

**MINUTES OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD MEETING:  
25 JULY 2008**

	<b>ACTION</b>
<p><b>1. Welcome, Introductions and Apologies</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and the apologies were <b>noted</b>. A full list of attendees and apologies is attached at <b>Annex A</b>.</p> <p>The Chair expressed his thanks, on behalf of the Board, to those members who stepped down from the Board at the last meeting.</p> <p>Members were informed that the Deputy Chair position on the Board was still vacant. It was confirmed that, as the Deputy Chair must be a member of the Assembly's SEE Partner Group, members of that Group would be contacted and nominations sought – with the hope that a new Deputy Chair would be appointed in time for the next meeting of the Board.</p>	<p>Nicola Baylis</p>
<p><b>2. Minutes of the Last Meeting – 4 April 2008</b></p> <p>The minutes of the last meeting were <b>agreed</b> as an accurate record.</p>	
<p><b>3. Matters Arising</b></p> <p>It was confirmed that the matters arising from the previous meeting that related to RFA2 (the packaging of schemes, alternative sources of funding and future RFA timetable) would be picked up at the October meeting of the Board. Government Office added that DfT were currently working to produce some guidance on RFA2 and officers would liaise with their colleagues at the Assembly prior to the October meeting to ensure the guidance is incorporated into the discussions.</p> <p>Members asked if there was any update following the joint meeting with the Sustainable Development Board. It was confirmed that this work was continuing and updates would be given at future meetings.</p>	<p>Chris Martin/ Alison Biddulph</p>

A supplementary paper on the Review of Sub National Economic Development and Regeneration (SNR) was tabled at the meeting and members were asked to provide a steer for the Chair on how they would like him to feed into the ongoing SNR debate on behalf of the Board.

In the discussion that followed, a number of points were raised:

- Still a lot of 'discomfort' from local authorities around the proposals to move housing, planning and transport powers to Yorkshire Forward under the new arrangements.
- Need to ensure that elected members are adequately represented in the new structures.
- SEE Partner representation does not appear to be a priority under the new arrangements. It was confirmed that the Assembly SEE Partner Group had submitted its own response to the SNR Consultation and copies were available from the Assembly.

It was **agreed** that, as members had not had sufficient time to debate this within their organisations in advance of the meeting, comments should be sent to Nicola Baylis, via e-mail, by Friday 15 August 2008.

#### **4. Yorkshire and Humber Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy) 2009 Update**

Members were updated on the approach being taken on the Yorkshire and Humber Plan 2009 Update, including the use of transport evidence for determining future areas of growth, and the next steps in the process.

In the discussion that followed, a number of points were raised:

- The criteria need to include economic opportunities.
- Need to refer to transport and climate change – not just transport.
- Need to be more proactive about where transport links need to be improved.
- It is important that transport links are in place before development and that the links are kept as short as possible (e.g. need to ensure homes are near to workplaces etc).
- Concern that there will be over-development of areas

with good transport links already in place.

Members were thanked for their comments.

It was **agreed** that the analysis of the implications arising from the evidence gathering should be circulated to the Board prior to the development of the 'options' document.

Richard Wood

## **5. Managing the Programme of Major Schemes Funded from the Regional Funding Allocation**

Members considered proposals for a strengthened approach to monitoring and reporting on schemes resourced from the RFA. It was **agreed** that these proposals should be adopted with immediate effect (Recommendation 1).

A summary of risk to the existing programme was then presented to members. It was stated that there were several key steps that should be taken forward to the next stage of the RFA process:

- At a scheme level there needs to be greater 'review and challenge' of promoters' project plans to assess their realism – and the quarterly milestone is a significant step here.
- At the programme level, to acknowledge inherent risk in the programme arising from scheme specific uncertainties, to understand the potential outcomes of these risks through scenario testing, and to use the scenario testing to inform the development of an appropriate risk mitigation strategy.
- To ensure the provision of clearer detailed cost information from scheme promoters, with the base costs, cost assumptions to derive out-turn costs, and treatment of risk, all clearly set out.
- For the Board to be clear on the Approved Cost level or range within which RFA prioritisation status is granted.
- At a programme level, to consider whether to include a 'risk allowance' which recognises that some schemes will undergo cost increases.

