

REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD MEETING

10 OCTOBER 2008: 10.00AM – 12.30PM

KINGSWOOD SUITE, TOWN HALL, WAKEFIELD

AGENDA

1. Welcome, Introductions & Apologies

BUSINESS ITEMS

10.05 – 10.15

2. Minutes of the Last Meeting – 25 July 2008 Attached
3. Matters Arising Attached

DISCUSSION ITEMS

10.15 – 11.00

4. Sub National Review Attached
5. Regional Spatial Strategy 2009 Update Attached

DECISION ITEMS

11.00 – 12.30

6. Review of Regional Funding Advice
 - a. Progress on RFA2 and Programme Management Attached
 - b. Refreshing the RFA Assessment Methodology and Criteria Attached
 - c. Initial Proposals for the Integrated Transport Block and Highways Maintenance Attached

7. Any Other Business

Date of Next Meeting: 12 December 2008 (2pm – 4pm)

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

	ACTION
<p>1. Welcome, Introductions and Apologies</p> <p>The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and the apologies were noted. A full list of attendees and apologies is attached at Annex A.</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>2. Minutes of the Last Meeting – 4 April 2008</p> <p>The minutes of the last meeting were agreed as an accurate record.</p>	
<p>3. Matters Arising</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

DRAFT

**MATTERS ARISING FROM THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD MEETING
HELD ON 25 JULY 2008 – FOR NOTING**

1. This note provides an update on those matters not covered elsewhere on the agenda.

Item 1 – Welcome, Introductions and Apologies

2. Following the last meeting, nominations for the Deputy Chair of the Regional Transport Board were sought from the Assembly's SEE (social, economic and environmental) Partner Group. One nomination was received and Tom Glossop, the Town and Parish Councils representative, was confirmed as the SEE Partner nominee and will be appointed as Deputy Chair of the Board (subject to confirmation by the full Assembly at their meeting on 2 October 2008).

Item 3 – Matters Arising

3. It was confirmed that the matters arising from the previous meeting related to the handling of the second round of Regional Funding Advice (RFA2) – in particular that the programme management and process issues (such as guidance on the packaging of schemes, alternative sources of funding and future RFA timetable) would be picked up at the October meeting of the Board. Formal Government guidance on preparing RFA2 was issued shortly after the Board meeting - on 30 July 2008. RFA is covered under Agenda Item 6.
4. As members did not have sufficient time to debate the SNR paper within their organisations in advance of the meeting, members were asked to submit their comments via e-mail to the Assembly. SNR is now covered under Agenda Item 4 and will allow for further discussion.

**Item 4 - Yorkshire and Humber Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy) 2009
Update**

5. At the last meeting, 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. Agenda Item 5 looks at the RSS and the engagement of Regional Transport Board in the 2009 Update.

SUB NATIONAL REVIEW

For Discussion

Members are asked:

- To note the latest national and regional developments around the Sub National Review;
- To consider how the Board can help inform the development of the new Transport Board; and
- To shape emerging LGYH/YF thinking on the operation of the new structures.

Background

1. At its last meeting, the Board was only able to have a short discussion on the implications of the Sub National Review (SNR). It was agreed any further comments these should be sent in by email. This paper provides a report-back on comments received from members, provides an update on recent developments with SNR and allows further discussion on new arrangements.

Developments since July

2. Since the last meeting there have been a number of developments. Most significantly, Local Government Yorkshire and Humber (LGYH - the regional Local Government Association) Leaders' Board has recommended to its full membership that 1 April 2009 be set as the start date for new arrangements. This recommendation was also endorsed by the Assembly's Executive Board, and will be going to the full Assembly meeting on 2 October 2008. The Assembly paper is attached as **Annex A** for your information. An update on the Assembly meeting, and the full meeting of LGYH leaders will be given at the meeting.
3. Effectively, these decisions mean that the Assembly and its associated structures, including the Regional Transport Board, will not exist after 1 April 2009. Detailed thinking about the way in which transition to new arrangements will work is now taking place, and today's meeting is an opportunity for members to inform that thinking.
4. John Marsden, Chief Executive of North Yorkshire County Council, has been identified as the Chief Executive-lead by LGYH on developing the new Transport Board. He will be working closely with Cllr Carl Minns, Leader of Hull City Council, who has been identified as the member-lead on the

development of the new Board, and Yorkshire Forward. Representatives of LGYH will be attending today's meeting to discuss emerging thinking with members and to listen to members views on how we can help ensure the new arrangements are as effective as possible. A joint paper from LGYH and Yorkshire Forward on the development of the new governance arrangements and Boards is attached as **Annex B** to assist discussion.

