed that, in terms of aiming to create an NGT system which is both legible and presents a step change in quality, Vision B should be the preferred approach. Dave Haskins also pointed out that if Vision B is not adopted it is likely that any future opportunity to upgrade to a tram system will be lost.
- 4.3 Dave Gilson raised the issues of ensuring a high level of ride quality and ensuring consistent reinstatement following Statutory Utilities (SU) works. Gary Bartlett mentioned that LCC are currently considering moving from the current system of SU notices to a permit system, which would enable more control of SU works and could therefore have some benefits for NGT.
- 4.4 With regard to the Procurement report, Dave Gilson questioned whether it was correct in 2.31, to suggest that concessions would not be valid on the NGT system. Kieran Preston and Jean Dent both agreed that concessions would in fact have to be honoured on the NGT system.
- 4.5 In terms of how NGT best fits within the wider bus network, Richard Threlfall reported that KPMG are currently undertaking detailed work to understand the issues on each of the NGT routes.
- 4.6 Kieran Preston raised the issue of the capacity of 18m vehicles and asked for clarification on whether further consideration is being given to the use of bi-articulated vehicles. Dave Haskins confirmed that more work is required to understand the case for bi-articulated vehicles.

Dave
Haskins

5. Public Consultation

- 5.1 Louise Porter summarised the key points contained within the consultation report and circulated draft copies of the proposed NGT leaflet and questionnaire. The following issues were raised:
- 5.2 Kieran Preston suggested that the materials should clearly state what the preferred option for NGT is, both in terms of the mode and the route. He also added that alternative options that have been considered for each route could also be identified. Phil Jones agreed that given the amount of work undertaken to date on the project, it would be sensible to present the preferred option and request feedback on this.
- 5.3 Kieran Preston also mentioned that the consultation materials should clearly set the current NGT routes in the context of being a first phase of

a potentially wider network. This would include highlighting the potential for future NGT routes to serve west Leeds and the Aire Valley.

- 5.4 A discussion took place around the presentation of scheme costs in the public arena. Kieran Preston suggested that presenting NGT as a £280m scheme is misleading since this figure includes costs such as optimism bias which is a difficult concept to explain. It was agreed that quoting infrastructure costs may be more valuable, although Dave Haskins raised the point that this may lead to confusion with the public. Selective dissemination of this information is therefore needed.
- 5.5 With regard to obtaining the necessary Member approvals to proceed with the public consultation, Jean Dent suggested that these approvals need to be sought as early as possible. Dave Gilson explained that a potential approval route has been identified for the end of May. Louise Porter agreed to re-draft the consultation materials based on the discussion, in order that these can be presented to the various LCC Member meetings as outlined by Dave Gilson. Louise Porter
- 5.6 It was agreed by the Project Board that a business briefing should be arranged to take place during the public consultation period. Louise Porter to action. Louise Porter
- 5.7 Jean Dent suggested that it will be necessary to prepare a briefing note for key politicians, in order that they are fully prepared to answer questions on the scheme during the public consultation period.
- 5.8 It was also noted that it is intended to hold an open Bus Operator briefing session in mid-June and preparations for this are now underway.
- 6. Risk Management/Risk Register**
- 6.1 The Risk report was noted.
- 7. Project Team Management Group Minutes**
- 7.1 The Project Team Management Group papers were noted
- 8. Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board / PTA**
- 8.1 No further issues were raised, other than those noted above around obtaining approvals for the consultation process.
- 9. Any Other Business**
- 9.1 No other business was raised
- 10. Date of Next Meeting**
- 10.1 Tuesday 7th July 2009, 10am at Wellington House.

NGT Project Board

Minutes of Meeting 15 held on 7th July 2009 **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Dave Gilson	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Phil Jones	GOYH
Maureen Taylor	LCC
Neil Chadwick (Part)	Steer Davies Gleave
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro

Apologies:

Gary Bartlett	LCC
Jean Dent	LCC
Alan Gay	LCC
Nick Winney	Metro

Action

1. Minutes of Meeting held on 8th May 2009

- 1.1 These were agreed as correct.

2. Matters Arising

- 2.1 All matters arising were dealt with under the main agenda.

3. Progress Update

- 3.1 Dave Haskins gave an overview of key areas of progress, the main issues covered can be summarised as follows:
- 3.2 A meeting was held with the DfT on 1st July to discuss key project issues. Dave Haskins reported that although this meeting was generally positive, the issue of potential reductions in national transport expenditure was acknowledged. At this meeting the DfT confirmed that, based on a mid-October MSBC submission, they would expect to give a Programme Entry decision by Christmas 2009.
- 3.3 Dave Haskins reported that two further meetings are scheduled with the DfT in July. The first of these on 16th July will involve presenting the economic appraisal outputs to the DfT and considering other key

issues such as procurement. This will be followed by a more technical meeting with DfT economists scheduled for 21st July.

- 3.4 With regard to the letter sent by Kieran Preston to the DfT on 16 June, David Hoggarth reported that John Dowie had agreed to respond in writing to this, following the meeting on 16th July.
- 3.5 A discussion took place around procurement options and the potential for bus operators to come forward with a proposal for partnership working following the recent Bus Operators Forum. Dave Haskins mentioned that the procurement options currently under consideration had been agreed on the basis of delivering a transformational scheme and that clear arguments for pursuing this route had been set out by the Procurement Working Group.
- 3.6 Kieran Preston requested that the Project Board be provided with a note clearly setting out the various procurement approaches that have been considered. He suggested that this should include a summary of the arguments for and against each potential approach. Dave Haskins agreed to circulate a paper on this issue following the forthcoming DfT meeting.
- 3.7 With regard to the proposed procurement objectives prepared by KPMG, these were endorsed by the Project Board subject to minor wording amendments.
- 3.8 With regard to the ongoing development of the Joint Venture Agreement, Dave Gilson reported that LCC's solicitors had now passed minor amendments to Metro and therefore envisage that the agreement will be finalised imminently.

**Dave
Haskins**

4. MSBC Update

- 4.1 Neil Chadwick from Steer Davies Gleave, joined the meeting and gave a presentation outlining the emerging results of the economic appraisal to date. A discussion took place around a number of key issues which can be summarised as follows:
- 4.2 Phil Jones stressed the importance of having a robust scheme cost at the point of submitting the MSBC, since this cost will be fixed at the Programme Entry stage.
- 4.3 Kieran Preston asked for clarification on the total cost that had been allocated to risk. Dave Haskins explained that approximately £40 million has been included for risk at this stage and added that work is ongoing to reduce this figure and convert risk items to scheme costs where appropriate.
- 4.4 David Hoggarth questioned whether the next best and low cost alternatives have been agreed with the DfT. Dave Haskins reported that the principles have been agreed and that the detail of these

alternatives is to be discussed at the DfT meeting of 16th July.

- 4.5 Dave Gilson asked whether an option to provide the maximum level of segregation, but operate the system with hybrid vehicles had been considered. Neil Chadwick explained that this option had been discounted, as under this scenario a quality partnership or quality contract would have been used rather than a Transport and Works Act Order. He explained that the Procurement Working Group have concluded that this type of procurement route would not give the Promoters sufficient control over the system, to deliver the desired step change in quality.
- 4.6 David Hoggarth questioned why the next best option performs markedly worse than the preferred option. Neil Chadwick explained that this was largely due to the lack of key sections of dedicated infrastructure, such as the Headingley bypass, which therefore reduced the user benefits considerably.
- 4.7 Kieran Preston asked for clarification on the economic case for the potential extension to Holt Park. Neil Chadwick reported that this had not yet been fully tested. Dave Haskins added that it is intended to keep this option open for as long as possible, since it appears to be popular with stakeholders and would have some clear benefits.
- 4.8 Dave Gilson queried the assumptions that have been made in the economic appraisal to date, regarding capacity and asked whether the use of double articulated vehicles had been considered. Dave Haskins explained that the modelling outputs to date do not show a sufficient level of demand to require double articulated vehicles. He also mentioned that work is underway to investigate what legislative changes would be required to operate vehicles over 18 metres in length and what the implications on infrastructure requirements would be.
- 4.9 Kieran Preston mentioned that capacity of the system is likely to be a key issue going forward and suggested that further work on the case for double articulated vehicles was required.

5. Public Consultation

- 5.1 Louise Porter reported that the second phase of NGT public consultation is now underway with exhibitions having already taken place in Headingley, Hunslet and in the city centre. She explained that to date over 1,100 people had attended the exhibitions and over 14,000 questionnaire packs have been distributed by promotional staff.
- 5.2 With regard to the emerging findings of the consultation, Louise Porter also mentioned that the questionnaire responses that have been analysed to date, have demonstrated a high level of support for the scheme (over 70%).

5.3 Phil Jones asked whether any specific consultation activities had been targeted at people from outside the Leeds district. Louise Porter explained that an article advertising the exhibitions and on-line questionnaire had been published in a newsletter circulated to all members of the West Yorkshire Travel Plan Network. In addition advertisements have been posted in the Yorkshire Evening Post and free Metro newspaper.

5.4 Kieran Preston suggested that a supply of consultation packs should also be sent to all West Yorkshire District Councils with a request to put these on display in public areas. Louise Porter agreed to arrange this.

**Louise
Porter**

6. Risk Management/Risk Register

6.1 Dave Haskins reported that, following the last Project Board meeting, a third QRA workshop had been held which has led to a further 62 risk items being closed. He mentioned that in some cases these risks had now migrated to scheme costs and that further mitigation of risk will be a key area of focus in preparation for the MSBC submission.

6.2 With regard to risk no. 84 (climate proofing), Dave Gilson mentioned that LCC are currently developing a flood relief scheme which should also be taken into consideration.

7. Project Team Management Group Minutes

7.1 The Project Team Management Group papers were noted.

7.2 Dave Gilson raised the issue of land referencing. Dave Haskins explained that LCC had originally indicated that they had the capacity to undertake the necessary land referencing, but have since reviewed this and now wish to appoint a third party to complete this task. Arrangements to facilitate this are currently in progress.

8. Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board / ITA

8.1 No specific items were identified.

9. Any Other Business

9.1 Dave Gilson mentioned that Councillor Downes has submitted a White Paper to the next full council meeting on 15th July requesting all-party support for the NGT proposals. This was noted and Kieran Preston agreed to speak to Jean Dent regarding this issue.

10. Date of Next Meeting

10.1 7th September 2009, 2pm at Wellington House.

NGT Project Board

Minutes of Meeting 16 held on 7th September 2009 **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Gary Bartlett	LCC
Jean Dent	LCC
Alan Gay	LCC
Dave Gilson	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Phil Jones	GOYH
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro
Richard Threlfall (Part)	KPMG
Nick Winney	Metro

Apologies:

None

Action

1. Minutes of Meeting held on 7th July 2009

- 1.1 These were agreed as correct.

2. Matters Arising

- 2.1 All matters arising were dealt with under the main agenda.

3. Progress Update

- 3.1 Louise Porter gave an update on the findings from the recent public consultation exercise. She explained that following the formal closing date of 4th September, an initial analysis of all questionnaires received had now taken place and the following headline figures had been identified:
- Approximately 20,000 consultation packs were distributed in total;
 - 2,594 questionnaire were completed;
 - 77% of respondents are supportive of the NGT proposals (44% strongly support); and
 - 76% of respondents support the use of Trolleybuses (43% strongly support).

- 3.2 Louise Porter explained that a number of enquiries and requests for information had been received as a result of the consultation and the focus was now shifting towards objection management in advance of the Transport and Works Act Order (TWAo) application. Dave Haskins added that it is intended to proactively contact those people who have indicated, through the questionnaire, that they oppose the NGT scheme in order to minimise the number of potential objections.
- 3.3 Jean Dent commented that the interim consultation findings demonstrate a very positive message in terms of the high levels of support in general and particularly from respondents in the vicinity of the north route.
- 3.4 Dave Haskins reported that close liaison is continuing with the DfT on key project issues. He mentioned that a meeting to discuss the Promoters' approach to the local funding contribution is due to take place on 6th October. This will also involve Angela Hirst and Maureen Taylor.
- 3.5 With regard to the proposed 4ps Gateway Review, Dave Haskins reported that rearranged dates have now agreed for 17-19th November. He explained that the 4ps team would want to interview several Project Board members as part of the review and the NGT Project Team would be in touch to make the necessary arrangements. Dave Haskins stressed the importance of attendance at these interviews.
- 3.6 In terms of the current budget position, Dave Haskins explained that a mid-year budget review is currently in progress. He highlighted that initial indications show that the 2009/10 budget is likely to be exceeded. Kieran Preston commented that further more detailed information setting out the figures involved for this financial year and for 2010/11 will be needed by the Project Board.
- 3.7 Dave Haskins also mentioned that it will be necessary to gain formal agreement from LCC to the level of funding to be contributed to the project this financial year. Angela Hirst added that she has recently received updated figures on projected costs and once these have been reviewed, will discuss the situation with Maureen Taylor/Alan Gay.

4. MSBC Update

- 4.1 Dave Haskins introduced the MSBC update report. He reported that discussions to date with the DfT on the economic appraisal outputs have been progressing well and that the baseline Benefit:Cost Ratio is strong.
- 4.2 Richard Threlfall joined the meeting and gave a presentation on the proposed strategy for the 10% local funding contribution. The key

points presented and discussed can be summarised as follows:

- 4.3 Projected capital costs as at 18th August for the base case, (i.e. not including Holt Park and based on single-articulated vehicles), exceed the Regional Funding Allocation (RFA) by 2.4% which equates to approximately £6.6 million. Dave Haskins reported that work is still ongoing to refine capital costs prior to MSBC submission and it is intended that costs will be reduced to meet the RFA allocation prior to MSBC submission. He reiterated that it is not intended to request further funding over and above the existing RFA allocation.
- 4.4 If the DfT grant the project Programme Entry it will be on the basis of the Approved Scheme Cost (ASC). The ASC is made up of the following two components:
 - 1) Quantified Cost Estimate or QCE (made up of base cost, risk and inflation)
 - 2) Additional Risk Layer (which has a value of 50% of the 44% optimism bias currently assumed)
- 4.5 David Hoggarth asked how the £278m scheme capital cost figure relates to the DfT definition of scheme costs. Richard Threlfall explained that the £278m would be considered by the DfT as the QCE.
- 4.6 In terms of the necessary 10% local funding contribution, Richard Threlfall presented the proposed approach to funding this. He explained that the strategy involves a combination of eligible project development costs, land costs and a direct contribution to capex. The following issues were discussed in relation to the local funding contribution:
- 4.7 Alan Gay requested clarification on what land costs could be counted towards the local contribution. Richard Threlfall explained that DfT guidance is unclear on this and unique agreements are generally reached on individual schemes. He added that to date, discussions with the DfT on their likely position on eligible land costs had been constructive.
- 4.8 Richard Threlfall also mentioned that the potential to include pre-Programme Entry development costs as part of the local contribution, has also been discussed with the DfT. He explained that the key argument for inclusion of these costs, is the need to accelerate spending prior to Programme Entry in order to meet the RFA timescales. Jean Dent queried whether the DfT had committed to this approach. Kieran Preston explained that whilst nothing had been committed in writing, discussions on this issue have been positive.
- 4.9 Dave Haskins mentioned that a figure of £10m has been identified for the costs of holding a TWAO enquiry and whilst this figure required further challenge, it is a cost that can not be put forward as part of the

local contribution under DfT rules.

- 4.10 In addition, Dave Haskins also mentioned that current scheme costs are based on an assumed inflation rate of around 3.5%, however the DfT have since indicated that they are likely to suggest a rate of 2.7%. In cost terms this could lead to a reduction of around £10 million in overall scheme costs. He added however that accepting a lower rate of inflation at this stage, would expose the promoters to further risk should inflation exceed 2.7% in the future.
- 4.11 In terms of the Preferred Option to be put forward in the MSBC, a discussion took place around the potential for delivering an extension to Holt Park. Dave Haskins clarified that the capital cost of a Holt Park extension is approximately £12 million, although it is believed that there is scope to significantly reduce this figure. He added that including Holt Park would enhance the economic case in addition to offering wider operating benefits.
- 4.12 Jean Dent queried whether the option of Holt Park can be kept open in the MSBC without committing the Promoters to the expenditure at this stage. Dave Haskins reported that the Project Team are currently considering this issue in order to identify a means of ensuring that Holt Park is not ruled out in the MSBC submission. Kieran Preston suggested that Dave Haskins raise this issue directly with the DfT to gain their initial view. Dave Haskins agreed to do this. Dave Haskins
- 4.13 Dave Haskins also explained that in submitting the MSBC, the Promoters would effectively be agreeing to fund 50% of the Additional Risk Layer (ARL), should the cost threshold set by the DfT at Programme Entry be exceeded. Since the ARL is equivalent to the current level of Optimism Bias i.e. 44%, this would mean that in principle, the Promoters would need to underwrite 22% of the overall scheme costs between them, which currently equates to approximately £30 million.
- 4.14 Kieran Preston commented that in reality the Promoters are unlikely to ever be in a position where they would need to find this £30 million, since there would be an alternative option to reduce the scope of the scheme. Jean Dent suggested that the need to underwrite this figure needed to be reported to LCC/ITA members whilst stressing that this financial risk is unlikely to ever materialise.
- 4.15 Kieran Preston also mentioned the need to provide a letter signed by Metro/LCC Section 151 Officers effectively committing to underwrite any cost increases on the scheme. He queried whether this would be required at the time of MSBC submission. Dave Haskins agreed to provide clarification on this issue following discussions with the DfT. Dave Haskins
- 4.16 Dave Haskins also raised the issue of using bi-articulated vehicles to operate the NGT network. He explained that following a request from the Project Board further work has now been undertaken to

understand the demand for using these vehicles and the cost/legislative implications of doing so.

- 4.17 Dave Haskins reported that the emerging demand forecasts do not currently demonstrate a need for longer vehicles. He did however point out that there are some forecasted capacity pressures in the height of the peak on the north line after 3-5 years of operation, but initial analysis suggests that this could be accommodated by running one extra vehicle to provide a direct service from the Park and Ride site.
- 4.18 Kieran Preston stressed the importance of avoiding a situation where infrastructure was provided for single articulated vehicles, which then had to be modified at a later date to enable longer vehicles if demand increases. Dave Haskins reported that the cost of providing bi-articulated vehicles has been estimated at approximately £11 million for the entire network (£4-6 million for the North Route).
- 4.19 Dave Haskins suggested that appropriate wording could be included in the MSBC to protect the opportunity to revert to bi-articulated vehicles should a need for this be identified as the scheme develops. Dave Haskins agreed to speak to the DfT in order to clarify whether this approach would be acceptable to the DfT. Dave Haskins
- 5. Risk Management/Risk Register**
- 5.1 Dave Haskins mentioned that there has been a recent increase in the P80 risk figure, due to the fact that more risks have now been fully costed. He also mentioned that the number of red risks has now reduced and explained that in terms of the Project Risk Register the top 10 risks account for around 60% of the total risk cost.
- 5.2 Gary Bartlett expressed some concern that not all of the detailed engineering risks have yet been fully resolved and mentioned that further involvement from LCC highway officers could assist in addressing this issue. He suggested that increased integration of appropriate LCC officers into the wider project team would help to ensure that all issues are appropriately addressed prior to costs being capped at Programme Entry stage. Dave Haskins welcomed the proposal to enhance the project team through greater LCC involvement and it was agreed that this should be discussed further outside the meeting. Dave Haskins/ Gary Bartlett
- 6. Project Team Management Group Minutes**
- 6.1 The Project Team Management Group minutes and papers were noted.
- 7. Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board / ITA**
- 7.1 Dave Haskins summarised the content of the report on MSBC approvals. He explained that the meetings at which the MSBC submission needs to be reported have been identified. He added that

further guidance from the Project Board on key issues to be reported to each meeting would be welcomed.

7.2 Following a discussion on this subject, it was agreed that for both the ITA meeting and LCC Executive Board meeting, reports should be drafted that summarise the proposed content of the MSBC in terms of the current position. Jean Dent also suggested that these reports should contain key financial information as it currently stands.

7.3 Dave Haskins also mentioned that discussions are ongoing with Yorkshire Forward to understand the emerging Regional Transport Board process for re-endorsing RFA schemes. David Hoggarth added that he had held discussions with Yorkshire Forward and the DfT on this issue to try and clarify the process which is still to be defined in more detail. He suggested however, that it is likely that a extra process to re-endorse RFA schemes will be introduced.

8. Any Other Business

8.1 No other business was raised.

9. Date of Next Meeting

9.1 5th November 2009, 10am at Wellington House.

NGT Project Board

Minutes of Meeting 16 held on 5th November 2009 **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Gary Bartlett	LCC
Bhupinder Chana	LCC
Jean Dent	LCC
Nick Evans (Part)	BDB
Dave Gilson	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Phil Jones	GOYH
Francis Linley	LCC
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro
Nick Winney	Metro

Apologies:

Alan Gay	LCC
----------	-----

Action

1. Minutes of Meeting held on 7th September 2009

- 1.1 These were agreed as correct.

2. Matters Arising

- 2.1 David Hoggarth mentioned that at a recent meeting of the Regional Transport Executive Group, it was proposed that several RFA schemes be subject to a Peer Review. This process is intended to further scrutinise schemes which are considered to be contributing to the 'spike' in RFA funding between 2013-2015. He explained that NGT had been selected for this review as one of 12 schemes put forward and as such Dave Haskins will be attending a Peer Review interview shortly.
- 2.2 Kieran Preston reported that Councillor Ryk Downes is intending to write to Lord Adonis and Rosie Winterton MP to stress the importance of timely ministerial endorsement of NGT, in view of expected cuts in RFA spending.

3. Progress Update

- 3.1 Dave Haskins reported that, in the lead up to MSBC submission, liaison with the DfT had focussed upon the strategy for funding

the 10% local contribution and the specification for the Next Best/Lower Cost Alternatives.

- 3.2 He reported that a suggested approach to funding the 10% local contribution had been presented to the DfT, which includes £7.1 million of pre-Programme Entry costs incurred over the last 2 years. He explained that the DfT had asked for further clarification on the case for including these costs and a subsequent note had therefore been sent to DfT setting this out. A response from DfT on whether to accept these costs is awaited.
- 3.3 In terms of setting out development costs, Phil Jones stressed the importance making a clear distinction between the Promoters' own monies that have been spent to date and the level of previous DfT funding that has been spent. Dave Haskins explained that whilst this is being considered it is very difficult to disentangle these costs. However it was highlighted that it was clearly evident that the Promoters had spent a significant amount of their own money on the previous project, that will be of key benefit to the NGT project.
- 3.4 Dave Haskins reported that a summary note has been submitted to the DfT to clearly set out the specification of the Next Best and Lower Cost Alternatives, since these options are likely to come under further DfT scrutiny. David Hoggarth explained that the note very clearly sets out the implications of not delivering a scheme through the TWAO route. Kieran Preston added that without this approach, the step change and system legibility that the scheme seeks to provide will not be achieved.
- 3.5 Dave Haskins mentioned that following MSBC submission, Bob Collins had indicated that it may be difficult for the DfT to provide Programme Entry approval by the end of December 2009. This is due to the timing of internal DfT investment meetings which are scheduled for early December and mid January. Bob Collins has suggested that it won't be possible to get the necessary information to the early December investment meeting.
- 3.6 Dave Haskins explained that whilst the DfT can indicate that they intend to grant Programme Entry, it will be necessary to obtain written ministerial approval for this before proceeding with the TWAO application. If this approval is not provided until after the January DfT investment meeting timescales will be extremely tight, as in order to meet a March TWAO submission, it will be necessary to formally advertise the proposed Section 239 resolution by 24th January 2010 at the latest.
- 3.7 Kieran Preston mentioned that a strategic meeting with John Dowie is due to take place in November and this will be a key issue for discussion. He also undertook to contact John Dowie
- Kieran
Preston /
Phil Jones

ahead of the meeting in order to reiterate the key NGT programme milestones. Phil Jones also agreed to contact John Dowie in order to set out the key programme issues from the GOYH perspective.

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------|
| 3.8 | With regard to the forthcoming Gateway Review, Jean Dent questioned why Councillor Carter was not included in the list of interviewees. Dave Haskins confirmed that contact had been made with Councillor Carter's office and agreed to confirm the reasons as to why he was not taking part. | Dave Haskins |
| 3.9 | Dave Haskins summarised the current position in terms of NGT expenditure. He explained that there are some areas of potential overspend and highlighted KPMG's increased recent involvement in terms of input on procurement and funding issues. He agreed to send further details relating to ongoing budget monitoring to Angela Hirst/Bhupinder Chana. | Dave Haskins |
| 3.10 | Gary Bartlett raised the issue of early contractor involvement and the opportunities for increased LCC contribution to the design and delivery of the scheme. It was agreed that a separate meeting be set up to consider these opportunities in more detail and Dave Haskins agreed to arrange this. | Dave Haskins |
| 3.11 | A wider discussion around further refinement of the proposed procurement approach took place. It was agreed that due to the complexity of the issues it would be necessary to set up a separate session for Project Board members to take place in December 2009. | Louise Porter |
| 3.12 | With regard to the Joint Venture Agreement, it was agreed that whilst there are still some issues outstanding, this should be signed in its current form. Jean Dent and Francis Linley agreed to discuss the procedure for LCC sign-off outside of the meeting. | Jean Dent/Francis Linley |
| 4. MSBC Update | | |
| 4.1 | Nick Evans from Parliamentary Agents Bircham Dyson Bell joined the meeting and gave an overview of the TWAO process. He summarised the six main stages involved in the TWAO process as follows: | |
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Preparation and submission of application and supporting material2. 6 week formal representation period (Cambridge Guided Bus project received around 4,000 objections)3. Preparation and submission of the Statement of Case4. Public Inquiry (duration could range from 3 weeks to 3 months)5. Decision from Secretary of State (possibility for legal challenges)6. Implementation | |

- 4.2 In terms of the current NGT programme, Nick Evans reported that the anticipated submission date for the TWAO is 11 March 2009. This incorporates the following key milestones:
- 11th January 2010 – final draft of all TWAO documentation
 - 24th January - advertisement of first Section 239 resolution
 - 24th February full Council Meeting – first Section 239 Resolution
- 4.3 Kieran Preston asked how much of the TWAO documentation has already been prepared and whether there is any flexibility in the programme. Nick Evans explained that work is still underway to compile some of the environmental survey data which remains a risk to the programme. He also confirmed that there is very little flexibility in the programme due to the need to advertise and submit the TWAO before a General Election.
- 4.4 Kieran Preston asked for clarification on the risks associated with the ongoing environmental surveys. Nick Evans confirmed that the key risk relates to anything unexpected that arises through survey work. Francis Linley added that as the majority of surveys have been completed this risk is relatively low.
- 4.5 Gary Bartlett queried whether the alignments for NGT will be fixed at the 11th January date and mentioned the need to obtain further LCC approvals for this. Francis Linley explained that a series of briefing sessions with LCC Area Committees and Ward Members are planned for December and January following which the full Council meeting on 24th February will provide the opportunity for official approval of the NGT alignments.
- 4.6 Nick Evans explained that in the TWAO application it will be necessary to show the worst case in terms of the Limits of Deviation, but there will still be opportunity for refinement of the proposals through detailed design. Dave Gilson commented on the balance between ensuring the Limits of Deviation are wide enough to incorporate the worst case and the need to avoid causing unnecessary objections to the scheme.
- 4.7 Kieran Preston asked whether Holt Park will be included in the TWAO application. Nick Evans confirmed that this will need to be included in order to obtain the necessary powers to progress. Francis Linley explained that since the Holt Park extension had not been explicitly included within the Preferred Option at the recent consultation, further consultation will be needed on this option. Proposals for this include attending the Area Committee for Holt Park in December and holding a public exhibition.
- 4.8 Kieran Preston mentioned the extent of resources that would be required for the TWAO Public Inquiry. Nick Evans confirmed that

a data room to store all TWAO documentation would be necessary as would a central venue for the Inquiry itself. Jean Dent mentioned that a venue would need to be secured early in the New Year.

