

New fund will encourage residents across East Renfrewshire to get on their bike or take a stroll ?

Posted by RM64 - 19 May 2020 09:32

Published Barrhead News On Line 8/5/2020-

News

2 hrs ago

New fund will encourage residents across East Renfrewshire to get on their bike or take a stroll

By Tristan Stewart-Robertson @srtristan Chief Reporter

COUNCIL chiefs hope to create temporary cycle lanes and walkways in East Renfrewshire to encourage people to exercise as the coronavirus crisis leaves them facing a 'new normal.'

The Scottish Government has launched a new £10million Spaces for People fund to help residents maintain social distancing while out and about.

And East Renfrewshire Council has confirmed it has registered with the scheme in a bid to secure a share of the cash.

A council spokeswoman told the Barrhead News: "We have registered interest in the Scottish Government's Spaces for People initiative and, in line with government guidance, will be assessing measures across the authority to help residents social distance safely while undertaking essential trips and exercise.

"Once measures have been agreed, they will be implemented over the coming weeks to help mitigate virus transmission."

The new fund has been launched in response to a large increase in walking and cycling since the coronavirus lockdown began, with latest figures showing journeys by bicycle are up by 35 per cent on the weekly average, while walking has also increased significantly.

Scottish transport secretary Michael Matheson has stressed that capacity on public transport will have to be reduced as long as social distancing measures are in place, at between 10 and 25 per cent of previous levels.

The Spaces for People fund will be used to reallocate road space for active travel such as cycling and walking, while some routes may be reclassified.

Mr Matheson has written to all Scottish councils to give details of how the Spaces for People initiative will work.

He said: 'I'm pleased we are able to put forward a package of support for our local authorities to implement temporary active travel measures, helping to ensure that people can walk, cycle and wheel during this public health emergency whilst physically distancing and keeping safe from traffic.

'Our communities need this support quickly, especially with the welcome increases in cycling we are seeing across the country.

'At the same time, almost every journey starts and ends on our pavements in some way, so it is vitally important that people can physically distance for those essential trips or for exercise.'

=====

Re: New fund will encourage residents across East Renfrewshire to get on their bike or take a stroll ?

Posted by RM64 - 25 Mar 2021 09:53

From the documents provided It appears that AECOM Limited, Aurora, 120 Bothwell Street, Glasgow, G2 4BG have got this approx £70,000 contract.

It would appear there is a temporary post for 26 weeks @

£10.79 - £12.14 per hour 35 hour week

Some Council emails regarding the Tender won by AECOM.

RE: SXL Mini competition - technical & engineering framework

Morning ,

Quick Quote won't be an option as this is over the QQ threshold of £10k > £50k, therefore it would be a full tender process (route 2). Given that there is competition within this framework, I still think a mini comp would be a quicker option and this FW is already in place.

I have attached the template for the Mini Comp Information Pack Template and the Contract Strategy that would need to be completed. We could turn this around a bit quicker however, it is better that we know about this exercise much sooner to allow us to add to our tender plan as this helps determine the teams and myself's workload.

Let me know how you wish to proceed?

Regards

Sent: 24 August 2020 17:57

Subject: SXL Mini competition - technical & engineering framework

Hi ,

Thanks for your time and advice earlier this afternoon. I have been pondering what you said re mini-comp. Although this would be the best route under normal circumstances, I am mindful that we grant we have available is via emergency Scottish Government transport/COVID funding ('Spaces for

People' administered via Transport Scotland/Sustrans). Very mindful of the 2-3 month lead in time for mini-comps would not work in our favour given the expectations for quick spend.

Just wondering what other options are available. Don't think I can perpetually dish out SXL Direct Awards. Would this leave Quick Quote as the way forward?

Senior Strategy Officer

Roads & Transportation

RE: Mini Comp Templates

Hi ,

I understand that you have funding and you're not seeking the cheapest competitive bid, however you do want to ensure that you are getting value for money and we would want the bidders to demonstrate what they could do for the full £80k. I think you would need some weighting on the commercial section say 10% and the technical section would address on how they intend to approach the specification as one bidder could show that they can do XY&Z whereas another would only do X&Y (does that make sense?).

I will continue to work on this, however will speak to on Tuesday (I'm off on Monday), to get her thoughts on how best to proceed.

