

## Board Meeting Agenda

Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> July 2024, 1400 to 1600.

Location: Virtual

1	<b>Welcome, apologies and introductions</b> – Allan Creedy	14:00
2	<b>Governance and election of Chair and Vice Chair</b> – Allan Creedy <b>Nomination of SIP Project Board executive</b>	14:10
3	<b>Minutes and actions from the previous meeting</b> – Chair (See <b>Appendix 1</b> below)	14:20
4	<b>Public Participation – Chair</b> <b>(Paper circulated separately to Board members)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions or Representations from members of the public in line with the Board’s Public Participation Scheme.</li> </ul>	14:25
5	<b>Updates from Associate Members – in addition to written updates, verbal updates from those attending where relevant.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DfT – David Glinos – <b>Verbal Update</b></li> <li>• Network Rail – Matt Haywood <b>Paper H</b></li> <li>• National Highways – Alice Darley <b>Paper G</b></li> </ul>	14:30
6	<b>Revised business Plan 24/25 sign off</b> – James White <b>Paper A</b>	14:45
7	<b>Strategic Investment Plan Update</b> – Hannah Fountain <b>Paper B</b>	14:55
8	<b>Strategic Cycle Network</b> – Hannah Fountain <b>Paper E</b>	15:05
9	<b>Rail Strategy</b> – James White <b>Paper C</b>	15:15
10	<b>Work Programme <u>Paper D</u> and Financial Update</b> – Mena Abidakun <b>Paper F</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural Mobility – Hannah Fountain</li> <li>• Coach – Hannah Fountain</li> <li>• Decarbonisation policy Playbook – Hannah Fountain/Hattie James</li> <li>• Alternative Fuels for Freight – Hattie James</li> <li>• EV Charging – Hattie James</li> <li>• Freight Strategy – James White/Hattie James</li> <li>• Regional Centre of Excellence – James White</li> </ul>	15:25
11	<b>Formal decisions/votes for meeting</b> - Chair	15:45
12	<b>Communications and Engagement Lead Procurement</b> – Mena Abidakun <b>Communications and Stakeholder Engagement Update 2024/25</b> - Arina Salhotra/Jess Holroyd <b>Paper I</b>	15:50
13	<b>AoB</b> - Reflections on General Election	15:55

Date of next meeting: Weds 2<sup>nd</sup> October, 14:00 – 16:00, face to face – venue tbc

**APPENDIX ONE - Draft Minutes and Actions from the Board meeting**Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> March, 14:00 -16:00

Location: County Hall, BytheSea Road, Trowbridge, Wiltshire, BA14 8JQ

<b>Attendees:</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Cllr David Gray	Gloucestershire County Council (DR)
Cllr Don Alexander	Bristol City Council (in person) (DA)
Cllr Hannah Young	North Somerset Council (HY)
Cllr Chris Willmore	South Gloucestershire Council (in person) (CW)
Cllr Caroline Thomas	Wiltshire Council (in person) (CT)
Cllr Vikki Slade	Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole (BCP) (in person) (VS)
Andrew Whitehead	South Gloucestershire Council (in person) (AW)
Orlagh Stoner	Gloucestershire County Council (in person) (OS)
Pam Turton	Bath and North East Somerset Council (PT)
James White	Western Gateway STB (in person) (JW)
Arina Salhotra	Sphere Marketing (in person) (AS)
Michaela Bushell	Sphere Marketing (online) (MB)
Alice Darley	National Highways (in person) (AD)
Colin Chick	Gloucestershire County Council (via Teams) (CC)
Matt Haywood	Network Rail (joining online) (MH)
Jack Wiltshire	Dorset Council (joining online) (JW)
Simon Chapman	National Highways (SC)
Hannah Fountain	Western Gateway STB (in person) (HF)
Jessica Holroyd	Western Gateway STB (in person) (JRH)
Matt Palmer	South Gloucestershire Council (MP)
Cllr Manda Rigby	Bath & North East Somerset (MR)
Samantha Howell	Wiltshire Council (in person) (SH)
Julian McLaughlin	Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole (BCP) (in person) (JM)
Martin Aldam	Wiltshire Council (in person) (MA)
Louise McBride	West of England Combined Authority (LM)
Ross Burton	Department for Transport (RB)
Mena Abidakun	Western Gateway STB (in person) (MAB)
Tamara Reay	Wiltshire Council (in person) (TR)
David Redgewell	South West Transport Network & Rail future Severnside (DR)
Jaime Rockhill	Network Rail (joining online) (JH)
<b>Apologies were received from:</b>	
Dan Taylor (Ross Burton to stand in)	Department for Transport
Cllr Sarah Warren	Bath North East Somerset
Bill Davies	West of England Combined Authority

