



Joint Secretaries

Guy Townsend
Global Crossing
Rosalind House,
Jays Close
Viables,
Basingstoke RG22 4BS
Tel: 01256 858580
Fax: 01256 858581
E-mail: guy.townsend@globalcrossing.com

Barry Lucas
Network Co-Ordinator
Islington Council
222 Upper Street,
London, N1 1YA
Tel: 0207 527 2582
Fax: 0207 527 2194
E-Mail: barry.lucas@islington.gov.uk

Quarterly meeting.

Held at: -

TFL Boardroom, Eccleston Place, London.

On: -

Wednesday, 30th May 2007.

In attendance:

Peter Loft	(Chairman)	PL	Thames Water
Steve Barriff	(Joint Chairman)	SB	City of London
Barry Lucas	(Secretary)	BTL	Islington / Northeast London Group
Guy Townsend	(Joint Secretary)	GT	Global Crossing
Peter Dixon		PD	Croydon / South London Group
Tony Pegrum		TP	Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea/North West London Group
Eddie Owen		EO	Three Valleys Water
Helena Kakouratos		HK	Camden / Northeast London Group
Martin Zelder		MZ	National Grid Gas
Dave Broomfield		DB	EDF Energy Networks
Keith O'Brien		KO'B	thus
Keith Childs		KC	BT Openreach
Tony Norman		TN	Network Rail
Jim Blewett		JB	TfL

Apologies for absence:

Alan Florry	AF	Southern Gas Networks
Steve Leeks	SL	EDF Energy Networks
Bob Bayley	BB	TfL
Julie Ulliott	JU	National Grid Distribution
Mark Ostheimer	MO	Virgin Media
Neil Davies	ND	Metropolitan Police
Julia Burgoyne	JBu	W.S.Atkins (Cable & Wireless)
Dave Lambert	DL	Bromley / South London Group

1. Minutes of the last meeting (accuracy)

Mis-spelling of Eddie Owen's surname – no "s". Apologies to EO for that.
Melanie Grindrod attended on behalf of TfL.

2. National & Regional HAUC Matters & Traffic Management Act

Minutes of the HAUC(UK) meeting of 25th April 2007 are attached.

Paper by Peter Goode on s81 not discussed but accepted as an agenda item for the next meeting.

3. London HAUC Expo.

Minutes of Organising Committee after-event meeting and report attached.

4. TfL Issues.

JB confirmed that the rollout of the Central Register continues.

It was asked whether there was a TfL standard for traffic management drawings submitted to TfL Network Assurance. JB reported that guidelines were being prepared and should be available shortly. It was also possible that there would be a presentation on these guidelines to LJUG.

5. Met Police

HK reported on a recent emergency road closure initiated by the emergency services. She said that barriers had been 'borrowed' from local work sites and not returned, inappropriate diversions had been posted and the road not re-opened once the emergency was over. It was apparent that the local police, who had instigated the closure for the fire service, did not contact the traffic division for advice or guidance. She also said that the highway authority had not even been informed of the closure and did not find out about it until the following day when telephone complaints began to be received.

6. LHAUC Web Site.

Minute 7 of the London HAUC Expo Organising Committee meeting held on 23rd April states; "It was proposed by AC that londonstreetworks.net and lhauc.co.uk should merge under the strategic management of a steering group drawn from LHAUC members. TfL would continue to provide administrative support and fund the provision of the technology. The decision would rest with the LHAUC council but the Organising Group could see the benefits, provided TfL support did not dominate". Alison Clarke will be invited to attend the next London HAUC meeting to expound upon this.

7. London HAUC Considerate Contractor's Scheme.

CLP failed to attend the April meeting of LJUG so the subject rests.

It was suggested that a small working group be established to simplify the CLP system. SB, MZ, GT and HK agreed to do this.

8. Recycled Materials

EO outlined the three documents prepared by the working group. These are attached. BTL said that the group could not have achieved what it had without EO and that he had been the prime mover in the group. He added that EO had put in a considerable amount of work and gave thanked him on behalf of the group.

9. Matters arising from the Meeting of 28th February 2007 not already covered.

Item 10, paragraph 3. of October 2006 meeting stated "DB to seek clarification of SL's comments".

SL writes - A clarification was sought by the committee on item 10, paragraph 3 reported in the minutes of the 25th October 2006 regarding the payment by EDF Energy Networks for defects associated with *Works for Road Purposes*.

In the summer of 2004, I was asked to clarify the position of EDF Energy in respect of the payment of defect charges for reinstatement defects and inspection charges arising from *work for road purposes*. The approach taken was that these charges would not be accepted from the 1st August 2004, unless an exceptional situation arose. This position has not changed and will continue to be applied until further notice.

I would like to confirm that EDF Energy will continue to promote the use of the *Specification for Reinstatement of Openings in the Highway* (SROH) as the standard for reinstatement. Reinstatement defects that arise from *work for road purposes* will be processed in accordance with the spirit of the *Inspections Code of Practice*.

Opening notices with zero inspection units will continue to be issued for co-ordination purposes.

I trust this confirms the position of EDF Energy Networks.

PL confirmed that he had still received no response from Nicola Cheetham. JB to chase up a reply.

PD reported the TfL boundary issue had now been resolved.

10. Any Other Business

MZ confirmed that utilities were still awaiting the contingency plan for the execution of emergency works during the period of the Tour de France event.

DB reiterated comments that he had made to both Islington and Camden on receipt of their respective s56a notices; "There is a problem with this Section 56 Directive for EDF Energy as we do not submit notices for 'emergency works' but do submit notices for 'urgent works' in order to carry out cable fault repairs and we would certainly expect the latter to be exempt from the requirements of the directive. I trust that in practice this will be the case and look forward to your confirmation of this".

GT confirmed that the current London HAUC financial standing was;
Current account - £20,830.17p
Reserve account - £15,721.37p

EO asked whether there had been any update on the 'idle time' charging suggested by Westminster. No information was available.

