

Response ID ANON-PA1N-7G3U-P

Submitted on 2015-08-04 23:40:30.941371

Evidence

Questions about you: In order for the evidence to be analysed and taken forward by the Inquiry we will need some further information about you and / or your organisation. Please note that all evidence submitted to the Inquiry may be published at any point during the Inquiry or when the Inquiry Report is issued. If you are responding as an organisation your full details will be published. If you are responding as an individual your name will be published, but your address will only be published if the Inquiry considers this to be relevant to the evidence submitted.

Organisation Name (if applicable):

Surname:

Leckie

Forename:

Stuart

Postal Address:

[REDACTED]

Edinburgh

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

Phone:

Email:

[REDACTED]

Are you responding as an organisation or an individual?

Individual

Does your evidence relate to a particular period of time?

Yes

If yes, what period?:

2008 to 2011

Does your evidence relate to a particular event or activity?

Yes

If yes, please explain what the event / activity was.:

The removal of and continued lack of guidance from Transport Scotland and/or the Government on the project in light of them having had to take over from Tie on another rail project (c. 2008) which they failed to project manage effectively.

We are particularly interested in:• How you found out about what was happening, and how informed you were throughout the project• What did you think would happen• What actually happened• What were the effects if any, on you (or your organisation) at the time of the project• What if any, were the on-going or longer-term effects on you (or your organisation). Please write your evidence here.

We are particularly interested in:

For a significant amount of time that the project was experiencing difficulty, it would have been known to the Scottish Government that Tie had failed to deliver the Stirling-Alloa-Kincardine railway reinstatement and had to be removed from the project. This objectively was a much more straightforward project than the tram project and it could have been reasonably concluded that Tie were out of their depth. Much is made of the council's involvement with Tie, however it seems the council may not have had much control over Tie with Transport Scotland being removed from the project.

In an Audit Scotland review of major projects (http://www.audit-scotland.gov.uk/docs/central/2008/nr_080624_major_capital_projects.pdf), the issues are dealt with.

The project scores 'red' for cost, time and quality. The 'Main reasons for increase in cost' are given as "Increase in the scope of the project and underestimating of costs at appraisal and outline design. Weak project governance and mis-aligned roles and responsibilities". Tie were employed by Clackmannanshire Council at the time as project managers. The issues are covered on pages 20 and 21, with a case study on page 24.

The publication was dated June 2008, months before issues with the tram project first entered the public domain. In light of this, should the government have put Transport Scotland 'back on' the tram project at a much earlier date? It seems like all the decisions taken in 2011 regarding the project could have been done far earlier and at far less expense had Transport Scotland been allowed to have an active role in the project.

The delays not only directly inflated the final cost, but also prolonged the disruption to the city, took any benefit away from Leith and lost years of operating income.

It would also be interesting to look at this in the context of the SNP having members in the council post-2007. In the following Herald article (http://www.heraldscotland.com/news/13035823.Driven_to_distraction__behind_the_scenes_of_the_latest_tram_fiasco/), relating to the 2011 vote and subsequent revote, the SNP were clearly determined not to support the project. The article mentions:

"The SNP didn't think the Haymarket option had a hope of succeeding, so abstained on the key vote to preserve their pristine record of opposition to the project. If they had voted with their LibDem partners, it would have been St Andrew Square as planned. "I was incredulous," said Cardownie. "We thought that the Tories would have abstained. Little did we think they were going to join with Labour.""

Given the scale of cost of what was involved at that stage, it would seem borderline negligent for political games to be taking precedence at that stage. It would

be interesting to look at whether that was representative of decisions taken at other stages and whether the council were prevented from taking action earlier that would have lead to a more favourable outcome.

Thank you.

Do you have any documents which you think it would be useful for the Inquiry to see?

Yes

Details of documents:

http://www.audit-scotland.gov.uk/docs/central/2008/nr_080624_major_capital_projects.pdf

Upload documents:

No file was uploaded