Cllr Noc Lacey-Clarke	Dorset Council
Allan Creedy	Wiltshire Council
David Glinos	Department for Transport
Nigel Riglar (Emma Blackham to stand in)	South Gloucestershire Council

Actions	Allocated to	Target Date:
HF to provide David with some more information on the coach network and cc in Cllr Alexander and Cllr Willmore.	HF	22/03/2024
RB to report back on disability access with regards to Coach travel	RB	12/06/2024

DATE	KEY DECISIONS	STATUS:
13/03/24	The Board noted and approved the finance report.	Approved
13/03/24	The Board approved the STP draft	Approved
13/03/24	The Board noted and approved the Business Plan.	Approved
13/03/24	The Board approved the £20,000 contribution from each authority for the next financial year 2024/25	Approved
13/03/24	The Board noted and approved the Forward Decision Plan.	Approved

Item No	Notes / Actions
1	<b>Welcome, apologies and introductions</b>
2.	<b>Minutes and actions from the previous meeting</b>  The Board approved the minutes and actions of the previous meeting.  Louise McBride to be added to attendee list of previous Board meeting.
3	<b>Public Participation</b>  David Batho sent in a written question so the Board have provided a written answer.  Question from DR: Wants to know what discussions are happening with link between Bristol to Bournemouth - where are discussions with MegaBus, DfT, Scottish City link and FlixBus and National Express? Need a working party with Peninsula to improve the coach network in the region.  DA: There is a strong North-South link theme coming through in our STP and there are several weaker modes in that area. There is a whole area there to be discussed in relation to coach.  HF: I am the lead and I can provide some bits of information to David.  DA: Hannah will reply to David and cc in Cllr Alexander.  CW: Please can I be copied in that reply.

	<p><b>Action:</b> Hannah to provide David with some more information on the coach network and cc in Cllr Alexander and Willmore.</p>
4	<p><b>Updates from Associate Members</b></p> <p><b>Matt Haywood and Jaime Rockhill from Network Rail:</b></p> <p>MT: Jaime and I speak regularly to ensure we're coordinated. Firstly, I'll talk through some wider industry updates. Since the last meeting in February the ministers have put forward a draft Rail Reform Bill. It's the Bill that proposes legislation that would enact reform agenda, Great British Railways, to create an integrated rail body that would see the transfer of franchising powers of rail services to that body from the secretary of state. The Bill carries a plan for rail, one of which includes stronger regional partnerships. The draft Bill is now going through pre-legislative scrutiny. One of the themes is regarding the importance of rail freight in the railway system, which is well known but often neglected. The government has confirmed a rail freight target of 75% of freight carried by rail by 2050. WG has nationally significant freight flows and origins such as the Mendip quarries. On the 13<sup>th</sup> March, we are at the doorstep of control period 7 (2024-2029) on which Network Rail is funded. The Office of Rail and Road (ORR) has set out the final determination on what Network Rail need to deliver. This is slightly lower than CP6, reflecting where we are financially as an industry. Small reduction in what we need to do in terms of renewal of the network but an increased focus on core assets, train performance, carbon reduction and freight growth. Network Rail publishing final business plan at end of this month. Enhancements are funded separately.</p> <p>Wiltshire Study:</p> <p>MH: Builds on the hourly Trans-Wilts business case, looking at a wider suite of improved passenger and freight services in Wiltshire. Hourly service between Paddington and Westbury is being investigated and Trans-Wilts services. Coming to conclusion at end of next month. Will identify business cases as a result of that work.</p> <p>Salisbury Study:</p> <p>JR: Really pleased with the STP that shows how aligned we are with WG. There was reference to all our studies, and it is a good example of how we work together. Salisbury strategic study looked at Salisbury signalling area which spreads out to Tisbury, Warminster and down towards Romsey and Gratley on the East Side. Planning on a big re-signalling of the area so it's important our strategy is done. Looking at number of service changes. We have looked at reopening platform 1 at Salisbury, increasing the number of signals to Warminster and Romsey to stack trains better, and looking at the impact of the decarbonisation work we are doing on the West of England line. Work will continue into the end of Spring. Also have strategic station plans which are very focused and local. Joint documents done with all stakeholders, with bus companies involved. Published one on Wareham which is associated with Dorset Metro and in the process of doing one on Bournemouth, which is the precursor to Dorset Metro work- we are doing some timetable work as part of that. Also looking at Dorchester West and Dorchester South stations with the view you can interchange between them. James has been invited to a first steering group meeting on that.</p> <p>We have been given some funding to help progress some recommendations, which include Dorset Metro, Heart of Wessex line (hourly train). WG have funded some of the</p>

