



## TRANSPORT SCOTLAND DIRECTORS' BOARD MEETING

### MINUTES OF MEETING HELD IN BUCHANAN HOUSE, GLASGOW AT 10AM ON MONDAY, 19 FEBRUARY 2007

<b>Present:</b>	Malcolm Reed	Chief Executive
	Jim Barton	Director of Trunk Roads Network Management
	Guy Houston	Director of Finance & Corporate Services
	John Howison	Director of Trunk Roads: Infrastructure & Professional Services
	Bill Reeve	Director of Rail Delivery
	Lucy Adamson	Head of Communications
	Jacqueline Redmond	Non-Executive Director
	Ainslie McLaughlin	Head of TR:IPS Special Projects Team
	Janet Egdell	Head of Strategy & Policy Integration
<b>In Attendance:</b>	Angus Macleod	PS/Transport Scotland
	Claire Dunbar-Jubb	Head of Corporate Finance ( <i>For Agenda Item 2 only</i> )
	Jim Berryman	Corporate Finance ( <i>For Agenda Item 2 only</i> )
	Anne Martin	Rail Regulation & Standards ( <i>For Agenda Item 3 only</i> )

#### Apologies

1. Frances Duffy was on leave and Iain Docherty was out of the country on business.

#### Agenda Item 1: Minutes of Previous Meeting and Matters Arising

2. The minutes of the meeting held on 19 January (TSDB(07)1<sup>st</sup> Conclusions) were approved.

## **Matters Arising**

### *Network Output Programme (NOP)*

3. **The Directors' Board agreed** that it would be helpful to see a timetable of key milestones for the NOP at the next Board meeting to ensure that the dates for decisions being taken left sufficient time to carry out any related processes, such as procurement. **(Action: Janet Egdell to provide Board with timetable for March meeting).**

### *Quarterly Review Report*

4. *Part of the record of discussion under this agenda item is considered exempt from publication at this time and has been redacted.*

### **Agenda Item 2: Executive Board Pack (Paper TSDB(07)03)**

5. Jim Berryman introduced paper TSDB(07)03 which gave the Board the latest summary of the key issues in the agency for February 2007. There had been some formatting changes to the pack and there was some additional information in light of comments made at the previous meeting.

6. In discussion the following points were made:

#### **6.1 Format of the pack**

(a) The front page summary included the figures for the number of Partnership Agreement (PA) commitments at red, amber or green status, but there was no further detail of what these commitments were or why they were not on track. Whilst the Board would not want to discuss every commitment at every meeting, it would be helpful to have more detail on those that were in danger of not being met. There were currently no commitments at red status and the 5 at amber status were all related to major projects which were discussed elsewhere in the pack;

(b) Given the Parliamentary elections were taking place in May, it would be advisable for the Board to discuss the status of those PA commitments that the agency was leading on at the next meeting;

(c) The table on 'Other Projects progress' (table 2(d)) included a lot of information, but rather than there being too much, some of the projects could actually need more details supplied;

(d) The risk matrix in annex C should be discussed by the Board as it was responsible for the management of risk rather than the Audit Committee. However, the current version was not as helpful as it needed to be.

## 6.2 Concessionary Fares

- (a) The situation with the contractor and sub-contractor for the security modules had been resolved. The target to roll-out the electronic ticketing machines from mid-2007 would therefore be met;
- (b) Integrated ticketing and concessionary fares were not currently covered by any of the existing investment decision-making (IDM) bodies in the agency and such a group was needed to take key decisions around the project. Guy Houston, Jim Barton and Claire Dunbar-Jubb should be the standing members.

## 6.3 Waverley Station Redevelopment

- (a) The Balmoral Hotel had objected to the planned redevelopment of the Waverley Steps. There was no scheme that met the necessary planning consents that would be acceptable to the Hotel management, which meant that there would need to be a revised scope for the project;
- (b) 95% of the station redevelopment would be completed on time and within budget, the project was therefore still considered to be on course.