4.9 Nick Evans highlighted the following main areas of risk: to the TWAO process:

- Failure to hit March 11th TWAO submission date due to very tight programme with no flexibility. This would potentially mean a September 2010 submission (due to the election) and the need to repeat some work items already carried out.
- Environmental survey work/Saturn modelling could identify issues that cannot be dealt with before the March deadline.
- LCC do not pass the necessary Section 239 Resolutions
- Programme Entry is not granted in required timescales (i.e. by 24th January when Section 239 resolution is advertised)
- Late supplementary information (if required) could delay the date for the Public Inquiry
- Public Inquiry could be lost.

4.10 Dave Haskins mentioned that with regard to the Highway (Saturn) model issue, it had previously been assumed that the NGT proposals could be tested against the TIF model. However as this is now delayed, the existing Saturn model will have to be used for TWAO purposes if a March submission is sought. There are concerns over some of the Saturn model results, particularly redistribution of traffic onto parallel routes and air quality impacts. The current results are counter-intuitive, but could be an area of vulnerability at a Public Inquiry.

4.11 A discussion took place on the risks associated with achieving TWAO submission in March 2010. Nick Evans explained that after March, the next available opportunity would be September 2010. Dave Haskins questioned why in the event of a delay the submission could not be made in June. Nick Evans explained that this would be difficult due to the need to advertise the intention to submit a TWAO application in the period leading up to a General Election. He did suggest that in the event of a May election date it may however be possible to submit in July 2010.

4.12 Given the risks to the TWAO programme it was agreed to consider the issues in more detail at the Project Board meeting to be arranged for December. In view of the deadline of 11th January for finalising TWAO documentation, Kieran Preston suggested that more detailed advice would be needed at this meeting on the various TWAO scenarios and associated risks.

4.13 Dave Haskins explained that a review of future resource requirements is underway. In terms of expanded accommodation needs for the TWAO process, the potential to use the 5th Floor at

David
Hoggarth /
Gary Bartlett

Phoenix House was suggested, as was the potential use of the UTC conference room for TWAO documentation. It was agreed that these options be investigated further.

- 4.14 With regard to future NGT development costs, Kieran Preston suggested that further consideration of how these will be funded will also be required at the December meeting.

5. Risk Management/Risk Register

- 5.1 Jean Dent queried whether the detailed TWAO risks as outlined by Nick Evans had been included in the project risk registers, Dave Haskins confirmed that they are covered.

6. Project Team Management Group Minutes

- 6.1 The Project Team Management Group minutes and papers were noted.
- 6.2 Dave Gilson referred to item 7.5 in the PTMG minutes from 15th October 2009 which highlighted the need for delegation of decision making authority in the lead up to TWAO submission. It was agreed that approvals for any decisions that needed to be taken quickly could be sought through the delegated decision processes in place for certain members of the Project Board.

7. Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board / ITA

- 7.1 No items for referral were identified.

8. Any Other Business

- 8.1 David Hoggarth mentioned that further work will be required to consider alternative routeing options for NGT in light of the expected delays to the Eastgate development. He explained that whilst an interim solution has been identified, this will require further refinement.

9. Date of Next Meeting

- 9.1 10th December 2009, 9am at Wellington House

NGT Project Board

Minutes of Meeting 17 held on 19th February 2010 **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Gary Bartlett	LCC
Jean Dent	LCC
Alan Gay	LCC
Dave Gilson	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Phil Jones	GOYH
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro
Richard Threlfall (Part)	KPMG
Andrew Wheeler	LCC
Nick Winney	Metro

Apologies:

None

Action

1. Minutes of Meeting held on 5th November 2009

- 1.1 These were agreed as correct.

2. Matters Arising

- 2.1 There were no matters arising.

3. Progress Update

Procurement

- 3.1 Richard Threlfall and Andrew Wheeler gave a presentation on key procurement issues for NGT. This covered the potential for a Delivery Partnership (D&B/DBM) approach with various potential procurement options and an Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) model. The key issues arising from the discussion are summarised below:
- 3.2 Kieran Preston commented that whilst the ECI approach appears to be an attractive proposition, it could prove difficult if the procurement of NGT results in a number of different contracts. Richard Threlfall agreed that if an ECI approach is followed it

would be vital to ensure that the highways design work does not evolve in isolation from other areas of work such as OLE design/vehicles etc. He added that it would be vital to ensure that the different parties responsible for delivery of different elements of the scheme are communicating at all stages.

- 3.3 Kieran Preston also mentioned that in addition to early contractor involvement in terms of infrastructure, it would also be beneficial to seek operations expertise at an early stage, particularly since modern trolleybuses have not been operated in the UK before. Richard Threlfall explained that early operator involvement had been adopted for the Edinburgh tram.
- 3.4 Jean Dent queried whether there are any circumstances in which all elements of the design and construction could be packaged together. Richard Threlfall explained that whilst this has been done on other schemes such as Dublin Metro, the NGT Procurement Working Group have concluded that the highway works element of this scheme cannot be easily separated from current LCC Highways functions.
- 3.5 David Hoggarth raised the issue of funding an ECI approach, since a greater level of funding will be required earlier in the programme. Dave Haskins explained that the work undertaken to date suggests that costs of around £4 million would be incurred (according to the current cost plan) beyond Conditional Approval. This would be of a higher quantum and may not be reclaimable if the project were to be cancelled. He added that this early expenditure could result in a time saving of up to 6 months.
- 3.6 Gary Bartlett suggested that a key issue is how we deliver NGT against the RFA profile, once this has been agreed and which procurement option will achieve this.
- 3.7 Kieran Preston asked whether the DfT have a particular view on ECI. Richard Threlfall explained that on previous PFI schemes the DfT have not historically supported an ECI approach, however they are expected to be more open to this for NGT.
- 3.8 Jean Dent suggested that it would be useful to have a more detailed set of scenarios for each procurement approach showing the pros and cons in addition to key risks. It was agreed that this information be provided and then used as the basis of a more detailed meeting/workshop to specifically consider procurement.

Dave
Haskins

DfT Approvals/Project Timescales

- 3.9 With regard to the continued delay to a Programme Entry decision, Kieran Preston reported that it is intended to advise Members to write to relevant MP's on this issue, at the forthcoming ITA Executive Board meeting. He also suggested that it may be necessary for local politicians to seek a meeting

with ministers.

- 3.10 Gary Bartlett asked what the final deadline is for gaining Programme Entry in time for a June TWAO submission. Dave Haskins reported that the crucial date is 24th March, when the first LCC Section 239 resolution will need to be advertised.
- 3.11 Kieran Preston mentioned that once Programme Entry is confirmed it will be necessary to hold further discussions with the DfT in order to get assurance about the security of the project.
- 3.12 With regard to the deferral of the NGT report from the February meeting of the LCC Executive Board, Jean Dent explained that this was due to a by-election in the Woodhouse Moor area and the sensitivities around the proposed alignment in this area. She explained that a briefing on NGT is due to be given to cabinet members and requested copies of the NGT photomontages for the Woodhouse Moor options to assist in this. Louise Porter
- 3.13 Dave Haskins suggested that going forward it may be useful to provide a monthly Project Director's report to Project Board members. It was agreed that this would be a useful update on activity in-between scheduled meetings. Dave Haskins
- 4. Design Issues**
- 4.1 Dave Haskins outlined a number of key design issues at locations along the NGT routes and presented photomontages to illustrate these.
- 4.2 With regard to the alignment in the Woodhouse Moor area, there was some discussion around the reasons behind recommending the route across part of Monument Moor. Dave Haskins explained that the detailed study into alternative options had shown that the local traffic impacts of accommodating NGT within the highway were considered to be too great.
- 4.3 With regard to the proposal to extend the Limits of Deviation around the Bodington Park & Ride site to allow for potential expansion, David Hoggarth asked whether discussions had taken place with the University on this issue given difficulties in the past. Dave Haskins confirmed that discussions are currently ongoing with regard to the need for replacement playing fields in a location at King Lane.
- 4.4 Gary Bartlett mentioned for information that English Sport have become involved in the process where sports fields have been affected by other schemes.
- 4.5 Dave Haskins pointed out that the urban realm measures currently shown in the photomontages are an indication of

possible treatments at this stage and will need to be revisited after a full costing exercise has been completed.

- 4.6 The Board endorsed all recommendations made in the report relating to the preferred design option at each location.

5. Budget and Resources

- 5.1 In terms of background to the report, Dave Haskins explained that the quantum of work undertaken to get to this stage in the project had been significant. He explained that there had been a need to undertake additional work over and above the expected budget largely in terms of procurement and in answering DfT questions on the MSBC. He also added that an expected overspend had been reported at the November meeting of the Project Board.
- 5.2 Kieran Preston explained that whilst the extra expenditure incurred was necessary and the level of work appreciated, it was disappointing that the level of overspend had not been made clearer to the Board at an earlier stage. He suggested that it would be necessary to adopt a more sophisticated approach to committing expenditure on the project going forward.
- 5.3 Alan Gay added that in addition to the budget figures that had been presented to the Board, it would also be useful to include information on sources of funding. Angela Hirst mentioned that she had spoken to Maureen Taylor on this issue and regular meetings were currently being set up to capture this type of information.
- 5.4 Kieran Preston raised the issue of the extra work areas highlighted in 2.13 of the report, which are not included within outline budgets for 2010/11. Alan Gay confirmed that whilst funding for these tasks could be provided, more information will be required on what can be counted as part of the local contribution.
- 5.5 Dave Haskins suggested that a separate meeting be set up to involve David Hoggarth and Gary Bartlett to go through these additional areas of work in more detail.
- 5.6 David Hoggarth queried whether it is possible to further challenge Mott MacDonald on their costs. Dave Haskins explained that at the beginning of the financial year Mott MacDonald set out their expected scope of work for the year. Where additional work is highlighted the Project Team challenges this internally and also seek advice from other scheme promoters (e.g. NET Project Team). To date the advice from other scheme promoters has confirmed the need for the extra work identified.

Dave
Haskins

- 5.7 Jean Dent queried whether the Project Team were satisfied with the quality of the work provided by consultants. Dave Haskins reported that the quality was felt to be very good and this had been reiterated through feedback from the Gateway Review and from the DfT on the MSBC. He added that due to the limited Project Team resources and tight timescales, there are inevitably some areas where inefficiencies occur. He suggested that the increased level of resource on the LCC side will help to identify and rectify these issues.
- 5.8 Kieran Preston asked whether any market testing of the advisors work is undertaken. Dave Haskins explained that this had been done on specific packages of work such as a review of the modelling approach and capital costs but not on a wider basis due to the difficulty of meeting challenging timescales.
- 5.9 Jean Dent queried when the fee levels for NGT had been set. Dave Haskins advised that these are agreed at the beginning of the financial year. Kieran Preston suggested that in terms of the Mott MacDonald costs it is necessary for further discussions with them on value for money issues.
- 5.10 Dave Gilson mentioned that further work could be undertaken by LCC to help reduce costs. Gary Bartlett added that following the last Project Board meeting discussions had commenced on this issue to identify potential areas for increased LCC involvement. Dave Haskins explained that the emerging view is for LCC to initially provide further resource in terms of managing Mott MacDonald areas of work until after the TWAO Public Inquiry.
- 5.11 With regard to the predicted budget overspend for 2009/10 David Hoggarth asked whether the Board are prepared to draw down funding from 2010/11 to accommodate this increased level of expenditure. Jean Dent explained that further discussions on this would be required with Maureen Taylor. Kieran Preston agreed that the work should be progressed, but added that further discussions will be needed with Mott MacDonald in terms of their ongoing costs.
- 5.12 In terms of the issues around land compensation monies, Dave Gilson queried whether these could be used to fund the additional work identified. Angela Hirst explained that this issue forms part of the ongoing discussions with LCC. Kieran Preston queried whether any allocation has been made within the capital costs of NGT for possible land compensation claims. Angela Hirst confirmed that an amount has been included in the overall costs for potential new claims arising from NGT.

6. Project Team Management Group Minutes

- 6.1 The Project Team Management Group minutes and papers were noted.

- 6.2 Dave Gilson mentioned the reference in the minutes of 15th December to First Group requesting engineering plans, he queried whether these had been released. Dave Haskins explained that these hadn't been released as they are still work in progress but that meetings had been held with First to go through the plans. Dave Haskins also confirmed that no other operator had yet asked for any further information or meeting on NGT.

7. Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board / ITA

- 7.1 An NGT update report seeking sign off on the NGT alignment is to be taken to the LCC Executive Board meeting of 10th March.
- 7.2 Kieran Preston suggested that an NGT update report be taken to the ITA Executive Board by the end of March setting out key project issues and costs.

8. Any Other Business

- 8.1 No other business was raised

9. Date of Next Meeting

- 9.1 23rd April 2010, 2pm at Wellington House

NGT Project Board

Minutes of Meeting 18 held on 23rd April 2010 **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Gary Bartlett	LCC
Jean Dent	LCC
Dave Gilson	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Phil Jones	GOYH
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro
Maureen Taylor	LCC
Andrew Wheeler	LCC

Apologies:

Alan Gay	LCC
Nick Winney	Metro

Action

1. Minutes of Meeting held on 19TH February 2010

1.1 These were agreed as correct.

1.2 Item 3.13: Dave Haskins queried whether Project Board members had found the interim Project Directors Report issued in March of use. It was agreed that this was a useful update and should be produced on a monthly basis.

2. Matters Arising

2.1 There were no matters arising.

3. Project Directors Update

3.1 Dave Haskins highlighted key areas of progress since the last Project Directors Update Report. He mentioned that a formal response to the DfT's Programme Entry letter had not yet been sent out, but had been drafted and he agreed to circulate this to Project Board members.

Dave
Haskins

3.2 A discussion took place on network development issues in light of the DfT decision not to fund the East Route or the full city centre loop. Dave Haskins explained that if the Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) application includes those sections of the network without Programme Entry Approval it will be necessary to

demonstrate that there is a clear funding source identified for these. If this is not the case there is a risk of being refused TWAO powers for the whole network.

- 3.3 Kieran Preston mentioned that it would be difficult to justify the East Route in economic terms, if it were to be progressed in isolation. Jean Dent suggested that it may be more appropriate to deliver the East Route in association with a route into the Aire Valley.
- 3.4 Jean Dent also added that LCC are waiting to hear whether Leeds will be selected as a pilot for 'Accelerated Development Zones'. She explained that if this is the case there will be funding opportunities for infrastructure projects and could therefore be some potential to construct a good case for delivering a future phase of NGT to serve East Leeds and the Aire Valley.
- 3.5 Dave Gilson also raised the issue of the future need to find a location for a High Speed Rail Link station in Leeds and how NGT could play a part in linking such a station to the city centre.
- 3.6 Dave Haskins suggested that there may be some scope for funding those sections of the network without DfT approval through the proposed City Region Strategic Fund. Kieran Preston suggested that, since this is still in the early stages of development, it would be difficult to gain the necessary agreements within the timeframe available.
- 3.7 With regard to the Headrow/Eastgate/Markets section of the city centre loop, David Hoggarth highlighted the issues in relation to the discussions with the developer. Gary Bartlett also pointed out the importance of providing this section of route in terms of the profile of NGT.
- 3.8 Jean Dent suggested that even if the Eastgate section of the route cannot be pursued at the current time, the alignment should still be protected through the planning system.
- 3.9 Following further discussion on this issue it was agreed that the Project Board recommend to politicians that only those sections of the network with DfT funding be taken through the TWAO process at this stage, given the risks to the whole project being undermined. It was agreed that key politicians be briefed on this recommendation and that in the meantime the Project Team should work on this assumption. It was also agreed that the alignment through Eastgate should be protected by the developer.
- 3.10 It was agreed that a note be prepared setting out the rationale for this position to be used as a basis for briefing politicians. It was Dave Haskins

also suggested that this note should clearly highlight the opportunities for progressing the East Route and full city centre loop as a later phase of NGT also taking account of wider opportunities for the city.

4. Design Issues

4.1 Andrew Wheeler summarised the key issues presented in the Design Issues report. He explained that with regard to the proposed location for an NGT depot, the most likely location for this is Stourton. He mentioned that whilst a site at Sayner Lane would be the preferred option in design terms, due to an existing planning consent on this site for residential development, it is believed to be unacceptable in planning terms.

4.2 Gary Bartlett queried whether the omission of the East Route and full city centre loop from the initial phase of NGT would have any implications on depot location. Dave Haskins explained that there might in theory be an opportunity to use a smaller site due to the reduced number of vehicles required, however this wouldn't allow for future expansion.

4.3 Dave Gilson queried the operational feasibility of the proposed city centre turn-backs highlighted in the report. Andrew Wheeler explained that work to date had confirmed the suitability of these for emergency use and that further consideration of turn-back requirements would be needed if the Eastgate section of the route is not initially progressed. Dave Gilson also mentioned the need to join up the work on location of turn-backs with the City Park proposals.

Andrew
Wheeler

4.4 With regard to land compensation issues mentioned in the report, Dave Gilson queried whether Joe Ratcliffe from LCC had advised on this issue. Dave Haskins confirmed that Joe Ratcliffe had been involved in the process. Dave Gilson also asked that Ian Mason of LCC is consulted on the plans and Andrew Wheeler agreed to arrange this.

Andrew
Wheeler

4.5 David Hoggarth asked whether it is still intended to pursue a novel clause as part of the TWAO to enable the regulation of buses in the city centre. Dave Haskins suggested that this would need to be reviewed in light of the decision not to initially pursue the Eastgate section of the route, which is where the greatest reliability problems occur.

5. Budget and Resources

5.1 Dave Haskins highlighted the key issues contained within the budget and resources report. He explained that following the last Project Board meeting a significant amount of work had taken place with regard to identifying efficiencies in light of the revised TWAO application timescales.

- 5.2 With regard to the 2010/11 budget, Dave Haskins explained that that initial work with the advisors had identified that the level of work required this financial year amounted to approximately £7.5 million. This would exceed the budget of £6.3 million and as such work is ongoing with advisors to identify where savings can be made.
- 5.3 Andrew Wheeler added that with regard to Mott Macdonald they have been given a maximum budget figure to work to which is less than their initial estimate. He explained that they have been asked to re-do their estimates to omit non-essential tasks whilst also highlighting the risks of not undertaking these tasks or of de-scoping some tasks. Andrew Wheeler commented that he expected some of these risks to be too big for the project to bear.
- 5.4 Dave Haskins mentioned that risk and cost control going forward is going to be hugely challenging for the project. David Hoggarth added that the key risk is that if key areas of work are not progressed there may be a lack of detail to respond to issues at the Public Inquiry.
- 5.5 Jean Dent asked whether any further areas of work had been identified which could be undertaken by LCC. Andrew Wheeler explained that he had considered opportunities for greater LCC involvement in the Mott MacDonald workstream, however had concluded that it would be difficult to transfer work at this stage since Mott MacDonald would be defending the design at Public Inquiry. He added that there should be further opportunities for LCC involvement following Public Inquiry.
- 5.6 Dave Haskins also mentioned that recent discussions had been held with the LCC Public Private Partnerships Unit (PPPU) to identify any opportunities for their involvement in the future.
- 5.7 Gary Bartlett queried whether there was any opportunity to redirect the work undertaken by Ardent and Gillespies to the in-house teams. Dave Haskins mentioned that LCC had originally agreed to undertake the land referencing that Ardent are leading, but had later decided that it wouldn't be possible to resource this. With regard to the Gillespies work on Urban Design, Dave Haskins confirmed that LCC officers had been heavily involved in this work to date.
- 5.8 The draft NGT client team structure was discussed. Dave Haskins explained that this had recently been presented to the Metro Executive Board and that the intention was to strengthen client side resources as far as possible. The Board endorsed the approach including the principle of 'spend to save' posts and further discussions on the funding will be held on this as part of drafting the second Joint Venture Agreement.

- 5.9 With regard to the second Joint Venture Agreement, Dave Haskins reported that Nick Winney is drafting initial principles for this. David Hoggarth added that it will be necessary to set out timescales for getting the agreement signed. Jean Dent commented that it will also be necessary to take this back to the LCC Executive Board in June.
- 5.10 Maureen Taylor asked for clarification on the current position regarding the funds that are being held for potential Supertram land claims. Angela Hirst confirmed that work was ongoing to assess the risk of potential claims on individual sites and suggested that this be discussed further in the forthcoming NGT Budget Working Group meeting.
- 5.11 Kieran Preston suggested that it would be useful to bring a report to the next Project Board meeting setting out the key Supertram land issues. Dave Haskins

6. Project Team Management Group Minutes

- 6.1 The Project Team Management Group minutes and papers were noted.

7. Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board / ITA

- 7.1 Following discussions with key politicians, the revised proposal to progress a TWAO for those sections with DfT approval only should be reported to the June meetings of the LCC and Metro Executive Boards.
- 7.2 The second Joint Venture Agreement should be taken to the June meeting of the LCC Executive Board.
- 7.3 The first Section 239 Resolution for the TWAO application is to be taken to the July meeting of the full Council.

8. Any Other Business

- 8.1 Gary Bartlett queried whether any further engagement with First Group is needed at this stage. Dave Haskins explained that several meetings have taken place with First Group, including sessions to look at the NGT plans. A response from them on the detailed plans is currently awaited. He also added that a meeting with Arriva is due to take place very soon. Other operators would also be offered the opportunity as part of the engagement strategy.

9. Date of Next Meeting

- 9.1 6th July, 9am at Wellington House (This meeting has been re-arranged from the original date of 23rd June).

NGT Project Board

Minutes of Meeting held on 16th June **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Gary Bartlett	LCC
Jean Dent (Chair)	LCC
Alan Gay	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Phil Jones	GOYH
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro
Andrew Wheeler	LCC
Nick Winney	Metro

Apologies:

Kieran Preston	Metro
Dave Gilson	LCC

Action

1. Project Directors Update

- 1.1 Dave Haskins explained that this meeting had been specially arranged to discuss the recent Government announcement regarding the suspension of the Major Schemes process. He outlined the key issues set out in the Project Directors Update Report.
- 1.2 Dave Haskins pointed out that, while there is a high level of uncertainty around the future security of NGT, there are clear reasons to remain optimistic that the scheme will continue to be supported following the review. He cited that fact that DfT officials had invested significant time in ensuring that NGT received Programme Entry and were likely to continue supporting the scheme in internal discussions. Phil Jones supported this view, mentioning the DfT commitment shown to provide Programme Entry in relatively short timescales.
- 1.3 Dave Haskins also mentioned that of all schemes in the national RFA programme, only around a quarter of these have some kind of formal status (e.g. Programme Entry/Conditional Approval). The vast majority of schemes therefore have no formal status which could put them at greater risk than NGT.
- 1.4 Jean Dent asked whether it was clear that December 2010 is the earliest we could expect to hear the outcome of the major schemes review. Phil Jones suggested that it could realistically be November 2010, given that the major schemes review is being

undertaken in parallel to the Comprehensive Spending Review process.

- 1.5 Dave Haskins highlighted the scale of the recently announced LTP funding cuts and how this further exacerbates the situation, since there will be difficulties in funding NGT development costs going forward.
- 1.6 Dave Haskins summarised the current position in terms of ongoing advisors activity. He explained that in the case of Mott MacDonald around £750k of committed work has now been put on hold. He added that work that would cost up to £250k (if continued to completion) was still proceeding (based on an assessment of where abortive costs or contractual liabilities would be greatest).
- 1.7 With regard to the option of placing all work on hold, Dave Haskins mentioned the associated contractual implications of halting work that has already been committed. He explained that to date, agreements to pause activity have been reached with advisors, however contractual issues could be raised dependent on the length of the current pause.
- 1.8 Nick Winney added that within the advisor's contracts there is generally an emergency stop provision which means that work can be halted with 28 days notice. However he advised that where specific pieces of work have been ordered against a Job Inception Proforma (JIP), this then also forms a binding contract for that piece of work and contractually would have to be paid for. He added that while there is a prospect of NGT going forward it is not in the Promoters interest to terminate contracts and therefore individual agreements will need to be reached with each advisor.
- 1.9 Jean Dent asked for clarification on what level of expenditure we would be exposed to in terms of the Mott MacDonald (and wider) work currently ordered. Andrew Wheeler explained that the overall level of contracted work on NGT is in the order of £1m, with an estimated exposure level at £250k. Gary Bartlett also suggested that something will need to be provided to advisors in writing to set out any temporary agreements.
- 1.10 With reference to the limited amount of work that Mott MacDonald are currently proceeding with, David Hoggarth asked for clarification on whether all of these tasks will still be valid in six months time. Andrew Wheeler explained that all items included in the list of tasks would still be valid.
- 1.11 Jean Dent requested that a note be prepared to set out the key contractual issues and to summarise the Promoters exposure to costs. Nick Winney

- 1.12 The four options for future scheme development activity, as set out in the Projects Directors Update Report, were discussed in detail. David Hoggarth suggested that it will be crucial to arrange a meeting with ministers as soon as possible since this may provide improved confidence of the prospects for NGT. He added that other major scheme promoters may be progressing work in the interim period and as such it will be important to ensure that NGT is not at the back of the queue following conclusion of the review.
- 1.13 Jean Dent suggested that it is necessary to close down expenditure as quickly as possible and only scale this back up following a meeting with Ministers and assessment of the prospects for NGT. Gary Bartlett agreed with this approach but expressed some concern that certain major schemes may still be proceeding. Jean Dent suggested that given the scale of work needed for the TWAO application this is not a feasible option for NGT.
- 1.14 The Project Board agreed that the most appropriate approach was to proceed with Option 2 (pause all activity pending outcome of Spending Review), but to continue with the £250k expenditure on Mott MacDonald tasks identified as essential, subject to further challenge of these (and reducing the value down as far as possible). This would minimise the potential contractual liability and put the project in the best position to re-start.
- 1.15 Andrew Wheeler also described several further pieces of work (not currently commissioned), which would be of value to take forward now. This work would put the project in a better position to proceed following the Spending Review. These tasks can be summarised as follows:
- Analysis of NGT using the Leeds Transport Model (estimated value: £150k)
 - Balm Road Bridge – work to confirm most appropriate design option (estimated value: £50k)
 - Stourton Park and Ride – further design layout work (estimated value: £30k)
 - King Lane playing fields – assessment of site for the Environmental Statement (estimated value: £40k)
 - Stakeholder consultation with key bodies e.g. Network Rail, Highways Agency and respondents to RFI's (estimated value: £50k)
 - Further Bat Surveys (estimated value: £10-25k)
 - Wider Economic Benefits – work which could help to build the case for retaining NGT (estimated value: £40k)
- 1.16 In each case the Project Board agreed that these items of work should not be progressed as yet, but should be reviewed following the proposed meeting with ministers. It was also agreed that the use of internal resources to progress these tasks should

be investigated in the interim period.