Transport Board Members' Previous Comments

5. A summary of the discussion on SNR at the last meeting of the Board can be found in the minutes (see Agenda Item 2). Following the meeting, two comments were received by email, raising the following additional issues (general comments relating to principles of SNR are not repeated):
 - The need for new arrangements to recognise the role of functional sub-regions (e.g. Sheffield City Region crosses into the East Midlands). This means cross-boundary collaboration between regional agencies.
 - Sheffield City Region may want the option to have Board representation from outside the Yorkshire and Humber Region.
 - The need to allow for input from sub-regions and for delegation and subsidiarity of resources and decision-making to the appropriate level.
 - Given the need for democratic accountability the Strategic Leaders' Board should have equal input and 'sign off' with Yorkshire Forward on the regional strategy – the aim being joint agreement.
 - Questions about how the 'operational support' will be given to the new Board and the preparation of the new Regional Strategy.
 - Questions about the role and remit of the thematic boards and how their work will be integrated.
 - The role of the independent board could be broadened to include a stakeholder/consultation element as part of an ongoing challenge process.

Next Steps

6. We still await Government's response to the summer consultation on taking forward SNR. However, the clear timescale for a shift to new structures that have now been agreed means that detailed thinking on new arrangements will happen quickly. Part of today's discussion may cover the process by which members believe they can best engage with this fast moving agenda.
7. Members are asked to consider this report and the report at **Annex B** and identify any key messages that they want to see LGYH/YF building into new regional arrangements.

Chris Martin, Executive Director
September 2008

**REPORT TO THE YORKSHIRE AND HUMBER
ASSEMBLY: 2 OCTOBER 2008**



**REVIEW OF SUB-NATIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND
REGENERATION (SNR) PROGRESS AND TRANSITION ISSUES**

For Decision:

Members are asked to consider activity relating to the SNR set out in this paper and agree the recommendations set out at Para 15.

Background

1. At the AGM Members considered progress to date developing regional responses to the SNR and next steps in relation to the future work of the Assembly and its transition arrangements. This report sets out the most recent position.

Government Response to the SNR consultation paper 'Prosperous Places'

2. The national consultation on SNR closed on 20 June 2008. 491 responses were received and they show:
 - Strong support for a single regional strategy;
 - Support for a duty on local authorities to undertake economic assessments;
 - Concern over a perceived democratic deficit in RDAs taking on planning functions; and
 - Concerns from business over a perceived watering down of SNR economic focus and the proposed wider role for local authorities.
3. Government was expected to give its response to the consultation in late September but had not done so at the time of writing (22 September). When published we anticipate it will:
 - Restate the key principles of SNR;
 - Set out the legislative requirements to deliver Government's agenda and an anticipated time-table; and
 - Clarify what elements will be nationally prescribed and what will be left for regional discretion.
4. We still expect that the Bill will be published later this year along with draft guidance on production of the Single Regional Strategy.

5. If the Government's response is published before this meeting an update will be tabled.

Progressing to New Regional Arrangements

6. At the last meeting of the Executive Board Members considered the latest position in relation to the transition to the new regional governance arrangements set out in the LGYH/Yorkshire Forward response to the Sub National Review (This paper was circulated at the AGM, further copies are available on the Assembly web site www.yhassembly.gov.uk).

7. At the inaugural meeting of the LGYH Strategic Leaders' Board held on 4 September the following resolution was agreed;

'The LGYH Leaders' Board is recommending to the full membership of LGYH, at its meeting to be held on 25 September 2008, that April 2009 be set as a deadline to move to the new arrangements.'

8. The Assembly Executive Board also considered this proposition and agreed to make the same recommendation to today's meeting.

Ongoing Work

Functional Boards

9. The new regional governance arrangements proposed by LGYH and Yorkshire Forward include four thematic boards – housing and regeneration, planning, transport and employment and skills.
10. It has been recognised that the Assembly Boards are key components of existing regional strategic capacity and the experience and expertise of members will be invaluable in shaping the new arrangements. Representatives from LGYH and Yorkshire Forward will be attending meetings of all three Boards in October for discussions to help inform the development of the successor bodies.

Sustainable Development Board

11. In addition to the four thematic boards Yorkshire Forward and LGYH are proposing an Independent Board to 'ensure the principles of sustainable development and economic opportunity for all are fully ingrained in the development and delivery of the Integrated Regional Strategy'.
12. To this end, the Sustainable Development Board, with input from LGYH and Yorkshire Forward are steering a small project funded by DEFRA to ensure there is an independent and effective process for challenge on sustainable development issues going forward.

Scrutiny Board

- 13.** We are waiting for further announcements on when Regional Committees will start work, and how this will be linked to regional scrutiny. Messages from Government have confirmed the importance of regional scrutiny during the transition period. The 2008/09 scrutiny programme includes a piece of 'what's worked' research to inform new arrangements.

Social Economic and Environmental Partners

- 14.** The SEE Partner Group responded independently to Government on SNR. Since then they have been working with a consultant funded by Yorkshire Forward to develop a way forward. Following a workshop held in September they have committed to continue meeting as an independent body. This new group will have a broader membership base, and would see its role to input to regional strategy development through strong linkages with the new structures via individual partners and organisation. They also anticipate a role supporting delivery and transacting business within and between the membership. Discussions are continuing about how this model may be resourced.