engineering feasibility work. Single track between Castle Cary and Weymouth so need to loop infrastructure to double track some sections. Send out an early draft of strategic case that is with local authorities for WG to comment on. Aiming next month to have a first draft to send out with economic cases. Also looking to increase services between Salisbury and Yeovil Junction. Looking for performance benefits, journey time improvements and additional capacity. Working with James on that.

MH: WG has contributed to Bristol to Oxford direct service. Working to produce SOBC for case for hourly service. Both GWR and SWR are operating at a fleet of diesel trains. We are building case for replacement to be not solely diesel. With be role for STB and local authorities to get involved in this.

CW: Bristol to Oxford. Talked about this at Network Rail breakfast this morning. The levels of interest are of national strategic significance when you put a number of developments together (Temple Quarter, Swindon redevelopment, Brabazon). It was echoed we need a bigger group of partners, like universities to put a case that is of national strategic significance to connect this put forward a case for the region of what has typically been the Oxford, Cambridge and London triangle into a bigger triangle. If we get these conversations going please can we include Wiltshire. It is critical in that.

CT: Wiltshire is good for travelling through but not for starting journey. Thank you for raising that we are not just a through county.

TR: You will be aware that Wiltshire has aspirations for Rail activity at Corsham and Royal Wootton Bassett. Will that SOBC cover those in any way?

MR: We are not making the case for Corsham but will be clear on how the service could fit the station at Corsham. One of the key considerations is a service that could call there. The case is focused convincing DfT to fund this service.

DA: Thank you to Jaime and Matt.

DG: The reference to non-diesel, would hope it was clear it is off the table, but it seems like a possibility? Or is it a question of what they are being replaced with.

MR: We need to make it clear that should not be the new option, but all options need to be costed and allocated for.

JR: The work we have been doing on the West of England Line - we need to make it clear that changing the rolling stock also requires changes to the infrastructure too.

**Alice Darley at National Highways:**

AR: There is a written update in the pack.

On the A417 missing link scheme we have reached the next major milestone. Now putting in the earthworks. Early phases where we have been clearing and demolishing properties and re-digging up the landscape. Ramping up communications to remind people of the purpose of the scheme and emphasising care of wildlife and rehoming that. Looking forward to showing members of the STB around the site.

	<p>Public information events during March and April with monthly newsletters. Open doors event open to everyone on 19<sup>th</sup> March along with a range of upcoming archaeology events.</p> <p>Regarding Stonehenge, there is a positive outcome from the latest legal challenge. There are plans to do preliminary works on site later this year.</p> <p>RIS3 - no update. Waiting for DfT publication of draft RIS. Finishing completion of delivery of RIS2.</p> <p>CT: What is the update on the North-South publication?</p> <p>AD: No change. Still awaiting the go-ahead. Cannot go public until ministers have responded.</p> <p>HF: Noted that this is relevant to the public question received from Mr Batho.</p>
5.	<p><b>Proposed Programme and Business Plan for 24/25</b></p> <p>JW: Proposed programme and business plan for WG over 2023-2025 was based on a higher level of funding (£896k) from the Baroness Vere letter of March 2022. Subsequently, DfT have advised we should put forward alternative options should funding be less for example the £605k for 23/24 plus £20k contribution from each of the nine authorities. The paper sets out the proposed programme for increased funding levels. Want to continue work on Rural Mobility, rail, freight and coaches. Picking up work on alternative fuels for freight, business case support and centre of regional excellence, EV, and cycle work. In section 3, should the WG receive a reduced level of funding we will have to reduce the budget allocated to work areas or put some on hold. We would then have to bring back a revised programme for the Board. All other STBs are in the same position waiting to hear about budget for 24/25.</p> <p>DG: We are talking about a period that starts in 3 weeks. In terms of the decisions regarding picking and choosing between projects, can we afford to wait for the next Board meeting, or do we need to have a proposal and call to talk through and confirm? Otherwise, there will be a period where we don't know what we are committing to.</p> <p>JW: We can call another meeting between this one and next board. We did not hear until July 20<sup>th</sup> last year from DfT. Agreed we do not want to wait until June for a revised proposal.</p> <p>HY: Echoes the frustrations around the timing.</p> <p>JW: There are four recommendations to the Business Plan report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Approve the 2024/25 Business Plan for the Western Gateway as set out in Table One</li> <li>II. To note the work areas where funding would have to be reduced should lower levels of funding be awarded.</li> <li>III. Request a revised Business Plan be brought to the Board should a lower level of funding be awarded.</li> <li>IV. Agree to the £20,000 annual contribution per authority for 2024/25</li> </ol>