1.17 David Hoggarth suggested that given that the pause in work has been imposed on the project, the Promoters should seek dispensation from the Government on certain issues (e.g. the need to repeat bat surveys and the land referencing process). He added that it should be argued that repeating certain tasks is not an efficient approach, given that the pause in work is beyond the Promoters control.

1.18 Jean Dent raised the issue of further expenditure on Turner and Townsend staff who are currently supporting the Project Team. David Hoggarth also mentioned the issue of LCC and Metro staff input to the project and the level of resource needed going forward.

1.19 Following further discussion it was agreed that with regard to Turner and Townsend input, Steven Hemingway should be retained at the current level for a minimum required period of the next two months in order to advise on key land and TWAO issues. This will be necessary since all input from Parliamentary Agents (BDB) has been put on hold.

1.20 The Project Board also agreed that with regard to the internal Project Team, further consideration should be given to the amount of work likely to be needed prior to the outcome of the Spending Review and the impact on Project Team staffing levels.

Dave
Haskins/
Andrew
Wheeler

1.21 A discussion took place around the importance of political lobbying during the review of major transport schemes. Andrew Wheeler reported that in recent discussions with DfT officials, he had been given clear advice that an initial letter should be sent to Norman Baker (Parliamentary Under Secretary for the DfT) requesting a meeting in London.

1.22 Jean Dent suggested that in the first instance, a joint Metro/LCC letter to Norman Baker should be prepared. Gary Bartlett added that further lobbying will be needed to ensure that ministers do respond positively to the letter by agreeing to hold a meeting. David Hoggarth reported that initial work on such a letter had been undertaken and agreed to coordinate preparation of this in association with LCC

David
Hoggarth /
Gary Bartlett

2. Any Other Business

2.1 No other business was raised.

3. Date of Next Meeting

3.1 To be confirmed, subject to ongoing requirements.

NGT Project Board

Minutes of Meeting held on 31st August **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Gary Bartlett (Items 4&5)	LCC
Alan Gay	LCC
Dave Gilson (Items 4&5)	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Nick Winney	Metro
Cath Cox (Minutes)	Metro

Apologies:

Louise Porter	Metro
Phil Jones	GOYH
Andrew Wheeler	LCC

Action

1. **Minutes of Meeting held on 16th June 2010**
 - 1.1. These were agreed as correct.
 - 1.2. Dave Haskins explained that no contractual issues had arisen with advisors in relation to suspending activity as a result of the Project Pause.
2. **Matters Arising**
 - 2.1. There were no matters arising
3. **NGT Project Director's Update**
 - 3.1. Dave Haskins highlighted key areas of progress since the last Project Director's Update.
 - 3.2. David Hoggarth queried whether sufficient work had been undertaken on the Carbon Benefits query from the Norman Baker meeting. Dave Haskins indicated that it would be difficult to generate any further NGT specific data in the 'Pause' period and any data would be reliant on how NGT functioned within the LTM. However it was agreed that more general statistics on electric vehicles are available and that these should be compiled and included in the presentation to Norman Baker on the 27th.
It was agreed that it would be important to use this presentation to sell the benefits of Trolleybus in general, and its similarity to a tram system. The photomontages would be particularly helpful in

this.

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----------------------------|
| 3.3 | Kieran Preston queried the legal situation with regards to introducing bi-articulated vehicles on NGT routes. Dave Haskins to raise issue with DfT to see whether they have a view on the situation. | Dave Haskins |
| 3.4 | Dave Haskins highlighted that the Project Team are due to commence Market Testing work. It was agreed that Nick Joyce from the DfT may be able to assist in this area and should be contacted. | Dave Haskins |
| 3.5 | David Hoggarth requested further clarification on the University's reluctance to sign-up to the King Lane agreement and if there is any potential to use CPO powers to resolve the issue. Dave Haskins to circulate a note clarifying the situation. Nick Winney to discuss the detailed issues with Steve Hemingway. | Dave Haskins
Nick Winney |
| 3.6 | Dave Haskins highlighted the tasks that has been identified as being required for advisors to undertake in the pause period to ensure that a June TWAO submission remains achievable should NGT be prioritised in the CSR. It was agreed that all activities were signed off in principle by the Project Board, with work on the LTM (activity 1) to be commenced immediately and work on Land Referencing Updates (activity 5) to commence once discussions have been undertaken with LCC Environmental Services on whether they can undertake the remaining land referencing tasks in place of Ardent. Approval for the remaining tasks should be sought individually from David Hoggarth and Gary Bartlett when the appropriate time arrives for them to commence (most likely in October, post CSR). | |
| 3.7 | David Hoggarth informed that he had recently met with Ian Williams from the Chamber of Commerce. They had indicated that there had only been a low level of response to the NGT consultation, and support had been mixed. The Project Team will supply a briefing note on NGT for the Chamber to use at the upcoming party conferences. | Dave Haskins |
| 3.8 | Dave Haskins to compile and circulate a note setting out the timescales for completion of the JVA.

Dave Haskins updated the meeting on progress made on the approach to charging Promoter costs to the project. He indicated that any work undertaken by LCC in lieu of advisor input would still require a relevant JIP to ensure that costs are kept within forecasts. It was agreed that the wider costs incurred by the project (i.e. Director, Legal and Finance inputs) would continue to be recorded for the purpose of inclusion in the local contribution but would not be charged directly to the project. | Dave Haskins |

4. Programme Development and Funding

- 4.1 Dave Haskins outlined the revised programme, highlighting that this programme is considered to be of higher risk than previous programmes. This approach has been adopted to ensure that some capital funding (approx £50m) will be drawn-down in the forthcoming CSR period.
- 4.2 The revised programme has also led to a revision of the Development Costs. Kieran Preston queried when both Promoter organisations would have clarity of the affordability of these development costs. It was agreed that there would be no certainty until after the CSR. Angela Hirst indicated that in particular the forecast costs for 2012/13 would be unaffordable in Metro's LTP allocation.
- 4.3 The meeting discussed the options available to reduce the call on central government funding of NGT. It was agreed that Options 2 & 3 were the most realistic, with further development needed of Option 3.
- 4.4 David Hoggarth highlighted discussions which had taken place on funding the risk layer (Option 2) from future NGT revenues. Dave Haskins highlighted that increased warranty at design stage may further reduce exposure through the risk layer.
- 4.5 Kieran Preston queried how LCC Executive Board would be likely to respond to the proposition of underwriting the risk layer at a cost of approx £35m. It was agreed that assurances are needed on the likelihood of risks and associated costs being realised before any presentation is made to LCC Executive Board.
- 4.6 The meeting discussed whether this was an appropriate time to take a defined proposition to the DfT which would call on less government funding, or whether the project should hold out for the full funding offered at Programme Entry. David Hoggarth indicated that from his discussions with DfT, schemes that are able to offer something are likely to be favoured in the CSR and that opportunities to incorporate private sector input need to be developed in particular on the back of future revenue streams.

Kieran Preston requested that a report is brought to next Project Board outlining the scale of the issue of funding the development costs.

Angela
Hirst/ Dave
Haskins/
Andrew
Wheeler

Kieran Preston voiced concern that the LCC leader may be unwilling to make any further concessions to the DfT in light of loss of Supertram, the years of waiting for a system and the loss of the City Centre loop and East Route in the PE approved

scheme.

- 4.7 Following the discussion the meeting agreed that Kieran Preston, Dave Haskins and Gary Bartlett will arrange to meet with John Dowie ASAP. This meeting will table the options which the promoters are looking at without providing any definitive numbers and try and gain a steer on the extent that these options should be progressed. This information will then be used to develop an outline proposition to be put to Norman Baker on the 27th. Based on the response from both the DfT and Norman Baker it will be identified if the Project Board need to seek approvals from LCC Executive Board/ ITA for the chosen proposition. Dave Haskins

- 4.8 It was agreed that Options 2 & 3 will be discussed at the Transport Strategy Group on the 13th September to see if any wider opportunities/funding strategies can be identified.

5. **Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board/ITA**

- 5.1 It was agreed that approval would be needed from the LCC Executive Board/ITA for any proposal which includes the Promoters underwriting the risk layer or increasing the local contribution. However, it was agreed that as the propositions that will be put to Norman Baker and the DfT at this stage will be outline proposals/options to test the water, rather than funding commitments, this will not be necessary at this stage.

6. **Any Other Business**

- 6.1 Dave Haskins queried whether the current composition of the Project Board should be retained or whether a direct replacement is needed for Jean Dent. Alan Gay indicated that Martin Farrington does not intend to take Jean's role, so the current attendee list should be retained.

7 **Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for 22nd October, two days after the CSR. It was agreed that there would be greater benefit in holding the next meeting two weeks after the CSR. Dave Haskins to rearrange the meeting date and time.

Dave
Haskins

NGT Project Board

Minutes of Meeting held on 12th November **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Gary Bartlett	LCC
Alan Gay	LCC
Andrew Hall	LCC
Andrew Wheeler	LCC
Phil Jones	GOYH
Dave Haskins	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Nick Winney	Metro
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro

Apologies:

No Apologies

Action

1. Minutes of Meeting held on 31 August 2010

- 1.1. These were agreed as correct.

2. Matters Arising

- 2.1. There were no matters arising

3. NGT Project Director's Update

- 3.1. Dave Haskins gave a presentation to summarise key project issues arising from the recent Comprehensive Spending Review and subsequent meeting with the DfT.
- 3.2. Alan Gay queried the DfT feedback that NGT should potentially be considered as an 'enabling scheme'. Kieran Preston explained that the DfT consider the Benefit:Cost Ratio (BCR) for NGT to be at the lower end of the scale and therefore have suggested that the scheme could offer better value for money if considered as part of a wider transport package for Leeds.
- 3.3. David Hoggarth added that the DfT also consider the North Route to be more attractive, due to it having a higher BCR.
- 3.4. Dave Haskins summarised the process for submitting an Expression of Interest to the DfT in January 2011, followed by a 'Best and Final Offer' by Autumn 2011 and decisions on schemes by the end of 2011. David Hoggarth added that the DfT had indicated that there is still a possibility of some early decisions on schemes in Summer 2011.

- 3.5 Dave Haskins presented a series of options for NGT moving forward. Gary Bartlett added that these options had also been presented to the LCC Leaders Management Team (LMT) the previous day. LMT had given a clear steer that the scheme should not be halted, while also acknowledging the challenges involved in raising a significantly higher local contribution. LMT requested further detail on the options before any firm decision on the way forward could be made.
- 3.6 A discussion took place around the various options and the funding implications of these. It was agreed that further detail on the options should be taken to the Leeds Transport Strategy Group scheduled for the 29th November. Dave Haskins
- 3.7 Gary Bartlett raised the issue of increasing timescales associated with delivering NGT and suggested that the opportunity to bring forward some shorter term schemes needed to be considered. The potential for early Park and Ride schemes as part of a wider strategy to fit with the NGT proposals was discussed. However Gary Bartlett also pointed out that a funding source for the development and delivery of such schemes is not currently identified.
- 3.8 A discussion took place on various funding mechanisms that NGT could potentially draw on going forward. Alan Gay gave an overview of which of these would potentially be suitable for NGT. The consensus was that Tax Increment Financing (TIF), which LCC are currently considering in relation to the Aire Valley Leeds proposals and the potential to borrow against future NGT revenues initially appeared to be the most feasible options.
- 3.9 Alan Gay mentioned that legislation on the TIF mechanism is expected by mid-late 2011. He suggested that within these timescales it may be possible to develop an NGT Best and Final Offer which incorporates a TIF contribution.
- 3.10 Andrew Wheeler pointed out that it will be necessary to demonstrate to the DfT that the various funding options have been fully explored. Alan Gay confirmed that a resource from his team would be identified to assist in this process. Alan Gay
- 3.11 Angela Hirst also highlighted the issue of scheme development costs and pointed out that the Promoters' capacity to fund these needs to be considered as part of the overall funding package.
- 3.12 Following further discussion, Kieran Preston suggested that the revised offer for NGT should cover both the North and South routes and should put forward a reasonable local funding offer taking account of cost savings from within the project and TIF funding which is dependent on cost approvals outside DfT. This offer should also paint a wider picture of transport opportunities in Leeds to include Park and Ride schemes and options for Aire Valley Leeds.
- 3.13 With regard to the wider opportunities for early Park and Ride schemes it was agreed that a separate meeting to be convened on this subject to involve Andrew Hall, Gary Bartlett, Paul Roberts and David Hoggarth. David Hoggarth

- 3.14 Kieran Preston suggested recommending to Members that they seek a meeting with Phillip Hammond before Christmas. It was agreed that Kieran Preston approach ITA members with this suggestion and Gary Bartlett approach relevant LCC members. Kieran Preston/
Gary Bartlett
- 3.15 Dave Haskins summarised the further scheme development work that will be needed ensure the Expression of Interest and subsequent Best and Final Offer are robust. He explained that the estimated value of work required is approximately £250k. He also reported that this level of expenditure can be met from within the £1.8m budget agreed for 2010/11.
- 3.16 Andrew Wheeler explained that the further work largely relates to the Leeds Transport Model which will be vital in seeking to increase the BCR for NGT and to establish a more robust understanding of the potential revenue surplus (to inform funding discussions). He added that if this work is not progressed at an early stage the production of a Best and Final Offer bid will be delayed. Andrew Wheeler also explained that work to review the capital cost estimates is required to ensure that they are robust. This will be necessary to inform any value engineering exercise.
- 3.17 David Hoggarth questioned why the majority of this work is required at this stage other than some high level input to the Expression of Interest. He added that feedback from the DfT on the Expression of Interest should be sought before any resources are committed. Kieran Preston agreed that some high level consultant input would be required to help inform the January submission, but that substantial work should not take place until feedback on the submission has been received from the DfT.
- 3.18 Dave Haskins pointed out that if the bulk of the work was not progressed until after feedback from DfT in January 2011 at the earliest, this would result in the Best and Final Offer being delayed until April/May 2011. As a result an early decision from the DfT in Summer 2011 on NGT is unlikely to be feasible. This was acknowledged by the Project Board.
- 3.19 With regard to resources, Dave Haskins explained that following the submission of the Expression of Interest in early January, workloads for the LCC/Metro NGT team would substantially reduce, other than some targeted input to the Best and Final Offer document. As a result redeployment of staff will be necessary. David Hoggarth commented that a flexible approach will be needed in order that resources can be drawn back into the team as and when required.
- 3.20 Dave Haskins also pointed out that the current NGT budget only allows for continued input from Steve Hemingway (Turner and Townsend) up to the end of December 2010. It was agreed that from January 2011 Steve Hemingway's services should only be procured on an as needed basis. Dave Haskins agreed to discuss the continued availability of Steve Hemingway on this basis with Turner and Townsend. Dave Haskins

4. Joint Venture Agreement

- 4.1 Nick Winney summarised the content of the Joint Venture Agreement report.

He explained that a recent meeting had been held between Metro and LCC legal officers to discuss land issues relating to NGT. As a result of this meeting a Heads of Terms document has been agreed at officer level and was presented to the Project Board for their endorsement.

- 4.2 Nick Winney highlighted a particular issue regarding land which was acquired for Supertram but which is not needed for NGT. In some instances this land is owned by LCC but Metro has paid a 100% deposit. He drew the group's attention to the proposed process for dealing with this land as set out in the draft Heads of Terms. He also highlighted the proposal within the draft Heads of Terms to establish a joint scheme fund for all expenditure and receipts relating to Supertram/NGT land.
- 4.3 With regard to these issues Alan Gay mentioned that further LCC discussions would be required to identify how to treat monies arising from land transactions.
- 4.4 In terms of the joint land fund proposed in the draft Heads of Terms, Kieran Preston recommended that the principle be to share any benefits between the two promoter organisations and retaining any income to the fund for the benefit of transport.
- 4.5 The Board's attention was also drawn to the proposal in the Heads of Terms in respect of agreeing to resurrect the existing suite of documents that dealt with the LCC land for which Metro had paid 100% deposit. It was proposed that the simplest way forward that was agreed by LCCs legal officers was to enter a short supplemental agreement to reconfirm that the existing documents simply continue with an extended timescale and by reference to either full approval or to scheme abandonment, rather than specific dates which might elapse again. Work could commence rapidly on these agreements outside of the proposals for JVA 2, in the interests of speed.
- 4.6 Following further discussion it was agreed that the draft Heads of Terms be endorsed in principle, subject to further detailed discussions between LCC/Metro and within their respective organisations.
- 4.7 Andrew Wheeler also explained that in addition to land issues, an agreed position on the treatment of Promoter costs in the JVA had also been reached by LCC and Metro officers. This includes agreement to a 50/50 split in terms of development costs (subject to annual variation) and in terms of the allocation of staff costs.

5. Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board/ITA

- 5.1 A report is to be taken to the Leeds Transport Strategy Group on 29th November to provide more detail on the various options for NGT. This should recommend that the Best and Final Funding Offer for NGT covers both the North and South Routes and puts forward a reasonable local funding proposition taking account of potential TIF funding and wider funding opportunities. This offer should also set NGT in the context of a wider picture for Leeds including opportunities for Aire Valley Leeds.

6. Any Other Business

- 6.1 Andrew Wheeler mentioned that negotiations are progressing well with the University on the provision of replacement pitches at King Lane. He explained that planning permission on the sports pitches will be required for the Heads of Terms agreement to be signed with the University. A revision to the current planning permission, which is not yet enacted, is being sought to increase the term from 3 years to 7 years.
- 6.2 Andrew Wheeler reported that this request was to be taken to the November LCC Plans Panel, however given the ongoing delay to NGT and at the request of the University, this will now be deferred. This was noted by the Project Board.

7 Date of Next Meeting

- 7.1 13th December 2010, 2pm Wellington House.

NGT Project Board

Minutes of Meeting held on 13th December 2010 **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Gary Bartlett	LCC
Andrew Wheeler	LCC
Maureen Taylor	LCC
Phil Jones	GOYH
Dave Haskins	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
Nick Winney	Metro
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro

Apologies:

Alan Gay	LCC
Andrew Hall	LCC
David Hoggarth	Metro

1. Minutes of Meeting held on 12 November 2010

- 1.1. These were agreed as correct.

2. Matters Arising

- 2.1 Item 3.10 - Andrew Wheeler confirmed that liaison with LCC finance officers is continuing to take place on possible NGT funding approaches
- 2.2 Item 3.13 - Gary Bartlett reported that a meeting to discuss early Park and Ride opportunities has been arranged.
- 2.3 Item 3.14 – Dave Haskins mentioned that a letter to the Secretary of State for Transport has been drafted, the purpose of which is to seek a meeting with him. It was agreed that this should be circulated to Kieran Preston/Gary Bartlett. Dave Haskins

3. NGT Project Director's Update

- 3.1. Dave Haskins summarised the key issues outlined in the Project Directors Update Report. He explained that the key focus of current activity is on the preparation of an Expression of Interest (EoI) to be submitted to the DfT in early January. He explained that the DfT have indicated that they are seeking scheme promoters to offer up a Local Funding contribution of around 40%.
- 3.2. The draft EoI proforma was circulated and Dave Haskins gave a summary of the issues included in the document. A discussion took place around the content of the EoI proforma and the following principles and amendments were agreed:
- Section 1.4 - Risk 1 regarding development costs should be

removed/re-worded.

- Section 1.5 - The table showing outturn costs should include a totals column. The associated commentary should make it clear that these costs reflect the current cost estimates, before any attempt to identify savings (cross reference to section 3.4).
- Section 2.1 - agreed that the continued promotion of trolleybus as the preferred mode and the delivery of both the North and South routes should be put forward as 'red-line' issues.
- Section 3 – agreed that a two-step offer should be outlined at this stage, the first scenario showing the scope of a local contribution without the inclusion of TIF funding and the second scenario to include a potential TIF contribution.
- Section 3.4 - a further option based on the continued inclusion of the Holt Park extension should be shown.

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------------|
| 3.3 | The Project Board agreed the content of the Eol proforma subject to the above comments/amendments being incorporated. | Dave Haskins |
| 3.4 | Maureen Taylor pointed out that following submission of the Eol further detailed work will be needed to fully understand the risks associated with the various options presented. She added that it will be vital to ensure that the Promoters can honour any proposition put forward in the Best and Final Funding Offer. | |
| 3.5 | With regard to the 40% local funding contribution that DfT are seeking, Dave Haskins pointed out that the value of a 40% contribution on a scheme the size of NGT is much greater than that of the rest of the schemes in the Development Pool, since these are of a much lower value. Kieran Preston suggested that this issue should be discussed with the DfT in more detail and raised in the Eol proforma/covering letter. | Dave Haskins |
| 3.6 | Dave Haskins summarised the key areas of further consultant input that has been identified to inform the development of the Best and Final Funding Offer. He explained that the LTM modelling work will be vital in order to satisfy the DfT that the Benefit:Cost Ratio for NGT can be increased. He also explained that the work to verify scheme costs is necessary in order to ensure that any cost saving measures are identified from a robust baseline. | |
| 3.7 | Andrew Wheeler mentioned that discussions are continuing with the Aire Valley team in relation to securing TIF funding for NGT. He explained that discussions have been positive and current thinking is to use TIF funding to fund the whole of the South Route. Kieran Preston queried the quantum of TIF money that could potentially be available for the Aire Valley. Andrew Wheeler suggested that this is thought to be approximately £30m. | |
| 3.8 | Dave Haskins raised the issue of procurement and pointed out that further work in this area will be required if a new approach to funding is adopted (e.g. leasing of vehicles/depot and borrowing against NGT operating surpluses). He explained that KPMG had recently approached the NGT team to discuss the type of work that may be necessary. As a result of these discussions KPMG have indicated that they may be willing to undertake this work on the basis that they only seek payment if Programme Entry Approval is | |

reactivated, however they would then also charge a 'success fee'. Dave Haskins explained that KPMG are currently considering whether to submit such an offer.

- 3.9 Andrew Wheeler highlighted the issues relating to Balm Road Bridge. He explained that some initial design work on OHLE equipment will be required now if this is to be incorporated into Network Rail's forthcoming scheme to strengthen the bridge. The Project Board agreed that some initial work should proceed at this stage to reduce the risk of increased costs in the future. This initial work will cover the first two tasks as set out in the Project Directors Update Report (at 2.16) i.e. The Mott MacDonald design tasks at a value of £7k and Network Rail's design costs.
- 3.10 With regard to resources, Dave Haskins confirmed that arrangements are in place to largely disband the Metro/LCC project team post-Christmas. With regard to the continued input of Turner and Townsend, he reported that Steve Hemingway's activity has now been reduced to three days per week and post-Christmas the need to retain this level of input is likely to reduce.
- 3.11 Nick Winney explained that Steve Hemingway is currently providing input to four separate 'problem' land issues, however two of these are close to being resolved and as such there may be an opportunity for Joe Ratcliffe to take on this role. It was agreed that Steve Hemingway's input should therefore be reduced to one day per week from January and reviewed on an ongoing basis.

4. King Lane

- 4.1 Andrew Wheeler summarised the position relating to King Lane Playing Fields and the ongoing discussions with Leeds University regarding the planning Permission for these.
- 4.2 Andrew Wheeler explained that it is proposed to seek approval from the LCC Planning Panel in January, to extend the planning permission timescale from three to seven years in order to account for the delay to the delivery of NGT. He also mentioned that this would then allow the NGT team to finalise the Heads of Terms agreement with the University.
- 4.3 The Project Board noted the report and agreed that approval to extend the planning permission to seven years should be sought from the January meeting of the LCC Planning Panel.

5. Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board/ITA

- 5.1 A summary of the content of the NGT EoI is to be taken to the December meetings of the ITA Executive Board and the Metro Executive Board. Gary Bartlett confirmed that no further LCC approvals will be required for submission of the EoI.
- 5.2 It was also noted that the Best and Final Funding Offer for NGT will need to gain formal LCC/ITA approvals. Dave Haskins confirmed that work is in progress to map out the necessary approvals route.

6. Any Other Business

- 6.1 With regard to continued lobbying activities for NGT, it was agreed that a draft of the proposed letter to the Secretary of State be circulated asap. Dave Haskins also agreed to discuss wider lobbying activities further with Metro PR officers and to circulate a proposed short term lobbying strategy. Dave Haskins
- 6.2 In addition Gary Bartlett suggested that further approaches could be made to local MP's. Kieran Preston mentioned that monthly briefing sessions with Alec Shelbroke MP are in the process of being arranged and suggested that this could also be an opportunity to raise NGT.