Recommendations

- 15.** The next key milestone will be the publication of the Government's response to the consultation. In the meantime members are asked to:
- Approve proposals to move to new arrangements from 1 April 2009;
 - Note progress to date with regarding the development of successor arrangements for the functional boards, the sustainable development board and regional scrutiny; and
 - Note the proposals of the SEE Partners regarding their future engagement.

Source Papers

Report	Location
Regional Executive Board: 10 April 2008 Sub National Review Consultation Paper – <i>Prosperous Places</i> Annual General Meeting: 26 June 2008 Review of Sub National Economic Development and Regeneration	All available from: Emma King Yorkshire and Humber Assembly 18 King Street Wakefield WF1 2SQ Tel: 01924 331590 E-mail: emma.king@yhassembly.gov.uk

Report	Location
Regional Executive Board: 4 September 2008 Assembly Transition Arrangements Review of Sub-National Economic Development and Regeneration	As previous.

Sue Jeffrey, Executive Director
September 2008



SUB NATIONAL REVIEW – DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL BOARDS

Purpose

To consult with Board members on the development of new regional boards and to provide information on the approach and timescales adopted.

1. The Joint LGYH and Yorkshire Forward response to the SNR consultation included the proposed establishment of a number of thematic regional boards, which would be commissioned by the Strategic Leaders Board (SLB) and the Yorkshire Forward Board (YFB), to input into the development of the Integrated Regional Strategy (IRS) and ensure effective delivery by monitoring and reviewing the IRS.
2. The four thematic regional boards proposed are:
 - a. **Spatial Planning** - Chaired by Local Government, Deputy Chair nominated by YFB.
 - b. **Regeneration and Housing** - Chaired by Local Government, Deputy Chair nominated by YFB.
 - c. **Work and Skills** - Chair nominated by YFB, Deputy Chair from Local Government.
 - d. **Transport** - Chair nominated by YFB, Deputy Chair from Local Government.
3. In addition to these boards, it is proposed that an Independent Board be established to ensure the principles of sustainable development and economic opportunity for all are fully ingrained in the development and delivery of the IRS. This Board would be Chaired by an independent/expert Chair to work with SLB/YFB and the thematic advisory boards and would provide expert input, and test IRS development and delivery against the principles of sustainable development, diversity and leadership, and ambition.

Development of Future Regional Boards

4. In order to develop these proposals further, leaders, chief executives, Yorkshire Forward Board members and officers have volunteered to progress this work, and a development group for each board has been established -

details of which are set out below (local authority leaders and chief executives will be supported by officers from LGYH and Yorkshire Cities).

Thematic Board	Leader	Chief Executive	YF Board Member	YF Officer
Work & Skills	Andrew Carter (Leeds)	Phil Coppard (Barnsley)	Laura Moynahan	Thea Stein
Transport	Carl Minns (Hull)	John Marsden (North Yorkshire)	Mark Kirk	John Jarvis
Spatial Planning	Steve Houghton (Barnsley)	Paul Rogerson (Leeds)	John Weighell	Simon Foy
Regeneration & Housing	Roger Stone (Rotherham)	Tony Reeves (Bradford)	Kath Pinnock	Jan Anderson

5. The development groups will consider the role, purpose and membership of the future thematic boards and the outcomes of these discussions and developments will be submitted to the new Regional Board for consideration.
6. In order to ensure the experience and learning from the existing regional boards is taken into account in the development of the new arrangements, both the boards and individual Chairs and Deputy Chairs are to be consulted. The regional board Chairs and Deputy Chairs have an important role to play in these discussions and developments and individual meetings will be held with them.
7. At the meeting key representatives from the development groups will be in attendance at the meeting to seek the views of members.

Clare Coates, Deputy Chief Executive – LGYH
September 2008

REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY 2009 UPDATE

For Decision

Members are asked:

- To note the progress on the review of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS);
- To note the forthcoming consultation on options; and
- Support the approach being taken to transport in the RSS Review.

Purpose of the 2009 Update

1. The Yorkshire and Humber Plan (RSS) was published by the Secretary of State in May this year. The Plan's strategy remains focussed on the continued transformation of the region's towns and cities. One of the key changes made by the Secretary of State to the final Plan was an increase to the housing requirements, reflecting more recent household projections.
2. The Plan's policies require that a partial review of the Plan should be undertaken by 2011 to "ensure that longer term housing growth is planned and accommodated in the most sustainable way by identifying broad locations to meet longer term development needs, considering proposals for New Growth Points and Ecotowns and other evidence".
3. This review is being focussed on issues such as infrastructure, flood risk and transport. The aim is to refine the Plan's approach and further develop the Plan's sub area strategies. This will help the region to be more effective in adapting to climate change, co-ordinating development and investment over the longer term and in dealing with the challenges presented by current RSS housing numbers in parts of the Region.
4. The Minister for Housing and Planning has also recently confirmed the need for a review to test the future housing supply ranges put forward by the National Housing and Planning Advice Unit (NHPAU), with the aim of stabilising the affordability of market housing. It is important that the NHPAU's assessment is rigorously tested by the region, in light of both the short term impact of the credit crunch, the longer term economic and social needs of the region and more recent national trend based projections of the rate of household growth in the region.