Regards

Sent: 15 October 2020 18:30

Subject: RE: Mini Comp Templates

Hi ,

Thanks for chat and advice this afternoon.

I have attached a draft Mini Comp strategy for your info & action. The only area where I anticipate an issue is with the Award Criteria, specifically the Commercial Offer section. We are not interested in competitive quotes per se, rather, how consultants propose to use the £80,000. However, I am unsure how we might assess a commercial offer based on hourly staff rates alone. A solution may be to have commercial at 0% and bidders instead demonstrate staff breakdown costs as part of the technical section? Keen for your input on this.

I have also included the Expressions of Interest from suppliers. Hopefully have a final draft of the tender ready by tomorrow.

Thanks in advance

Senior Strategy Officer

Roads & Transportation

Sent: 15 October 2020 12:22

Subject: Mini Comp Templates

Templates as discussed.

Regards

Procurement Category Manager

Corporate Procurement Section

East Renfrewshire Council

RE: Draft Tender Docs - MC 20 21 038 - Covid-19 Transport Measures

Hi

I've updated the overview as requested and I have now published tender with a closing date of Friday 6th November 2020.

Will advise if I receive any technical questions rec'd in relation to the above tender.

Regards

Sent: 27 October 2020 10:31

Subject: RE: Draft Tender Docs - MC 20 21 038 - Covid-19 Transport Measures

Hi ,

this seems OK to me and no qualms about approach suggested below. Please proceed with approval for ITT.

The only minor omission is within the PCS Tender pdf (Overview – ITT Description section) is inclusion of a fourth point to include

“Contribute towards the development of an ongoing monitoring and evaluation framework”

Thanks

Sent: 27 October 2020 08:44

Subject: Draft Tender Docs - MC 20 21 038 - Covid-19 Transport Measures

Morning ,

Please find attached draft ITT and all associated documents that will be uploaded as part of the tender, would appreciate if you can review and advise if you happy are with the content and would like to proceed to publish or advise if you have any changes that you would like to make prior to publishing.

I've made the closing date Friday 6th November as I will be off w/c 9th November and won't be able to facilitate the evaluation, however I can start the qualification evaluation and have it concluded by the Monday for the technical evaluation to begin.

Let me know how you would like to proceed, as I still need to get to approve the ITT before I can publish.

Regards

Procurement Category Manager

Corporate Procurement Section

East Renfrewshire Council

Sent: 28 October 2020 17:00

Subject: Q via PCS-T - extension to deadline

Hi ,

Please see undernoted request to the deadline, given the short timescale we have put into this for a quick turnaround, may have an impact on how many responses we get back.

"We wish to request a two-week extension to the tender submission. With a 90% quality weighting we feel that one week is not sufficient time to allow us to develop a comprehensive response that will directly respond to the bespoke requirements of this scheme.

Given the short timescale, we will also be unable to fully complete our internal review of the terms and conditions and therefore request that our bid may be submitted subject to a full review if we are successful.”

Regards

Procurement Category Manager

Corporate Procurement Section

East Renfrewshire Council

Q - via PCS-T - Liability

Forwarded 29/10/2020

Hi

Another question re liability.

“We refer to the level of liability requested in your invitation to tender (table contained in Section 8 of Appendix 2: Work Package Data for work package conditions NEC3 Professional Services Contract (April 2013) Option A). Whilst we are able to provide the relevant level of insurance cover for each of the particular elements within the table, the ‘each and every claim without limit to the number of claims’ is essentially requesting the consultant to provide unlimited liability cover, which I am sure you will appreciate no consultant can provide.

Under call-off’s from the Scotland Excel Framework, local authorities are expected to provide a suitable and relevant cap value on the ‘Consultant’s total liability to the Employer for all matters arising under or in connection with this contract, other than excluded matters’ which is the information immediately under the table contained in Section 8. However, this has been left blank and therefore is effectively unlimited.

We request a suitable cap is provided based on the size and complexity of the services to be provided which we believe should be no more than 10 x the consultants total fee for delivery of services or £2m, whichever the lesser.”

Would appreciate your thoughts on this.

Procurement Category Manager

Corporate Procurement Section

East Renfrewshire Council

RE: MC 20 21 038 - COVID-19 Transport Response Measures; Spaces for People - Technical Evaluation

Morning ,

Do you want me to change from to for the technical evaluation?