## 6.4 Legal Resources

- (a) Tenders were due to be submitted to the Office of the Solicitor to the Scottish Executive (OSSE) to carry out the backlog of legal work around the major trunk road projects. A number of firms were known to be preparing bids;
- (b) OSSE had appointed a member of staff to deal with Transport Scotland's requirements which would also help reduce the backlog of legal work.

## 6.5 M74 Completion Project

- (a) The joint venture consortium had written to Transport Scotland with a positive response to the tender process, which meant that tenders were likely to be submitted in July.

## 6.6 Major Rail projects

- (a) The Edinburgh Airport Rail Link (EARL) and the Airdrie to Bathgate Bills were approaching their final stages in the Parliamentary process. The Airdrie to Bathgate project was being objected to by a local fishing club, although Network Rail's position was legally sound. The EARL Bill had received a favourable report from the Bill Committee;
- (b) The Borders Rail project was unlikely to meet its deadline for completion by December 2011 unless there was an accelerated process. There were issues with the Borders Rail partnership not using its powers effectively which meant that the project may experience delays.

## 6.7 Finance

- (a) Whilst the budget was still forecast to be £11 million over, this hid a number of significant changes within different budget lines, such as an underspend on rail following a rebate from Network Rail. There would also be an underspend on smartcards, which would have an impact on next year's budget as the procurement of the equipment would take place in 2007-08;
- (b) Some of the changes in the budget were due to factors that either were, or should have been, anticipated, but hadn't been factored into previous forecasts. The different finance teams within Transport Scotland needed to make Corporate Finance aware of such factors as early as possible to make forecasts as accurate as possible.

## 6.8 Communications

7. *Part of the record of discussion under this agenda item is considered exempt from publication at this time and has been redacted.*

- (a) Coverage of the announcement of the Forth Replacement Crossing had gone well.

8. **The Directors' Board agreed that:**

- (a) An integrated ticketing IDM should be established. (**Action: Guy Houston**);
- (b) The 'Other Projects progress' table was a useful management tool and should include more detail for some projects. (**Action: Jim Berryman**); and
- (c) The Road and Rail Finance teams needed to inform the Corporate Finance team of any factors that would affect the budget forecast as soon as they became aware of them. (**Action: John Howison/Bill Reeve and TR:IPS/Rail Delivery**)

### **Agenda Item 3: Equal Opportunities for Disable (Paper TSDB(07)04)**

9. Anne Martin introduced paper TSDB(07)04 which informed the Board about the commitments made in response to the Parliamentary Equal Opportunities Committee Disability Inquiry. Transport Scotland had a duty to actively consider ways to ensure disabled people were treated equally and also to ensure that external contractors worked within that duty. There were a number of ongoing actions to fulfil the duty, such as the training for staff, the use of Equality Impact Assessments and the involvement of groups such as the Mobility and Access Committee for Scotland (MACS). Directors would need to take the duty into account when drafting business plans for the next year.

10. In discussion the following points were made:

- (a) Transport Scotland's duties in this area would need to be highlighted to staff, one possibility was using the next monthly managers forum. Given the need to actively consider disabled access, it may also be worthwhile to make sure this was included in the Investment Decision-Making (IDM) checklist that needed to be

completed as part of the process of managing projects;

(b) Transport Scotland would need to show that it was, at the very least, in the process of carrying out its commitments; and

(c) Staff had had the opportunity to attend awareness-raising seminars in November 2006, but there would need to be more detailed and specialised training for staff in certain roles.

11. **The Directors' Board noted** the response to the Disability Inquiry and **agreed** that:

(a) Relevant actions should be included in the Business Plans for 2007-08. (**all Directors**);

(b) Disability access should be included in the IDM checklist. (**Action: PS/Transport Scotland and Strategy & Investment**); and

(c) Research should be done on what training was available and who needed to have done the training. (**Action: Anne Martin and Dougie Andrews**).

**PS/Transport Scotland**

February 2007