

Minutes

Name of meeting Solent Gateway – Floating Bridge Project Board

Date and time Wednesday 6 May 2015 at 11am

Venue Red Funnel Offices, Bugle Street, Southampton

Present John Roseveare (JR) – Parose Projects, consultant
Mark Slawson (MS) – Red Funnel
Stuart McIntosh (SM) – Cowes Harbour Master
Sean Newton (SN) – IWC, Project Lead
Tim Light (TL) – King Harry ferry, Cornwall
Andrea Jenkins (AJ) – IWC, Surveyor

1. **LEP Business Case**

Issues for the LEP:

- i) Better costings are required for the floating bridge business case, and are urgently needed in the next couple of days. SN to update costs and circulate to all tomorrow morning for approval and to submit to BBP tomorrow if possible.

[REDACTED]

SN stated that part of the problem is that we cannot know what changes may be needed to the slipway/access until we have a design specification. MS said that it would be worth making some reasonable assumptions instead. SN agreed.

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- iii) TL pointed out that the floating bridge is a 'bridge' not a 'vessel' [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The normal life of a floating bridge was discussed and it was agreed that it is generally 20-25 years, and that it

would be reasonable to assume 20 years for the purpose of this business case if preferred, as the last third of a floating bridge's life involves a great deal of maintenance and potentially result in a lot of out of service time.

All other costs/benefits to be included in the floating bridge revised costings, including:

- (1) Three boats to be provided over a 60 year period, not one.
- (2) Works to bridge square
- (3) Annual maintenance.
- (4) Borrowing costs.
- (5) Council time/on costs.
- (6) Local community benefits (access to shops, jobs, etc).
- (7) Infrastructure costs: allowance for slipway/access works, maintenance, etc.
- (8) On-site 'clients representative' to oversee operations on a day to day basis.
- (9) Costs of meeting the new floating bridge Code which is shortly to become statute
- (10) Remove restriction of shallow water at the location of the floating bridge which restricts the width of the river preventing access to The Medina River for bigger boats, limiting trade.
- (11) Regular dredging of the River Medina.
- (12) Extra cost to IWC if no vehicular floating bridge and all vehicles used the road network instead.
- (13) A sinking fund to replace the floating bridge at the end of its life.

██████ to gather the above information, revisit the Executive paper and proposal to increase charges, etc, and then update costs to circulate to all for comments. Then SN, TL and JR to discuss tomorrow. ██████

SN to get a quote from the Jenny Boats for an annual pedestrian service only. ██████

2.

Naval Architect selection

The selection process for the Naval Architect has been halted. Only two of the three companies expected to submit an expression of interest submitted a PQQ, but one was likely to fail therefore this would have led to only one company being invited to tender. Therefore, it was decided to halt the process and advertise. Accordingly 23 PQQ's have now been received, 3 have been withdrawn therefore we now potentially have 20 parties interested in tendering.

[REDACTED]

Effect on the timetable:

- PQQ's received: 22 May.
- Evaluation: 25 May – 10 June.
- Presentations: week commencing 8 June.
- Successful company to start: 1 July.

SN confirmed that he has asked for a breakdown of costs in the tender.

3. Selection of Shipbuilder

The ITT for this was advertised in Europe.

20 expressions of interest were received but only eight PQQ's were received [REDACTED]

Evaluation needs to be undertaken by 15 May. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Advantages of design and build process:

- IWC wishes to increase the vehicle carrying capacity of the floating bridge.
- IWC (in conjunction with CHC) want to consider overcoming the problem of the chain's effect on the draught in the River Medina.

TL advised that naval architects often want to dominate this part of the process and pointed out that ship builders also have some excellent ideas which should be considered, therefore he advised that tender documents should be based on the objective of the exercise, not a prescriptive design. (Allow the shipyard to be innovative, discuss and influence the design.)

SM reiterated the need for some rapid decisions to achieve the timetable set out in this programme, and recommended that a single company be given 100 per cent of the responsibility of the design risk to avoid any room for error between more than one party.

4. **Ticketing Solution**

SN forwarded the brief to MS's colleagues for comment but no response has been received to date. MS to chase. **Action for MS.**

SN intends to start writing the ITT next week. **Action for SN.**

SN has spoken to one firm and an indicative price of [REDACTED] has been confirmed.

TL confirmed that they designed an app themselves for tickets, but point out that you will always have some users turning up with cash how have not already bought a ticket.

SN confirmed that in the interim the IWC will have one or two staff to take pedestrian charges.

5. **Any Other Business**

- It was reiterated that only one party should be appointed with design responsibilities as if there is two or more they will play each off against each other when problems arise.
- Incentivise bidders with savings.
- Be mindful of the LEP and IWC's decision making duties re tight timescales for delivery of the floating bridge.

6. **Future Meeting**

The next meeting will provisionally be held on 3rd July at Red Funnel office; time tbc.