It is only the evaluators that can access the technical envelope.

Regards

Hi ,

I will issue a communication advising that we will extend until 16th November 2020.

Thanks

Sent: 29 October 2020 12:06

Subject: RE: Q via PCS-T - extension to deadline

Hi ,

how do you feel about this? Mindful deadline was in place before you go on leave so you could get documentation sent over for evaluation.

What are the implications of an extension?

Sent: 29 October 2020 12:10

Subject: RE: Q via PCS-T - extension to deadline

Hi ,

The timescales are I feel a bit tight due to the nature of this project as companies will need to review the t&c's, the scope etc. I'm due back from annual leave on the 16th November, therefore we could extend it until then which gives them another eight days to provide a response, I'm not sure how this will affect your timelines though.

Regards

=====

Re: New fund will encourage residents across East Renfrewshire to get on their bike or take a stroll ?

Posted by RM64 - 25 Mar 2021 09:58

Sent: 29 October 2020 13:04

Subject: RE: Q via PCS-T - extension to deadline

Importance: High

Hi ,

any thoughts on extension?

Original deadline was 6 Nov prior to Sandra going on leave. The idea being sends over documents for evaluation and awards contract on her return on the 16 Nov.

I empathise with the short turnaround time, however keen to understand how this potentially impacts delivery.

P.S. I am less concerned about the Fenwick Road (south), however, mindful about the rest of Ayr Rd

Sent: 29 October 2020 13:12

Subject: RE: Q via PCS-T - extension to deadline

There is no doubt it's a seriously tight timeframe.

Generally, my attitude is that if only 1 tenderer has asked for an extension, I would decline. If more than 1 asks for it – I would agree.

However, in this case, my inclination is that the additional 8 days would give us better considered responses.

The downside of 8 days slippage is not too severe.

Regards

Sent: 29 October 2020 13:20

Subject: FW: Q via PCS-T - extension to deadline

Hi,

I would tend to agree with (below) that an additional 8 days would provide better quality responses. Heartened that slippage wont be too severe

Feel free to progress extension

RE: Q via PCS-T - Legal Queries

Hi ,

I think we need to formulate a response to TQ's received, however he is referring to Z clauses in NEC's which I assume we should have detailed as 'not being used'. My limited understanding of NEC is that this is a standard suite of T&C's which is applicable for works project which can include professional services. We have selected the 'Professional Services Short Term Contract' and without having visibility of the content of this suite of terms it's difficult to know what's applicable and what's not.

I think we need to go back to Scotland Excel to get the details of Clauses of the Scotland Excel framework for Engineering and Technical Consultancy Services Ref: 06-16 in which they have detailed this at framework level.

Given that we have taken some time and still not provided a response and as this is technically a legal document I do not have the knowledge or expertise to provide any further guidance, we may need to extend the deadline again to ensure that we are giving bidders sufficient time to provide a robust response given the legal implications that need to be considered.

I finish up tonight for a week's annual leave but I will keep checking my emails in the hope that we can provide a response sooner rather than later.

Regards

Sent: 03 November 2020 11:06

Subject: Q via PCS-T - Legal Queries

Morning ,

Received a Question via PCS-T this morning, looking for some clarification, would appreciate if you can provide a response to the undernoted:-

TQ1

Contract Data Part One – Insurance Table – Professional Indemnity

By way of notice as to the annual aggregate limits that apply to our PI cover we attach our certificate of insurance. (Not attached)

TQ2

Framework Contract Additional Clauses Z33

Z33 of Section 6B of the Scotland Excel Framework stipulates that the TUPE Regulations will apply. In order for us to appraise the attendant risks, please provide us with the employment details for all employees or other consultant's employees who have been spending a substantive amount of their time engaged in providing the services we are to provide OR please confirm TUPE will not apply. I don't think this would apply – should this clause have been removed?