EO asked whether a Highway Authority could change a road category without back-up data. The meeting agreed that road type was dependent purely on traffic flow and that count data should be available to confirm the need for change.

KO'B confirmed that all NJUG publications had now been removed from the website. This was so that they could be updated and they would be available for download from mid-July. The new web address will be www.njug.org.uk.

KC asked about the environmental impact of Highway Authority works involving burning off carriageway markings. BTL and HK confirmed that the markings were generally thermoplastic and that most HA's ground them away as it was deemed that to burn them off was unacceptable.

PD said that the Sutton/EDF problem that was taken to conciliation in October 2005, where poor planning and bad practice had been allowed to become the norm, still continues.

PD reported that this would be his last meeting. Ian Hawthorn from Merton would be replacing him as Chair of the South London Group. He said that he had enjoyed his time working with London HAUC and hoped that he would meet members of the group at trade conferences and exhibitions. PL formally thanked PD for his work on London HAUC and wished him well for the future.

SB asked how he should respond to the London Councils' suggestion that a Highway Authority/Thames Water liaison group be established to resolve perceived difficulties. The group felt that any difficulties would be better resolved on a one-to-one basis rather than in open forum. SB agreed to write to Michael Ojo reflecting the London HAUC view. (Copy attached).

BTL said that he had been asked by the NELSWG to report to London HAUC the disappointment and dissatisfaction expressed by delegates to the recent HSC07 conference in Telford. This was echoed by all present. SB agreed to write to Graham Eaton informing him of the group's feelings. (Copy of SB email and GE's response attached).

11. Dates of Future Meetings.

29th August 2007, Eccleston Place, Boardroom

28th November 2007, Room 9A, Windsor House

All meetings commence at 10.00 a.m.



Sean Parsons
Utility Secretariat
NJUG
28 Broadway
Westminster
London, SW1H 9JX
Tel: 0207 340 1423
Email: info@njug.org.uk

Graham Eaton
Local Authority Secretariat
C/o Derbyshire County Council
Environmental Services Dept.
County Hall, Matlock
Derbyshire DE4 3AG
Tel: 01629 760062
Email: graham.eaton@derbyshire.gov.uk

HIGHWAY AUTHORITIES & UTILITIES COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HIGHWAY AUTHORITIES AND UTILITIES COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 25th April 2007 AT THE OFFICES OF THE LGA, SMITH SQUARE, LONDON, WC1P 3HZ

PRESENT

Chris Tunstall (Chair)	Durham CC
Dave Turnbull (Joint Chair)	Openreach
Les Guest	National Grid
Peter Goode	NSWHG
Richard Wakelen	EDF Energy
Lester Sonden	WaterUK
Mark Ostheimer	Virgin Media
David Baker	TFL
Peter Whitehouse	Sandwell MBC
Marc Owen	Welsh HAUC
Stephen Chandler	WAG
Gary Quinn	Roads Service Northern Ireland
David Bowe	CSS
Nick Morris	TfL
Bob Bayley	Permits Working Group
Ellen Duffy	DfT
Kevin Fuller	Highways Chair – Specification W.G.
Richard Crockett	Network Rail
Keith O'Brien	Thus
Steven Hennah	Welsh Water/Welsh HAUC
John Poole	Inspections Working Group
Roger Culpin	Inspections Working Group
John Crowther	Dudley MBC
Thomas Coales	NJUG Secretariat
Sean Parsons	NJUG Secretariat
Graham Eaton	NSWHG / Highway Secretariat

1. Apologies for Absence

Ben Still	DfT
Bill Barker	Highway-side Chair, RAUC(S)
Steve Barriff	Corp of London/London HAUC
Julia Burgoyne	Atkins – Cable & Wireless
Bob Millican	NIRAUC (Utility)
Alan Rainford	Virgin Media / Specification Working Group
Robert Hudleston	Surrey County Council/Training Group

2. Notes of the Meeting on 24th January 2007

07.29 The notes were approved as a correct record apart from:
Apologies – Peter Goode had sent his apologies.
07.24 – Bob Bayley had objected to the minute as it stood and an amendment was later circulated.

3. Matters Arising

07.30 07.02 **HSE and High /Low Speed Roads.**
Due to the absence of Robert Hudleston, a report was not available.
Robert to provide a written report.

Action: Robert Hudleston

07.31 07.03 **Use of Steel Plates.**
Bob Bayley reported that the working group continue to consider the use of steel plates and will keep HAUC(UK) advised.

Action: Bob Bayley

07.32 07.06 **Office of Fair Trading Complaint.**
The matter has been dealt with by an exchange of correspondence with the parties concerned.

07.33 07.07 **Diversions Works – Provision of C4 Estimates.**
The provision of C4 estimates within the timescale contained within the code continues to be a problem with some utilities. Individual instances of failing to provide the requested information within the timescale are being brought to the attention of the relevant company representatives on HAUC(UK) for action.

07.34 07.08 **Training and Accreditation.**
The latest Improvement Notice information will be circulated with the notes of the meeting.

Action: Secretariat

07.35 07.09 **S74 Code of Practice.**
Richard Wakelen reported and requested that the current dispute resolution procedure for s74 disputes be clarified. Ellen Duffy to respond.

Action: Ellen Duffy

07.36 07.11 **HAUC(UK) Website.**
NJUG secretariat has investigated the costs associated with the transfer and improvement of the existing site following the change in NJUG secretariat together with incorporating the DfT good practice guide requirements. A cost of approximately £3000 is likely depending on the extent of the work. The work was approved and is to be progressed. The DfT are to consider their financial contribution to the costs.

Action: Ellen Duffy / Secretariat

07.37 07.12 **FPNs**
Ellen Duffy's explanation regarding the different levels of FPNs under

permits was noted. The different levels were proposed by the Home Office and derived from the current levels of fines.