	<b>DECISION:</b> The Board approved all four recommendations.
6.	<p><b>Strategic Transport Plan Update and approval</b></p> <p>To facilitate the short timeframe of the Strategic Transport Plan (STP) we divorced the development of the Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) from the development of the policy plan as the SIP requires sustainability appraisal and public consultation. Have not undertaken additional consultation above what was done on the issues and options paper this time last year. We were not able to undertake any ongoing research to finish off the Plan so there are some things that are light touch - for example: cycling strategy and M4 South Coast study. These things have been signposted for future work. We have been updating the Transport Model - it gives core forecast scenarios but it isn't ready to support more detailed scenarios, however these will be in the SIP.</p> <p>Taken forward some elements of work when we were developing the longer version of the STP programme. We have retained the overarching vision of the document which was discussed and approved in earlier meetings. The framing of the STP is still around immediate aims for the Department for Transport (DfT) and the criteria is used to differentiate matters relevant to a regional plan as opposed to a national or local plan.</p> <p>Project Board was created to direct the STP which included Cllr Caroline Thomas as Executive member from Wiltshire, Steve Thorne from North Somerset Council, and Alice Darley from National Highways representing the user and supplier perspectives. While no additional public consultation we undertaken, we have engaged extensively through groups and received and responded to 200+ comments.</p> <p>The Board are asked to approve the STP as it stands or approve with minor amendments and then to move into the stage to develop the SIP.</p> <p>DA: Thank you, Hannah. We will assume there will be a delegation of minor amendments to the Board.</p> <p>VS: It's been good to see this develop and thank you earlier for agreeing to make a bigger mention of cycling for active travel and changing Western Gateway to West Country, not just Wales. What are the proposal around implementation plans and engagement with local authorities and when they're likely to be done and the level of engagement?</p> <p>HF: Can I clarify if this is relating to the SIP?</p> <p>VS: Yes, this is a starter for 10.</p> <p>HF: We have been heads down on the immediate STP. Our next stage is to build a programme plan for the development of the SIP. We will work with other STBs to get a starting point for the evaluation of proposals. It is undefined as yet.</p> <p>VS: Would we expect to see it being started by September?</p> <p>CT: We talk about consultation in late 24/25 (fourth quarter). If work can be done to bring it closer that would be ideal but there are funding difficulties. We do need to give ourselves a little bit of space.</p>

JW: We will be using the Senior Officers Group, Transport Officers group, Transport and Business Forum and yourselves in all of this. We will hold a number of informal workshops for input.

CT: Will it be worthwhile taking the model we've used to help develop the SIP?

DA: It has worked well in the hands of the individuals.

CW: This may not be quite as quick and agile with the SIP and things to tease out. Other complication is the timeline and recognising that we may have a new government and sort out the priorities of what we do next while working out their agenda.

CT: Consultation end of 24/25 has to be flexible.

DA: It is a big piece of work.

CW: The final draft is amazing, but you do notice some emphasis that aren't quite where we think they are. The last mile and end-to-end journey planning. There is the use of the word sustainability alongside growth - we don't want unsustainable growth. Concerns about the holding map being out of date. We know where economic hotspots are but blobs that aren't specific then you only have tourism areas and that plays into the narrative of the West of England only being about buckets and spades. Hoping final version will not include final map as this will make it dated. I also feel there's something about accessibility needed.

CT: We do have accessibility as a theme that runs through everything. The logic of the map is that it speaks to where we are now and what we need to address - and it will hopefully not be out of date.