TQ3

Additional Clauses

1. In order to build certainty as to the duration of our liability under this contract please add the following; "Any and all claims against the Consultant under the terms of this Contract must be made before the expiry of the 5-year period immediately following practical completion of the Services or such shorter period as may be prescribed by law."
2. Y(UK)3 - In light of the change of law in Scotland we request addition of the following clause; "Unless expressly stated to the contrary no provision of this Agreement is intended to or creates any right or benefit enforceable against the parties to this Agreement under the Contracts (Third Party Rights) (Scotland) Act 2017 or otherwise".
3. Limit of Liability - The Scotland Excel Framework anticipated a standard NEC3 PSC limit of liability to included in any call-off contract. A proportionate limit of liability would also allow us to submit a most economically advantageous tender. On that basis we would seek for the following to be included in the contract: again I think the undernoted is looking to 'cap' their liability and we have refused this to two other bidders.

“Notwithstanding any other provision in this contract, the total liability of the Consultant under or in connection with this contract (other than for death, personal injury or fraud), whether in contract, tort, breach of statutory duty or otherwise shall not exceed the lower of ten times the fees paid for the scope of services and £2 million.

The Consultant shall have no liability under this contract for any loss of profit, indirect or consequential losses howsoever caused and whether or not such losses were foreseeable at the time of carrying out of the services”

Regards

Procurement Category Manager

Corporate Procurement Section

East Renfrewshire Council

Sent: 03 November 2020 17:12

Subject: RE: Q via PCS-T - Legal Queries

Hi ,

I think the Conditions of Contract we need are either Professional Services Contract (PSC) or Professional Services Short Contract (PSSC), both from the NEC3 suite of documents. This would apply also for my forthcoming “design of cycle path” Mini Comp.

I dropped a note to to see if he has an electronic copy – but he doesn’t.

He does have a hard copy which I will collect just as soon as I get the OK to enter the office.

Can’t really offer any answers until then, I’m afraid.

Meantime, do we know what Conditions applied to The Scotland Excel Framework contract?

Regards

Sent: 04 November 2020 08:08

Subject: RE: Q via PCS-T - Legal Queries

Hi ,

I've downloaded this from SXL website that contains information, hopefully this is what you're looking for?

Sent: 04 November 2020 09:08

Subject: RE: Q via PCS-T - Legal Queries

Hi ,

I was very happy to see the attached documents and hoped we would just be able to make reference to it as the Framework's 'master' conditions - and that would resolve all issues for 's contract and my subsequent contract.

But it was not to be.

The document seems to imply we just have to state whether we are going for Professional Services Contract (PSC) or Professional Services Short Contract (PSSC) – both from the NEC3 suite of contracts. The short contract would be the way to go, methinks, as neither contract has any great complexity or risk.

All good – so far.

The bad news is that the document you attached constantly refers to “Renfrewshire Council, Cotton Street, Paisley” so we would need to change that. Do you have it as a ‘word’ document?

There is also on Page 68 a list of information we need to provide, like ‘start date’, ‘completion date’,

'damages' etc - not difficult to provide most of the info but can't fill it in on a pdf.

There are some options (Page 70) on the consultant's liability limit which have to be completed by us. (That might be what one of the tenderers was querying).

Finally, there is a long list of "Z" clauses which are probably valid but would have to be checked out.

Regards

=====

Re: New fund will encourage residents across East Renfrewshire to get on their bike or take a stroll ?

Posted by RM64 - 25 Mar 2021 10:08

Sent: 04 November 2020 15:26

Subject: FW: Q via PCS-T - Legal Queries

..... downloaded a Short Contract template, which I reckon is what you want to refer to in your contract. Most of it is easily filled in, but there are a couple of Clauses that look a bit tricky – namely, insurance and arbitration. You may need to seek advice from Legal for these.

I am hoping get into the office soon to lay hands on a hard copy of the NEC3 Short Contract, but I doubt it will help re insurance and arbitration.

Regards

Sent: 04 November 2020 15:31

Subject: RE: Q via PCS-T - Legal Queries

Hi ,

Please see document uploaded in relation to PSC Option A Contract Data template, check the information on this.

Regards

Sent: 04 November 2020 15:38

Subject: FW: Q via PCS-T - Legal Queries

This just in.

The answer to all your prayers. (But check it!)

Regards

SXL NEC3 T&C's Engineering & Technical FW

5/11/2020

Afternoon,

Looking for some help, can you possibly provide a copy of the NECs T&C's that have been set up for Professional Services Short Term Contract (PSSC) for the above FW, so that we can have visibility of the clauses stated within the NEC terms.