Members **agreed** that the approach in the first bullet point should be incorporated into the improved quarterly monitoring process, and that the approach set out in the remaining points should be considered at the programme level by the Region, at the same time as consideration of over-programming as part of the Full Review

Mike Padgett

(Recommendation 2).

Following a brief discussion, it was **agreed** that over-programming should not be increased by a given percentage for the Interim Review (Recommendation 3) subject to a higher level of over-programming being introduced for the Full Review.

Members then discussed the treatment of exceptional maintenance schemes. There was some debate around whether it would be appropriate to ring-fence a percentage of the RFA funding for exceptional maintenance schemes, but it was felt that each individual scheme should be considered on its merits and that 'top slicing' could result in an underspend if not enough exceptional maintenance schemes are put forward.

Members **agreed** that the Board would give serious consideration to including some expenditure on exceptional maintenance schemes as part of the Interim Review in the early years of the programme (Recommendation 4).

Members felt that it was important that they had the full picture in relation to exceptional maintenance schemes – therefore it was **agreed** that a stocktake should be undertaken. It was also **agreed** that formal criteria for considering maintenance schemes should be developed in time for the Full Review of RFA (Recommendation 5).

Mike Padgett/  
Chris Martin

## **6. Planning for a Full Review of the Regional Funding Allocation for Transport**

It was confirmed that the invitation to participate in RFA2 had not yet been received from DfT – although it was expected shortly.

Members gave consideration to the additional areas of transport spending which were expected to be included in the RFA2.

There was some concern about local transport funding being diverted from local authorities into a regional pot; therefore it was essential that local authorities were involved in developing the guidance for Government on this.

Members **agreed** that a further report should be brought to the October meeting of the Board to inform the Board's

Mike Padgett

approach to developing advice to Government on highway maintenance and the Integrated Transport Block (Recommendation 1).

Members then considered potential changes to the assessment criteria/methodology for considering schemes put forward for RFA funding.

It was **agreed** that a further report be brought to the October meeting of the Board detailing specific proposals for refreshing the criteria/methodology for assessing schemes in RFA2 (Recommendation 2).

Mike Padgett

It was also **agreed** that an outline Strategic Prioritisation Framework be brought to the October meeting to inform the assessment work in RFA2 (Recommendation 3).

Mike Padgett

## **7. Interim Review of the Regional Funding Allocation for Transport - Deferred Elements from 4 April 2008**

Members were reminded that, at the April Meeting of the Board, it was agreed that further information on the schemes not recommended for inclusion in the Interim Review at that meeting be brought back to the Board for consideration at the July meeting.

Members were also reminded that the purpose of the Interim Review was to address under-spend in the early years of the programme. This meant placing an emphasis on scheme deliverability. However, officers were advising that deliverability should not be the only criterion and were only recommending support for schemes that also had a 'good' or 'very good' fit with policy. The Board would need to take a view whether this balance between deliverability and policy fit was appropriate.

The Highways Agency confirmed that they had now successfully secured internal funding for the A64 Hopgrove Roundabout improvement scheme and were therefore withdrawing the scheme from the Interim Review.

The Chair referred to a letter from the Leader of East Riding of Yorkshire Council concerning the A164 scheme, arguing on deliverability and value for money grounds that it should be supported, contrary to the recommendation in the report.