CW: The idea works but it goes back to a set of strategic plans that are out of date. They do not have our new local plans in date. Areas that have had strategic growth may be a better way to put it.

HF: What is intended to go on the map is not what is there but what is committed. For our updated highways model all local authorities provided their future planning information and what they provided was development up to 2050 and that is what is proposed to be included on the map.

CW: Some of these areas date from 10 years and the rate at which development happens means they're already done. In the context of where everyone is around local plans that is potentially troublesome.

CT: They may have been committed once but not necessarily committed now.

CW: No, they're not.

HF: Mixture of built-out and future commitments, so about making those distinctions clearer.

DA: Yes, a harder line between what is delivered and what is planned is needed.

JM: This map is really important in terms of bidding.

CT: It was a key consideration to bring out unique nature of WG.



	<p>HY: I found the maps are an excellent way forward and would want us to keep the second map in. The joy of the process is what we put on the map is within our gift. I am sure Chris could outline in 2 minutes the strategic growth in our area - whether 10 years ago or current thinking. It's incumbent on all of us to be clear about these in our local areas. I would support this remaining.</p> <p>TR: Is there a logic to having the image on the front page with a single track?</p> <p>HF: Images are all up for discussion. Plan to get even spread of modes and locations but it is not there yet.</p> <p>AS: This is just for the purpose of look and feel and isn't the final version. Take on board the feedback and we hope to tell a story on the front page. Perhaps a montage.</p> <p>DG: I think we need a tagline; what is the theme or ambition? A marketing, eye-grabbing line that grabs a civil servant.</p> <p>DA: The members of the Board are recommended to approve the STP for publication. To agree production of subsequent SIP. We will update this recommendation to change this to draft STP.</p> <p>All for, no against. Unanimous decision.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> All recommendations on paper A approved, with a delegation of minor amendments to the project Board.</p>
4.	<p><b>DfT update</b></p> <p>RB: Couple of consultations coming out. EV charging points and road works. Funding confirmation will come before the end of financial year. Lots of internal changes and reorganisation due to HS2 announcement. This will happen by 1<sup>st</sup> April. We are looking at creating cross-modal services.</p> <p>CW: Where is DfT with coach compliance in regard to disability access provision. The shortage of stock in bus companies means we're increasingly unable to provide rail services and the rail replacement services can't cater to those with disabilities.</p> <p>RB: I don't know the specifics, but I will take the question away and focus on more detail. Our key focus is a transport system that works for everybody.</p> <p><b>Action RB - to report back on disability access with regards to Coach travel</b></p> <p>JW: You mentioned funding and end of financial year, please can you clarify.</p> <p>RB: Hopeful for end of this financial year.</p> <p>CW: One question raised this morning when met rail operators was in relation to rail resilience and accessibility. For example, Bristol Parkway is not accessible for those with mobility issues. How do we think with you and other rail operator in improving resilience?</p> <p>RB: I will go away and get some answers on this.</p>
7.	<p><b>Programme Financial Update and Forward Decision Plan</b></p>

MA: 2023/24 financial year. We have nine workstreams that we have been working on. STP as a priority. Strategy cycle routes reporting as amber. Final report went to Board last year, having initial discussions with Atkins to complete work, however this will require some additional costs. We have not been able to complete that with priority on the STP. The board to note the request off additional costs for cycling. Alternative fuels for freight is amber. Waiting for updates from Midlands Connect which is stalling this project. In discussion with them and once we have updates, we will report. STP is green and thank you for signing this off. Strategic Rail Phase 2 work is green. Rural phase 2, work is ongoing with Peninsula Transport. We had a face-to-face event which was positive. This is reported as green. Freight phase 2 - work is ongoing with sub groups (maritime, aviation, road and rail). Forum in February had good participation with over 40 participants for one of them. Main group meeting on Monday. We have also agreed on the year two programme and will be taking this forward in the next financial year. EV is green and the report produced with Peninsula and brought to the Board in December 2023 is now up on our website. The strategy work for EV is in the pipeline and will be done in house. We will also be setting up a South West EV forum. Coach strategy phase 2 work is reporting as amber as there have been delays to the feasibility work on the first of three new strategic coach routes.

We had the first coach meeting in February which was positive. The Decarbonisation policy playbook tool is underway. Last month it was reporting as amber because of the new procurement framework.