Many Thanks

Regards

Procurement Category Manager

Corporate Procurement Section

East Renfrewshire Council

Sent: 05 November 2020 11:42

Subject: RE: Q via PCS-T - Legal Queries

Morning,

Just wondered how you are getting on with the TQ's as I'm due to finish up today for a week's annual leave and would like to deal with this before I finish up.

Many Thanks

Regards

Sent: 05 November 2020 12:36

Subject: RE: Q via PCS-T - Legal Queries

Hi

Hopefully I have the right end of the stick on this... I have updated the Professional Services Short Contract work to the best of my abilities – see attached (please check!). I am assuming this is the correct contract rather than the Professional Services Contract (Option A) previously completed.

I have not included telephone, email and the delay damages, I don't think the later is applicable in this instance.

I am also assuming that the insurance cover is in line with the Mini-comp tender.

I also note reference to an "appendix 1" within the price list at end of contract. Just wanted to highlight as I don't have a copy.

Get back to me if you need anything else.

Senior Strategy Officer

Roads & Transportation

Sent: 17 November 2020 12:50

Subject: MC 20 21 038 - COVID-19 Transport Response Measures; Spaces for People - Technical Evaluation

Afternoon,

The above tender deadline closed yesterday and I have finalised the qualification evaluation, we have received 4 submissions from the undernoted:

Aecom

Mott McDonald

Stantec

WSP

I have now opened up the technical envelope and you should be able to commence your technical evaluation. Please ensure that that you provide a justification for your scoring as we will require to provide feedback to the unsuccessful bidders.

I noticed that is on annual leave until 23rd November, can you wait for his return to start his evaluation? Or is there anyone else that could possibly do it?

Regards

Procurement Category Manager

Corporate Procurement Section

East Renfrewshire Council

Sent: 17 November 2020 22:21

Subject: RE: MC 20 21 038 - COVID-19 Transport Response Measures; Spaces for People - Technical Evaluation

Hi ,

great news.

I would volunteer, but that would be outside my paygrade.

Can you provide some information on how to access the 'technical envelope' for evolution?

Re: MC 20 21 038 - Covid Transport Measures

Hi ,

head of service is Gillian McCarney. Happy to proceed with award. J

Sent: 25 November 2020 14:48

Subject: MC 20 21 038 - Covid Transport Measures

Hi ,

The technical evaluation has now been concluded and the commercial envelope has now been opened for review. I attached a copy of attachments offered by all bidders for you to review (there doesn't appear to be anything that jumps out), let me know if you are happy to proceed or require further clarification in

relation to any of the bidders commercial offer(s).

Regards

Procurement Category Manager

Corporate Procurement Section

East Renfrewshire Council

Sent: 25 November 2020 20:46

Subject: RE: MC 20 21 038 - Covid Transport Measures

Hi ,

looks OK to me. Happy to proceed.

(– I have saved a spreadsheet of collated pricing schedules here if this is of interest)

Sent: 26 November 2020 09:12

Subject: RE: MC 20 21 038 - Covid Transport Measures

Hello,

I'm intrigued – who won?

Regards

Sent: Thursday, November 26, 2020 9:29:52 AM

Subject: RE: MC 20 21 038 - Covid Transport Measures

Hi All,

Please see attached final rankings – AECOM have achieved the highest overall score therefore is the 1st ranked bidder. Can you advise who your Head of Service is? And if you are happy to proceed to award?

Regards

=====

Re: New fund will encourage residents across East Renfrewshire to get on their bike or take a stroll ?

Posted by RM64 - 13 Sep 2021 12:14

13/9/2021

Published Barrhead News On Line -

News

4 hrs ago

Ayr Road: Petition hits out at cycle lane bollards causing road disruption

By Pippa Smith Reporter

A PETITION has been launched over fears of “serious road safety concerns” on a two-mile stretch of road in East Renfrewshire.

Residents living on Ayr Road, in Newton Mearns, have slammed East Renfrewshire Council following the installation of cycle lane bollards, which now stretch from the Crookfur Park to the Malletsheugh junction.

Karen Flo, who set up the petition, believes that the cones are creating issues for delivery drivers, essential visitors, and emergency vehicles who are “unable to stop safely on the road”.