07.38 07.24 **Temporary Traffic Lights.**

Bob Bayley clarified the position of TfL in that they had discussed with NJUG about a trial but time had elapsed and since the procedure appeared to be being followed then it cannot be seen that there are any benefits to be gained from a trial. Dave Turnbull reported that there are still some issues with the procedure and NJUG would like to work with highway authorities to develop a template for a national scheme. Following discussion, it was agreed that the matter should be left in abeyance.

4. **Traffic Management Act.**

07.39 Ellen Duffy reported on the current situation regarding the TMA implementation – the key points being:

- There is a lot of work being done behind the scenes by the DfT in association with the relevant working groups that may not be apparent to all. This work relates to ensuring that the detail contained within the Codes and Regulations is correct. It is accepted that things are taking a long time and causing delay but it is important that matters are correct and any inconsistencies are removed.
- Notices and FPNs – new code together with the regulations are being finalised.
- S74 – the revised procedure that was proposed and agreed at the post consultation working group meeting is being worked on and will need to be consulted on. The procedure includes the highway authority giving the works promoter 24 hours to clear the site, which if done will only require a charge to be paid. If the site is not cleared then the full s74 fee will be charged from the time of discovery, including the 24 hours period of grace. Off-carriageway works would also be removed from the exemptions.
- It is hoped that the code, etc will be put to ministers shortly, probably immediately after the HSC07 conference.
- It is likely that a 6/9 month period will be allowed for software development, implementation and training of staff.
- Implementation could be April 2008 but it is noted that the implementation is not fully in the hands of the DfT.
- Permits – DfT is currently analysing the consultation responses and a post consultation working group meeting is planned for the 30th April 2007. The regulations need to go to both Houses of Parliament for debate hopefully before the summer recess.
- The technical specification will cover all codes and be a separate document to facilitate amendments.
- The new consultants appointed to assist the DfT are Halcrow.

Action: DfT

5. Working Group Reports.

07.40 5.1 Co-ordination.

See TMA Notices report.

07.41 5.2 Specification

Kevin Fuller reported and spoke to the joint Chairs report already circulated. There are still a number of outstanding items being considered by the working group. These include:

- ARMs – simplifying the approval process.
- CSS Compliance testing report is being looked at to see how its recommendations may be incorporated.
- Maintenance standards in very high amenity areas involving tighter tolerances.
- Guarantee period.
- Encouraging the use of sustainable materials and processes.
- Compaction using single drum roller – considering a move to end performance specification on narrow trenches.
- Incorporating cut back.
- SMA – incorporating the previous guidance notes.

Action: Working Group

- Highway Agency representation is still being sought.

Action: Chris Tunstall

- Technical support from the DfT's consultant is needed.

Action: DfT

Advice on the outstanding issues may be given via the HAUC(UK) website – see 07.53.

Handbook issues will be clarified via the HAUC(UK) website.

Action: Working Group/Secretariat

07.42 Diversionary Works

David Baker reported:

The HAUC(UK) letter regarding C4 estimates was still with the DfT and a response awaited.

Action: DfT

It was also reported that the working group still do not have a Highway Agency representative but one is being sort.

07.43 Training & Accreditation

Robert Hudleston report was noted. Re-registration proposals being worked on. In addition, a single module for S, L & G proposed by the working group along with Scottish colleagues is not possible, as the primary legislation does not allow for it.

07.44 Records

Nothing to report.

07.45 Inspections and Inspection Fees

Roger Culpin reported on behalf of the Joint Chairs:

The work of the inspection group is progressing satisfactorily having just had a 2-day meeting in Bracknell aimed at putting together the proposed code of practice. The proposed major changes from the existing code are:

- Inspection units are to be based on works duration.
- Additional 10% inspections to cover s74 and permit condition checks.
- New list of inspections – proposal for ten types of inspections - see below. It was agreed that the list should be passed to the Fees group for them to commence work. Where possible each fee should be determined from derived formulae. Les Guest asked for assurance that there would not be any duplication of work within the fees. Roger confirmed that that issue would be part of the work undertaken in determining each fee.
- Level of inspections relating to performance.

Improvement Notices/Plans and dispute procedure are outstanding. The permit condition checks inspection is awaiting details of the new code.

Proposed list of inspections:

1. a random sample inspection for safety measures and reinstatements;
2. a random sample inspection for a s74 compliance check*;
3. a random sample inspection for a permit condition check*;
4. a third party inspection undertaken as a result of a report from a member of the public or the police where a defective reinstatement or defective safety measures or failure to meet s74 or permit requirements are identified. (A member of the public is deemed to be any person not qualified to assess reinstatement or street works safety measures respectively);
5. an inspection carried out as a result of a defective reinstatement being reported, to jointly inspect the defect or inspect the remedial work in progress or to inspect the completed remedial work;
6. an inspection carried out in accordance with an Improvement Plan;
7. a compliance inspection carried out where an undertaker has not complied with the procedures for dealing with defective reinstatements;
8. a random sample inspection that was aborted as the works or reinstatements could not be located or the works had already been completed prior to the site inspection commencing or as a result of incorrect noticing;
9. an inspection for a s74 compliance check carried out as a result of a previous s74 non-compliance; and
10. an inspection for a permit compliance check carried out as a result of a previous permit non-compliance.

* these random sample inspections are those that are the 10% additional sample inspections identified in the Department for Transport – Letter to Inspections Working Group dated 27 October 2005. A Highway Authority that is operating a Permit Scheme to only part of its highway network will determine the ratio of s74 compliance checks to permit condition checks to ensure that the sample number conforms with the 10% additional inspection requirement.

Action: Roger Culpin, John Poole, Mark Ostheimer, Richard Coombes

NJUG asked that for the interim period whilst the Fees working group consider the new set of fees that the defect multiplier of '2' should be suspended and the 2006/7 fee of £42 be maintained. The highway-side agreed to consider and respond within 6 weeks.

Action: Highway-side Secretariat.