7 Date of Next Meeting

- 7.1 To be confirmed

NGT Project Board

Minutes of Meeting held on 10th March 2011 **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Gary Bartlett	LCC
Andrew Hall	LCC
Andrew Wheeler	LCC
Maureen Taylor	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
Angela Hirst	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Nick Winney	Metro
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro

Apologies:

Alan Gay	LCC
Phil Jones	GOYH

1. Minutes of Meeting held on 13 December 2010

- 1.1. These were agreed as correct.

2. Matters Arising

- 2.1 Kieran Preston mentioned that Phil Jones from GOYH will no longer be attending Project Board meetings since he is due to leave the organisation in the near future. On behalf of the Project Board Kieran Preston had thanked Phil Jones for his contribution to the group. It was agreed that Margaret Jackson from GOYH be invited to join the Project Board in place of Phil Jones.

3. NGT Project Director's Update

- 3.1. Dave Haskins summarised the key issues set out in the Project Directors update report. He explained that liaison with the DfT is continuing in order to identify a date for a meeting with Philip Hammond. This is now likely to take place at the end of March and a technical meeting with the DfT is scheduled for mid-March.
- 3.2. Dave Haskins mentioned that he had recently attended a DfT workshop to provide scheme promoters with more information about the Best and Final Funding Bid (BAFB) process. At this workshop the DfT had made it clear that the financial offer will be key and had also ruled out the potential for any pain/gain cost sharing agreement to be pursued.
- 3.3 With regard to lobbying activities, Dave Haskins reported that an interim lobbying strategy has been drawn up to focus activities around submission of

the BAFB. Kieran Preston also mentioned a forthcoming event to be held at the House of Commons on 22nd March, which would provide a further lobbying opportunity.

- 3.4 LP gave an update on the current financial position and highlighted the estimated future development costs of approximately £25m from a full project restart (assumed in August 2011) to Full Approval in December 2015. She explained that these costs are of the same order as those previously presented to the Project Board in August 2010 and mentioned that they have been developed without any input from the NGT advisors. Angela Hirst pointed out that the source of funding these development costs has not yet been identified.

4. Best and Final Funding Bid

- 4.1 Dave Haskins introduced the report on the development of the BAFB for NGT and explained that a significant amount of work had been undertaken to refine the scope of the scheme to date. This work had included a review of capital costs and a Value Engineering exercise.
- 4.2 Andrew Wheeler explained that an initial Value Engineering/re-scoping exercise had taken place to identify possible cost savings. He gave an overview of the main measures to have been identified through this process and a discussion on each of these items took place. The key points arising can be summarised as follows:
- Ticket machines - it was agreed that while removal of ticket machines from stops would result in a capital cost saving there would be an impact on revenue costs due to the need for conductors.
 - Stop specification - there are a number of ways that this could be approached. This could include retaining high specification stops in the city centre but lower specification stops elsewhere for example.
 - Holt Park - with regard to the proposal to defer the Holt Park extension to a later date it was agreed that further clarity from politicians was needed in order to agree the way forward on this. This represents the single biggest cost reduction that can be made (c£10m).
 - Reduced number of spaces at Stourton Park and Ride – this was agreed on the basis that projected demand would still be catered for.
 - Pepper Road stop - the proposal to remove this stop was agreed
 - Balm Road Bridge - the proposal to strengthen the existing Balm Road Bridge rather than build a new structure was agreed in principle. However, Gary Bartlett did point out that LCC have not prioritised any maintenance on this particular structure.
 - Leeds Bridge - there was agreement to the principle of not strengthening Leeds Bridge, if a design solution could be found that does not result in significant delay to NGT services.
 - Vehicle Fleet reduction - the proposed reduction in vehicles from 24 to 20 was agreed.
 - Risk - the use of the P50 risk value rather than the P80 risk value was agreed.
 - Bi-articulated vehicles - it was agreed that the costs included in the QRA for the provision of bi-articulated vehicles could be removed on the basis that contracts for vehicle manufacturers could be structured

in a way to preserve the opportunity for introducing bi-articulated vehicles incrementally in the future.

- 4.3 Angela Hirst queried whether there is a target for how much cost needs to be removed overall. Dave Haskins explained that whilst there was no specific target ideally a figure lower than the original £254m construction cost is needed.
- 4.4 Following further discussion, Kieran Preston suggested that the BAFB assumes a cost reduction of at least £30m to be found through the Value Engineering/rescoping measures outlined above, but without being too specific about individual measures. A DfT view will need to be sought on the acceptability of this approach.
- 4.5 It was agreed that this approach could be presented to the Leeds Strategy Board on 1st April. Andrew Wheeler added that the agreed approach will need to be set out in the LCC Executive Board report which needs to be drafted by 9th April. Kieran Preston also suggested that a briefing note be prepared for Councillor Wakefield on the proposed scope of the BAFB. Dave Haskins/Andrew Wheeler
- 4.6 With regard to the level of inflation to be applied to scheme costs in the BAFB, Andrew Wheeler explained that the Project Team had undertaken some recent analysis to understand the most appropriate level at which to assume future inflation. Dave Haskins explained that the DfT prescribed a rate of 2.7% at Programme Entry, but have recently stated that scheme Promoters should decide on the rate they apply.
- 4.7 Andrew Wheeler circulated a graph to show the impact on costs of assuming various levels of inflation. Dave Haskins explained that whichever rate is used for NGT, there will be an associated cost built into the risk register to cover any increase in inflation above that assumed. He added that the range in risk is significant with approximately £40m difference in terms of risk exposure between using the lowest and highest inflation rates.
- 4.8 Following further discussion it was agreed that the central case in terms of inflation (i.e. applying a rate of 2.7% going forward) is the most sensible option to proceed with, subject to further discussion with DfT. Dave Haskins
- 4.9 Andrew Wheeler also reported that in terms of the approach to estimating costs, the cost of preliminaries had been assumed at 26% following a benchmarking exercise. He also reported that a revised assumption had been made on utilities which had resulted in an overall cost saving. This revised approach assumes the cost of the C3 estimates (provided by utility companies) + 12.5% contingency.
- 4.10 Andrew Wheeler also mentioned a number of potential cost saving measures which had been considered through the Value Engineering process, but which are not recommended to be taken forward at this stage. These can be summarised as follows:
- Reduction in costs included for urban design
 - Reduction in tree replacement policy (reducing this from a 3 for 1

replacement to 2 for 1)

- Sale of land at Hyde Park Corner
- Advanced programme/procurement options
- Revised M621 junction design
- Removal of central running lane at Lawnswood Roundabout

4.11 The Project Board noted that these measures had been discounted at this stage.

4.12 Andrew Wheeler reported that work has been continuing on the potential for implementing a lease financing arrangement for the NGT vehicles, depot and overhead equipment as a means of reducing the call on government funding. A discussion took place on the benefits of lease financing arrangements in comparison to prudential borrowing options. The following key points were noted:

- It is worth exploring whether the DfT perceive any benefit in lease financing in terms of involving a 3rd party and therefore transferring an element of risk.
- The proposed soft market testing will be an opportunity to test some of the possibilities in terms of lease financing.
- There are issues around the responsibility for maintenance under a lease financing arrangement.
- The general feeling is that prudential borrowing against expected NGT revenues will offer better value for money than lease financing.

4.13 Dave Haskins explained that in terms of obtaining a robust estimate for annual NGT operating revenues, this is unlikely to be available until May. This is due to not being able to progress the LTM modelling work as early as hoped, as a result of the pause in activity.

4.14 A discussion took place around the best local funding offer that can be taken forward in the BAFB. The following outline was agreed as the basis for the offer to be discussed further with politicians:

- Total scheme cost following the recent capital cost review is £274m
- Promoters have identified a reduction in costs of at least £30m through Value Engineering measures.
- Therefore baseline scheme cost in BAFB is £244m
- Assume the capped DfT contribution is in the range of £185m-£199m
- Promoters local contribution is therefore between £40-£60m be made up of:
 - £25m development costs
 - £12m land costs
 - Remainder (up to £25m) through prudential borrowing, lease financing or TIF
- There would potentially be an opportunity to increase the local contribution further if TIF legislation came forward within the timescales for NGT.

- 4.15 It was agreed that a note be prepared on the scope of the offer to be put forward in the BAFB for use in briefing politicians ahead of the Philip Hammond meeting. This should also include key lobbying messages to be put forward such as integrity issues as a result of the Supertram history and the scale of the local contribution for NGT in comparison to lower value schemes. Dave Haskins
- 5. Land Issues: Hoagy's Bar**
- 5.1 Nick Winney circulated a draft report on land issues associated with Hoagy's Bar and Eastgate. He explained that LCC need to serve a Compulsory Purchase Order imminently in relation to the Eastgate development, which will affect the land at Hoagy's bar for which Metro originally paid the deposit in full. He explained that the land at Hoagy's Bar will be caught in the land transfer agreement between LCC and Hammersons.
- 5.2 A discussion took place on how to best ensure the land is protected for NGT and on the issue of recouping the deposit paid by Metro for the benefit of the scheme. David Hoggarth suggested that the original agreement signed with Hammersons in 2007 needs to be revisited. He explained that it was acknowledged in this agreement that the full deposit be recouped by the NGT project and that the public transport contribution agreed with Hammersons was reduced to reflect this.
- 5.3 It was agreed that a solution needed to be agreed by Metro and LCC which provided the greatest level of compensation for the NGT project as a whole. The best case scenario is that the NGT project receives £750k i.e. the full amount of the deposit originally paid by Metro.
- 5.4 Andrew Wheeler suggested that the best course of action was for Metro to serve notice on LCC to require LCC to transfer title to Metro, which would give Metro more control over the issue of compensation from Leeds. Nick Winney's view was that this would immediately reduce the potential benefit to the scheme, and it was really more a question of how robustly could LCC and Metro put their case to Hammersons for compensation at £750k and not current market value.
- 5.5 It was suggested that further discussions were required outside of the meeting. Gary Bartlett agreed to raise the issue with Martin Farrington and advise Metro of these discussions. This was required urgently as Metro had little time available in which to serve a transfer notice, if that was ultimately the best route decided upon. Gary Bartlett
- 5.6 Gary Bartlett also mentioned that the Eastgate Developers are pursuing a stopping up order for Eastgate with an agreement that NGT will be allowed access to the route. A discussion took place on the issues that may arise as a result of allowing a stopping up order for Eastgate.
- 5.7 Andrew Wheeler explained that if Eastgate remains as a highway this will always give the Highway Authority power to control access issues. It was therefore agreed that the starting position should be to retain Eastgate as highway.

6. Items for referral to LCC/ITA Executive Board

- 6.1 Andrew Wheeler reported that an LCC Executive Board report to provide an outline of the BAFB document is currently in preparation.

7 Any Other Business

- 7.1 No other business was raised

8. Date of Next Meeting

- 8.1 To be confirmed

NGT Project Board

Minutes of Meeting held on 21ST March 2012 **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Gary Bartlett	LCC
Alan Gay	LCC
Andrew Wheeler	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
Angela Taylor	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Nick Winney	Metro
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro

Apologies:

Andrew Hall	LCC
-------------	-----

1. NGT Project Directors Update

D Haskins explained that there was no set agenda and that the purpose of the meeting was to update Project Board members on the scope of the NGT bid to be submitted to the DfT at the end of March 2012.

D Haskins gave a presentation covering key aspects of the proposed NGT bid including the economic case, scheme costs, funding, programme and budget issues. The following areas were discussed in more detail:

A discussion took place on the current central economic case for the scheme. D Haskins agreed to circulate a brief explanatory note clarifying the different scale of Benefit:Cost Ratio according to whether the revenue risk lies with the public or private sector.

DHa

D Haskins reported that engagement with the DfT's modellers and economists has been very positive to date. G Bartlett suggested that a separate discussion with John Dowie is required to ensure that he has been fully briefed on the outputs from the modelling work and is comfortable with these.

KP

A discussion took place around the funding offer to be put forward in the NGT bid. D Haskins explained that DfT have indicated that further reassurances may be required on the potential for securing the proposed £30m contribution via the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) mechanism.

The Project Board agreed that the core funding offer should remain as per that submitted in the Best and Final Funding Bid. It was agreed that the £30m TIF contribution could not be underwritten by the Promoters and that there is still a level of uncertainty around the TIF fund, given the budget announcement that

there will now be a bidding process for this funding stream. It was however acknowledged that there would be scope for further discussions with DfT/ Treasury on future funding options once their requirements are more clearly understood. It was agreed that these issues be raised as part of the proposed discussion with John Dowie to ascertain what further assurances the DfT are seeking on funding.

KP

D Haskins explained that the programme for the scheme had been revisited and compressed in some areas to meet the funding profile. It was agreed that a more detailed refresh of the programme and associated scheme development costs would take place upon scheme re-mobilisation.

D Haskins reported that the original budget approval of £1.8m is now likely to be fully utilised in order to complete all work required for the NGT bid. He added that it is also possible that further funding above this approval will be necessary depending on the scope of any further work required to respond to DfT or Treasury questions. The Project Board noted the budget position and agreed that this further work would be necessary. D Haskins to follow this up with Metro and LCC finance officers once the scale of further work is known.

DHa

The process for project remobilisation following a positive DfT decision was discussed. It was agreed that a resource allocation plan be drawn up following submission of the NGT bid, in order to focus internal discussions.

DHa

With regard to the re-engagement of external advisors it was agreed that initial discussions commence with the existing advisor teams to ascertain what they would offer in terms of both resources and rates upon remobilisation. Following consideration of their responses a view will be taken on whether to go out to the wider market.

DHa/AW

A discussion took place on the communications strategy and it was agreed that the submission of the bid should be kept relatively low-key in terms of publicity. It was suggested that requesting a meeting with the Secretary of State for a delegation of local MP's/leaders may be beneficial. KP agreed to consider this further and liaise with A Gay on the process for this.

KP/AG

D Haskins gave an overview of the submission document that is currently being prepared for the NGT bid. It was agreed that a briefing note on the content of the document be prepared for politicians.

DH

G Bartlett and D Hoggarth agreed to review the bid document and provide comments on this ahead of the submission deadline.

GB/DHo

Any Other Business

No other business was raised

Date of Next Meeting

To be confirmed

NGT Project Board

Minutes of Meeting held on 29th June 2012 **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Gary Bartlett	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
David Hoggarth	Metro
Angela Taylor	Metro
Maureen Taylor	LCC
Nick Winney	Metro
Louise Porter (Minutes)	Metro

Apologies:

Andrew Hall	LCC
Andrew Wheeler	LCC

ACTION

1. Minutes of the Meeting held on 21st March 2012

These were agreed as correct.

2. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

3. NGT Project Director Update

A discussion took place on the continuing uncertainty on the timing of a DfT decision on NGT. It was agreed that if a decision on NGT is not announced in association with the expected City Deal announcement, an urgent meeting should be sought with the Secretary of State. Kieran Preston and Gary Bartlett to liaise on this issue.

**K Preston/
G Bartlett**

Dave Haskins reported that PR/media plans have been developed around a positive DfT decision. He agreed to check that this process had involved LCC's PR team following a request from Gary Bartlett.

D Haskins

Dave Haskins summarised the proposed revisions to the Project Board Terms of Reference and membership, which have been suggested to more closely comply with PRINCE 2 methodology. It was agreed that these be accepted on the basis that, while a smaller group of Project Board members is defined, other individuals be invited to attend Project Board meetings as and when required. It was suggested that attendance be agreed by the Chair of the Project Board and the NGT Project Director as part of the planning process for each meeting.

A wider discussion took place on the application of PRINCE 2 methodology to the NGT project and it was agreed that this should be applied from the outset. David Hoggarth commented that it will be important for the Project Board to agree the key project tolerances for each stage of the project.

Dave Haskins summarised the proposed project remobilisation process. Gary Bartlett queried how the recruitment process would work for the joint Metro/LCC posts. It was agreed that further consideration of an appropriate process for filling these posts is required, to ensure adequate opportunity for internal applicants, while also minimising the timescales for filling these positions.

D Haskins

Kieran Preston asked whether the new posts were intended to be fixed term positions. A discussion took place on the need to ensure that it is made clear, through the recruitment process, that NGT is a finite project and as such any posts associated with it have a limited life.

It was agreed that Metro initially draw up a proposal for how to deal with the NGT recruitment process for discussion with LCC.

D Haskins

Gary Bartlett mentioned that he had a few minor comments on the detail of the proposed NGT structure and agreed to provide these to Dave Haskins outside of the meeting.

G Bartlett

Angela Taylor suggested that it would be timely to review which Metro/LCC posts are charged to the project going forward. Prior to the project pause, this issue was due to be developed through the Joint Venture Agreement (JVA). It was agreed that Angela Taylor and Maureen Taylor arrange a meeting to discuss this in more detail following a positive decision from the DfT.

**A Taylor/
M Taylor**

Dave Haskins reported that the figure quoted in 2.19 of the report, relating to the expected financial saving to be made through securing reduced advisor rates, is an under-estimation. He explained that the scale of savings is actually estimated at around £300k per annum. Kieran Preston queried whether any key external staff were no longer available to the project. Dave Haskins confirmed that this was not the case and that the team could largely be reassembled.

With regard to accommodation for the NGT Team, the Project Board agreed to the proposal to accommodate a co-located team at Wellington House.

A discussion took place around the potential opportunity to include the East Line and City Centre Loop in the Transport and Works Act Order application. It was agreed that this should not be progressed at this stage.

The proposed financial approvals process was noted. David Hoggarth pointed out that there was no increase in development costs proposed, but that these costs would need to be re-profiled. Dave Haskins added that, following a positive DfT decision, further detailed work would be undertaken with the NGT advisors to update the proposed spending profile.

The unresolved issues log was noted and Dave Haskins explained that this had been provided in order to give the Project Board an indication of the key areas of

work that would be required once the project has been restarted.

4. Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board/ITA

It is proposed to seek an interim funding approval from the WYITA Executive Board in July.

A report is to be taken to the September meeting of the LCC Executive Board to cover LCC funding approvals and to ratify the next stages of project development.

A list of required Metro/LCC approvals going forward is currently being drawn up and will be brought back to the Project Board. **D Haskins**

5. Any Other Business

No other business was raised.

6. Date of Next Meeting

To be set up for approximately four weeks after a positive DfT decision.

NGT Project Board

Minutes of Meeting held on 4th October 2012 **at Wellington House, Leeds**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Gary Bartlett	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
John Henkel	Metro
Alan Gay	LCC
Steve Speak	LCC
Angela Taylor	Metro
Andrew Wheeler	LCC
Cath Cox (Minutes)	Metro

1 Minutes of the Meeting held on 21st March 2012

These were agreed as correct.

2 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

3 NGT Project Director Update

Project Team Staffing

KP to discuss future resourcing of Quality Contracts work with JH. KP

DH to investigate whether Jon Turton (KPMG) could have input into the NGT Procurement and Commercial manager recruitment. DH

GB asked to be kept informed if any additional resource was needed on the project. AW

Development Cost Forecasts

The Project Board approved the Development Cost Forecasts and the funding for 2012/13 financial year along with the funding strategy for future years.

AW to send the LCC Executive Board Report to KP and AT. AW

Consultation

The Project Board approved the public consultation outlined within the report.

It was also agreed that a Leeds MPs briefing would be organised, either through the Chamber of Commerce or at House of Commons. SS indicated that a Team Leeds meeting has been organised which could include NGT. DH

KP suggested that DH organises an NGT Business Breakfast seminar. DH

KP queried whether properties along the route would receive an update leaflet. DH to action this. DH

AW to organise an NGT Display stand for the next LCC Full Council Meeting. AW

DH to ensure the NGT website is reviewed to ensure all sections are up-to-date. DH

Procurement

DH to organise a Project Board Procurement Strategy Workshop in early November. DH

GB queried whether there was a formal mechanism for resolving issues where Project Board cannot agree. KP agreed that this needs to be considered and suggested forming a joint group of Members which has ultimate responsibility for the project, similar to the previous Supertram Working Group. DH to consider the remit and format of this group and present to the next Project Board. DH

The Procurement Objectives outlined in the report were approved in principle by the Project Board and will be revisited at the November Workshop.

Gateway Review

The Project Board approved the commencement of the Gateway Review. AT suggested that the recommendations from the previous review in 2009 are revisited and actioned where required. DH

Programme Entry Approval Letter

DH updated the meeting that the DfT had suggested visiting Leeds to discuss NGT. KP suggested that this would provide an opportunity for Metro and LCC Finance officers to discuss financial issues such as revenue share with the DfT. Prior to this meeting, DH to produce a position statement on key issues to be shared with the DfT. This should be agreed by Project Board prior to the meeting with the DfT.

DH

Sayner Lane

AW outlined the operational advantages of Sayner Lane, KP stated that these needed to be quantified before a decision can be made.

SS stated that in addition to owning some of the land at the proposed depot site, Hydro also own an adjoining site, so will have an interest in proposals for the site.

The following next steps were agreed

- Work to be commissioned by SDG to fully quantify the operational case for Sayner Lane. DH

- An outline cost comparison on the Sayner Lane and Stourton depot sites to be undertaken to understand the cost differential between the options. AW

- Liaise with LCC Planners/Planning Board to ensure that depots will be acceptable in planning terms at both locations. AW

Project Board to visit key sites on NGT Route as part of October's Project Board meeting, to be organised to follow Planning Board on 26th October. DH

Bi-Artic Trolleybus Vehicles

DH summarised the requirement to undertake investigative work on Bi-artics at this stage of the project.

GB queried whether a mix of articulated and bi-articulated vehicles could be used, it was indicated that this would be a

choice that was made by the NGT operator.
 GB queried what impact the increased weight of the bi-artic vehicles would have on the highway and structures. AW agreed that this could be an issue, and will ensure that this is included in the investigative work.
 The Project Board approved the commissioning of Bi-artic investigate work.

AW

Bodington Park and Ride

DH informed the meeting that the proposals for the Bodington Park and Ride site also involved providing replacement provision of sports pitches at the Clonmore Farm site on King Lane. The forecast cost for this replacement provision which has been included in the scheme CAPEX is £10 million. Since NGT remobilisation, the requirement to provide this provision has been re-examined in order to identify if any cost savings can be made and also to avoid any programming issues caused by the required two year bedding in period for the new pitches.

AW presented three identified options, which could reduce the requirement for replacement pitches. AW informed the meeting that following a meeting with the University that day, an additional option had arisen which utilised land on the Weetwood site in addition to a small amount of land-take from the adjoining donkey sanctuary. The viability of this option relies on Sport England/LCC Planners accepting that a lesser number of artificial pitches would be required than grass pitches.

Following questions on the advantages of this option for the Promoters and the University, AW indicated that this option is likely to be less expensive for the Promoters than the Clonmore Farm site in terms of capital investment and for the university it would be preferable to run two sites (Bodington and Weetwood) rather than three.

AW stated that the University are concerned about proposed plans for the cemetery at the Bodington site. AG will clarify with Jane Cash (LCC) what the proposals are

AW

The Project Board agreed the following next steps:

- Definitive set of proposals and related costs will be presented to project Board at the end of October.
- AW to write up minutes of the meeting with University and gain their agreement on the work packages to be undertaken to identify the preferred option.
- Work to be commissioned to undertake surveys at Weetwood site and provide cost estimates, and a cost update for Clonmore Farm proposals
- LCC Leisure to review cost estimates for Clonmore Farm site and compare against outturn costs for recently constructed sports pitches in Middleton.

DH/AW

AW

AW

AW

AW highlighted that it would be useful once a preferred option has been identified, that a strategic lead is identified to undertake all discussions at that level with the University. In the meantime, Tom Riordan/Martin Farrington to be briefed on issues regarding Bodington prior to any events they attend

which may also have key personnel from University attending. DH/AW

Project Risks

A fully updated Strategic and Project Risk Register to be brought to next Project Board. DH

AW informed the meeting that work was currently underway to review the NGT route in relation to the impact on cyclists, which would inform the risk register item relating to cycling.

AW to keep KP and GB up to date on any issues regarding Hunslet Sidings so that they can be flagged at the Rail programme Board which KP and GB attend. AW

JH queried why Operator Response and Construction Impacts not considered to be one of the top risks.

Programme

DH indicated that the programme to submit the NGT TWAO application was on track, but issues which had been highlighted at this Project Board meeting i.e. Bodington/Clonmore Farm, Depot location and Bi-articulated, may cause delays when the impacts of the preferred approaches are fully understood.

KP stated that it is important that the Project Board is convened whenever key decisions are required.

4 Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board/ITA

A report seeking an LCC Approval to Spend for 2012/13 has been submitted to the October LCC Executive Board.

5 Any Other Business

No other business was raised.

6 Date of Next Meeting

DH to organise a monthly Project Board Catch-up with KP and GB. DH

Next meeting to be organised in late October and incorporate a site visit to key locations on the NGT Route. DH

Post Meeting Note – In order for LCC to promote a TWAO application, The Local Government Act 1972 (section 239) requires that the Full Council of a local authority wishing to promote an Order must pass two resolutions, one before and one after the Order deposit. As the planned application date is the 11th of April 2013, it would be preferable for the report requesting the resolution to go to the February Meeting of the Full Council (there is no March meeting), however this is the Council's budget meeting and it is the exception for standard reports to go to this meeting. Although there is a Full Council meeting in January, the deadline for report submission is the 4th of January. It is anticipated that the level of detail required by the Council on the NGT Design, impact and mitigations to pass the resolution will not be ready for inclusion in a report by the 4th of January, therefore it is not advisable to go to this meeting.

If the resolution was delayed until the April Full Council meeting, it could cause a two month delay to the submission of the application as a result of the activities that can only be undertaken once the resolution has been passed.

It is therefore requested that LCC Project Board Members advise on whether a request should be made to include the Section 239 resolution on the Full Council February Agenda or whether a special meeting should be sought solely to consider the resolution.

NGT Project Board

Minutes of Meeting held on 12th November 2012 **(site visit, Leeds)**

Present:

Kieran Preston (Chair)	Metro
Gary Bartlett	LCC
Dave Haskins	Metro
Steve Speak	LCC
Angela Taylor	Metro
Andrew Wheeler	LCC

1 Minutes of the Meeting held on 4th October 2012

These were not reviewed.

2 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

3 Route Issues

Depot Location

The Project Board update paper on depot location was discussed and it was agreed that the depot is to be located at Stourton.

KP requested that the implications of an Aire Valley extension through WYTF work be explored in terms of depot requirements **DH**

Stourton Issues

It was noted that local members are not in favour of access to the Park and Ride site from Middleton Ring Road. It was explained that it is intended to show the access on the TWAO plans but could be marked as an emergency access.