Homeowners on Ayr Road have also raised concerns over “ongoing disruption” to the flow of traffic, leading to “increased congestion, emissions and air pollution”.

The petition states: “Ayr Road is one of the busiest roads in Newton Mearns and has a variety of road users including drivers and cyclists.

Emergency measures during lockdown saw orange plastic cones appear which acted as a temporary extension to the pavement for people out walking.

“These cones have now been replaced and extended with black and white plastic bollards which act as hard segregation for cycle lanes.

“While we appreciate that East Renfrewshire Council is trying to support and encourage cycling, there seems to be limited or no benefit from the installation of the bollards which are in place.”

The Barrhead News previously spoke to Stephen Page, who is among those to hit out at the bollards, claiming they were putting the safety of road users at risk.

“It has implemented changes to the cycle path and road that have made an accident extremely likely but refuse to accept the road is more dangerous,” the 56-year-old said.

A council spokesperson said the bollards aim to safeguard the existing cycle lane and help keep people safe.

They added: “The measures on Ayr Road are being undertaken on a trial basis following community

feedback identifying a local demand for improved active travel provision in the area.

“There has been significant increase in active travel during Covid-19, and these measures aim to safeguard the existing cycle lane.

“Consultation has been ongoing since November 2020, and we continue to consider the views of residents, pedestrians and road users.”

To view the petition, visit [HERE](#).

www.change.org/p/east-renfrewshire-counc...arns?recruiter=false

=====

Re: New fund will encourage residents across East Renfrewshire to get on their bike or take a stroll ?

Posted by RM64 - 15 Sep 2021 14:18

15/9/2021

Published edinburghlive On Line Website -

www.edinburghlive.co.uk/news/edinburgh-n...red-warning-21261189

News Edinburgh News The City of Edinburgh Council

By Joseph Anderson Local Democracy Reporter

09:30, 9 AUG 2021 Updated 16:21, 9 AUG 2021

Edinburgh Council given 'red' warning over Spaces for People scheme

The council has been warned that 'significant improvement is required' to the controversial scheme, while watchdogs found there was no clear cost for ending it.

Edinburgh City Council watchdogs have warned the local authority that 'significant improvement is required' over its controversial Spaces for People scheme.

The council's internal auditors have concluded that both the council's finances and reputation have been put at risk by the traffic schemes, which were first implemented in response to the need for social distancing during the coronavirus pandemic.

The damning report gives the council a 'red' rating - the second worst possible - which means 'significant and/or numerous control weaknesses were identified, in the design and/or effectiveness of the control environment and/or governance and risk management frameworks'.

The report concludes that:

Initial SfP initiatives considered for prioritisation were based on suggestions from a relatively small group of officers and external local community stakeholders

The majority of initiatives were initially prioritised by six project team members in April 2020

Where public feedback was incorporated into projects, no audit trail was available to confirm that this was completed

There is currently no clear strategy for determining the potential exit costs associated with reversing individual projects, or transitioning them into permanent solutions, and it is currently unclear how any significant exit costs will be funded.

The council's reputation took a hit due to a public perception that feedback provided through the Commonplace survey was not considered in relation to ongoing schemes

The report will be discussed at a meeting of the council's governance, risk and best value committee, which is due to meet on Tuesday August 10.

The history of the Spaces for People in Edinburgh has been mired in controversy, with various pressure groups and community organisations both criticising and lauding the traffic schemes.

In May 2020 the Scottish government announced funding for the Spaces for People programmes, which aimed to provide safe options for essential journeys during the coronavirus pandemic.

Since April of that year, the council has used the £5m it received from the Scottish government to introduce various road closures and temporary traffic measures using emergency coronavirus powers.

At the time, the council used Temporary Traffic Regulations Orders (TTROs), which allowed them to install temporary bike lanes, wider pavements and road closures for a maximum of 18 months.

The council says residents living near these schemes were able to provide feedback which was then used to alter and improve the schemes, but anti-Spaces for People campaigners and resident's organisations have complained about the perceived lack of consultation and improvements to the schemes.

But in June, as the council approached the end of the 18-month TTRO period, city planners began extending the Spaces for People schemes for another 18-month period using Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETROs).

This means some 'temporary' traffic schemes will have been in place for three years before either being made permanent or scrapped entirely.

=====