07.46

KPI's

Ellen Duffy reported:

The next meeting of the working group is planned for the 26th April 2007. The working group have identified five possible KPI's, which need testing using volunteer authorities. The intention is that the information necessary to produce the KPIs will be held in the Register and so should require little or no subsequent analysis other than a standard computer generated report.

Action: DfT

07.47

Conference

Lester Sonden reported:

The organisation of the conference is progressing well. Registrations are reported as being at the level of the 2005 conference. The industry awards have been chosen by the Joint Chairs of HAUC(UK) and Ben Still. Unfortunately, due to a change in her diary, the minister is now unable to attend in person and arrangements have been made for her to deliver her speech by DVD as per last year. The HAUC(UK) stand is at no cost to HAUC(UK) but posters and 'giveaways' will cost approximately £600 and be equally split between both sides. The HAUC(UK) working groups using the stand have been liaising with the committee regarding their requirements.

There is concern that there are problems with obtaining suitable accommodation for delegates. If the official booking agent is used then there should be no problem, however, any problems should be reported to Lester who will raise them with the committee and the Surveyor.

Action: Lester Sonden

6.

07.48

HAUC(UK) Priorities.

Chris Tunstall presented the proposals for an agreed list of HAUC(UK) priorities. Dave Turnbull confirmed that NJUG was content with them and therefore HAUC(UK) confirmed them as their list of priorities. The list to be passed to the DfT for their consideration and a response requested within 6 weeks. David Baker asked that when the DfT considers its response to the HAUC(UK) letter then consideration be also given to work re-commencing within the working group to deliver its proposals to the agreed priority. This was confirmed but DfT input may be a problem depending on the final agreed list of priorities.

Action: DfT/Secretariat

7.

07.49

Reports from Wales, Scotland and NI.

Wales

No report.

Scotland

- 07.50** - The report was noted.

Northern Ireland

- 07.51** Gary Quinn reported:
- The report was noted.

8. NUAG.

- 07.52** Les Guest reported:
The project is progressing and is due to report in May 2007. Les will copy on to HAUC(UK) members.

Action: Les Guest

Another group (Highways Term Maintenance Association – HTMA) is also looking at underground apparatus recording with similar goals. The Elgin developers are also looking at recording of apparatus in geographic areas. It was agreed that HAUC(UK) should be leading on this issue and developing a strategy. It was agreed that this was best achieved by recalling the Records working group (in line with the priority list) and for them to arrange a meeting/workshop with interested parties. Secretariat to advise the joint Chairs of the Records working group.

Action: Secretariat.

9. AOB.

- 07.53** Effectiveness of HAUC(UK).
Peter Goode spoke to his paper on the way that HAUC(UK) was perceived by practitioners. There is variation within regional HAUC's with some achieving progress whilst others were experiencing problems especially in securing agreements on good practice. Following discussion the following actions were agreed:
- HAUC(UK) to reconsider the issuing of 'advice notes' in advance of a revised code of practice.
 - HAUC(UK) to consider incorporating a 'notice board' within their new website to allow practitioners to exchange information. It was noted that this requirement would add to the costs outlined in 07.34.

Action: Secretariat.

- 07.54** Peter Goode spoke to the paper on problems being encountered on obtaining information on underground apparatus. The NSWHG have put forward a possible solution using an amended ASD type 23 record that can be implemented quickly if agreement was reached. Ellen Duffy pointed out that it would mean changes to the Technical Specification currently being finalised. NJUG agreed to consider and respond urgently in order that any changes could be incorporated.

Action: NJUG

- 07.55** A way forward is required to overcome the problems currently being encountered with s81/83 matters. Although an agreement to the legal interpretation of the requirements of the parties involved was unlikely it

was agreed that the issue be passed to the Inspections working group with the view of producing a working protocol for dealing with utility apparatus needing attention. Although s81 is included in the new co-ordination code, it was not covered in sufficient detail, and it was too late for further work to be undertaken by that working group and so referral to the inspections group for consideration was agreed.

Action: Inspections Working Group

07.56 Chris Tunstall reported that this was his last meeting as Highway-side joint Chair as he is retiring from Local Government at the end of June 2007. Nick Morris is taking over as Highway-side joint Chair. Peter Whitehouse also reported that it was his last meeting before his retirement later this year. Members wished them well and thanked them for their contributions to HAUC(UK) over the many years they have been involved.

07.57 Richard Wakelen advised members of the new NJUG vision statement available on the NJUG website and requested HAUC(UK) to endorse it

10. Date of next meeting:

07.58 Wednesday, 4th July 2007 at the offices of NJUG, Broadway, London.

Improvement Notice Report to HAUC(UK)

HAUC(UK) Meeting Date: 25th April 2007

1 HAUC(UK) No.	2 Improvement Notice Date	3 Improvement Plan Date	4 Highway or Road Authority.	5 Statutory Undertaker	6 HAUC(UK) Meeting Date	7 SU released from Imp. Plan - Date
06/01	22 July 2006	31 July 2006	Kirklees MC	Virgin Media	11 October 2006 24 January 2007 25 April 2007	
07/01 07/02	10 January 2007 10 January 2007	19 February 2007	West Sussex C.C. West Sussex C.C.	BT Scottish and Southern Energy	24 January 2007 24 January 2007	Rescinded.
07/03 07/04 07/05 07/06 07/07	22 January 2007 22 January 2007 22 January 2007 22 January 2007 22 January 2007		Cumbria C.C. Cumbria C.C. Cumbria C.C. Cumbria C.C. Cumbria C.C.	BT NG Gas NW UU NGN UU Electricity UU Contract Solutions	24 January 2007 24 January 2007 24 January 2007 24 January 2007 24 January 2007	
07/08 07/09	30 January 2007 30 January 2007	30 January 2007 30 January 2007	North Yorkshire C.C. North Yorkshire C.C.	NEDL YEDL	24 January 2007 24 January 2007	
07/10 07/11	20 April 2007 20 April 2007	20 April 2007 20 April 2007	Kirklees MC Kirklees MC	NG Gas NG Gas	25 April 2007 25 April 2007	
07/12 07/13	27 April 2007 27 April 2007	14 May 2007 14 May 2007	Bracknell Forest B.C. Bracknell Forest B.C.	South East Water BT Openreach	25 April 2007 25 April 2007	

KEY:

- Col. 1. Unique number assigned by the Secretariat on being notified of an Improvement Notice by the Highway Authority.
- Col. 2. Date Improvement Notice issued by Highway Authority.
- Col. 3. Date Improvement Plan agreed.
- Col. 4. Name of Highway / Road Authority issuing Improvement Notice.
- Col. 5. Name of Undertaker receiving Improvement Notice.
- Col. 6. Date of HAUC(UK) meetings reported to.
- Col. 7. Date Improvement Plan is terminated.