Progress to Date on the Review

5. Over the last four months, consultation has been undertaken on the draft *Project Plan* agreed by the Regional Planning Board, which sets out the context, work and timetable for the RSS 2009 Update. It also includes a public consultation and engagement programme. A final Project Plan has been agreed by the Planning Board and is being submitted to Government Office.
6. Following an earlier steer from the Regional Executive Board that the RSS Update should test all possible options for accommodating future growth in the Region, a *Call for Evidence* document was issued for consultation in May. Over 90 responses were received allowing an early surfacing of views and ideas as to how and where the Region should accommodate future development. The 'detail' of the responses to the Call for Evidence is being picked up in the options work for the RSS Update, alongside work on the evidence base for the review.

Next Stage

7. During September 2008 we have drawn together the evidence base work to identify options. These have been discussed and tested with the Regional Planning and Transport Forums and the Planning Board's Technical Advisory Group. The next stage in the RSS 2009 Update is to produce an options consultation document. The Regional Planning Board will consider the Options at their meeting on 21 October 2008. Following Board approval, consultation and engagement on the Options will run from 3 November 2008 to 2 January 2009. It is proposed that the options will focus on:
 - The overall scale of housing growth in the region – testing the NHPAU's assessment and reflecting on current market conditions;
 - The distribution of housing growth across the region; and
 - Longer-term choices and opportunities for accommodating growth (examining how long the current approach can last for in different parts of the region and whether/how the approach needs to be evolved).

Transport Considerations

8. As reported at the last Board meeting a more pro-active approach is being taken to transport in the RSS review – so that transport is being considered alongside other factors such as flood risk in identifying opportunities. This will help improve integration between development and transport policy and investment.
9. Following recommendations made by Arup, in a study into how to use transport constraints and opportunities to aid identifying areas for growth, and discussions with the Regional Transport Officers' Group the following data has been collected and mapped:

- High and medium frequency and other key bus services, based on a mix of local and national data sources.
- The rail network and stations, and (simple distance only) access to all the stations.
- AM peak rail passenger service frequencies (concentrating on the peak direction).
- AM peak rail route capacity utilisation index, based on data supplied by Network Rail. The capacity utilisation depends on physical and signalling characteristics of the lines and service timetabling.
- Road networks - excluding local (e.g. housing estate) roads
- Annual Average Daily Flow (AADF) for the main through routes using information obtained from DfT. Arup recommended mapping peak hour traffic flows; unfortunately, we were unable to obtain consistent data.
- Road traffic speed and congestion information (though it has not been possible to map all the data yet).
- Network stress for the strategic road network, provided by the Highways Agency
- Travel to Work information from the 2001 Census (further analysis of this is planned).

10. Arup also suggested that it would be useful to have information on train overcrowding. Unfortunately this is difficult to use as overcrowding depends on the class and formation of trains in use, which can vary from day to day. The data confirms observations that most local services in the AM peak into the main cities have some level of overcrowding.

Options Development

11. A two-stage approach is being used to identify and develop options. The first stage has identified possible opportunity areas for growth by looking at a series of strategic considerations focussing on public transport services (both rail and bus) presented as key transport corridors, key environmental assets and flood risk.

12. The approach of focussing initially on public transport corridors or areas into which public transport could readily be expanded further develops the emphasis placed on this in the current RSS. It also ties in with the findings of the Low Carbon Transport Study and the challenges identified in the Integrated Regional Framework.

13. Other transport considerations and studies are being taken into account and will continue to be looked as part of a second "reviewing" stage of the options and opportunities. The transport data would also be used together with information on planned transport improvements to identify gaps in the provision of transport infrastructure and hence likely requirements for future investment.

Recommendation: The Board is asked to support the approach being taken to transport in the RSS Review.

Options Consultation

14. Four sub-regional events are being held to explain and discuss the Spatial Options. They are open to everyone, including elected members and the public. The events will consist of presentations, discussions and hands-on workshops during the day. For those that cannot attend during the day, there will be an open drop-in information session in the evening. Board members should already have received an invitation to the events which are as follows:

- 11 November – York, National Centre for Early Music
- 13 November – Hull, Octagon Centre
- 18 November – Sheffield, Megacentre
- 20 November – Leeds, Marriott Hotel

15. Members will also receive an invitation to a region-wide event being held on the 4 November 2008 in York, which will reflect on the findings from the four sub-regional events.

Source Papers

16. Past reports on this subject are available as follows:

Report	Location
Regional Transport Board: 30 November 2007 Achieving Low Carbon and Sustainable Transport Systems in Yorkshire and Humber	Available from: Hannah Madajewski Yorkshire and Humber Assembly 18 King Street Wakefield WF1 2SQ Tel: 01924 331560 E-mail: Hannah.Madajewski@yhassembly.gov.uk
Regional Executive Board: 13 March 2008 Eco Towns, Growth Locations and the RSS Review	
Regional Transport Board: 4 April 2008 RSS Review Project Plan and Transport Work	
Regional Planning Board: 8 April 2008 RSS Review Project Plan	

Report	Location
Regional Transport Board: 25 July 2008 Yorkshire and Humber Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy) 2009 Update	As previous.