GB expressed concern that the strategic objectives could be compromised if the access was not provided.

Whitfield Sq / Penny Hill Stop

Project Board queried the width required for NGT running. Shared space issues were also highlighted. **AW**

GB expressed concern over potential delays to NGT at the Balm Rd / Church St junction..



Woodhouse Moor

Project board were updated on the current options being investigated. Project Board stated that NGT benefits should not be compromised in this area

Headingley Hill

The issues for cyclists were noted.

Lawnswood

The loss of trees was pointed out.

Bodington

AW explained the issues as described in the project board papers on Bodington. It was agreed to;

- Engage specialist sports fields consultants from the Sports England framework, as a sub-consultant to Motts, to determine the requirements for replacement pitches including artificial pitches.
- Meet with the University to discuss in detail their strategy for playing field provision including current and future demand.
- Agree a pitch relocation strategy with the University and provide robust evidence to Sports England to demonstrate adherence to National Planning Policy in terms of loss of playing fields.
- Undertake a cost estimate of the relocation measures and a baseline estimate of relocation to Clonmore Farm.
- Keep Clonmore Farm within the TWAO until agreement is reached with the University and Sports England, and to progress the HoT on this basis until agreement can be reached over the relocation of pitches within the Bodington site.

4 Programme

The challenges on the programme as described in the position paper presented to project board were discussed. Project Board understood that the dates were always challenging as the programme originally assumed a DfT decision in December 2011 and not the actual date of July 2012.

It was explained that outputs from the transport model may need some further work to refine and that some junctions may need to be redesigned. Further work is being undertaken this week to determine the scale of the issue and the full implications on programme however it is inevitable that the programme will slip.

Design Freeze will now be post-Christmas with the TWAO application also being put back from April. It was agreed that the S239 resolution will now be put to the April Full Council meeting to avoid the budget meeting in February.

It was also accepted that it would not be possible to start

operations in 2018 and 2019 should now be quoted as the date. DH to explore how to handle the PR for this.

DH

Project Board members will be updated as soon as the full implications on programme have been assessed.

LP

5 Consultation Updated

The activity described in the report for past and future consultation and engagement was noted.

AW explained that the informal RFI notices would be distributed over a 3 week period starting to 26th November to 4,500 properties along the route. These would be followed 2 weeks later by the statutory notices requesting details of land ownership.

6 Project Reporting

The project reporting schedule was highlighted.

7 Any Other Business

DH explained that the work on Bi-articulated vehicles was ongoing and would be reported to the next Project Board. The key issues relate to the balance between additional cost and the most cost-effective means of provide sufficient capacity, together with a consideration of the risks to TWAO success through pursuing bi-articulate vehicles in the Order.

The Gateway Review is take place on the 29th – 31st January 2013. Project Board members will be notified of diary requirements.

NGT Project Board Meeting Minutes, 14th January 2013

2pm, Boardroom, Metro Offices

Attendees:

Kieran Preston (Chair)
 Gary Bartlett
 John Henkel
 Angela Taylor
 Maureen Taylor (for Alan Gay)
 Dave Haskins
 Andrew Wheeler
 Jacqui Elliott (NGT Team)
 Tom Hacker (Minutes)

Meeting Minutes

1	Apologies for absence Steve Speak (LCC)	
2	Minutes of the Meeting held on 12th November 2012 JH Requested his apologies be added to the minutes from the previous Project Board meeting.	TH
3	Matters Arising There were no matters arising.	
4	Project Board Report	
4a	Revised Programme DH provided the group with an update on the current programme for NGT including the modelling issues which may lead to the programme being delayed to 2019/2020. Board members acknowledged the complications and briefly discussed key milestones in the programme. KP questioned where (if at all) there could be an opportunity to bring the programme forward. KP requested that a note be produced which details areas where there is potential to save time on certain tasks and bring the programme forward again. It was reported that the programme provided contains no obvious scope for pulling back, other than areas outside of the Promoters control. GB questioned how much 'float' there is within the proposed new programme as there is potential to damage the image of the project if this revised programme is not met.	AW

	<p>AW suggested that there is very limited float within our own control and as such GB requests more flexibility be built into the programme and suggests the end of the 2019/2020 financial year to be shown as the expected completion date.</p> <p>JH questioned whether the vehicles will be tested prior to them being delivered for trial operations. DH reported that the manufacturers should have testing facilities and will check to see if this is the case</p> <p>Recommendation: The Project Board agreed the revised programme.</p>	DH
4b	<p>Gateway Review</p> <p>DH provided a summary of those who are aware of their involvement in this process and who have been allocated an interview slot. Cllr Richard Lewis and Bill McKinnon (Friends of Woodhouse Moor) are yet to confirm their availability, but are currently being chased-up.</p> <p>DH mentioned that it would be inadvisable for the NGT team to develop a 'briefing note' for interviewees as it may be seen to 'lead' those involved KP requested that a set of FAQ's be provided as a briefing note to participants to bring people up to speed with the key facts. DH to develop briefing note and circulate to the board. JH questioned whether the Review Team could pick up on a lack of operator involvement to date. DH provided an update on operator involvement including details of the operator seminar held last year GB requests that the briefing note for participants should also cover what interviewees should expect from the process</p> <p>Recommendation: The NGT team should develop a brief for interviewees which should include details of what shall be expected of them as part of the review.</p>	<p>DH</p> <p>DH</p>
4c	<p>Budget Update</p> <p>DH provided an update on the increased cost given the extended programme. DH reported that there are also some potential increases in costs due to the fact that an NGT Procurement Manager was not appointed following the recent procurement exercise. However he explained that costs should not be a major concern moving forward as savings could potentially be made during the advanced design stages MT reinforced the point that the LCC funding is fixed AT added that Metro money is also fixed although there is still potential to re-profile monies given the programme changes JH questioned how well the promoters understand the Leeds Transport Model DH outlined current reservations regarding modelling using the LTM and the issues of applying a strategic model at a local level. Complications with modelling in turn complicate TWAO land take decisions especially at junctions KP questioned what additional data is needed</p>	

	<p>DH believes we have everything we need but using LTM is slowing the process and costing more money</p> <p>Recommendation: The Project Board noted the change in scheme cost for the current phase of the project.</p>	
4d	<p>Position on the release of plans</p> <p>DH provided an update on the Promoters current position on the release of plans, which is to not release the Design Freeze 6 plans</p> <p>DH explained that if these are issued after Design Freeze 7 the plans that are released as part of the TWAO application will again be different since they will show the limits of deviation to be included in the TWAO.</p> <p>DH suggested that it may be necessary to include a disclaimer before people can download Design Freeze 7 plans from the website.</p> <p>GB questioned why we cannot release both Design Freeze7 plans & the plans showing the TWAO limits at the same time.</p> <p>AW advised that DF7 will not be ready until March, then work will begin on the 'urban realm' plans and only then will work begin on TWAO limits</p> <p>Recommendation: The Project Board agreed with the recommendation to release DF7 plans as they become available, and to hold back on release of current DF6 plans.</p>	
4e	<p>Draft terms of reference for NGT Members WG</p> <p>DH provided a brief update on the plans to develop this group</p> <p>GB requested that the 5th bullet point becomes 1st bullet point ("To champion the project at a wider political level").</p> <p>GB questioned how engaged we are with the people living in/members representing communities along the south line</p> <p>DH reported that engagement with members has taken place and various public drop-in events are now programmed for the South Route which will enable greater engagement with people over the coming weeks/months.</p> <p>A discussion took place on the proposed membership of the NGT Members Working Group. GB advised that he believes Cllr Taylor should be considered for the NGT Members WG and AW agreed to arrange meeting with Cllr Taylor</p> <p>DH also suggested that there is a political balance of members on the WG in as much as is practical</p> <p>MT questioned whether Weetwood members would be suitable</p> <p>AW advised that Cllr Bentley could be a good potential addition to the WG</p> <p>KP believes Cllr James Lewis should also be approached</p> <p>GB requested a note listing potential members.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Project Board agree to setting up an NGT Member Working Group and agree to the draft terms of reference for a NGT Member Working Group.</p>	<p>DH</p> <p>AW</p> <p>AW</p>

4f	<p>Consultation Update</p> <p>DH provided an update including proposals for publishing a comprehensive set of FAQ's to answer queries raised by attendees at the events held to date, including where gaps exist, such as with local business.</p> <p>TH provided an update on the key concerns/questions being raised.</p> <p>GB questioned whether links between the LCC and NGT website are working.</p> <p>DH informed the Board he will be appearing on Look North following their attendance at the recent drop-in event at Headingley. He explained that since the reporter had interviewed a number of concerned residents, that the article could come across as negative in some respects.</p> <p>Recommendation: Project Board members noted the current approach to consultation</p>	AW
4g	<p>Procurement</p> <p>DH provided a brief update on the situation following the recent recruitment exercise for a Procurement Manager which did not result in an appointment. He suggested that there may be a need to work with Leeds PPPU in an attempt to save money given the high cost of procuring KPMG to undertake further work.</p> <p>A discussion took place on the options available.</p> <p>DH believes we should continue to use KPMG, bring in PPPU to 'oversee' their work and increase the role of PPU overtime.</p> <p>MT reminded people that it was highlighted in the last Gateway Review that we (the promoters) should use PPPU</p> <p>KP believes we should look into the PPPU approach further, as proposed by DH. GB also added that we should continue to look for the right member of staff to work on procurement.</p> <p>KP thinks it may be too big a risk not to search for the right person and that we may need (not now but later on) a high level advisor as has been appointed at Blackpool and Nottingham tram schemes</p> <p>DH to look at this in more detail including the urgency for appointing someone of that nature.</p> <p>AW stated that the next Project Board will concentrate on procurement.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Project Board agree with the proposed approach on potential resource options.</p>	DH
4h	<p>Visits to other systems</p> <p>DH summarised the potential risk around only a limited number of the NGT Project Team having visited a working Trolleybus system. He also mentioned the</p>	

	<p>issues regarding potential public perception of Members visiting European cities to see Trolleybus networks</p> <p>This was discussed further and it was agreed that system visits can be hugely beneficial for Members, but initially it is more important that officers undertake such visits. It was also agreed that any such trips need to be undertaken quickly and within appropriate budgets.</p> <p>KP and GB suggested that in terms of a Member visit it would be useful to include think Cllr J Lewis and Cllr R Lewis.</p> <p>DH to pull together cost and plan for such a trip</p> <p>DH to develop list of modern cities in Europe that are developing a trolleybus and circulate with the cost plan</p> <p>Recommendation: Detailed proposals for visits to other systems to be developed.</p>	<p>DH</p> <p>DH</p>
5	Design Issues Report	
5a	<p><i>Bodington Land Update</i></p> <p>AW provided a brief update including plans to relocate the displaced sports pitches within the university owned land at Bodington instead of Clonmore Farm. The key objective at present is to void the need to include Clonmore Farm in the TWA0 submission.</p> <p>AW mentioned that as the discussions progress it may be necessary to involve more senior officers and questioned who should lead the negotiations at the highest level.</p> <p>GB suggested that Martin Farrington (LCC) would be ideal and will need briefing at some point.</p> <p>AW to arrange briefing when/if needed</p> <p>Recommendation: To continue to develop the proposals for relocating the displaced sports pitches within the current Bodington / Weetwood University sports complex.</p>	<p>AW</p>
5b	<p><i>Balm Road Sidings</i></p> <p>AW updated the Board on the plans/risk involved with plans to run NGT along the Hunslet sidings in the vicinity of Balm Road Bridge (Design Freeze 6) and explains current plans are partly a result of issues arising as a consequence 'value engineering' work undertaken during the project pause.</p> <p>KP questioned what ward Members views were of the earlier DF5 option, which avoided the sidings and ran through allotments/gardens/sports pitch</p> <p>AW stated that he believed the response from Members was negative, which formed part of the basis of adopting an option that avoided this alignment .</p> <p>GB believes we should wait and see what future comes out of the High Speed Rail 2 announcement later this month (Jan)</p>	

	<p>In light of the risks attached to the options that have been considered to date, a further new Option D was tabled (Belle Isle Road). AW made it clear that this is an entirely new option, but that it does appear to have a number of attractions attached to it.</p> <p>AW did state however that Option D may have longer journey times, and could add at least 2-3 months onto the programme, but would increase patronage, avoid a great deal of risk, complications and save costs.</p> <p>Recommendation: To appoint advisors to look into this option in more detail (check) and to suspend any further advisor work on the sidings options.</p>	
5c	<p>Cycling Issues (including Headingley Hill)</p> <p>AW provided a brief update on the cycling provision within NGT and the ongoing consultation with cyclists.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Board noted the update and were comfortable with how this scheme is developing in this area (cycling provision).</p>	
5d	<p>Woodhouse Moor Alignment</p> <p>AW provided a brief update on the current plans for the Moor alignment options. Board Members discussed the relative merits of the options and viewed that the off-line option ensures that all future options are kept open.</p> <p>Recommendation: That the off-line option is included within the TWAO submission. Further information to be provided at the next meeting.</p>	
5e	<p>Bi-Articulated Vehicles</p> <p>DH summarised the findings of the work that has been done on the case for using bi-articulated vehicles. This has raised issues over vehicle capacity, £2m additional infrastructure cost (estimate) and £10m addition vehicle costs (estimate).</p> <p>JH raised the issue of what the operators might want in comparison to what we would like to plan for.</p> <p>AW advised that the bigger the vehicle the more issues he envisages relating to representation from cyclists and public opposition through to the Public Inquiry. Although no significant additional land take is envisaged for bi-articulated vehicles there could be some issues with longer stop lengths.</p> <p>DH explained that the work has shown that we could possibly deal with the demand by introduction of extra articulated vehicles, although this is still work in progress.</p> <p>GB questions if we would need bigger vehicles if we planned on expanding the network. AW reported that this is a possibility.</p> <p>JH highlighted the risk of such long vehicles given they would be the first bi articulated in the UK.</p> <p>AW suggested that overall, the bigger vehicles carry more risk to successful project delivery.</p>	

	<p>GB reiterated that we need to clearly articulate our reasoning for whatever choice the Board make.</p> <p>KP added that it will be necessary to have a robust plan for dealing with excessive demand.</p> <p>DH to develop a note laying out options for dealing with excessive demand including what would be needed to be done to change to bi-articulated vehicles post-implementation.</p> <p>Recommendation: Following the discussion the Project Board agreed that we should discontinue work on bi-articulated vehicles and that provision for bi-articulated vehicles should not be included in the TWA0.</p>	DH
5f	<p><i>Depot Assumptions</i></p> <p>DH provided a brief update on the depot work being undertaken by the NGT team including assumptions about the footprint.</p> <p>KP suggested that it should be designed for current proposals but in a way that is 'modular' and can be expanded when/if needed.</p> <p>JH questioned what we will do if any incumbent bus operator should successfully bid to run NGT and wish to incorporate the depot within their own facilities.</p> <p>AW advised that if single articulated vehicles are used then it might be feasible for the operator to run the buses offline into their depot without TWA0 powers.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Project Board agreed that the depot should be built with a 'modular design'.</p>	
5g	<p><i>Interim Capital Costs Direction</i></p> <p>AW provided a brief update on areas where capital cost is going up and where cost could potentially come down. It is too early to be able to assess whether overall costs will be within the defined affordability envelope.</p> <p>Recommendation: This was noted by the Project Board.</p>	
5h	<p><i>Taxis in Bus Lanes</i></p> <p>AW provided a brief update on plans to allow Hackney Carriages into bus lanes but not NGT lanes.</p> <p>GB needs more convincing with regards to safety, feels this policy would need political agreement to move forward, needs signing off by the LCC Highways Board and taken to the LCC steering group.</p> <p>Recommendation: Report to be prepared for Members outlining the issues with taxi's in NGT lanes.</p>	
5i	<p><i>Turnbacks</i></p> <p>AW provided a brief update on the work SDG are doing for turnback facilities on the NGT route.</p> <p>GB agreed that these plans appear sensible but questioned whether an operator is likely to get involved at some point. DH advised that they will.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Project Board noted this report.</p>	

5j	<p>Tree Policy</p> <p>AW provided a brief update on how plans affect trees and how we plan to deal with tree replacement and relocation.</p> <p>KP questioned what the proposed approach to this issue was on the Supertram scheme.</p> <p>DH to check Supertram documents for a tree policy document</p> <p>GB suggested that the A65 QBC scheme approach was one that should be investigated for NGT i.e. replanting trees that need to be moved from the NGT route.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Project Board agreed the proposed Tree Policy.</p>	<p>DH</p> <p>AW</p>
6	<p>Items for Referral: S239 Agreement and the LCC Planning Process</p> <p>AW provided a brief update on the timescales for the two Section 239 Resolutions which will be required from the full council.</p> <p>GB questioned whether the general public can demonstrate their opposition directly to the Plans Panel.</p> <p>AW advised that the general public can encourage members to not recommend the TWAO.</p> <p>AT also questioned whether the TWAO application is to be considered by the ITA board.</p> <p>AW advises it will go to the ITA board either shortly before or after the S239</p> <p>DH to add S239 agreement to the agenda for the LMT meeting on the 7th of February.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Board noted the above process</p>	<p>DH</p>
7	<p>Any other Businesses</p> <p>N/A</p>	
8	<p>Date of the Next Meeting</p> <p>Scheduled for the 19th of February 2pm – 5pm.</p>	

Meeting: NGT Project Board

Date: 19th February 2013

Time: 2:00pm



Attendees:

Kieran Preston (Chair)

Gary Bartlett

Steve Speak

Angela Taylor

Dave Haskins

Andrew Wheeler

Cath Cox (Minutes)

Item		Actions
1.	Apologies for Absence John Henkel Alan Gay	
2.	Minutes of Meeting held on 14th January 2013 Item 4a – DH informed that he was still in the process of confirming the vehicle testing processes carried out by manufacturers. Item 4e – AW requested further guidance from the Project Board on the remit of the NGT Member Working Group. The meeting discussed the need for a strong strategic lead on the group. AW to revise the list and send to GB, who will discuss with Councillor Richard Lewis w/c 25 th February. KP to discuss membership of the group with Councillor James Lewis	DH AW GB KP
3.	Matters Arising There were no matters arising	
4.	Project Directors Report	
4a	Accommodation DH highlighted the issues with the existing NGT Project Team accommodation. AT to look at options for retaining the Project Team in Wellington House.	AT
4b	Belle Isle Alignment The Project Board challenged the cost forecasts for the Belle Isle alignment. DH explained that as the route was being designed from scratch, there was a wide-range of tasks that needed to be undertaken in a relatively short space of time.	

	The Project Board approved the approach being taken	
4c	<p>Programme Update</p> <p>AW outlined the programme impacts of incorporating the Belle Isle alignment into the TWAO. The Project Board agreed that 2020 should now be communicated as the date for start of operations and that DH should liaise with Metro PR Team and produce a press release communicating the Belle Isle alignment and related programme changes.</p> <p>DH to refresh the note previously produced for Tom Riordan on the timescales for delivering a Trolleybus scheme.</p>	<p>DH</p> <p>DH</p>
4d	<p>Planning Update</p> <p>AW provided a verbal update on the outcomes of Plans Panel Workshop which had taken place on the 14th February.</p> <p>The next steps of the process will be to return to Plans Panel in April to update Members on the progress of design and following that attend an all-day Plans Panel in June, where members of the public will be allowed to make deputations to the Panel. Following this the Panel will form a planning view to be presented to Full Council ahead of the request for them to make their Section 239 resolution.</p> <p>AW highlighted that there currently is not sufficient resource to provide the planning input required from the NGT Project Team and requested that additional resources are drafted in in this particularly busy period. The Project Board agreed that this resource was required</p> <p>GB and SS to discuss options for this resource.</p> <p>It was agreed that Strategic Members should be briefed in the run-up to the June Plans Panel. GB suggested that his regular briefing with Councillor Richard Lewis could be used as a starting point for this.</p>	<p>GB/SS</p> <p>GB</p>
4e	<p>Gateway Review</p> <p>DH provided a summary of the outcomes of the Gateway Review.</p> <p>The meeting agreed that a summary of the outcomes should be disseminated to all attendees. KP suggested that the recommendation relating to Roles and Responsibilities is re-worded prior to circulation.</p>	<p>DH</p>
4f	<p>Engagement of a PR/Marketing consultant</p> <p>Project Board agreed that a workshop should be held to agree the key themes required of a PR/Marketing strategy, with possible attendees being Martin Driver, David Baggaley and Ian Williams.</p> <p>GB to contact Lurene Joseph to discuss any opportunities there may be for Leeds and Partners to provide support in this area.</p>	<p>DH</p> <p>GB</p>
4g	<p>Project Controls</p> <p>The Project Board approved the revised PID and the structure of the Highlight Report.</p> <p>SS requested that the PID is reviewed for any mentions of EASEL etc. which may no longer be applicable to the current scheme.</p> <p>The Budget Working Group to discuss the annual cost tolerances to be applied to the project.</p>	<p>DH</p> <p>AW</p>
4h	<p>Business Case Update</p> <p>GB asked to be informed if there are any further issues regarding conflicts of interest with ITS, so that he can raise them with Tom Riordan.</p>	<p>DH</p>

4i	<p>Procurement Update</p> <p>GB requested that if AW has not had any response from PPPU by w/c 25th February, then he should contact Alan Gay directly to try and progress matters.</p> <p>KP to meet with David Outram and Alan Gay to discuss PPPU input into NGT Procurement.</p> <p>The issues relating the procurement resource requirements were noted by the meeting, DH and KP to set out the potential scope of a Strategic Procurement Manager role.</p>	<p>AW</p> <p>KP</p> <p>DH/KP</p>
4j	<p>Bi-articulated vehicles</p> <p>The Project Board noted the current position and agreed that no further work should be undertaken in this area.</p>	
4k	<p>Objection Management Approach</p> <p>AW to give further consideration to which of the Promoter organisations will negotiate on financial settlements.</p>	AW
4l	<p>Choice of Counsel</p> <p>Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4m	<p>Consultation Update</p> <p>KP suggested that he and DH meet with Ian Williams to discuss consultation opportunities.</p> <p>SS stated that 6 week consultation periods were standard for planning applications and the Project Board approved the 6 week consultation period for Belle Isle.</p>	KP/DH
4n	<p>Cost Update</p> <p>Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4o	<p>JVA Update</p> <p>The Project Board noted the current position and requested that the Heads of Terms are circulated to the Project Board at the earliest opportunity, prior to them being reported to LCC Executive Board.</p>	
5a	<p>Overview on Scheme Design and Costs</p> <p>Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
5b	<p>Headingley Hill</p> <p>Project Board noted that there would be further widening of Headingley Lane as part of the DF7 design.</p>	
5c	<p>Woodhouse Lane Bridge</p> <p>AW highlighted the issues relating to the Woodhouse Lane Footbridges and possible re-routing of traffic along Blenheim Walk to enable the existing Woodhouse Lane bridge to be retained.</p> <p>GB suggested that where issues arise which create a conflict with project objectives, discussions should take place a strategic level to see if a resolution can be found, prior to accommodation being made in the design.</p>	
5d	<p>Shaw Lane/Alma Road</p> <p>The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	

5e	Holt Park Termini Project Board approved the principle of the draft revised design.	
5f	Woodhouse Moor It was decided that the decision should be deferred to March's Project Board. In order to make a decision KP requested that a full presentation of data relating to both options is presented.	DH/AW
6	Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board/ITA GB queried why the next Capital Expenditure approval being sought was to cover the period through to Full Approval, rather than just an annual approval. GB to discuss further with AW	GB/AW
7	Any Other Business There was no other business	
8	Date of Next Meeting 2pm 6 th March – Project Board Procurement Workshop 2pm 19 th March – Project Board Meeting	

NGT Project Board Meeting Minutes, 14th May 2013

2pm, Boardroom, Metro Offices

Attendees:

Gary Bartlett (GB)-(Chair)
 John Henkel (JH)
 Angela Taylor (AT)
 Steve Speak (SS)
 Alan Gay (AG)
 Dave Haskins (DH)
 Andrew Wheeler (AW)
 Richard Capenerhurst (RC)-(Minutes)

Meeting Minutes

1	Apologies for absence Kieran Preston	
2	Minutes of the Meeting held on 15th April 2013 4c – Still some work to be done on clarifying roles and responsibilities following Gateway Review feedback. 4d – Work on formulating a robust response to questions on battery/hybrid technology still on-going. 4e – DH has requested further information on shipping a trolley bus to Leeds. Awaiting a response from Salzburg.	DH DH DH
3	Matters Arising	
	DH advised that Nathan Huntley is now working full time on the NGT project.	
4	Project Director Report	
4a	Highlight Report DH referred the group to the full highlight report outlined in Appendix 1 of the supplementary reports, summarising the work done this month including positive feedback from the 10 th May Plans Panel meeting where a high level of buy in from members was received. There are still some process issues to resolve. Outcome: The Project Board noted the points raised in the latest Highlight Report.	