HIGHWAY AUTHORITIES AND UTILITIES COMMITTEE TRAINING AND ACCREDITATION WORKING GROUP

Membership worries:-

The registrar and awarding bodies updated the committee. It was discussed that, although percentages had remained more or less constant, a number of candidates were failing to re-register and that consideration was being given to the idea of contacting them. This idea was supported.

Update on Utilities CSCS Affiliation:-

The difficulty of accessing construction sites without a CSCS card was discussed, with it being noted that such troubles would probably continue due to ever increasing security issues.

It was highlighted that while chip cards had already been piloted, a national smart card scheme was currently under development and supported by the Government.

Draft Regulations

The Committee went through the draft regulation. It was noted that the certificate is for life and never expires. However, registration of the certificate does expire every five years. PB clarified that the certificate symbolises the qualification while the registration is what allows one to work on the highway.

While the group struggled with this legal issue, PB highlighted that there seemed little point in pursuing the subject since the Primary Legislation was not going to be changed. The main issue was that little difference existed between the two countries. CH (DfT) accepted 2 and 10 as a qualification.

DfT informed the group that their RIA would change in May. From the emails received so far, only a limited amount of data had been received.

A small sub group was organised to arrange this information, representing water, electricity, telcos & gas (Peter Crouch, Rob Scott, Chris Perkins, and Brian Goddfrey) all agreed to join the new sub-group, and invitations would be extended to individuals not present.

HCS07:-

The Group wanted to use the event to explain 'where we are' and 'where we are going'.

GE pointed out the importance of presentation whether the Committee was considering banners, photos, borders, logos etc. It was agreed that whatever was decided on would have to fit with the other two groups on the stand (Specifications and Inspections) and therefore liaison was required.

Revised Timetable for Traffic Management Act Regulations Implementation April 2007.

The following tables are an extract from the current timetable on the DfT website with suggested changes to priorities with added comments.

Wave 1 – No Change.

	Estimated date for full public consultation.	Estimated date of laying/making regulations.	Estimated date of regulations coming into force.	Comments.
Notices, Directions and Restrictions.		Early 2007.	Mid-late 2007.	Ongoing for early 2008 implementation.
Fixed Penalty Notices.		Early 2007.	Mid-late 2007.	Ongoing for early 2008 implementation.
Section 74 Over Staying Charges.		Early 2007.	Mid-late 2007.	Ongoing for early 2008 implementation.
Permits.	October – December 2006.	Mid 2007.	Late 2007.	Ongoing for early 2008 implementation.

**Revised Timetable for Traffic Management Act Regulations Implementation
April 2007.**

Wave 2.

	Working Group commences.	Comments.
Training and Accreditation.	Ongoing HAUC(UK) Working Group.	Important to deliver improvements in quality so reducing disruption. Fundamental to the TMA.
Inspections.	Ongoing HAUC(UK) Working Group.	Includes s74 and Permits inspections, which tie in with Notices and Permits codes.
Reinstatement Specification.	Ongoing HAUC(UK) Working Group.	Need for Code to be brought up to date to reflect new requirements and codes, sustainability and new materials. Estimated working group review to be completed "summer / early autumn 2007".
Safety Code.	TBA.	Move from Wave 3 to Wave 2. Safety is priority. Safety Code is overdue for review and issues need addressing including Chapter 8 review, high and low speed roads and parity with other codes outside of HAUC(UK).
Records.	<i>Late 2007 (TBC)</i>	Safety is priority and reviewing this code will produce safety outcomes. NUAG and VISTA projects are ongoing but expected to input to the review.
Qualifications.	TBA.	Add to T&A working group remit following completion of ongoing work.

**Revised Timetable for Traffic Management Act Regulations Implementation
April 2007.**

Wave 3.

	Working Group commences.	Comments.
Diversionsary Works.	Ongoing HAUC(UK) Working Group.	Ongoing but currently stalled. Awaiting response from DfT (nearly 12 months) as to whether Regs can be changed. Currently remit is for 2 stage approach. Stage 1- update and Stage 2- full review. If Regs not changed then working group advises that publication dates are: 1-Spring 2008, 2- Summer 2011. If Stages 1 & 2 combined then 2010. If Regs are to be changed the respective dates are 2009, 2012 and 2011.
Resurfacing.	TBA.	Phase 3 of TRL research on long-term damage to be completed mid- 2007.
Highways Act FPNs and Overstaying Charges.	<i>Late 2007 (TBC)</i>	Existing arrangements operated by HAS considered adequate for the time being.