**Schemes progress update:**

JW: Just got through the sixth round of sub groups for the Freight Strategy and the main forum. Some areas of work include work on bridge strikes and focusing on the bridge just out of Salisbury which is hit 10 times a year. Work is due to be undertaken on lorry parking. AECOM is producing a package of material on freight awareness to go to local authorities. We're also doing work on a backloading trial along with Peninsula Transport. 20% of freight movements in South West are running empty, so we're looking to fill them. We're encouraging operators to join the scheme run by a company called Transport Exchange.

HF: To touch on the coach strategy, we had the first forum in February, comprising of operators, local authority officers, industry and passenger representatives. 33 attendees at the peak of the meeting. Started work on the assessment of the first three strategic coach routes highlighted in the original strategy (route from Cheltenham to Bristol airport). Other routes in the strategy are down the South Coast to Bournemouth. We have worked up different permutations of routes and are evaluating the value of these routes. On cycling, the key officer at Sustrans has been on sabbatical so this has stalled things. He is back and we are in discussion on how to take things forward. Our carbon tool is due for delivery by the end of May. In June we will be holding a workshop with the officers to understand how they can use it for testing top-down policies, and interventions and how that impacts on decarbonisation trajectory for the rest of the region and goes down to the MSOA level. Hoping to bring motion on that at the June Board and we will be contacting senior officers to get people lined up on a training course.

The Board:

- Noted the status update on delivery progress and overall programme.
- Noted and agreed the additional costs to progress cycling strategy.

**Financial Update:**

MA: We have the first instalment of payment from DfT around January, and we were paid £345k plus and second instalment of £259k will be paid in March. We will be meeting with DfT to have this discussion. We have £151k left in budget after meeting with DfT. We have £100k untouched as a contingency. Underspend total is £51k minus outstanding payment from DfT. We have done some reallocation on some projects to cover shortfall and some committed funds.

The Board:

- Noted the financial update and reallocation of funds across projects, as needed.

**Forward decision plan**

MA: Presented the forward plan and explained the decisions. With focus on STP we have deferred some work to June and the September Board. We hope to come with big updates on the work packages. Freight, Rural Mobility, and Rail have been referred to the June Board.

DA: By the June Board we will have clarity regarding finance and will have got through the flurry of work around the STP.

CW: Do we need to be a bit more realistic between meetings?

DA: Difference between reporting and updating. In June we need to update and rebase the line where we're at. Reporting suggests where the outcome will come through and that isn't always going to happen.

CW: Can I have an update on Cheltenham Spa?

JW: This is a piece of work looking at providing a south facing bay platform at Cheltenham Spa. WG has been funding some feasibility work on that. It is a good scheme to have but there are implications elsewhere particularly around Gloucester station and further north at Abbotswood Junction. Work has paused. We have been doing work to explore services coming in from South Wales, aspiration for more services and benefits they would bring to the bay platform. We need to decide at the Board meeting in June where we are going with the Cheltenham Spa work alongside the Heart of Wessex line. With the Heart of Wessex line, the strategic outline business case is almost there and we have a draft version.

CW: We need milestones on all these projects, so we know where they are.

DA: It can be difficult to find time within our portfolio to move forwards quickly.

CW: We might be able to look at an independent Board Chair.

JW: Looking to follow a model by Midlands Connect where they don't pay their independent Chair. Transport for the North does pay them. This has come from DfT but perhaps Ross can clarify this advice.

RB: We have tended to favour non-remunerated positions as preference.

CT: Do we have a job description?

JW: We have Transport for East's approach which we are hoping to use, along with Midlands Connect. It is early stages, and we need a list of possible candidates.

CT: We need a job description first.

JW: Yes, when we have a job description, we will circulate it to the Board and it will be for the Board to decide.

AS: A few meetings ago we signed lead members from transport projects. Maybe members can come and report key milestones at the meeting.

MA: We do have an active milestone register, we just haven't had time to report on this.

The Board:

- Noted the forward decision plan for Senior Officers and the Board

**AOB**

DA: Upcoming board meeting. We will need papers earlier than normal as we are looking for a Chair. May be good to have an interim meeting second week of May.

MR (via chat): Volunteered to be the interim chair if elections /other pressures changed members post May. This was read out and noted by the board.

VS: Thank you to Cllr Don Alexander for stepping in as chair.