4b	<p>Planning Update</p> <p>AW advised the board that the planning update would be covered by the Plans Panel presentation later in the meeting.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position on the Planning process.</p>	
4c	<p>Consultation Update</p> <p>DH provided an update on the current position. He stated that there was an on-going requirement to look at how the NGT team countered issues and misinformation including that presented at Full Council. There is a feeling that some councillors are taking more information from constituents at face value rather than members of the NGT team. AG said he felt that there was a significant opposition to address as highlighted by the YEP letters page and the recent deputation. DH explained that there was a hard-core of opposition who were perpetuating the same misinformation about the project even when repeatedly shown the facts. Councillors around Headingley and Woodhouse Moor were generally supportive of the scheme but there was a minority of well organised opposition in that area.</p> <p>GB enquired about the current state of the Communications Plan and DH updated the group with future engagement plans, including City Centre events and meetings with local groups. He highlighted that Councillors Richard and James Lewis have put themselves forward to answer questions. GB asked how the Public meeting on 11th May had been received and DH stated that this had gone well. GB asked about the NGT website in relation to counteracting myths and DH said that a report to address this would be made available shortly. The team are also in communication with the YEP to investigate how more positive media about the scheme can be communicated.</p> <p>JH raised the issue of strategy to address misinformation in general. He raised the point that the more the myths are rebutted; the better informed the opposition become. AW stated that we need to make sure the facts we communicate are correct, and explained that the revised process for engaging with LCC Plans Panel necessitated a greater need to rebut misinformation and myths surrounding the project. This required significant time and resource to ensure that the information presented is accurate. DH stated that we are now on better ground to rebut the claims, citing work that had been done around journey times as an example. JH raised the issue about community champions and finding people who will speak on our behalf. DH then updated the group on the recent consultation events at Belle Isle, highlighting the low turnout. AT then enquired about the current status of the Member Working Group which DH said he would investigate.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position. DH to ask James</p>	

	Lewis for the current position on the Member Working Group.	DH
4d	<p><i>Business Engagement and Marketing Strategy</i></p> <p>DH provided a brief update on current activities highlighting the strategy workshop that had taken place on 16th April 2013. LCC Marketing Manager David Baggaley is now working with the NGT team and DH referred the group to the detailed report in Appendix 2 which outlines how the strategy will be developed over the coming months. This strategy includes key meetings to promote the scheme in a more positive light and DH advised the group that a meeting with the Yorkshire Post Insider desk was taking place this week. JH raised the issue of the kind of message that was being put across and that we should be addressing the issues that matter to local people. DH explained that the marketing manager was working closely with Martin Driver (PR) to ensure that the Business Engagement Strategy was implemented in a consistent way. JH enquired about the current popularity of the scheme and AW highlighted that this was not dissimilar to that of other comparable schemes. DH stated that, overall, the project is in a much better place than it was 2 months ago regarding Business Engagement activities.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the points raised.</p>	
4e	<p><i>Procurement Update</i></p> <p>AW provided an update on the current position and highlighted the main issues following recent meetings with Leeds PPPU. Legal investigations are currently on-going to see if Mott MacDonald can carry out Advanced Design activities without the need for a formal tendering process. AW stated that the programme for Advanced Design activities is very tight and if a tendering process is required there will be programme issues. A prioritisation matrix will be required for the Advanced Design. JH enquired about the budget for Advanced Design tasks and asked if we are getting value for money. AW explained that the current budget is £5 million and will be more informed following the release of DF7.</p> <p>GB asked for clarification on the role of PPPU and asked whether they had been formally appointed. AW advised the group that PPPU had not been formally appointed and DH stated that he requires visibility on what approach PPPU are going to take and what this will cost in the immediate period up to 2015. This remains a high risk to the project. AW stated that PPPU were developing a procurement plan based on KPMG's procurement strategy which would be presented to Project Board in July. AW gave a brief update on market testing strategy with informal market testing proposed in June 2013 and formal market testing following in late 2014/early 2015. JH asked whether the DfT are aware of the current status of procurement activities. AW stated that they are aware and the team will continue to liaise with them. AG asked if the DfT have seen the outline procurement strategy and DH advised that a more formal</p>	

	statement on procurement will be made to them.	
	<p>Outcome: Project Board members noted the current approach to the issues on procurement.</p> <p>AW to provide DfT with a more formal statement on procurement activities.</p>	AW
4f	<p><i>Quality Contracts and NGT</i></p> <p>JH gave a brief update to the group, advising that the inclusion of the Quality Contract Scheme within the TWA submission would add an unnecessary amount of risk to the project and should not be undertaken. DH referred the group to the further information outlined in Appendix 3.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4g	<p><i>Choice of Counsel</i></p> <p>DH summarised the current position following the meeting with Neil Cameron QC on 14th May 2013, recommending that the board make a formal appointment. GB stated that first impressions had been very positive.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position and were recommended to formally approve Neil Cameron QC.</p> <p>DH to check if there is a prohibitive termination clause in the contract.</p>	DH
4h	<p><i>Accommodation issues and Public Inquiry venue.</i></p> <p>DH provided a general update to the group, reiterating the main issues and work done to date on procuring a suitable venue for the Public Inquiry, as well as the additional problems caused by expansion of the NGT team. AW explained that the situation regarding accommodation is fast becoming unsustainable. Various options have been investigated with preference given to keeping the team together in one place either at Wellington house or Leeds city centre. JH enquired about available space on the first floor at Wellington House and asked whether we need a more formal assessment in that area. AG offered the use of PPPU office space at no additional cost to the project and DH said he would investigate this. JH re-iterated the importance of keeping the team together in order to maintain the current team dynamic but said he would like to see the pros and cons of each option.</p> <p>DH explained that he had assessed the Regus offices for suitability as a Public Inquiry venue and said they were ideal in terms of facilities and space. He explained that a decision whether to use them would be required soon as it was highly likely Regus would not hold them for NGT after the end of May. DH stated that he will ask Paul Thomson from BDB to give an opinion on their suitability as he has experience in this area. AG enquired if the Town Hall</p>	DH

	<p>option had been explored and DH explained that this venue had been looked at and discounted. AW added that there was an additional risk in using the Town Hall if the Public Inquiry goes on longer than anticipated.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position regarding accommodation issues. DH to investigate offer of using PPPU office space. AW/DH to provide pros and cons for each option. DH to circulate details of Town Hall suitability.</p>	<p>DH AW/DH DH</p>
4i	<p>Green Electricity DH gave a brief update to the group, highlighting the recent meetings with LCC Waste Management team and the Sustainability Unit. It is proposed that a formal action plan is generated as soon as possible as the project will be criticised for not looking seriously at all the options available.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4j	<p>Property at 6 Wood lane, Headingley AW gave a brief update to the group highlighting the process currently being undertaken by LCC to obtain vacant possession of the above property and DH pointed out the risk of adverse media attention if the Council are seen to be dispossessing families from their homes to make way for NGT. JH stated that people need to be briefed about the current proposals and AW advised that all the relevant people in Metro/LCC were aware of the situation.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4k	<p>Eastgate Development (now known as Victoria Gate) DH gave a brief update to the group on the proposed alignments and stated that we are now at a stage where there is a preferred option, making reference to the diagrams shown in Appendix 4. AW explained the diagrams in more detail to the group. JH enquired about car park access and DH stated that there is now a workable solution in place and that Mott MacDonald are currently investigating alternative alignment plans with Hamersons. DH summarised the situation advising that all options had been investigated and that a report was due from Mott MacDonald in the next couple of weeks.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4l	<p>Cost Update DH reported that current forecast development costs are higher than approved at present due to the additional work involved in; the Belle Isle alignment option, servicing the requirements of Plans Panel, dealing with issues raised and communication from opposition groups, and the uncertainties regarding PPPU engagement. DH re-iterated that the programme up to full approval is still deliverable within the agreed budget as increased costs at this stage may be offset by lower future Advanced Design costs.</p>	

	Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.	
5	Design Report	
	<p>AW gave a presentation to the group highlighting the main design issues and feedback from the Plans Panel workshop held on 10th May 2013, as well as concerns over the process as it currently stands. AW stated that there is a concern about the type of recommendation that may emerge from the public meeting in June. The main points from the presentation are highlighted below:</p> <p>Holt Park The 2 options were presented including the preferred option (short loop around the surgery) AW stated that members were happy with the preferred option. JH asked whether we should be playing down visual impact issues and SS said the regeneration benefits should be highlighted.</p> <p>Bodington Park and Ride AW presented the options highlighting landscaping and tree retention proposals. He stated that Plans Panel members were happy with the revisions including the proposals for relocation of the sports pitches.</p> <p>Lawnswood Roundabout The preferred central running option was presented including revised proposals to retain more trees. AW explained that kerb side running had been considered but had been ruled out due to safety concerns and additional delays to outbound traffic north of the roundabout. He stated that Plans panel members were happy with the revised central running design.</p> <p>Headingley Hill AW provided a brief update on the available options for widening on north and south sides of Headinley Lane.. The merits and disadvantages of each option were briefly covered. The (preferred) south route widening option was explained. GB enquired about the loss of buildings. AW explained that the Gatehouse would need to be demolished along with another of poor quality. Two further buildings would require partial removal> However AW stated that the removal of the wall on the north route was the most contentious issue as although the wall could be rebuilt further back the trees behind would need to be removed as their roots would be affected by the wall removal. It was explained that land take issues with the nursery still need to be resolved and this could become an issue if no agreement is reached in the future. GB enquired whether cycle groups were happy with the proposals and AW explained that the designs provide for a wider combined NGT/cycle lane on the north route and a dedicated cycle lane running south.</p> <p>Monument Moor AW presented the revised on street option but stated that members preferred</p>	

the on moor alignment.

University

AW explained that much work had been done in this area and went through the various alignment options stating that the preferred option alignment was supported by Plans Panel. AG and GB ask about Woodhouse Bridge access and cycling provision and this was explained. AW said feedback from Plans Panel members had been very positive.

Whitfield Square/Way

AW explained that this had been a stumbling block at previous Plans Panel meetings and then presented the various options including double and single track running. He said that the overwhelming view was for the Whitfield Square alignment with double track running. A montage for the Penny Hill Centre was then shown.

Belle Isle

AW presented the latest proposals – central reservation running with a new tree belt on Belle Isle Road. The route through Belle Isle circus was briefly discussed as was Winrose Grove and the phased introduction at Stourton Park and Ride.

Substations

AW stated that there were concerns over the design and location of substations required along the route although it was felt that the issues could be overcome.

AW concluded the presentation and stated that, overall, members were happy and supportive of all the revised proposals and the Project Board commended the team on the work that had been done.

Further discussions followed regarding the Plans Panel meeting to be held on June 25th and what recommendation may emerge from the meeting. There are concerns over how this may affect the TWAO process. AW said that similar schemes do not involve the Plans Panel to the extent that NGT does and the main issue is how to manage the Plans Panel process. JH asked who Plans Panel make recommendations to and AW explained that they will form a view and transmit this to the Full Council. There was a general agreement that the wording of the resolution needs careful consideration and DH stated that a draft recommendation would be produced and circulated. AW also highlighted the need for more focussed meetings between Councillors Gruen, Councillor Taggart, Phil Crabtree and BDB. DH explained that he would be covering the Plans Panel meeting on the 25th June as AW is on vacation.

	Outcome: Project Board noted the points outlined in the Plans Panel presentation and were content with the preferred options described in the presentation. DH/AW to produce draft recommendation wording for further discussion. SS to arrange meeting with Councillors Gruen/Taggart.	DH/AW SS
6	Items for Referral to LCC executive Board/ITA AW to provide response to the deputation for the June Executive Board. Plans Panel on 25 th June and the Full Council S239 resolution in July. DH to provide full update on the scheme to the July ITA meeting.	AW
7	Any other Businesses None	
8	Date of the Next Meeting Scheduled for 18 th June 2013	

NGT Project Board Meeting Minutes, 18th June 2013

2pm, Boardroom, Metro Offices

Attendees:

Kieran Preston (KP) - Chair
 Gary Bartlett (GB)
 John Henkel (JH)
 Angela Taylor (AT)
 Steve Speak (SS)
 Alan Gay (AG)
 Dave Haskins (DH)
 Tom Gifford (TG)
 Angela Lawson (AL)
 David Outram (DO)
 Richard Capenerhurst (RC)-(Minutes)

Meeting Minutes

1	Apologies for absence Andrew Wheeler	
2	Minutes of the Meeting held on 14th May 2013 4c – Formation of the Working Group is in hand following further discussions with James Lewis. Meetings on-going to establish a way forward. 4e – DO clarified that PPPU were reviewing (as opposed to developing) a procurement plan based on the KPMG strategy. 4g – DH stated that there was nothing prohibitive and of concern in the contract to appoint Neil Cameron QC.	DH
3	Matters Arising None	
4	Project Director Report	
4a	Highlight Report DH referred the group to the full highlight report outlined in Appendix 1, stating that recent design changes have been positively received. Good progress has been made in preparation for the Plans Panel meeting on 25 th June, but there still remains a lot of work to do on TWAO, Advanced Design and Procurement activities to move the project forward. GB enquired about the feedback from key stakeholders and DH stated that the feedback has been mainly positive, citing Leeds Cycle Action Group as an example.	

	Outcome: The Project Board noted the points raised in the latest Highlight Report.	
4b	<p><i>DfT Update</i></p> <p>DH updated the group with recent developments. An updated Business Case to reflect the change in alignment through Belle Isle has been sent to the DfT for review and comment. Initial feedback from the DfT has indicated that there are no issues in broad terms, but that some work is required to verify the value for money case for the project, and that Ministers will need to approve the proposed alignment change. This needs to be resolved before submission of the TWAO in September. The DfT have also asked for an update on the procurement process and DH advised that a meeting is required as soon as possible as this was a condition of the Programme Entry Approval.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position. DfT meeting to be set up asap to discuss approach to procurment</p>	AL
4c	<p><i>Planning Update</i></p> <p>DH provided an update on the current position and highlighted the ongoing work to prepare for the public Plans Panel meeting on 25th June. He stated that although the Plans Panel process had required extra work and resources, it had been helpful in getting feedback of issues earlier than might otherwise have been the case. DH explained that further briefings had taken place with Councillors Taggart and Gruen regarding the scope and nature of the Plans Panel resolution and the proposed timetable of further meetings later in the year. He stated that a risk exists that the timetable may be amended based on the outcome from the meetings in June and July.</p> <p>DH referred the group to the LCC planning report outlined in Appendix 3. GB stated that everyone needs to understand what the implications (costs and timescale) are if certain decisions are made at the Plans Panel meeting. SS enquired if NGT advisors have vetted the legal implications and DH stated that they have.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4d	<p><i>Consultation Update</i></p> <p>DH provided a brief update on the programme of past and scheduled events. He highlighted that the sessions attended by Councillors Richard and James Lewis had been useful and that, although there were strong opinions against the project, some useful factual information had been fed back. He briefly</p>	

	<p>updated the group about the fracturing of the A660 Joint Council and said that a meeting had been held with a few members of a newly formed break off group. DH informed the group that all residents within 600m walking distance of the proposed re-provision of the Bodington sports pitches had been written to and encouraged to attend one of the upcoming drop-in sessions. He then went on to provide an update on the costs of shipping a modern trolleybus to Leeds and the need to link it with the correct promotional event. The cost of shipment has been quoted as €10,000 with an additional €130,000 – 420,000 required to set up a working test track dependent on length. GB stated that the idea is good, but that members need to be involved in the decision. JH stated that the idea would have limited value without a working test track and DO agreed that the infrastructure should be included. KP re-iterated that a political view was required. GB stated that the trolleybus would need to be of a high specification. It was agreed that DH would brief James and Richard Lewis.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the points raised. DH to speak with James and Richard Lewis a regarding Trolley bus demo.</p>	DH
4e	<p><i>Business Engagement and Marketing Update</i></p> <p>DH provided an update on the current position and highlighted the work that had been done to date following the recent appointment of Marketing Manager David Baggaley to the team. DH stated that he was very pleased with progress and some very productive meetings had taken place with business representatives at Trinity, New Dock and the Arena. Feedback had been positive so far and there had been good penetration into the Leeds business community.</p> <p>JH asked if there had been any consultation with existing bus users over what they would expect from NGT. He stated that expectations are constantly changing/increasing, and that we need to stay ahead of the game in this regard. He cited route 72 as an example where new features/facilities have been recently introduced (e.g. Wi-Fi) and that this would become the expected norm in the future. TG stated that we may be able to draw out some information on user expectations from surveys already carried out and DH added that something informal could be done at the upcoming drop in sessions.</p> <p>DH updated the group on recent work done to appoint a PR agency and stated that a brief had been sent out to 3 different companies with Aberfield being the preferred agency. DH recommended that they be appointed to support the team, as they demonstrated a suitable level of in-depth knowledge on transport and the Leeds area in general. KP enquired what added value they would bring to the project compared with the current PR arrangements and DH stated that they could offer better business engagement and networking and assist in</p>	

	<p>gaining wider business support at the Public Inquiry. AG said that the appointment may be perceived badly and DH re-iterated that Aberfield could offer more connections and national contacts than we have at present. GB enquired about the cost of engaging David Baggaley's team full time as opposed the appointing Aberfield. It was agreed that DH would speak to James and Richard Lewis to get a political view on this issue.</p> <p>Outcome: Project Board members noted the current approach to Business Engagement and Marketing activities. DH to speak with James and Richard Lewis to get a political view.</p>	DH
4f	<p>Procurement Update</p> <p>This section is confidential and commercially sensitive. It should not be circulated beyond Project Board meeting attendees.</p> <div style="background-color: black; height: 80px; width: 100%;"></div> <div style="background-color: black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> <div style="background-color: black; height: 100px; width: 100%;"></div> <div style="background-color: black; height: 80px; width: 100%;"></div> <div style="background-color: black; height: 80px; width: 100%;"></div> <div style="background-color: black; height: 80px; width: 100%;"></div> <div style="background-color: black; height: 80px; width: 100%;"></div>	

[illegible]

	<div style="background-color: black; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div> <div style="background-color: black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div>	
4g	<p>Bus Operator Consultation</p> <p>DH summarised the current position highlighting the consultation meetings currently planned.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4h	<p>Strategic Fit Update</p> <p>DH provided a general update to the group, stating that this would form a key part of the Public Inquiry. He referred the group to Appendix 6 for further information</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4i	<p>Objection Management Update and Joint Venture Agreement</p> <p>TG gave a brief update to the group, highlighting that the previously approved Objection Management Strategy forms part of the Joint Venture agreement and will require sign off before submission of the TWAO. It is proposed that a further update will be presented at the July 2013 Project Board.</p> <p>DH then referred the group to the draft Executive Board report in Appendix 7 which contains a summary of the main terms of the JVA, which needs to be signed off ahead of the TWAO submission. GB enquired if legal input had been obtained and DH stated that LCC and Metro legal advisors had been working jointly on the agreement and that the latest draft of the document has been with LCC for 3 months. GB to establish why the current iteration of the JVA has not been passed back to Metro.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position. GB to discuss JVA HoT issues with LCC Legal to establish any areas of concern that may be halting progress.</p>	GB
4j	<p>Financial Assistance Package</p> <p>TG gave a brief update to the group. KP stated that he was not keen for a</p>	

	<p>Financial Assistance Package (FAP) to be introduced, but could see how politicians may see the merit of such a scheme. There was a general consensus from members that they did not have a good enough feel for the level of disruption caused by the scheme and therefore it was difficult to make a judgement call on whether financial assistance should be offered. TG stated that Advanced Design would be important in helping to determine the exact level of disruption JH highlighted Sheffield and Edinburgh where similar schemes have been introduced.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position and that further information on the FAP is brought back to Project Board if the need is thought to arise</p>	DH
4k	<p>NGT Lanes – Rationale</p> <p>DH gave a brief update to the group, explaining the rationale behind NGT only lanes and lanes with NGT/shared use. He advised that this exercise had been a positive one for the project and should help to reduce bus operator objection. KP enquired if the outcomes of this work would affect the journey times figures already quoted, and DH advised it would not.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4l	<p>Public Inquiry venue</p> <p>DH advised the group that the Public Inquiry venue had been narrowed down to a choice between the Hilton Hotel and Regus serviced offices; the Town Hall and Civic Hall having already been ruled out as being unsuitable, and the need to relocate the NGT team to larger accommodation now being progressed separately (see 4m). DH stated that the Regus offices were preferred, as the Hilton was being revamped and could not offer the team the required flexibility.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position and agreed in principle to using the Regus Offices as the Public Inquiry venue subject to further negotiations.</p>	DH
4m	<p>Accommodation Issues</p> <p>DH updated the group on the current position, stating that the vacant PPPU office space at Great George Street would be suitable for relocation. Issues now remain in obtaining the required ICT support so that current systems can be accessed and maintained. AG enquired about the cost of the office relocation and DH stated that he was unable to give a figure at present. KP asked who the Metro ICT contact would be and AT advised that David Gill (AD ICT) would be looking at the cost and resource implications.</p>	

	<p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position on accommodation issue.</p> <p>DH to meet with ADICT to discuss prioritisation of NGT requirements</p>	DH
4n	<p><i>Resources post TWA0 Submission</i></p> <p>DH advised that work to assess resource requirements post TWA0 submission had been delayed due to Plans Panel preparation and other work, and therefore had not been given full consideration.</p> <p>He stated that there are no current gaps in resources/skills and that a full report would be presented to the Project Board in July.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4o	<p><i>Licence for Accessway at Waterloo Road</i></p> <p>DH provided an update on the on-going discussions with Carlsberg Tetley Brewery and the owners of Brewery Wharf regarding the use of the pedestrian accessway over Metro's land at Waterloo Street. He requested that the Project Board approve the granting of the licence to Rushbond for use of the accessway during the waterfront festival between 29th and 30th June 2013.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position and approved the granting of the licence to Rushbond subject to ADL approval.</p>	
5	Design Report	
5a	<p><i>Design Freeze 7 (DF7) Update</i></p> <p>TG updated the group with the latest progress on DF7, highlighting the full day LCC meeting where the complete set of plans had been reviewed. He stated that a substantial amount of work had been done in order to close out the remaining design issues and that this work was now nearing completion.</p> <p>This would enable the plans to be costed and a decision made regarding the extent of the order limits. GB stated that there are still some fundamental concerns that require signing off and that it was important that the people raising the concerns were being listened to. TG agreed with this and added that the current design would allow for flexibility later on.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position on design issues.</p>	
5b	<i>University Update</i>	

	<p>TG updated the group. Positive progress has been made concerning the relocated sports pitches and DH added that an acceptable solution is nearing fruition. The University are broadly in agreement over the requirement for some level of community use on the relocated pitches, but do not want this including in the agreement. This issue needs to be resolved before the submission of the TWAO in September and DH enquired whether it should be escalated further because it has the potential to delay the project should no agreement be reached in time. TG also highlighted that this is a major risk to the project, and GB advised that the issue should be escalated further if the on-going discussions stall.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position and that AW provides KP/GB with a progress update following the next meeting with the University .</p>	AW
5c	<p><i>Widening on Headingley Hill</i></p> <p>TG updated the group on the main issues surrounding the loss of nursery play space and the impact on the former Grammar School site. The land take issue is a monetary risk to the project and DH added that it is by no means insignificant. TG advised that the team is at an early stage with mitigation and that discussions were on-going.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
5d	<p><i>Open Space Position</i></p> <p>TG advised the group that the open space position in relation to Woodhouse Moor contravened both local and national guidance at present. He explained that the plans have been developed to promote a <i>better quality</i> of open space but that we need to demonstrate and determine the exact meaning of this betterment of design. SS asked if we have widened the limits of deviation at Woodhouse Moor and TG advised that we have. KP asked if there is guidance on how far away replacement land can be and TG advised that this is done at broadly the ward level. It was agreed that TG would update board members on this issue by email.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position on Open Space issues. TG to provide members with update via email summarising main points.</p>	TG
5e	<p><i>Cost Plan Update</i></p> <p>DH gave a brief update to the group, explaining that it is not known at present</p>	

	<p>whether the costs will come in within the affordability envelope, and this will not be established until a full update of the capital cost of the scheme has been carried out following DF7. He also explained that there is a risk that development costs may be affected by any decisions arising from the Plans Panel meetings if further work is required that leads to a delay in the TWAO submission. A full report on this will be presented to members in July.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position on costs.</p>	
6	<p>Items for Referral to LCC executive Board/ITA</p> <p>Full Council report now in system. Plans Panel report now distributed. Report to July ITA meeting completed as requested by members.</p>	
7	<p>Any other Business</p> <p>None</p>	
8	<p>Date of the Next Meeting</p> <p>Scheduled for 15th July 2013</p>	

NGT Project Board Meeting Minutes, 16th September 2013

2pm, Boardroom, Metro Offices

Attendees:

Kieran Preston (KP) – Chair
 Steve Speak (SS)
 Alan Gay (AG)
 John Henkel (JH)
 Andrew Wheeler (AW)
 Gary Bartlett (GB)
 Dave Haskins (DH)
 Martin Farrington (MF)
 Angela Lawson (AL)
 David Outram (DO)
 Richard Capenerhurst (RC) - (Minutes)

Meeting Minutes

1	Apologies for absence Angela Taylor	
2	Minutes of the Meeting held on 12th August 2013 3 - To note that the Board approved the change from appointing legal advisors through the GPS route and instead through direct appointment as a Part B service. 4d To note that the DfT report to Board recommended that DfT had advised that the Conditional Approval Business Case could not be submitted until SoS had approved the TWAO. This should have read "submission can happen well before the approval date but the Business Case decision will need to take place after or in conjunction with the SoS TWAO decision" Meeting minutes from 12th August to be amended and re-issued.	
3	Matters Arising	

4	Project Director Report	Action
4a	<p>Highlight Report</p> <p>DH provided a general update to the group highlighting the full report in Appendix 1. The TWAO process has required much resource from officers and advisors who have worked hard to meet tight deadlines despite a number of last minute changes. KP requested that a letter is sent to all staff involved thanking them for their efforts.</p> <p>The relocation of the NGT team to St George's House is scheduled for the end of October. DH stated that this would be good news for the project as a whole and would tie in well with the end of the objection management period.</p> <p>DH then referred the group to the cost update given in full on page 23, stating that future development costs were difficult to forecast at present due to uncertainties surrounding objection management resource and future advisor costs around procurement and advanced design activities. The position should become clearer over the next few weeks.</p> <p>It was reported that capital costs are currently being updated. DH stated that cost plan assumptions will be re-assessed over the next few weeks. KP asked about contingency and AW advised that this was built into the cost plan and was variable in specific areas along the route. AG asked if the risks associated with each cost had been assessed and re-iterated affordability issues from the LCC perspective. An update position on costs will be presented at the October Board meeting, with a final position to be reported at the November meeting.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the points raised in the latest Highlight Report. DH/AW to provide an update on scheme costs at the October board meeting.</p>	DH/AW
4b	<p>TWAO Update</p> <p>DH updated board members on the latest position including the next steps following submission on Thursday 19th September. JH enquired if the submission has been publicised through the usual Metro channels and DH stated that all relevant parties would be informed. SS asked about arrangements at the Leonardo building and DH advised that arrangements were in place. DH referred members to the further information outlined in Appendix 2.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	