Final Organising Group meeting

Held on Monday 23 April 2007 at 10.00am – 3rd floor south, meeting room no1, Parnell House, Victoria

Minutes

ATTENDEES

Steve Barriff	City of London/Chair of LHAUC
Dave Bloomfield	EDF Energy
Howard Lewis	Three Valleys Water
Eddie Owen	Three Valleys Water
Guy Townsend	Global Crossing
Barry Lucas	London Borough of Islington/LHAUC Secretary
Alison Clark	Transport for London
Vicky Kafetzi	Transport for London

APOLOGIES

Helena Kakouratos	London Borough of Camden
Stephen Leeks	EDF Energy
Dave Thompson	North London Gas Alliance

Item		Action
1	No-shows	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewing past attendance patterns will help us predict future attendance more accurately It was suggested to allow a certain number of free tickets per organisation and charge for additional tickets 	VK to propose freebie limits and fees
2	Workshop and event attendance	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To encourage delegates to come earlier and stay later, it was proposed to have an important morning keynote speech that doesn't get repeated so delegates will not want to miss it, and an equally important Expo- closing speech late in the afternoon. 	
3	Next year's venue	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was suggested to investigate other venues for 2008; ideal venue would retain Olympia's modern feel, but would be easier to get to. Next year's venue to also have better branding opportunities. 	VK to contact Horticultural Halls and view the space
4	Next year's participants	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Merging with Civils (as New Civil Engineer proposed) remains a 'no' 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was suggested to come up with a different strategy for engaging boroughs • It was proposed to establish a formal process where applications for participation (particularly workshops) are reviewed by the organising group before booking • Delegates to continue to vote for their preferred sessions, in order to assist the OG to identify the most popular ones. 	
5	Next year's programme	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation next year will come at a good time to make Expo very relevant and assist the organisers in the selection of the right topics and speakers • All agreed that the Expo formula is unique (pick-n-mix approach, networking lounge etc) and that we should retain it • Exhibition to grow (hopefully with more boroughs) and workshops to be fewer and repeated 	
6	Financial	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All paid apart from 360 ViewMax • Getting money out of the HAUC account was discussed. LHAUC to pay directly for some services next year. 	SB to have a word with ViewMax
7	AOB	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was proposed by AC that londonstreetworks.net and lhauc.co.uk should merge under the strategic management of a steering group drawn from LHAUC members. TfL would continue to provide administrative support and fund the provision of the technology. The decision would rest with the LHAUC council but the Organising Group could see the benefits, provided TfL support did not dominate. 	AC to put a proposal forward to LHAUC on 30 May

**LONDON HAUC EXPO 2007 REPORT FOR THE ORGANISING GROUP-
20/04/07**

Table 1: This year's main results, compared to London HAUC Expo 2006



London HAUC Expo 2006	London HAUC Expo 2007
Key facts	
450 pre-registered delegates	721 pre-registered delegates
130 organisations	188 organisations
456 attendees	559 attendees
148 no-shows	217 no-shows
154 unregistered showed-up	55 unregistered showed-up
30 stands	42 stands
17 workshops	22 workshops
Raised £12,700	Raised £21,150
	
Opportunity to meet people	Excellent networking opportunity
Good mixture of workshops and stands	TMA-driven programme, greater variety of things to do and see than in 2006
Great food	Excellent catering
Informal attitude and relaxed atmosphere	Friendly atmosphere, very helpful staff
	Clean, spacious, modern venue
	Constant stream of visitors to exhibitor stands
	Well-publicised
	Great presentation by London boroughs
	
More stands and more workshops	More exhibitors (boroughs and utilities)
Bigger space between stands and in workshop rooms	Later start for morning workshops
Would like to have found about the event earlier	Have less choice of workshops as workshops of interest clashed; repeat them
Not marketed enough, event was almost missed by many	Break between workshops
More high-level acknowledgment of what is happening in London from senior TfL, local government, DFT and/or Mayor's Office	Venue not conveniently located
Have more in-depth workshops	Allow exhibitors to dismantle stands earlier
Not enough time to see and do everything	
More Borough input	

Table 2: Shows/no-shows analysis

Out of 188 organisations that registered:

Classification	%	Who are they?	How do we know them?
Registered and all came	36%	29% public (14% London boroughs), 71% private	27% advertising or word-of-mouth, 73% came last year or .net
80% + of registered delegates came	14%	-	-
50%-79% of registered delegates came	10%	-	-
1%-49% of registered delegates came	13%	-	-
Complete no-shows	27%	24% public (6% London boroughs, everyone else from places such as Birmingham, Wales etc), 76% private	52% advertising or word-of-mouth, 48% came last year or .net

"Worst offenders":

Company	Pre-registered	Showed-up unregistered	Came	No-shows
National Grid	36	2	19	19
Transport for London	86	10	80	16
Skanska McNicholas	15	1	8	8
London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham	10	0	3	7
Laing O'Rourke	7	0	2	5
Severn Trent Water Ltd	7	0	2	5
London Borough of Southwark	5	0	0	5
Abovet Communications Uk Ltd	4	0	0	4

Expo 2007 in more detail

- 96.43% said event met their expectations
- 1 in 4 attendees completed a feedback form, the results of which follow:

1. Overall experience

Excellent 47%
 4 42%
 3 9%
 2 2%
 Poor -

Comments: Delegates enjoyed the variety of things to do and see and the pick-n-mix approach. They also commended the organisation of the event, the punctuality of the programme and the professionalism and helpfulness of staff.

2. Venue

<i>Excellent</i>	45%
4	44%
3	10%
2	1%
<i>Poor</i>	-

Comments: Delegates liked Olympia and described it as a clean, spacious and modern venue. Even though some found it conveniently located, many found it difficult to get to, particularly since the District line was experiencing problems that day and had 1 train every half hour from Earls Court. Delegates commented on the easy-to-navigate layout and the excellent catering.

3. Variety of exhibitors

<i>Excellent</i>	20%
4	56%
3	22%
2	2%
<i>Poor</i>	-

Comments: Many delegates liked the variety of exhibitors and many commented on the excellent presentation of London boroughs. Suggestions for improvement included more borough input and more utility representation. Exhibitors commented on the constant stream of visitors to their stand. Some requested to be allowed to dismantle their stands earlier.

4. Quality of workshops

<i>Excellent</i>	27%
4	54%
3	17%
2	2%
<i>Poor</i>	-

Comments: Delegates like the variety of workshops and the ability to choose what they wanted to see. Some commented on the poor attendance of the morning workshops which was due to the fact that it took a while for delegates to get there, and when they did they took the opportunity to catch-up with their colleagues over coffee rather than go straight in the workshop rooms. It was suggested that workshops start at 10.30. Then, some delegates didn't see everything they wanted to as their workshops of interest clashed, so they suggested less choice and more repeats.