Following presentation of the report, members raised the

following points:

- There is a spike in expenditure in 2010/11 so we need to be careful about which schemes we endorse that require funding in that period – if there are too many schemes, DfT will still have to make some difficult decisions and they would be unlikely to support all of them.
- The Board has agreed the criteria for assessing schemes and it needs to stick to its decision – even if it makes some scheme promoters/supporters unhappy.
- Regardless of the criteria, should the Board not use its discretion? Schemes like the A164 were deliverable and were value for money and perhaps more focus should be put on making sure the Regional allocation was spent?
- Some schemes that are not recommended for endorsement are good sustainable schemes – we need to encourage scheme promoters to resolve some of the policy fit and/or deliverability issues.
- If schemes are not endorsed at this meeting, what happens to them? It was confirmed that schemes could be resubmitted as part of the Full Review, although depending on if/how the criteria for assessing schemes changes, the schemes may still end up with the same (or a worse) policy fit/deliverability.

Members **agreed** that:

- Leeds City Region Rail Growth Scheme be endorsed for funding from the Regional Funding Allocation (Recommendation 1).
- The A636 Denby Dale Road, A639 Colorado Way and A630 Centenary Way exceptional maintenance schemes be endorsed for funding from the Regional Funding Allocation (Recommendation 2).
- The remaining schemes put forward should not be endorsed for funding from the Regional Funding Allocation (Recommendations 3 and 4).
- Bradford MDC be invited to further develop its Connecting Airedale scheme and re-submit it to the Board for approval as part of the Full Review of Regional Funding Allocations (Recommendation 5).

## **8. Any Other Business**

Members **noted** that an additional Board meeting would

need to take place during late November/early December to tie in with the Regional Funding Allocations timetable. It was confirmed that a suitable date would be agreed with the Chair and circulated to members in advance of the next meeting.

**Date of Next Meeting: 10 October 2008**

**ACTION**

Nicola Baylis

Nicola Baylis, Business Services Officer  
28 July 2008

DRAFT

**REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD MEETING:  
25 JULY 2008**

**Attendees**

Andrew Palmer	Business Sector
Chris Glen	Business Sector (Deputy for Michael Oughtred)
Cllr Mark Kirk	Chair
Anthony Rae	Environment Sector
John Hoare	Environment Sector
Alison Biddulph	Government Office (Deputy for Margaret Jackson)
Peter Godfrey	Highways Agency
Cllr Dave Woods	Hull and Humber Ports City Region Partnership
Cllr Martin Vickers	Humber Local Authority Partnership
Cllr Steve Galloway	Leeds City Region Partnership (Deputy for Cllr Andrew Carter)
David Phillips	Network Rail (Deputy for Richard Thompson)
Cllr Clare Wood	North Yorkshire Local Authority Partnership
Cllr Derek Bastiman	Rural Local Authorities
Cllr Ian Auckland	Sheffield City Region Partnership
Lyn Costelloe	Social Sector
Cllr Andrea Milner	South Yorkshire PTA
David Brown	South Yorkshire PTE
Cllr Allan Jones	Town and Parish Councils
Cllr Anne Hawkesworth	West Yorkshire Local Authority Partnership
Cllr Chris Greaves	West Yorkshire PTA
David Hoggarth	West Yorkshire PTE (Deputy for Kieran Preston)
Thea Stein	Yorkshire Forward
Chris Martin	YHA
Mike Padgett	YHA
Nicola Baylis	YHA
Richard Wood	YHA
Stuart Clewlow	YHA

**Visitors**

John Blackburn	Bradford MDC
Ruth Egan	City of York Council
Ian Burnett	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
Mike Ibbotson	Hull City Council
Amy Denton	JMP Consultants
Martin Revill	JMP Consultants

Dick Crump  
Andrew Bainbridge  
Ben Still  
Jodie Speight  
James Nutter  
Jonathan Brown

North East Lincolnshire Council  
North Yorkshire County Council  
Steer Davies Gleave  
YHA  
Yorkshire Forward  
Yorkshire Forward

**Apologies**

Michael Oughtred  
George Peach  
Margaret Jackson  
Cllr Andrew Carter  
Richard Thompson  
Mayor Martin Winter  
Kieran Preston

Business Sector  
Confederation of Passenger Transport  
Government Office  
Leeds City Region Partnership  
Network Rail  
South Yorkshire Local Authority Partnership  
West Yorkshire PTE