4c	<p><i>TWAO Next Steps</i></p> <p>DH provided a brief update stating that there were several workstreams that would need completing following the submission.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4d	<p><i>Planning Update</i></p> <p>AW updated the group. A site meeting had taken place with Plans Panel members at Weetwood Lane and Members were now satisfied with the proposals. Another Plans Panel meeting is to take place on the 17th or 22nd October to concentrate on issues raised previously. AW reiterated the risk of dealing with objectors at Plans Panel rather than through formal negotiations. KP stated that Councillor James Lewis and Councillor Wakefield did not wish for a repeat of the July Plans Panel meeting but AW advised that Councillor Gruen thought another meeting was necessary. In terms of the potential outcomes from such a Plans Panel meeting, AW stated that there was little room to change the order limits of the scheme as TWAO documentation had already been submitted. The views raised at the meeting would feed into the S239 vote in November.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the points raised in the report.</p>	
4e	<p><i>University Playing Fields</i></p> <p>AW updated members on the current position highlighting the key issues surrounding the replacement pitches. Some works on the University pitches may be required in advance of Full Approval to enable the Park & Ride site to be utilised as a depot and a recommendation for this may be brought to a future meeting for approval. SS enquired about planning permission implications and AW stated that we would be looking to implement after Secretary of State approval. JH enquired about Bodington Park & Ride and asked if other compound options had been examined. DH stated that other compound sites have been identified within the Order limits.</p> <p>JH asked if the Bodington site could be brought into use for existing bus services before NGT operation to act as a mitigation measure for construction disruption and AW advised that this was unlikely.</p> <p>AW highlighted the issues surrounding community use and stated that there was now a greater risk of not obtaining agreement because of the planning clause that requires more excessive conditions to be imposed. KP asked why the clause had been introduced. A general discussion followed regarding the costs of the community use provision with AW stating that the NGT project will</p>	

	<p>cover the net running costs of the new pitches for 10 years. KP stated that there should be no blank cheque approach to costs over the 10 year period and that there needs to be a mechanism which funds essential maintenance costs only with a capped commuted sum. NGT should not be paying for enhanced community provision. MF stated that current LCC hiring charges need to be obtained first before further discussions with the University.</p> <p>Outcome: Project Board noted the current position. AW to obtain current pitch hiring prices before further discussions with the University</p>	AW
4f	<p><i>Appropriation of Open Space</i></p> <p>AW provided an update on the issues surrounding replacement public open space (POS) explaining that if the TWAO includes for acquisition of POS then either the order has to be approved under Special Parliamentary Procedures which can be a lengthy process or the council to designate the land as surplus to requirements and to appropriate it for NGT. SS raised concerns that it will be difficult to designate the land on Woodhouse Moor as surplus and KP asked how this was dealt with on the Supertram project. GB stated that in hindsight this process should have been considered when the decision to go 'on Moor' was made earlier in the year. AW reiterated that the only other option was to consider Special Parliamentary Procedures which would introduce a greater risk to the project. He stated that legal advice had been sought from BDB on the issue and the briefing note would be circulated to Project Board members following the meeting. KP asked AG if LCC lawyers should discuss the issue with BDB. AW confirmed that this issue needed to be resolved before the Public Inquiry. KP asked about other opportunities in addition to the two options presented and stated he would seek to ascertain how this was handled during the Supertram project.</p> <p>Outcome: Project Board members noted the points raised. AW to circulate BDB briefing note and investigate other options.</p>	AW
4g	<p><i>Programme Update</i></p> <p>DH presented a verbal update to the board highlighting the main issues and stated that the procurement programme would need to be reviewed further. AL described the procurement programme in detail highlighting the following main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advanced Design (AD) and Technical Advisor role to be combined. • Design & Build contract for the pitch reconfiguration at Bodington needs to start before the Secretary of State decision (at risk) • AD work includes 15 months of site investigations. (Preparatory work 	

	<p>with LCC site investigation contractor already underway)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further review of commercial approach required. • Training for Competitive Dialogue and Lean Procurement included. <p>KP stated that this was a complex process. AL stated that it may be possible to amend certain timescales (at risk) if this was agreed. DO advised that certain timescales are restricted by DfT/Treasury approvals. KP enquired about a timescale for a commercial review of the overall project costs including capex and revenue and AL advised that she would need to see revenue and capital costs analysis and then build a financial model before this could be completed with a report including Commercial Strategy affordability and procurement programme to be reported to Project Board in December 2013.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position. AL and team to produce Commercial strategy financial model and review of procurement programme.</p>	AL
4h	<p>Procurement Update</p> <p>AL confirmed that the Legal Advisor specification was now complete and agreed internally and that discussions would now be held with DLA. AL confirmed that the Technical Advisor and Advance Design specification was being developed to include network systems analysis and ground works and analysis which would be warranted for bidders and that it was likely that the Council's site investigation framework would be used to develop a specification and appoint contractors. The output specification meetings were nearly complete and the output specification for the project would need to be developed with the technical advisors once appointed.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position on procurement.</p>	
4i	<p>Joint Venture Agreement</p> <p>AW gave a brief update to the Board. The terms of the JVA have now been agreed and this will be signed by LCC/Metro this week.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	AW
6	<p>Items for Referral to LCC executive Board/ITA</p> <p>None</p>	
7	<p>Any other Business</p> <p>None</p>	



8	Date of the Next Meeting Scheduled for 21 st October 2013	

NGT Project Board Meeting Minutes, 21st October 2013

2pm, Boardroom, Metro Offices

Attendees:

Kieran Preston (KP) – Chair
 Steve Speak (SS)
 Alan Gay (AG)
 John Henkel (JH)
 Andrew Wheeler (AW)
 Angela Taylor (AT)
 Gary Bartlett (GB)
 Dave Haskins (DH)
 Angela Lawson (AL)
 David Outram (DO)
 Richard Capenerhurst (RC) - (Minutes)

Meeting Minutes

1	Apologies for absence	
	Martin Farrington (MF)	
2	Minutes of the meeting held on 16 th September 2013	
3	Matters Arising	

4	Project Director Report	Action
4a	<p><i>Project Board Terms of Reference</i></p> <p>DH briefed the group referring to the updated terms of reference in Appendix 1. The JVA has now been signed off which has highlighted the Boards' decision making role within the project.</p> <p>MF is to become a board member and MF/AG to have discussions on board roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>KP stated that a voting process was probably not required as any issues of controversy are quickly escalated.</p> <p>JH advised that the current structure does not properly reflect the PRINCE2 model (using the example of Senior User and Senior Supplier roles).GB stated</p>	

	<p>that a balanced approach was needed - the process should not drive delivery. GB added that LCC follow a similar project management model. JH stated that some of the information in Appendix 1 was out of date and suggested adding a reference to the board's responsibilities in delivering the project's benefits.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the points raised. AG to discuss Project Board membership role with MF. DH/AW to amend terms of reference to include MF as a board member and update out of date information.</p>	AG AW/DH
4b	<p><i>Highlight Report</i></p> <p>DH updated board members referring to the full highlight report in Appendix 2. DH circulated the DfT's response to NGT's concerns over producing a reliable spending profile that could be used to 'lock down' the project's funding in future years. The letter re-iterates the need for a spending profile that the DfT can use in negotiations with the Treasury. AT stated that the question on whether unspent funding can be rolled forward has never been answered. AG advised that the situation is a potential showstopper. AW added that unforeseen programme changes make the profiling more difficult, using the availability of the TWAO unit for Public Inquiry as an example. KP suggested a meeting with the DfT would be required and asked for key points to raise with them. GB questioned the process citing the Leeds Inner Ring Road (Woodhouse Tunnels) project as an example where funding has been made available in one go. DH highlighted the lack of programme/cost detail in the highlight report and GB asked about the auditing process. KP suggested that issues around cost and programme should be minuted until further specifics are known and can be included. JH asked about the process for dealing with objections from directly impacted parties and questioned whether the stakeholder management plan should be revisited. KP advised that the team should be prioritising objections from people who are genuinely disadvantaged by the project. DH stated that he will look into this.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current Highlight Report. KP/DH to arrange meeting with the DfT. DH to look at how we manage the views of people disadvantaged by the scheme.</p>	DH/KP DH
4c	<i>Transport and Works Act Order Update</i>	

	<p>DH provided an update to the group. 500 objections have been received so far but over 90% of them are standard type objections. KP enquired if they are being categorised. DH advised that all objections are being logged and will be categorised. A full update and breakdown will be provided at the November board meeting. DH distributed a post TWA programme and highlighted the on-going work in Objection Management and Business Case review leading up to the Public Inquiry, and advised members that the Public Inquiry date was likely to be later than first thought due to staff shortages at the TWAO unit. Dialogue with the DfT is continuing. KP stated he would contact to Graham Pendlebury at the DfT to discuss this (amended post meeting- see below) GB asked about the petition feedback and DH stated that the protests are fairly high profile but low in number at present.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position. (Post meeting action amended) DH to contact Stephen Fidler to discuss issues in initial instance. Breakdown of objections to be provided to November Project Board</p>	<p>DH DH/AW</p>
4d	<p><i>Objection Management Update</i></p> <p>Main items covered in section 4c. GB asked if the College of Art had been a missed consultation opportunity. AW stated that meetings with the College had been arranged previously but these had been rescheduled (by both parties) due to other commitments. NGT had met a College of Art representative after the Plans Panel meeting with a further meeting planned for the end of October.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4e	<p><i>Planning Update</i></p> <p>AW updated members on the current position. The Plans Panel meeting had gone well, with land take issue at the College of Art (see above) being the main issue of concern. KP asked if this design had been a recent decision. AW stated that this had been in the scheme following the routing of through traffic down Blenheim Walk. The team are looking at the issue again, but it will be hard to mitigate against, and ultimately the College may object at the Public Inquiry. AG asked if there is an alternative to the present layout.</p>	

	<p>AW stated that the alternative would be to remove two way traffic down Blenheim Walk. This would also change the layout in front of the University. This will be covered in a site visit by Plans Panel members next w/c 28th October.</p> <p>AW stated that it was unlikely that both issues would be resolved in time for the next S239 resolution.</p> <p>SS enquired about the wording of the second resolution and said he would speak to Phil Crabtree regarding this.</p> <p>Outcome: Project Board noted the current position. SS to speak to Phil Crabtree about wording of the second S239 resolution.</p>	SS
4f	<p>Open Space</p> <p>AW has attended further meetings with legal advisors from Leeds and BDB regarding open space and the first appropriation notices have been placed in the local press.</p> <p>KP asked if the team is expecting many objections.</p> <p>JH stated that it is difficult to argue the case for the land being classed as surplus.</p> <p>AW advised that this is being dealt with through mitigation, citing the improvements to Woodhouse Moor as an example.</p> <p>JH asked who makes the final decision on whether to grant the necessary approvals. AW stated that this will be made at the LCC Executive Board meeting in December.</p> <p>AG queried if it was necessary for the decision to be taken at Executive Board and stated that appropriation decisions are normally and can be taken by the relevant Directors.</p> <p>DO advised that all information should be made available before decisions are made at the LCC meeting.</p> <p>Outcome: Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4g	<p>Section 239 Resolution</p> <p>AW updated the group.</p> <p>The second resolution on the 13th November ratifies the submission of the TWA0. A general discussion followed on whether this second resolution could be used to argue the case for the approval of Open Space (see 4f)</p> <p>GB stated that is important that elected members are managed through the process.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position. AW to manage elected members through the second resolution process</p>	AW

4h	<p>Procurement Update</p> <p>AL updated the group highlighting the main points reported in Appendix 3. A draft Technical Advisor specification has been developed. This will be issued to consultants on the framework and a mini competition will follow to bid back on the output specification.</p> <p>The Legal Advisor's specification and framework documents have been issued to DLA and a further meeting has been arranged.</p> <p>The appointment of Technical and Legal Advisors is expected to be finalised by the end of November.</p> <p>Work continues on input into the commercial strategy section of the Business Case review. AL highlighted that this workstream is different and separate to the full commercial strategy and financial model to be presented in December. JH questioned the approach to soft soft market testing.</p> <p>DO stated that the market should be tested informally before more formal soft testing.</p> <p>DO added that he will circulate the list of questions that will be asked.</p> <p>AL stated that site investigation work and TWAO approval are the major risks to the programme. The full commercial strategy will look at options to bring the programme back.</p> <p>GB enquired if timelines were available for the work. AL advised that the draft programme issued previously should not be used, but that verbal updates on progress would be given.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position on procurement. DO to circulate list of questions to be asked as part of soft soft market testing.</p>	DO
4i	<p>Business Engagement and Consultation</p> <p>DH gave a brief update to the Board.</p> <p>Generally, there is a good level of support from within the business community. The Federation of Small Business has raised the profile of businesses on the North route. There remain some concerns about this group.</p> <p>DH stated that information on the scheme had been distributed at Belle Isle and Winrose Grove through a door to door exercise.</p> <p>Comments received back from the team point to a lot of ambivalence to the scheme in that area.</p> <p>SS enquired if any contact has been made with businesses and local authorities outside the area.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4j	<p>Stage Reporting Process</p>	

	<p>DH updated the group highlighting the full end stage report shown in Appendix 4.</p> <p>SS suggested that a commentary should be added to cover the fact that the cost increase due to the Belle Isle alignment change should be offset against the risk due to HS2 (had the scheme progressed along the original Balm Road/Hunslet Sidings route)</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4k	<p>NGT Property Lettings</p> <p>DH provided a brief update to the group, explaining the short term lease arrangements which allow Metro to break the lease at any time after 1st January 2015 and the suggested recommendations to the lease terms put forward by Walker Singleton.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position and approved the break option extension and changes to the standard lease terms (subject to ITA and executive Board approval.</p>	
6	<p>Items for Referral to LCC executive Board/ITA</p> <p>Second S239 resolution. Open Space issues.</p>	
7	<p>Any other Business</p> <p>None</p>	
8	<p>Date of the Next Meeting</p> <p>Scheduled for 18th November 2013</p>	

NGT Project Board Meeting Minutes, 16th December 2013

2pm, Boardroom, Metro Offices

Attendees:

Kieran Preston (KP)
 Steve Speak (SS)
 Martin Farrington (MF)
 Andrew Wheeler (AW)
 Angela Taylor (AT)
 Gary Bartlett (GB) - Chair
 Dave Haskins (DH)
 Angela Lawson (AL)
 David Outram (DO)
 Richard Capenerhurst (RC) - (Minutes)

Meeting Minutes

1	Apologies for absence John Henkel Alan Gay	
2	Minutes of the meeting held on 21st October 2013 4a – DH advised that the revised Terms of Reference still need completing. 4i – GB asked if the position regarding the Federation of Small Business could be made clearer. Board Members agreed that some re-wording of item 4i is required. DO queried if the minutes are made available on the NGT website. AT advised that it was not normal practice within PTE for Project Board for minutes to be made public and NGT should conform to this practice, although this was something that could be investigated at a later time.	
3	Matters Arising None	

4	Project Director Report	Action
4a	<p>Highlight report</p> <p>DH briefed the group referring to the Highlight Report in Appendix 1. GB asked for clarification on the term 'Secretaries of State' and DH provided a brief overview.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the highlight report.</p>	
4b	<p>TWAO Update</p> <p>DH updated board members with the key issues, referring to the draft Statement of Case (SoC) outlined in Appendix 2. The SoC submission date is 30th January 2014 and DH asked for this to be reviewed by members by Thursday 9th January 2014 so that any issues and concerns can be addressed.</p> <p>DH advised the group that certain chapters of the Environmental Statement are being refreshed to accompany the SoC submission and there is a potential risk that further objections may be submitted. SS referred to Section 7 of the SoC and advised that a reference to the UDP needs including. AT enquired about the cost and funding section and DH stated that a revised version would be circulated in January although there would be limited time to achieve this.</p> <p>DH stated that no date has yet been given for the Public Inquiry, and although the team are still pushing for April/May 2014, there is a possibility that the inquiry may start later due to inspector availability or the refreshed Environmental Statement being seen as reason to delay further. DH stated that careful management is required and suggested a letter be sent to the DfT highlighting the consequences of delay to the programme. GB stated that the NGT contact at the DfT should realise the urgency of the matter and AT asked whether the DfT have specifically stated that the inquiry would be later than April/May 2014. GB suggested that clarification is sought from the DfT before the Christmas break and DH suggested he contact them to ask the question directly.</p> <p>DH then briefed the group on the recommendation that Junior Counsel be appointed to support Neil Cameron QC at the Public Inquiry. DO enquired about value for money considerations and MF asked whether Neil Cameron had set out requirements for a Junior Counsel. DH advised that Neil Cameron had been centrally involved in the specification of requirements and short-list of candidates, and that he will report back to board members on the VfM aspects raised.</p>	

	<p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position. DH to contact the DfT to enquire about Public Inquiry timescales. DH to advise on costs and requirements of Junior Counsel. Reference to UDP to be included in section 7 of the SoC. Revised cost and funding section to be circulated in early January 2014. Delegated authority to submit the Business Case was granted to DH, subject to comments received from Project Board members.</p>	<p>DH DH DH DH</p>
4c	<p><i>Objection Management Update</i></p> <p>DH provided an update to the group. 1800 objections have been received to date and all have been categorised/ prioritised accordingly. Objections from key stakeholders number 200 and these will require one to one contact. A large proportion of the objections have been categorised as general and will be dealt with using a standard response with information papers. DH noted that some major affected stakeholders had not yet objected to the scheme and that these would be contacted in due course. Referring to Appendix 4, item 5d, DH stated that political objections will need careful management.</p> <p>SS asked what process is in place to ensure that expert witnesses are made aware of all objections relevant to them and DH advised that a full list will be made available and he would report back on how quickly this could be achieved.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position. DH to advise timescales on making relevant objections available to each expert witness.</p>	<p>DH</p>
4d	<p><i>DfT Engagement</i></p> <p>DH provided a general update. A meeting had taken place with the DfT in London and this had been useful but inconclusive in regard to the DfT's future role regarding scheme funding. A further meeting will take place early next year to discuss procurement issues. DH reported that the HM Treasury requirement to provide a revised spending profile was now required in July 2014 and this would enable the team to request some flexibility. AT highlighted that this was still risky and asked that the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) included the correct wording to ask for such flexibility. DH advised he would check that the correct wording is included.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position. DH to check correct wording is included in the SEP.</p>	<p>DH</p>

4e	<p>Cost and Funding Paper</p> <p>DH advised the group that a clear position on funding is required, consistent with the Statement of Case and revised Business Case prior to the Public Inquiry. AW referred members to Appendix 5 Table 1, and highlighted the proposal to lease the vehicles which would require funding from the OPEX. AW provided clarification on queries raised on the revised costs and noted that the scheme cost is unchanged at £250.6m.</p> <p>KP enquired about the DfT's position on leasing and DH advised that the DfT had no immediate issue with surplus revenue being used in this way. AT highlighted that there is still no agreement on how funding will be provided. KP suggested a briefing paper be provided to members on the costs/benefits of leasing, and that the ITA Executive Board agree that this is one way to fund the scheme.</p> <p>GB enquired about the increase in construction costs and AW advised that the increase was due to new alignments at the University and Headingley Hill as well as mitigating environmental impact. He added that the Capex review had investigated reducing costs but there was limited opportunity to reduce costs without major changes to the scheme. AT enquired about the subsidy calculations in the early years and asked if there was a plan in place to deal with this and DH stated that these were based on a 3 month trial period.</p> <p>Outcome: Project Board noted the option of leasing vehicles subject to benefit/cost information being provided. A briefing paper to be provided to project board members on the costs/benefits of leasing, Approval to be sought from the ITA Executive Board for leasing to be considered as an option to fund the scheme. Project Board requested further detail as to how scheme costs have evolved over time Project Board noted the option of prudentially borrowing an additional £20 million.</p>	AW
4f	<p>Business Case Review</p> <p>DH provided a general update to the group highlighting the 5 separate sections and the major changes made to the economic case to include updated information on the next best alternative and low cost options. Given the time constraints, updated sections would be circulated to members for review. DH requested that Project Board members need to submit any comments on the Business Case to DH by the end of the first week in January.</p>	

	Outcome: Project Board noted the current position. DH to circulate updated sections to members as and when they become available.	DH
4g	<p><i>Land Appropriation</i></p> <p>AW updated the group on the main issues. Subject to agreement by lead members MF is to approve the appropriation of open space land on behalf of the Council under his powers of delegation. It was noted however that several members had been notified that the decision would be taken by Leeds Executive Board. AW to provide details to MF on this and also a draft letter to members setting out the change in position. There is a risk that if the decision is delayed beyond early January this could jeopardise the Public Inquiry.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position. AW to provide draft letter and list of recipients to MF.</p>	AW
4h	<p><i>Business Engagement</i></p> <p>DH updated the group on the continuing work with Aberfield. There have been further positive meetings and letters of support, including briefings with key contacts at the Yorkshire Evening Post (YEP). KP suggested further direct contact especially when key milestones are reached as this may lead to more positive press coverage in the future.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4i	<p><i>Procurement Update</i></p> <p>AL updated members on the procurement workstream.</p> <p>The Commercial Case has been updated for the latest Business Case submission and addresses the queries raised by the DfT.</p> <p>There is risk to timely completion of the Commercial Strategy and the Financial Model as this cannot be completed until technical costs are made available.</p> <p>AL distributed a briefing note on the appointment of the Technical Advisor and, briefed project board on the evaluation process and outcome and asked for approval to appoint Mott MacDonald to the Technical Advisor role (subject to receipt of satisfactory responses and clarification on a number of points raised during the evaluation interview held on the 16th December 2013)</p>	

	<p>GB enquired about the £2 million proposal costs and AL stated that this figure included £0.5 million to cover procurement advisor responsibilities which may be required, although these costs would be included for the time being.</p> <p>AL and AW stated that the recent Highways Risk Workshop had been a success with a further workshop arranged for January. Different procurement approaches may be possible based on this continuing work.</p> <p>AL advised that the next 6 months were critical for the procurement workstream.</p> <p>KP enquired about the secondment agreement and stated that this needed to be closed out as soon as possible.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position and approved the appointment of Mott MacDonald to the role of Technical Advisor (subject to satisfactory responses to points raised at the evaluation interview) and subject to Metro Executive Board approval.</p>	
4k	<p>Technical Advisor procurement</p> <p>This was covered in section 4i above</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4l	<p>Resource Update</p> <p>DH provided a brief update to the group.</p> <p>Resource issues remain a concern and DH advised that current roles are heavily geared towards completion of the TWAO workstream. This is causing some job insecurity because roles and responsibilities post public inquiry had not yet been clearly defined. DH advised that a meeting had been arranged to address this in the New Year.</p> <p>DH added that loss of key staff presented a major risk to the project and stated that he would keep members informed.</p> <p>KP stated that it was important to demonstrate that development work on future extensions to the NGT network was being carried out before the Public Inquiry. There was general agreement from board members that this would be beneficial to the project.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
6	<p>Items for Referral to LCC executive Board/ITA</p> <p>None</p>	

7	<p>Any other Business</p> <p>It was agreed that MF would act as Chair of the Board on an interim basis following the departure of KP in January until Combined Authority roles become clearer. AG is to remain on the board.</p> <p>GB thanked KP on behalf of board members for his support and leadership and wished him well for the future.</p> <p>DH/AW to amend terms of reference to reflect the current board member roles</p>	DH/AW
8	<p>Date of the Next Meeting</p> <p>Scheduled for 27th January 2014 14:00</p>	

NGT Project Board Meeting Minutes, 27th January 2014

1.30pm, Boardroom, Metro Offices

Attendees:

Martin Farrington (MF) - Chair
 Andrew Wheeler (AW)
 Angela Taylor (AT)
 Gary Bartlett (GB)
 Dave Haskins (DH)
 Steve Speak (SS)
 Angela Lawson (AL)
 David Outram (DO)
 John Henkel (JH)
 Alan Gay (AG)
 Richard Capenerhurst (RC) - (Minutes)

Meeting Minutes

1	Apologies for absence None	
2	Minutes of the meeting held on 16th December 2013 None	
3	Matters Arising None	

4	Project Director Report	Action
4a	Highlight Report DH briefed the group, referring to the Highlight Report in Appendix 1. JH questioned whether the DfT modelling risk still remained a showstopper and DH stated that the impact of this risk had decreased and would be	

	<p>reviewed. There followed a general discussion about the management of major risks and it was agreed that project board should have more visibility of the main risks and mitigation actions. JH added that the Public Inquiry has its own set of risks and it would be prudent to analyse these as the inquiry will be more complex.</p> <p>MF enquired about the experience of the 17 expert witnesses. DH stated that training options are currently being assessed but that direction will be offered in good time before completion of the proofs of evidence is required. AW added that some witnesses are more experienced than others. JH stated that this is a complex scheme requiring careful management. GB asked how expert witnesses will be questioned and AW stated that this will be dependent on whether there is formal representation or not. JH would like to see high visibility of Public Inquiry issues.</p> <p>DH highlighted the updated cost report and advised that the scheme still remained affordable following further scoping work subject to the risks identified.</p> <p>Project Risks are to be discussed at the next Project Board</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the highlight report.</p>	
4b	<p><i>Terms of Reference</i></p> <p>DH highlighted the updated Terms of Reference in Appendix 2. These have been amended to reflect changes to Project Board attendees. Any further amendments are required before Statement of Case submission. JH stated that there needs to be clarity around the PRINCE2 roles as currently the project board structure does not fully align to PRINCE2 methodology. Given the timescales for submission, it was agreed that the PRINCE2 roles should be removed. AL asked for clarity on the Project Director role as the ToR shows DH on the Project Board but also reporting to it. AL also asked for clarification on the role of Project Board in relation to section 2.2.8 (key role in decisions relating to project procurement)</p> <p>Outcome: AW to revise the Terms of Reference and circulate it to Board Members prior to submission</p>	DH
4c	<p><i>Statement of Case</i></p> <p>DH provided an update to the group. Good progress has been made. The Statement of Case includes updated Business and Financial documents. The deadline for submission of all Statement of Cases is 30th January 2014. A substantial amount of printing has been required. The team remain hopeful that the Public Inquiry will commence at the end of</p>	

	<p>April (Post meeting update – this has now been confirmed by the DfT)</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4d	<p><i>Objection Management</i></p> <p>DH provided a general update. Information Papers have now been finalised and published on the website detailing the promoter's response to common areas of objections. Letters and emails have also been sent from the database for each objection. Liaison with Metro and LCC PR continues. MF asked about the PR strategy – are there key messages that are communicated in a consistent way? DH explained that there are several key messages that are currently being refreshed in light of the statement of case submission. JH stated that a list of key rebuttals to misinformation would be helpful. GB asked how many objections would be resolved and AW stated that as many as possible would be mitigated before the Public Inquiry, but it was still likely that the majority of objections would not be withdrawn..</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position. DH to circulate key rebuttals to common misinformation, and to develop 2 or 3 key messages that need to be communicated in respect of NGT.</p>	DH
4e	<p><i>Design Development</i></p> <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 100%; min-height: 300px;"></div>	