5. Opportunity to network

<i>Excellent</i>	53%
4	35%
3	11%
2	1%
<i>Poor</i>	-

Comments: Almost all delegates found Expo a superb networking opportunity.

6. Heard about Expo

<i>Email invitation</i>	34%
<i>Colleague</i>	32%
<i>Advertising</i>	11%
<i>.net</i>	9%
<i>Other</i>	14%

Comments: Delegates also found out about Expo from: SEHAUC, LHAUC, went/exhibited last year, London Councils. Many said Expo was well-publicised.

7. Other observations

- *Projects or exhibitors that delegates said they particularly enjoyed:* Central Register, Learning Hub, Advance Planning, RITAG, 360ViewMax, underground utility survey, London borough exhibits, TWU plate, use of latest GEO Spatial Technology, FPN notices
- *Delegates mentioned they would like to see the following:* more on reinstatement materials, more street authority involvement, more examples of best practice, more on practical engineering issues rather than strategic issues, invite minister, more on sustainable transport, more DfT presence, more equipment suppliers (Wacker, Bell Group etc), more contractors, something on landfill regulations.
- *Winners of the manhole cover competition are:*
 1. **John Walsh** – Lambeth Highways
 2. **John Dimpsey** – Halcrow Group Ltd
 3. **Shelley Beard** – Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames
 4. **John Edwards** – London Borough of Islington
 5. **Tom Mullarkey** – London Borough of Hackney

Exhibition



Networking lounge



Session



Restaurant



For more photos please visit the Expo section in the londonstreetworks.net library

Quotations:

"I thought I got a really good deal. Lots to see and hear and very relevant TMA-driven programme. Hit the spot perfectly."

Andrew Thompson, Kent Highways/Thompson

"I liked the chance to come together with other people involved in the industry and I loved people's enthusiasm. Thanks for a great day."

Aaron Cox, London Borough of Croydon

"Enjoyable event, good seminars and liked the ability to choose."

Andrea Tongue, Energy Services

"There was a good cross section of exhibitors and attendees, a very worthwhile day."

Phil Cameron, Gloucester County Council

"Very good venue, good variety exhibitors, good quality workshops, good opportunity to network. An enjoyable experience."

Chris Morris, TfL

"Varied content, brilliant organisation and facilities. Managed to do almost all I wanted to. Please please do it again. Just thank you, very pleased."

Name and organisation not provided

"I thought it was well worth attending, very interesting and very informative."

Terry Morrison, London Borough of Hounslow

"Everything was punctual and well managed, which was most satisfying."

Con Finney, J. Murphy & Sons Ltd

"1st class, well organised and catered."

Paul Castleman, Herts Highways

"It was great as an exhibitor that there was a constant flow of people visiting the exhibition area."

Name and organisation not provided

"The venue was very nice. The atmosphere was excellent with great opportunities for networking. The event was very well organised."

Helena Kakouratos, London Borough of Camden

"Well organised event and great ability to meet potential clients and create awareness of services. The duration and the size of the show make it ideal for networking."

Martyn Knott, JSM Construction Ltd

"I liked the arrivals area with immediate refreshments and an atmosphere of friendly help. Thank you for all your help and support."

Peter Crouch, UK Society for Trenchless Technology

"The venue was right for the event and the whole thing had a professional feel. Traffic Management Learning Hub was fantastic and very impressive and it was good to see so many stands from London councils. Great event that gets better every year."

Ian Hawthorn, London Borough of Merton

"London boroughs gave excellent displays. Thank you for all your hard work, very professional show with excellent facilities."

Phil Baker, West Midlands HAUC

"The timetable was such that we had a constant stream of visitors to our stand."

Samantha Babister, Aligned Assets

"Very spacious, clean, pleasant location. More and varied exhibitors from 2006. Good workshops and good meeting point for coordinating and liaising. Thoroughly enjoyed."

Shelley Beard, Royal Borough of Kingston

"Extremelly well-publicised, organised and managed."

Brian McNamee, National Grid

"The atmosphere was relaxed and good opportunities to network were provided. I particularly enjoyed the presentations, they were more 'real world' than some other expos/conferences. Keep up the good work, looking forward to 2008!!"

Brian Foxton, London Borough of Camden

"Very professionally organised, good range of visitors. Excellent catering. Will be back next year."

Jane Harris, Instarmac Group plc

From: Barriff, Steve [Steve.Barriff@cityoflondon.gov.uk]
Sent: 30 May 2007 14:09
To: Michael Ojo
Cc: Peter.Loft@thameswater.co.uk; Lucas, Barry; Guy Townsend
Subject: RE: Thames Water Streetworks - Liaison with Local Authorities
Michael,

At the London HAUC meeting this morning the issue of Thames Water's performance was discussed at length. The opinion of the Highway Authorities was that there had been improvements from Thames following your meeting but where problems have arisen they are best dealt with on a one to one basis with Thames looking at specific examples. Most authorities have regular meetings with the likes of Thames, EDF, and National Grid and any failings in the standards provided are dealt at those meetings. We will continue to monitor the situation and should there be any change in the position I will let you know.
Regards,

Steve

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

From: Michael Ojo [mailto:Michael.Ojo@londoncouncils.gov.uk]
Sent: 24 April 2007 14:06
To: Barriff, Steve
Cc: Malcolm Allen
Subject: RE: Thames Water Streetworks - Liaison with Local Authorities

This is fine Steve. Members here have tasked me with looking at this issue and reporting back on progress and I would be grateful for your feedback on this item following the May meeting.

Regards,

Michael.