Richard Wood, Head of Planning Strategy/Stuart Clewlow, Transport Policy
Manager
1 October 2008

PROGRESS ON RFA2 AND PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT

For Decision

Members are asked to:

- Endorse the work plan for delivering the review of the Regional Funding Allocation for Transport – RFA2 (see Recommendation 1);
- Urge all local authorities with schemes in the RFA programme to forward key monitoring data to GOYH (see Recommendation 2);
- Increase the over-programming to 20% over the period to 2018/19 in line with DfT guidance on over-programming for RFA2 (see Recommendation 3);
- Agree that a 'stock-take' of highways maintenance schemes which qualify for funding from the 'major schemes' allocation will be reported to the Board in December (see Recommendation 4); and
- Agree that published DfT guidance on 'packages' of proposals should be followed when making submissions and note that the 'package' will be assessed as a whole (see Recommendation 5).

Background

1. At its meeting on 25 July the Board recommended that a full review of the programme of Regional Funding Allocations for transport should be carried out – extending the programme to 2019. At the time of the meeting the DfT had not issued guidance on the review, but this was published on 30 July.

Progress on the Review (RFA2)

2. The official DfT guidance endorsed the assumptions that had been made by officers in drafting Agenda Item 6 on the Board's July agenda. The key area where DfT guidance requires a new approach to programming is that in line with the Department's own new approach to transport planning, regions are encouraged to think about the period after 2014 in terms of prioritising "problems to be addressed" rather than as specific scheme-based solutions.
3. Since the Board's July meeting officers have taken a number of steps towards preparing the technical advice that the Board will require to identify its funding priorities. A timetable for the overall work plan is attached as **Annex A**.
4. As was reported to the Board in July, work has started on developing a "Strategic Prioritisation Framework" to identify where transport investments

should be focused, with the aim of providing greater spatial guidance than is given by the priority outcomes set out in Table 13.24 in the Regional Spatial Strategy. This is reported further at **Agenda Item 6b**.

5. The consultants who are working on the Prioritisation Framework are also carrying out a refresh of the assessment methodology in the light of developments in regional and national policy since the 2005 review. This is also reported further at Agenda Item 6b.
6. A letter was issued on 14 August to promoters of schemes in the RFA and to all potential sponsors of new schemes. This summarised the new guidance, outlined the work being carried out by the Assembly and Yorkshire Forward to carry out the review, and published the overall timetable for the work. It is understood that scheme submissions from authorities in city regions may be submitted as prioritised city region bids. This will assist the process of identifying overall priorities.
7. This was followed on 22 August by a letter to all potential sponsors which set out the detailed requirements for submitting bids for the review. For some schemes in the programme which are at or near Full Approval it will only be necessary to submit details of costs and progress on scheme delivery. On 9 September the promoters of schemes in this category were advised that they should only submit the information on costs and progress.
8. In the week commencing 22 September, a leaflet was sent to all scheme promoters summarising the principal changes to regional and transport policy (since 2005) which will inform the review of assessment methodology.
9. 10 October is the cut-off date for submitting detailed bids for schemes in RFA2. Promoters of post-2014 proposals have until 7 November to prepare their submissions.
10. The Officer Task Group met in August and September to advise on the preparation of the Board's papers. The Group will continue to meet throughout the process to provide guidance to the work. Officers on the Group have been full sent copies of the technical papers which are being presented to the Board.

Recommendation 1: the work plan for delivering RFA2 as summarised in the timetable at Annex A, should be endorsed.

Programme Management

11. At the July meeting of the Board, a new approach to monitoring and managing the schemes in the RFA programme was presented to Members. This proposed that a progress chart should be filled in by all scheme sponsors, giving realistic timescales for a number of key milestones drawn from a list of the standard milestones used for scheme management. This would enable

the Board to be given more complete reports on the progress of schemes than has been possible to date, and enable the Board to take a more active role in managing the programme of schemes.

12. The recommendations in that report have now been put into practice and all local authorities have been asked by GOYH to supply the key milestones for their schemes. As yet not all authorities have responded to this request. They will be sent a reminder and if necessary GOYH will visit authorities where there are outstanding data requests. A full report on the introduction of the new monitoring system will be presented to the Board in December.
13. A report will also be brought to the December meeting on the up-to-date expenditure figures on schemes in the RFA programme. The next quarterly round of local authority information is due at GOYH in the third week in October. When considered together with a decision on the scale of over-programming to be adopted, this will define the amount of funding available for allocation to new priority schemes.

Recommendation 2: that all local authorities with schemes in the RFA programme be urged to forward key monitoring data to GOYH to enable a detailed report on progress to be brought to the December meeting of the Board.