	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	AW
4f	<p>Rose Court Nursery</p> <p>AW explained the current situation. Various options have been investigated. The only outcome that would be acceptable to Leeds Grammar School would be the construction of a new nursery on the southern part of the site. This is unlikely to be financially viable. The northern Supertram route also widened at this location and AW added that the nursery was aware of the Supertram alignment before they extended buildings in this location. AG stated that the timing of this extended building work in relation to the Supertram powers was important and AW said this is currently being investigated.</p> <p>A general discussion followed on reducing the widening at this point with the implications of banning the right turn into Buckingham Road being discussed as a dis-benefit to NGT reliability. SS asked about how objections to the new proposals would be managed.</p> <p>Outcome: Project Board noted the current position. AW to advise on the nursery extensions in relation to Supertram powers</p>	AW
4g	<p>Bodington Playing Fields Update</p> <p>AW updated the group on the main issues, highlighting the costing and funding arrangements for community use of the playing fields. AW outlined the projected annual deficit for running the new artificial sports pitches which the Project would need to fund for 10 years. DO asked if any comparisons could be made with similar community use at Ralph Thoresby School. JH asked if we are getting advice and AW stated that the team are working with a sports pitch specialist. AW added that the current business plan includes provision for increased usage/availability of the replacement pitches. MF asked if the business case figures are robust and asked to see a report behind the business case plan.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position. AW to provide report detailing figures behind the proposed Business Case plan to MF</p>	AW

4h	<p><i>Business Engagement</i></p> <p>DH updated the group on continuing Business Engagement work. Aberfield have advised on recommendations/next steps covering the project up until the Public inquiry. DH stated that this is not a significant cost. DH advised that there had been several FOI requests which were taking time and resource to deal with. Aberfield have requested permission to put themselves forward for a local PR award based in part on work done on the NGT project. Project Board felt that this was too early given the current stage of the project leading up to the Inquiry in April.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4i	<p><i>Procurement Update</i></p> <p>AL updated the group on the procurement workstream, highlighting the report in Appendix 6. The Technical Advisor has now been selected (Mott MacDonald/Turner Townsend) and work continues on developing the output specification. Development of the Commercial Strategy and Financial model (with KPMG) is continuing. AL reminded the group that the inclusion of Treasury TAP approvals could have a significant impact on the programme. JH requested further information on the procurement strategy and it was agreed that a separate meeting for Project Board members be held to discuss procurement.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	DH
4j	<p><i>Funding Position</i></p> <p>DH updated the group referring to the more detailed report in Appendix 7. The detail of scheme costs has been updated for submission with the Statement of Case (SoC) Referring to Table 5 (SoC p51) AG asked if the borrowing figure had been extended based on the revised revenues and MF asked if the figures as shown represented the current position. AW stated that SDG had been working on the figures and that this was the current position subject to the risks and caveats set out in the paper including timescales for entering approvals.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	AW/DH
4k	<p><i>Programme Update</i></p>	

	<p>AW provided a brief update to the group, distributing a copy of the current programme. Construction activities are still scheduled to commence in 2017, but the timing of this is subject to a number of risks and assumptions. MF asked about the timing of the pitch construction and AW advised this would have to start immediately after FA in Nov 2016. JH questioned the length of procurement activities and DO re-iterated that DfT approval tasks are outside the control of the project.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
5	<p>Items for Referral to LCC executive Board/ITA</p> <p>None</p>	
6	<p>Any other Business</p> <p>None</p>	
7	<p>Date of the Next Meeting</p> <p>Scheduled for 27th February 2014 @ 14:00</p>	

NGT Project Board Meeting Minutes, 27th February 2014

1.30pm, Boardroom, Metro Offices

THESE PROJECT BOARD MINUTES CONTAIN COMMERCIALY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION AND SHOULD NOT BE CIRCULATED

Attendees:

Martin Farrington (MF) - Chair
John Henkel (JH)
Andrew Wheeler (AW)
Angela Taylor (AT)
Gary Bartlett (GB)
Dave Haskins (DH)
Steve Speak (SS)
David Outram (DO)
Alan Gay (AG)
David Ingham (DI)
Tom Gifford (TG)
Cath Cox (CC) - (Minutes)

Meeting Minutes

1	Apologies for absence Angela Lawson	
2	Minutes of the meeting held on 27th January 2014 None	
3	Matters Arising None	

[illegible]

	<p>DH stated that the DfT require further information on the refreshed financial position. They have indicated that HM Treasury may push for a revenue share agreement as a result of the operating position presented and leasing proposals shown in the Business Case. The DfT aim to get an agreed position prior to Conditional Approval.</p> <p>It has been advised that it would be useful to have the Promoter response to the DfT's PEA letter, in particular to use as evidence at the Public Inquiry. DH/TG to draft w/c 3rd March and circulate for approval.</p> <p>Outcome: DH/TG to draft promoter response to the PEA letter and circulate to Project Board members for approval.</p>	DH/TG
4d	<p><i>Business Communications and Engagement Update</i></p> <p>JH queried how the project should engage with the A660 Joint Council going forwards. It was agreed that rather than responding directly the key messages of NGT should be reiterated. MF suggested that these messages needed to be sharpened and embedded in the communications strategy. It may also be useful to find a comparator city, to demonstrate the transport infrastructure other cities of similar size to Leeds have.</p> <p>Outcome: DH to progress the sharpening of the key NGT messages and circulate for sign off.</p>	DH
4f	<p><i>JVA3</i></p> <p>The meeting discussed the initial matters identified for inclusion within JVA3. It was agreed that the mechanism for funding any additional costs would be agreed in principle rather than set out in detail in the JVA.</p> <p>Outcome: AW to progress the JVA3.</p>	AW
4g	<p><i>Public Inquiry Update</i></p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4h	<p><i>Public Inquiry (election and purdah issues)</i></p> <p>DH informed Project Board that the NGT website would be frozen during the Public Inquiry.</p> <p>An updated NGT briefing note covering purdah issues will be provided to lead members.</p> <p>DH stated that there may need to be a Metro/Council spokesperson in place during the purdah period.</p> <p>Outcome: DH to produce an updated Councillor briefing note for circulation.</p>	DH
4i	<p><i>Proofs of Evidence Update</i></p> <p>Project Board noted the progress made.</p> <p>Outcome: DH to send MF the current draft of Proofs of Evidence in respect of regeneration aspects.</p>	DH

4j	<p>Objection Management Strategy Update</p> <p>DH updated the meeting on the current position with objection management. Objections are currently being managed within an agreed framework and negotiations with some significant objectors are now reaching a stage where it would be useful to involve LCC/Metro senior management in order to progress outstanding issues. MF stated that sufficient time should be allowed to get these meetings diarised.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position and agreed to assist where applicable in reaching agreement with objectors.</p>	TG/AW
4k	<p>University of Leeds Update</p> <p>AW provided a brief update to the meeting and the current status of negotiations with the University of Leeds regarding the replacement sports pitches. In particular the LCC Planning advice that rates charged for community use of the replacement sports facilities should be in line with LCC charges was discussed. The meeting agreed that in principle the university should be able to propose a pricing structure, as long as there is an evidence base for the charges proposed. DO offered to find comparable PFI rates to support this</p> <p>MF suggested that he and SS discuss this issue further with Phil Crabtree.</p> <p>Outcome: DO to supply comparative PFI rates for community use of sports pitches MF/SS to discuss LCC Planning's advice concerning community use rates.</p>	DO MF/SS
4L	<p>Headingley Land Developments</p> <p>TG outlined the current position with Headingley Land Developments and possible options for reaching an agreement prior to Public Inquiry. Following discussions on the issues, TG will clarify the planning status of the land parcel and clarify land and easement issues. It was requested that the final recommended negotiating position is brought to next Project Board along with the surveyor's valuation report for this piece of land, with a view to taking the proposed agreement to Executive Board if approved.</p> <p>Outcome: TG to clarify planning and easement issues related to the plot of land owned by Headingley Land Developments. TG to bring the final negotiating position along with surveyors report to the March Project Board.</p>	TG TG
	<p>West Park Residents</p> <p>The agreement proposed in Project Board papers can be put in place under the delegated authority, so was presented to Project Board for their information</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the recommendation.</p>	
	<p>Drawing Updates</p> <p>AW presented the following design responses to objections made: <u>St Michaels Court</u></p> <p>AW presented the options for this parcel of land. MF queried what value of compensation has been allocated for this land parcel. This information should be reported to next Project Board.</p>	

	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p><u>Rose Court Nursery</u> AW presented a proposal to remove the right turn pocket by Buckingham Rd so that the effects on the Nursery car park are very similar to the previously approved proposals. Project Board agreed that this change should be implemented.</p> <p><u>Leeds College of Art</u> AW presented the proposal to increase frontage at the College of Art, which would lead to a likely small cost saving. Project Board agreed that this change should be implemented.</p> <p><u>Black Bull Street</u> AW presented the proposed design change, which would cost [REDACTED]. Project Board agreed that this change should be implemented.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p><u>Mecca Bingo</u> Project Board agreed that this change should be implemented.</p> <p><u>Corraccoat</u> Project Board agreed that this change should be implemented.</p> <p><u>Rolling Centre Uk Ltd (Belle Isle Road)</u> Project Board agreed that this change should be implemented.</p> <p><u>M621 J7</u> AW presented the proposed design change which is forecast to cost [REDACTED]. Project Board agreed that this change should be implemented.</p> <p>Outcome: TG to provide the compensation value for St Michael's Court parcel of land.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>The Rose Court design Change to be progressed. The Leeds College of Art design change to be progressed. The Black Bull Street design change to be progressed. The Pym Street design change should be presented to the relevant objectors, and be considered following this by Project Board. The Mecca Bingo design change to be progressed. The Corraccoat design change to be progressed. The Rolling Centre Ltd design change to be progressed. The M621 J7 design change to be progressed.</p>	<p>TG</p> <p>AW</p> <p>AW</p>
40	<p><i>Bridges Update</i> AW presented an update on the seven major bridges crossed by NGT, highlighting issues regarding required strengthening and maintenance work. This was noted by Project Board and agreed that this should be revisited in July. Outcome: The Project Board noted the report.</p>	
4P	<p><i>Procurement Update</i> DO presented the report and highlighted that the outputs of the KPMG financial modelling will be reported to Project Board in March.</p>	

	Outcome: The Project Board noted the report.	
4Q	Forward Resource Requirement. DH presented the programme of Forward Resource Requirements for the Project. Outcome: Project Board noted the direction of travel for the Forward Resource Requirements.	
5	Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board/ITA None, however it was agreed that an update should be taken to a forthcoming Lead Members meeting.	AW
6	Any other Business None	
7	Date of the Next Meeting Scheduled for 28th March 2014 @ 09:00	

NGT Project Board Meeting Minutes, 28th March 2014

9.00 a.m., Boardroom, Metro Offices

Attendees:

Martin Farrington (MF) - Chair
Angela Taylor (AT)
Gary Bartlett (GB)
Dave Haskins (DH)
Steve Speak (SS)
David Outram (DO)
John Henkel (JH)
Rich Capenerhurst (RC) - (Minutes)

Meeting Minutes

1	Apologies for absence Angela Lawson Andrew Wheeler Alan Gay	
2	Minutes of the meeting held on 27th February 2014 None	
3	Matters Arising None	

4	Project Director Report	Action
4a	Highlight Report DH referred the group to Appendix 1 and highlighted the current high workload as work progresses toward the Public Inquiry. Outcome: The Project Board noted the contents of the highlight report.	

4b/ 4c	<p>Public Inquiry/Expert Witness Update</p> <p>DH advised that the Pre-Inquiry meeting had taken place on 4th March. The team felt that certain issues were not fully covered at the meeting, but that the subsequent minutes had addressed any outstanding points of ambiguity. DH stated that all logistical issues are currently in hand, but that the running of the Inquiry is now out of the project team's control and is largely dependent upon the programme currently being finalised by the Programme Officer (Graham Groom).</p> <p>DH stated that current indications are that it was likely that the Inquiry would be run on an objector by objector basis rather than theme by theme. SS said that this could cause logistical issues for the expert witnesses. DH added that the Inquiry would run for 6 weeks or longer with a likely break for the Spring Bank Holiday (w/c 26th May 2014). GB asked if there were cost implications to the Inquiry lasting longer than 6 weeks and DH stated that the venue had been booked for 3 months. Other options would be considered should the need arise.</p> <p>The Inspector was satisfied with the venue and DH stated that the idea for a webcam had now been discounted. He also advised that First Group had hired a room at Regus for the duration of the Inquiry, and that rebuttals would need to be turned around quickly after exchange of proofs, with the First Group rebuttal a priority.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4d	<p>Objection Management Update</p> <p>DH updated the group referring to Appendix 2. 28 Heads of Terms have now been issued whilst 2 major objections have been resolved this week (Environment Agency and English Heritage)</p> <div data-bbox="180 1585 1294 1742" style="background-color: black; height: 70px; margin-bottom: 10px;"></div> <div data-bbox="180 1771 1294 1921" style="background-color: black; height: 67px; margin-bottom: 10px;"></div> <div data-bbox="180 1951 1294 2022" style="background-color: black; height: 32px;"></div>	<p>DH</p> <p>DH</p>

	<div data-bbox="181 380 1295 492" style="background-color: black; height: 68px; width: 100%;"></div> <div data-bbox="181 521 1249 638" style="background-color: black; height: 71px; width: 100%;"></div> <div data-bbox="181 665 1295 815" style="background-color: black; height: 90px; width: 100%;"></div> <p>LBC0027 (Trinity Building fixing) The promoters have agreed to withdraw the building fixing powers and an OHLE pole will be provided instead.</p> <p>DH stated that good progress had been made on priority 2 and 3 objections. JH asked if there was a critical list of objections and pointed out that there is a difference in objectors who are completely against the scheme as opposed to those with specific issues such as building fixings. Focussing efforts on closing out specific issues may be a better way forward, especially if these have a higher profile within the wider community where there is a groundswell of public opinion.</p> <div data-bbox="181 1249 1232 1471" style="background-color: black; height: 134px; width: 100%;"></div>	<div data-bbox="1323 412 1372 445" style="text-align: center;">DH</div> <div data-bbox="1323 741 1372 775" style="text-align: center;">DH</div>
4d	<p>Key Messages Update</p> <p>DH advised that this is still work in progress and asked for a general view of the work completed so far. MF cited an example from his proof of evidence (European Cities Monitor 2011) that out of 30 European cities, Leeds remains the only one without a Rapid Transport system. He suggested this could be a good message to communicate.</p> <p>JH highlighted the need to communicate the use of modern technology and ambition for a network of other lines. GB added that one of the messages should make reference to segregation. SS asked whether the quoted 4,000 jobs were directly attributable to NGT and DH stated that more work was required on the wider economic benefit of NGT to ensure a clear message is presented.</p>	

	Outcome: DH to continue to progress key NGT messages.	DH
4f	<p><i>Feedback from DfT Meeting</i></p> <p>DH advised that the minutes in Appendix 3 were not the latest version and said these would be distributed in due course. The general consensus was that the meeting had been worthwhile and that continuing dialogue with the DfT was critical to the success of the project.</p> <p>The offer of input from James Papps (IUK) was welcomed, and a meeting is in the process of being set up in Leeds to commence discussions around procurement advice (now set for 11th April).</p> <p>Outcome: Project Board noted the current position DH to circulate latest version of the meeting minutes.</p>	DH
4g	<p><i>Market Intelligence Feedback and Procurement update</i></p> <p>DO updated the group with recent developments. There followed a general discussion on the proposed procurement strategy. MF stated that it was important to procure the right contractor and operator to get best in class. MF and JH noted support for a DBOM approach but that potentially the operator could be appointed first whilst the specification for the more technical aspects is finalised, and also discussed the opportunity to split the procurement into a number of concurrent appointments once an Operator had been secured. JH stated that risk transfer is an issue as the potential bidders may not wish to be tied into penalty clauses. JH stated that the focus will shift more towards procurement following the Public Inquiry.</p> <p>It was re-affirmed that continued dialogue with the DfT was important. DO stated it was unlikely that a decision on the scheme would be made this side of the General Election in May 2015, and that DfT approvals could have further impacts on the programme schedule.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
5	<p>Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board/ITA</p> <p>None</p>	
6	<p>Any other Business</p> <p>None</p>	
7	Date of the Next Meeting	

	Provisionally scheduled for 1 st May 2014 16:00 (Public Inquiry dependent). DH to look into possibility of moving the meeting to fit around Public Inquiry schedule.	DH
--	--	-----------

NGT Project Board Meeting Minutes, 24th April 2014

8.30 a.m., NGT Meeting Room, Regus Offices

Attendees:

Martin Farrington (MF) [dial-in]
 Angela Taylor (AT)
 Gary Bartlett (GB) [dial-in]
 Dave Haskins (DH)
 Andrew Wheeler (AW)
 Steve Speak (SS)
 David Outram (DO)
 Angela Lawson (AL)
 John Henkel (JH)
 Rich Capenerhurst (RC) - (Minutes)
 Tom Gifford (TG)

Meeting Minutes

1	Apologies for absence Alan Gay	
2	Minutes of the meeting held on 28th March 2014 None	
3	Matters Arising None	

4	Project Director Report	Action
4a	<i>Public Inquiry Accommodation Issues</i> DH updated the group. The current capacity of the Public Inquiry venue is approximately 130 seats. There is a reputational risk to the project if the capacity is exceeded during the opening days when demand is expected to	

	<p>be greatest. DH highlighted 3 possible options to deal with this. Option 1 is to use a first come first served basis. This could expose the promoters to accusations of not providing a suitable venue. Option 2 is to use additional meeting rooms at Regus as overspill. Option 3 would be to hire a larger venue for the first days of the inquiry at an extra cost of ~£2000/day. This would mean the loss of 1-2 days of inquiry time due to re-location and could represent a greater reputational risk. TG added that the facilities at Regus are very good and the team have received good support. JH stated that plans can only be made on reasonable expectations and also asked if the live feed could be fed to rooms at Wellington House using conferencing facilities. DO suggested a more positive approach involving a press release that outlined the facilities and inquiry room capacity. DH replied that this had been considered but rejected as it was likely that certain opposition groups may attempt to exceed the stated capacity if known beforehand. DO stated that he still thought a general housekeeping press release would be useful. MF raised a question regarding the orientation of the inquiry room particularly the position of the witness in relation to the inspector. TG stated that this had changed several times already and was likely to change again at the inspector's request</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position. DH to draft press release and investigate possibility of using Committee Rooms at Wellington House as overspill.</p>	DH
4b	<p><i>Public Inquiry Programme</i></p> <p>TG distributed the latest inquiry programme issued by the Programme Officer. This has been revised following feedback from the project team regarding the availability of the assistant inspector to cover heritage issues. A more traditional programme has now been issued. TG highlighted that this is on an objector by objector basis which means that witnesses may be recalled later in the inquiry. DH added that the number of people speaking at the inquiry is substantially lower than that of other schemes of a similar size and this can be taken as a positive sign that the objection management process has been effective. TG added that there may be an underestimation in the amount of time for cross-examination and the programme is potentially tight as currently stands. TG highlighted that there is an additional reputational risk due to the programme being issued late and we may have to deal with the frustration this has caused. DH added that dialogue was continuing with PR on the best approach to head off any issues.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4c	<p><i>First West Yorkshire Objection</i></p>	

	<p>First West Yorkshire will be a key objector at the inquiry and TG circulated their key objections and the promoter's responses to them summarised in 11 main key areas. DH added that the team had been given 2 weeks for rebuttals and much effort had gone into this work. TG informed the group that First had asked to cross examine several key witnesses. JH inquired about the background of First's QC. DH added that he is also representing Leeds College of Art at the inquiry.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
4d	<p>Bus Stops</p> <p>JH highlighted an issue where the team could be exposed without Project Board backing/agreement. He asked how much concession could be given on certain aspects of the scheme, highlighting the separate bus stop strategy as an example. It may be a more constructive approach to share some stops with existing services, but JH questioned whether he would be able to say this whilst being cross examined. TG added that BDB had been consulted on this issue and had stated that flexibility was appropriate if the correct thing to do. DO stated that the inspector would also have role in dictating this. SS added that there was a balance to be struck, and there would need to be an assessment on whether giving flexibility would be taken as an acknowledgement that there was a problem. AW stated that combining some bus stops may cause congestion and expert witnesses should not re-design the scheme on the witness stand. The current position is that each NGT is separate.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position.</p>	
5	<p>Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board/ITA</p> <p>None</p>	
6	<p>Any other Business</p> <p>None</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DH circulated the media protocol for the Public Inquiry as the need may arise to issue press releases quickly to minimise reputational damage. JH enquired about the difference between a media and a press statement and DH said he would check and include Cllrs Lewis and box in the media protocol. 2. AW gave a brief update on the main objections: 	DH

	<p>First West Yorkshire – discussed previously.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	
7	<p>Date of the Next Meeting</p> <p>DH to look into possibility of scheduling the next meeting to fit around the Public Inquiry and availability of expert witnesses [now scheduled for 02/06/14]</p>	

NGT Project Board Meeting Minutes, 2nd June 2014

10.00 am, Wellington House

Attendees:

Martin Farrington (MF)
Dave Haskins (DH)
Andrew Wheeler (AW)
Steve Speak (SS)
David Outram (DO)
Angela Lawson (AL)
John Henkel (JH)
Alan Gay (AG)
Rich Capenerhurst (RC) - (Minutes)
Tom Gifford (TG)

Meeting Minutes

1	Apologies for absence Angela Taylor Gary Bartlett	
2	Minutes of the meeting held on 24th April 2014 Item 6 (AOB) DH highlighted that this should read Cllr Box not box as shown.	
3	Matters Arising None	

4	Project Director Report	Action
4a	<p>Highlight Report</p> <p>DH updated the group referring to the report in Appendix 1 and explained that the main project issues and risks would be covered in the Project Director's Report.</p> <p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current highlight report.</p>	
4b	<p>Public Inquiry Update</p> <p>DH provided an update on the current Public Inquiry programme, which is now expected to sit for around 15 weeks and is not likely to finish before the beginning of October (once non sitting weeks are taken into account). DH stated the underlying causes for the delay, highlighting the time being allocated to objectors and First Group to cross examine expert witnesses as a major factor. MF asked how this compared with other schemes where a Public Inquiry had taken place. TG stated that it was similar but that the NGT inquiry had to contend with a major bus operator and significant non-property related objections. MF stated that he felt there was little common ground between the objectors; with each having their own differing reasons for objection (pro-car, pro-cycle, pro-bus etc.) JH added that it was important not to forget or overlook the genuine property objections. TG said that these were not taking up a lot of inquiry time at present but that these were very important to resolve.</p> <p>DH advised that the Programme Officers were trying to address the programming issues with the Inspector as far as was practicable. AG asked what effect the delay would have on the overall programme and AW stated that this would impact on the decision making process. DO added that a key challenge is continuing dialogue with the DfT. DH stated that he would speak to DfT regarding latest position on the scheme, in advance of submitting the next Quarterly Return.</p> <p>MF said that the need for the scheme needs to be clearly reiterated on its own merit and not simply as a follow on to the Super Tram scheme. JH suggested that the top 5 weaknesses (identified through cross examination so far) are identified and addressed so these can be more effectively countered during cross examination of the objectors by Neil Cameron QC. DH to progress.</p> <p>DH added that there were immediate cost challenges to address and funding flows are a key issue. MF added that longer term inflation costs were a greater concern. DH said he would contact the DfT to advise them of current status. AL also suggested a discussion with James Papps as he had been in a similar position recently and his experience may prove useful to NGT.</p>	<p>DH</p> <p>DH</p> <p>DH</p>

	<p>Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position regarding the Public Inquiry</p> <p>DH to advise the DfT on current position regarding project costs/funding flows.</p> <p>DH to arrange discussion with James Papps.</p>	<p>DH</p> <p>DH</p>
4c	<p>Objection Management Update</p> <p>DH gave a brief overview. TG added that having the different advisors together had been a more efficient use of time and had worked well. A brief update followed on some of the remaining key objections listed in Appendix 2:</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Leeds College of Art</p> <p>TG advised that a noise visit had taken place last week and the mitigation report was due shortly. MF asked if Mott MacDonald had carried out a base noise test and TG said that one had been completed. TG to report back once the mitigation report has been submitted.</p> <p>Leeds Girls High School (Morley House Trust)</p> <p>AW advised that the site had been sold and the developers have submitted a planning application that takes account of NGT. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>West Yorkshire Police</p> <p>AW advised that there had been a request for a meeting between the Crime Commissioner and Councillor Wakefield. MF said he would discuss the matter with them.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>SS</p> <p>TG</p> <p>AW</p> <p>MF</p>

	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>MF</p> <p>SS</p> <p>AW</p> <p>MF</p> <p>MF</p>
4d	<p>Procurement Update</p> <p>AL distributed an update to the group at the meeting. This was not circulated ahead of the meeting due to commercial confidentiality issues. GB and AT to be supplied with a copy of the update report.</p> <p>AL outlined that work is continuing on the Output Specification with the first draft to be circulated for comment during June. AL advised that discussions had taken place with DLA on the risk allocation matrix and draft proposals. JH expressed concerns on the approach to procurement outlined in AL's paper. AL explained that the current draft proposal would enable the procurement documentation to develop satisfactorily. TG asked what effect the Public Inquiry would have on procurement milestones and AL explained that the programme outlined in her paper took into account the revised Public Inquiry programme.</p> <p>A discussion followed regarding a suggestion that early operator procurement would not be beneficial. JH asked what the counter argument to this was and enquired if Nottingham (NET) had sought early Operator involvement. MF stated he was inclined toward the idea of early Operator involvement and JH agreed, stating that it may be possible to obtain cost reductions this way. AG asked what an operator would actually bid on given that the design would not be at an advanced stage.</p> <p>MF stated that a workshop would be beneficial and felt that Project Board required more time to discuss and analyse the issues. AL suggested a series of workshops may be required to address all the issues. TG outlined that the wider scheme programme should be re-examined and re-considered by the Project Board in light of the changes to the Public Inquiry/TWA timescales,</p>	<p>AL</p> <p>AL</p>

	and this was corroborated by JH. . Outcome: The Project Board noted the current position on procurement AL to arrange procurement workshop(s) as required in July	AL
5	Items for Referral to LCC Executive Board/ITA None	
6	Any other Business A meeting with Hammersons in respect of Victoria Gate had taken place over a proposed revision to the layout of their car park and the impact it had on NGT. The proposals are being scrutinised to determine the impact on NGT.	
7	Date of the Next Meeting Tuesday 1 st July 2014 14:00	