

Present:, Roger Williams, Peter Burman, Bob Beaney, Charles Reed, Robert Hudleston, Ian Lancefield, Steve Leeks and Graham Barnwell	File Ref: SEHAUC/WG/May 06 Date: 4 th May 2006 Location: SCC A03 Recorded by: Robert Hudleston
Distribution: All Members	

ITEM	TEXT	ACTION
1	Apologies for absence	
1.1	Nik Goodman and Alan Florry	
2	Agreed Working Practices - Detector Loops	
2.1	As the previous minutes this has still to be resolved.	RH
3	Main SEHAUC minutes December 2005 and Agenda 17/3/06	
3.1	RW agreed to check that the new location for the next meeting was still correct.	RW
3.2	On the subject of alternative materials, BB suggested there should be more support from the manufacturers. RW still trying to collate a list of these ARMs. Hampshire results could be useful.	RW
4	Co-ordination – Common Return Form	
4.1	RW undertook to draft a common co-ordination format together with guidance notes that will be presented at the next SEHAUC meeting.	RW
5	Compliance Testing	
5.1	RW was successful in promoting his joint programme. There was agreement that the marking up and testing should be a joint process and costs would be shared on a 50/50 basis.	
5.2	In the instance that a defect is determined then there would be no defect recorded if the remedial works were completed within 60 days. Failure to comply would result in a defect being issued.	
5.3	RW also stated that only works within the guarantee period would be tested.	
6	Vehicle Crossings	
	A further discussion took place on why establishing the reasoning for this review of procedure was still ongoing. The utilities requested a clear process from Highway Authorities that	

	would ensures sufficient safe guards are in place so the damage to plant can be avoided. Ian has undertaken to carryout this work through determining the information requirements, to ensure consistency and present his findings at the next working party meeting in June.	
6.1	The questions that need to be researched for each highway authority are; who can do it; Who tells whom who should be doing it; Are these classified as Major Works; is Notification required and who covers plant damage?	
6.2	More research work is needed here especially into the requirements of the Highway Act and NRSWA with regard to plant records. Sometimes information is not readily available.	
6.3	IL will gather best practice and Brighton and Hove have developed a vehicle crossing pack which includes utility plant protection which may be used as best practice.	
6.4	IL has been volunteered to produce a draft procedure.	IL
7	Temporary Traffic Signals (Portable Traffic Signals)	
7.1	It was agreed that most highway authorities would continue to use the current SEHAUC form and procedures. BB tasked to produce a web version.	BB
8	Website	
8.1	BB indicated that the work to facilitate access to SEHAUC Minutes, newsletters etc was underway and would be completed shortly.	BB
8.2	This is currently a 'works in progress' status.	BB
9	Section 81	
9.1	BB had produced a draft document for all to consider. RH to send out to SEHAUC members for comment/consultation and to bring to the next working group meeting in June.	RH
9.2	BB indicated that Yorkshire HAUC have produced a S81 guidance note and agreed to circulate the details so this may be useful at the next WP meeting. PB had a version from Anglian HAUC for consideration too.	
10	Training	
10.1	The previous meeting discussed had the TMA new rules which will be introduced in the Autumn and agreed that SEHAUC	

	should run a series of seminars to cover these new areas.	
10.2	Many topics are on offer and no consensus was reached on which to tackle first. The decision should be reached at the main SEHAUC meeting.	ALL
11	Performance Monitoring - Celebrations For Success	
11.1	The possible implementation of FPNs was debated. RW would be running an error report forms on possibly a weekly or monthly frequency.	
11.2	The EtoN development group would be key in producing a consistent software that allowed for all eventualities. Whether Exor/Mayrise/Symology and Confirm could ensure compatibility between all programmes remains to be seen. These systems must be robust enough for any errors to be recognised.	
11.3	RW wanted to use FPNs in a positive way. Their use would be essential in providing a pro-active mechanism to keeping standards high.	
11.4	The position regarding 'celebrations for success' was still dubious. Innovation from any party is welcomed but maybe we should concentrate on already proven systems such as the Considerate Contractor Scheme!	
11.5	Final position to be decided at the next SEHAUC meeting.	
12	Arbitration	
12.1	The draft procedure will be tabled at the next meeting for ratification and formal adoption as a SEHAUC guidance note.	BB/RW
13	AOB	
13.1	RW suggested that like YHAUC a Business Plan could be an option.	
13.2	BB stated that the Working Group Mandate did not extend this far. It was not the wish of the group to make such a decision.	
14	Next Meeting Date 9th June Surrey County Council Area Office A03	