'Over-Programming'

14. Board members have accepted the general principle of over-programming and currently the total value of schemes in the programme now exceeds the total allocation over the period to 2015/16 by 8.7%. This includes the schemes added to the programme in July 2008 and the increased cost of the Cudworth and West Green Bypass in Barnsley.
15. DfT have now provided specific advice on over-programming in RFA2. The Department will allow 20% over-programming. It will be possible to calculate the "new money" available for RFA2 when we have more up-to-date cost reports for the existing programme. This will be reported to the Board in December.

Recommendation 3: we should follow DfT recommendations on over-programming for RFA2.

Treatment of "Exceptional Maintenance" Schemes

16. At the Board's meeting in April 2008, members considered bids for "Exceptional Maintenance Schemes". Three schemes were recommended for inclusion in the programme but it was agreed that formal criteria for considering maintenance schemes should be developed for the review of RFA. Members felt that it was important that they had the full picture in relation to exceptional maintenance schemes and it was agreed that a 'stock-take' should

be undertaken of these schemes across the Region.

17. DfT no longer refer to these schemes as “Exceptional” and guidance on RFA2 notes that they have been transferred from the highways maintenance allocation to the majors funding stream.
18. Local authorities have been asked to supply details of highways maintenance schemes which they consider eligible for RFA support and a report on the scale of the bids for RFA will be prepared for the Board’s meeting in December.

Recommendation 4: A further report will be prepared for the December meeting of the Board to set out the scale of the demand for funding for highways maintenance schemes from the “major schemes” allocation.

Treatment of Packages of Schemes

19. At previous meetings, the Board has debated the extent to which scheme promoters should put forward ‘packages’ of schemes to deliver priority outcomes and whether the Board should issue guidance on this. The key point is that after the Board gives support to an intervention, the next stage is to secure approval from the Department, so DfT guidance is critical. It is therefore suggested that, rather than developing our own guidance on packages, promoters should follow published DfT guidance on this issue. In that context, the scheme/intervention submitted (or proposed for future submission) will be assessed as a whole, rather than inviting the Board to cherry pick among its different elements.

Recommendation 5: It is recommended that the Board should consider packages of interventions as a single bid and that scheme promoters be advised to follow DfT guidance on submitting packages of schemes.

Source Papers

20. Past reports on this subject are available as follows:

Report	Location
<p>Regional Transport Board: 25 July 2008 Planning for a full review of the Regional Funding Allocation for Transport</p> <p>Regional Transport Board: 25 July 2008 Managing the Programme of Major Schemes Funded from the Regional Funding Allocation</p>	<p>Available from:</p> <p>Hannah Madajewski Yorkshire and Humber Assembly 18 King Street Wakefield WF1 2SQ Tel: 01924 331560 E-mail: Hannah.Madajewski@yhassembly.gov.uk</p>

Michael Padgett, Transport Advisor
 29 September 2008

RFA2 – TIMETABLE (FOR TRANSPORT ELEMENT)

Date	Meeting	Process/Step
25 July	Regional Transport Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Start RFA2 review
26 September	RFA Task Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider recommendations for 10 October RTB
10 October	Regional Transport Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider changes to assessment methodology Consider options for virement between major schemes/ Integrated Block/highways maintenance Consider possible top-slicing for local schemes Consider emerging "Prioritisation Framework" Agree approach to over-programming Consider approach to capitalised maintenance schemes
10 October		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cut-off date for submission of scheme details and outlines of "problems" to be addressed post-2014
November?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review meeting with DfT officials
7 November		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cut-off date for submitting detailed cases for cost envelopes for problems to be addressed post-2014
25 November	Assembly officers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meetings with senior local authority officers
End November		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultants complete assessments of identified schemes
2 December	RFA Officer Task Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider initial recommendations to Transport Board
9 December	Regional Transport Forum	
12 December	Regional Transport Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider draft officer recommendations on specific schemes and review bids for post-2014 proposals
7 January	RFA Task Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider final recommendations to Transport Board
23 January 2009	Regional Transport Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree final recommendations on Transport RFA
February		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Region to agree "across the board" RFA advice
End February		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Region to submit final advice to Regional Minister

REFRESHING THE RFA ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY AND CRITERIA

For Decision

Members are asked to:

- Support the adoption of a more focused approach to assessing the “policy fit” of interventions submitted to the Board in RFA2, and also recognise the value of smaller, local schemes (see Recommendation 1);
- Support proposals for addressing wider regional objectives in the assessment of interventions and the use of a Prioritisation Framework to inform this (see Recommendation 2);
- Support the use of DfT criteria for assessing value for money when assessing interventions (see Recommendation 3); and
- Support the development of guidance on the deliverability of interventions based on current work to improve monitoring of schemes across the Region (see Recommendation 4).

Introduction

1. At the Board's meeting on 25 July it was agreed that a report be brought to this meeting of the Board with specific proposals for the assessment methodology that we shall use to assess schemes in RFA2.
2. The consultants who are providing technical support for the RFA review (Steer Davies Gleave - SDG) will be making a presentation on their proposals to update the methodology used previously for RFA1 in 2005 and used also in an adapted form by the Board for the interim review of RFA earlier this year. SDG's update has been prepared in the light of Government guidance and changes to transport policies since RFA1. A full copy of SDG's technical paper will be circulated to Board Members in advance of the meeting.