From: Barriff, Steve [mailto:Steve.Barriff@cityoflondon.gov.uk]
Sent: 24 April 2007 13:22
To: Michael Ojo
Cc: Peter.Loft@thameswater.co.uk; Lucas, Barry; Guy Townsend
Subject: RE: Thames Water Streetworks - Liaison with Local Authorities

Michael,

I have discussed your attendance with my colleagues and at this stage it is probably best if the matter is taken forward by the members of the group alone. The attendance of a third party, however well intended, can sometimes stifle free discussion, and I feel sure that you will agree that such issues need to be freely aired in order that a positive way forward can be found.. We will, of course, keep London Councils fully

appraised of the the outcome and the steps Thames Water are taking to address the issues.

Regards,

Steve

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

From: Michael Ojo [mailto:Michael.Ojo@londoncouncils.gov.uk]

Sent: 20 April 2007 17:07

To: Barriff, Steve; Malcolm Allen

Cc: barry.lucas@islington.gov.uk; Peter.Loft@thameswater.co.uk; Guy Townsend

Subject: RE: Thames Water Streetworks - Liaison with Local Authorities

Steve,

Would it be possible for either Malcolm or myself to attend (the relevant) part of the meeting of the Committee on 30 May, presumably as an observer?

Regards,

Michael.

Michael Ojo

Section Manager, Environment & Public Realm

London Councils

59½ Southwark Street, London SE1 0AL

Tel: 020 7934 9945

Fax 020 7934 9946

Email: michael.ojo@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Website: www.londoncouncils.gov.uk

London Councils is committed to fighting for more resources for London and getting the best possible deal for London's 33 councils. We develop policy, lobby government and others, and run a range of services designed to make life better for Londoners.

From: Barriff, Steve [Steve.Barriff@cityoflondon.gov.uk]
Sent: 30 May 2007 13:48
To: Eaton, Graham (Environmental Services)
Cc: Lucas, Barry; Peter.Loft@thameswater.co.uk; Guy Townsend
Subject: HAUC (UK) conference

Graham,

I've just returned from our LHAUC meeting this morning and have to report that the feedback that I received from both sides of the fence was that the HAUC conference was not as good as some of the previous events. It was felt that the venue was far from ideal from both a location and conference hall standpoint. One of the main attractions of the event is the networking opportunities it provides and the fact that attendee's hotels were scattered around the rolling hills of Derbyshire put a damper on a lot of this. There was also criticism of the lunchtime and conference dinner catering; both of which were below the standards set on previous years.

I was on leave last week so must confess that I've not completed my feedback form yet but I would be interested to know if Lester or yourself had received similar criticisms from other attendees or whether us southerners are being hyper critical.

As has been discussed earlier the interminable dragging out of the TMA is disenchanting a lot of people and the perception at the coal face is that HAUC isn't being proactive enough. You and I know that everyone involved from HAUC is doing everything they can to push things on but we appear to be being tarred with the same brush as the DfT. The HAUC conference should be an opportunity to rekindle interest but this year may have turned more people off than on.

Sorry to be so negative since I know the conference organising committee put a lot of hard work in their own time in getting the thing on the road, and these things are never easy.

Regards,

Steve

THIS E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHED FILES ARE CONFIDENTIAL AND MAY BE LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the addressee, any disclosure, reproduction, copying, distribution or other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately and then delete this e-mail. Opinions, advice or facts included in this message are given without any warranties or intention to enter into a contractual relationship with the City of London unless specifically indicated otherwise by agreement, letter or facsimile signed by a City of London authorised signatory. Any part of this e-mail which is purely personal in nature is not authorised by the City of London. All e-mail through the City of London's gateway is potentially the subject of monitoring. All liability for errors and viruses is excluded. Please note that in so far as the City of London falls within the scope of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, it may need to disclose this e-mail. Website: <http://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk>

From: Eaton,Graham (Environmental Services) [Graham.Eaton@derbyshire.gov.uk]

Sent: 30 May 2007 14:35

To: Barriff, Steve

Cc: Lucas, Barry; Peter.Loft@thameswater.co.uk; Guy Townsend

Subject: RE: HAUC (UK) conference

Steve,

Many thanks for your comments. The committee welcomes all comments since without them then they are not aware of the feelings of delegates. The general comments I have received were that the conference content and presentations were good but the venue was poor. The only reason we went to Telford was that Cardiff was being dug up!!

Certainly the committee, along with many other people, are feeling very frustrated at the lack of TMA delivery. We were feeling confident that this year the DfT would come to conference and give some 'good news' - you may recall that the Notices code along with FPN's etc was due for publication before/at conference but that deadline was missed. That leaves the committee in a difficult position having built up hopes and then.....! I suppose it is inevitable that HAUC(UK) gets tarred with the same brush for 'not delivering' but I can assure you that a lot of work is being done behind the scenes to 'bring it on!' The problem being (if it is a problem in the end) is that the DfT and their lawyers were stung with the Judges comments about the 'demented computer' and so they are going through everything with the finest of tooth combs looking for inconsistent wording, etc, etc and etc. Peter Goode has even been recruited to work with their communication people and a plain English person to try and make sure that the code reads correctly. Coupled with that are the numerous hurdles that legislation has to go through including getting agreement from other government departments (you may recall that the 3 month delay in the consultation was down to them not being allowed to go out to consultation because the DTI said the legislation went too far and the Treasury said that it didn't go far enough!) Even now the DfT are in the hands of others but I still remain confident (I have to be.....!) that we shall see something soon.

One positive thing, I suppose, and the conferences have played their part in this, is that the information has been out in the public domain for so long and in sufficient detail that no one (highway authorities and undertakers alike) can say they won't be ready. Everyone will have had enough time to consider the implications and be making arrangements for the necessary changes in readiness for the big day.

Thanks again and if anyone wants to volunteer to join the organising committee then let me know!

Graham.

Graham Eaton

National Highways Street Works Manager,
and HAUC(UK) Highways-Side Secretary.

T: 01629 760062

M: 07748 333177

E: graham.eaton@nswhg.org.uk