Methodology

3. The basic approach to prioritising schemes will follow that adopted for the first review, in Autumn 2005. However, the process will first establish a shortlist of eligible schemes and then carry out full assessments to produce a set of recommended priorities.
4. The cut-off date for the submission of scheme Business Cases by scheme promoters is 10 October 2008. Each scheme will be checked to ensure that is eligible for RFA support and will then have an initial assessment of its policy

fit, value for money and deliverability. This first sift will identify some schemes where further clarification will be sought from scheme promoters.

5. Once a full set of information on the remaining schemes is available, they will be re-assessed and prioritised to produce a set of recommendations to the Board. This will be supported by advice on the best funding profile to deliver the priority schemes within the available funding envelope.
6. **Policy fit** is the key issue for prioritisation because we are working to identify the proposals that will best deliver regional objectives. As with the previous RFA work, the main areas of policy consideration are the economy, the environment and social equity. It is proposed that a more focused approach will be adopted – using eight indicators under the three policy areas rather than fifteen as previously. Government advice on RFA2 has highlighted the importance of reducing carbon emissions as a particular issue for the environmental assessment, although the advice itself offers little real guidance on how this should be done.
7. Members have previously commented on the difficulty of comparing locally-important schemes with schemes which have a clear regional impact. The “policy fit” stage of the methodology will take full account of the value of the smaller and local schemes by assessing their performance against local objectives - without requiring an emphasis on their impact on regional objectives.

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that assessment of the “policy fit” of proposals submitted to the Board should be more focused and should recognise the value of smaller, local schemes.

8. In order to address wider regional objectives, we have identified the key regional and national policy documents that provide the policy context for RFA2. Further guidance on policy fit will be provided by the “Strategic Prioritisation Framework” which is being developed by the Assembly and Yorkshire Forward to guide the RFA2 advice to 2018/19 and regional transport funding beyond 2018/19. As was reported to the Board in July, Yorkshire Forward have appointed Steer Davies Gleave on a long-term basis to develop a better regional evidence base for transport and there will be a presentation at this meeting by SDG to outline progress to date and also to indicate how the Framework will be able to inform the RFA review.

Recommendation 2: It is recommended that the outline Prioritisation Framework be used to inform the “policy fit” of proposals submitted to the Board in RFA2.

9. **Value for Money** will again be a specific criterion but the aim is to provide an indication of the risk attached to each scheme’s Value for Money - after considering how well the scheme fits the DfT’s own criteria and method of calculation. The specific risk is that the scheme will not meet the DfT funding

criteria for Value for Money.

Recommendation 3: It is recommended that Value for Money should be assessed using DfT criteria, with an indication of the risk that this may not be achieved.

10. We shall give more emphasis to **deliverability** when considering new scheme bids, given the underspending that has arisen in the early years of the programme. We now have a more structured approach to assessing deliverability with the new monitoring system. The systematic collection of indicators of progress for both existing and proposed schemes will allow deliverability to be assessed across the programme. The Board will also be given an indication of the risk associated with costs going up or down and also an assessment of the risk of the scheme falling behind its planned schedule.
11. For the **post-2014 programme** it will be necessary to take a different approach as there will not be the information on costs and benefits which is required for assessing detailed scheme proposals. It will be necessary to interpret DfT guidance on RFA2 in the light of the DfT's current development of transport policy. Government is developing a new approach to programme development (*Towards a Sustainable Transport System - TaSTS*) which places greater emphasis on problem identification and objective setting.
12. This implies that advice to Government for the period after 2014 should be in the form of 'priority outputs' that have the potential to deliver regional objectives and policies, rather than specific scheme. For example, it might identify a corridor where transport improvements are required to support priority objectives but without specifying the type of scheme to be developed. Future reviews of RFA will include more specific proposals for these priorities as they are developed in detail. This will enable the Eddington/TaSTS approach to scheme development to be followed.

Recommendation 4: It is recommended that advice to the Board on deliverability should be informed by current work in the Region to improve monitoring of performance.

Source Papers

13. Past reports on this subject are available as follows:

Report	Location
Regional Transport Board: 25 July 2008 Planning for a Full Review of the Regional Funding Allocation for Transport	Available from: Hannah Madajewski Yorkshire and Humber Assembly 18 King Street Wakefield WF1 2SQ Tel: 01924 331560 E-mail: Hannah.Madajewski@yhassembly.gov.uk

Michael Padgett, Transport Advisor
29 September 200

INITIAL PROPOSALS FOR THE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT BLOCK AND HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE

For Decision

Members are asked to:

- Consider possible changes to the distribution of Regional Funding Allocation for Transport between major schemes, minor schemes and highways maintenance (see Recommendation 1); and
- Agree that a further report should be brought to the December meeting of the Board on options for revising the highways maintenance block (see Recommendation 2).

Introduction

1. The original RFA advice from the Region covered major schemes (>£5m) only. Government guidance on preparing advice on the 2008 review (RFA2) significantly extends that remit. It indicates that regions may advise both on the balance of their proposed programmes between major schemes, integrated transport (i.e. the funding for <£5m schemes) and highways maintenance, and also on the distribution of the integrated transport and maintenance funding blocks between individual local authorities.
2. At the Board's meeting on 25 July it was agreed that a report should be brought to this meeting to inform the Board's approach to developing advice to Government on the two additional spending blocks.
3. The consultants who are providing technical support for the RFA review (SDG) will be making a presentation on the options available to the Board.

Possible New Approaches to Integrated Transport and Highways Maintenance

4. At the present time local authorities receive funding for "minor" works (below £5m) to support transport from allocations of integrated transport block. This is driven by a formula-based approach. This allocates funding to local authorities on the basis of public transport (30%), congestion (25%), road safety (20%), accessibility (20%) and pollution (5%). At present there is a degree of inter-authority competition where "performance" is assessed as part of the LTP (Local Transport Plan) process.

5. Funding for highways maintenance is also currently allocated by formula, but with a number of adjustments for specific areas of work such as structures. Both the integrated transport and maintenance blocks are fixed until 2010/11 by the current three-year transport settlement.
6. DfT have now provided an indicative level of RFA block funding for the period to 2018/19 which has a total single figure covering all three transport headings after 2011/12. Regions can now propose changes to the balance of funding between the three headings (major schemes/minor schemes/highways maintenance) and also advise on the distribution of funding to individual authorities.
7. DfT's idea is that including these additional areas of spend in the RFA should enable regions to make some strategic judgments about how transport funding should be best allocated in support of the regional strategy. DfT also want to improve alignment between the regional strategy and the Local Transport Plans which are the main vehicle for delivery of transport policy.
8. The consultants who are supporting this work will be making a short presentation on possible options for the integrated transport block. It is clear that of the options considered, each has advantages and disadvantages and also some options may create sets of "winners and losers" among individual local authorities if the option were adopted.
9. The options which have been considered by officers include the following:
 - A. **Do-minimum** - This would retain the current allocations between major and minor schemes by using the formula-based approach. However, the "performance" factors would disappear after 2011/12.
 - B. **Change the distribution of block funding** - This could mean changing the % allocated to each sub-heading under the DfT formula, or changing the distribution between local authorities in Yorkshire & Humber.
 - C. **Vire funding to the RFA for major schemes** from the integrated transport block/ highways maintenance. This would create more headroom for allocation to priority schemes in RFA2.
 - D. **Vire funding to the integrated transport block/highways maintenance** from RFA for major schemes. This would give more resources to individual local authorities to carry out their programmes of small major schemes and packages.
 - E. **Top-slice funding from the RFA** to create a special fund for relatively small (but still defined as 'major') schemes. This is one way of addressing the problems created by the major schemes threshold being held at £5m for many years.
 - F. **Vire between major schemes and the other headings** (integrated transport/ highways maintenance) to maintain spending year-by-year. This would in theory make it possible to address slippage by bringing in smaller schemes at short notice. However, it would require a significant degree of regional control over the RFA budget that does not exist at

present.

Shortlisting a Preferred Option

10. The options have been considered by the officer Task Group and their recommendation is that Option A ('do-minimum') should be adopted for RFA2. This has the advantage of maintaining the maximum flexibility for addressing regional priorities without taking resources away from individual authorities that they have gained via their LTP submissions. As noted in Item 6b the assessment methodology for prioritising schemes is being developed to recognise the value of local and smaller schemes that fall into the 'major schemes' definition (i.e. >£5m). This will mean that the full "pool" of major schemes funding left as a result of choosing the 'do-minimum' option will be available to support a prioritised programme that can cover major schemes of differing scales – small as well as large.
11. There was no support amongst officers on the Task Group for the virement options and the aims of Option E (top-slicing) should be addressed by recognising smaller schemes in the methodology (as noted above). Option F (which would adjust the programme on a continuous basis) would not appear to be practicable – particularly in terms of the need to "claw back" monies vired to either the integrated block or highways maintenance as a means of addressing under-performance in the major schemes programme.
 - **Recommendation 1: It is recommended that with regard to viring funds between headings (major schemes/ integrated block/ highways maintenance) the 'do-minimum' approach should be adopted. This would move towards basing allocations on the DfT's formula – without adjustments.**
12. With regard to making changes within the highways maintenance allocation, it has not been possible to present options in this paper as a meeting of officers who deal with highways maintenance was planned for 3 October 2008.
 - **Recommendation 2: It is recommended that a further report be brought to the Board regarding options for revising the distribution of the highways maintenance block.**
13. Past reports on this subject are available as follows:

Report	Location
Regional Transport Board: 25 July 2008 Planning for a Full Review of the Regional Funding Allocation for Transport	Available from: Hannah Madajewski Yorkshire and Humber Assembly 18 King Street Wakefield WF1 2SQ Tel: 01924 331560 E-mail: Hannah.Madajewski@yhassembly.gov.uk

Michael Padgett, Transport Advisor
29 September 2008