



Minutes

ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND LOCALITY SERVICES SELECT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND LOCALITY SERVICES SELECT COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY 2 SEPTEMBER 2014, IN MEZZANINE ROOM 2, COUNTY HALL, AYLESBURY, COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM AND CONCLUDING AT 12.14 PM.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr W Bendyshe-Brown, Mr W Chapple OBE, Mr P Gomm, Mr S Lambert and Mr W Whyte (Chairman)

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Mrs L Clarke OBE, Mr M Freestone, Ms S Griffin (Secretary), Mr L Hannington, Ms G Harding, Mr L Mercedes, Mr Y Patel, Ms A Poole, Mr S Ruddy, Ms R Vigor-Hedderly and Ms K Wager

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from David Carroll, Dev Dhillon and Tim Butcher.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the Tuesday 17 June 2014 were agreed as a correct record subsequent to the following minor amendments.

Item 9 - Public Transport Inquiry

Page 10

On the basis of engineering and licensing etc to be amended to vehicle safety



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



Page 11

The Concessionary fares scheme is a statutory responsibility given to all upper tier Local Authorities by Local Government to be amended to Central Government.

Page 12

Business Support Review to be amended to Business Performance Review

Matters Arising

Public Transport Inquiry

Community Impact Bucks are to be contacted for clarification of the contract details for the continuation of the Transport Hub.

Action: Andrew Clarke

A timeline/scope of the internal review, the review being undertaken by Gate One and the Transport review are to be provided.

Action: Cabinet Member for Transportation/Gill Harding/Andrew Clarke

4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no public questions.

5 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

The Chairman reported the following.

Public Transport Inquiry Working Group

Two days public evidence sessions took place on the 24 and 25 July. The evidence sessions were attended by about 30 representatives from the strategic client, commissioners, commercial bus operators, non-traditional transport providers and transport user groups etc. The attendees provided knowledge, advice and information about transport provision as well as raising any issues and concerns. Thanks were given to all who attended the evidence sessions. A further meeting of the Working Group is taking place on the 16 September.

6 OIL AND GAS EXPLORATION ('FRACKING') UPDATE

Lesley Clarke OBE, Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning and Lester Hannington, Lead Officer for Minerals and Waste policy were welcomed to the meeting.

Mr Hannington referred to his attendance at the 4 February meeting of the ETL Select Committee during which an update was given on the Council's most up to date position (in light of recent Government announcements) in relation to 'fracking'.

The Government has since published an invitation to apply for Licences for oil and gas exploration under the 14th Landward Licensing Round as well as additional planning guidance. The Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) will consider applications for licenses received no later than 2pm on 28 October 2014.

In terms of the implications for Buckinghamshire, Appendix 1 on page 24 of the agenda shows the blocks of land that are available for applications.

The Frequently Asked Questions section of Fracking for shale gas page of the BCC website has been updated to reflect the current stage of the process. The website will continue to be revised as and when new information is available. District councils are also hosting this page on their websites.

<http://www.buckscc.gov.uk/environment/planning/minerals-and-waste-planning-policy/fracking/>

There has been a review of existing Minerals and Waste policies. Part of the overall 'Replacement Minerals and Waste Local Plan' is out of date and is not consistent with the Government's National Policy Planning Framework.

A new Local Development Scheme has been published which sets out a timescale for the production of the Replacement Minerals and Waste Local Plan which will begin with a consultation on issues later in 2014.

The report points out that the Government is inviting applications for oil and gas exploration licenses. There is a key role for the County Council as the Minerals Planning Authority in terms of the Development Control Committee having an up-to-date local planning policy to enable better informed decisions to be made on any applications that may come forward.

Although the County Council needs to be mindful of advice from other regulators, there are many other links in the chain of this regulation of this process e.g. operators can't apply for planning permission unless they have a license. However, the outcome of the present round of applications for licenses will probably not be known until 2015. In addition, the geological information on Buckinghamshire isn't sufficiently advanced to show what the number of applications for Licenses may be received by DECC. There could also be further licencing rounds every 2-3 years. This is the indication from Department for Energy and Climate Change.

During discussions, the following questions were asked.

Previous understanding was that Buckinghamshire would not be selected for fracking. It now seems to be the case that Buckinghamshire will be selected. Buckinghamshire has not been selected in isolation. Information received from DECC infers that any area where there is slight indication of the presence of any form of oil or gas has been included in the areas of land available for applications for licensing. Historically there has been some indication about the presence of conventional gas in some parts of the county but there have not been commercial viable quantities. Nevertheless, these areas have been included. We would be talking about a different resource 'shale' which is much deeper in the ground. It is not clear if the two are connected. The indications are that it could take 30 test drilling sites before there a commercially viable quantity of gas is found.

During previous discussions, there was mention about Aylesbury allegedly over a slight fault line. What effect would fracking have on the fault line? Because the technique of hydraulic fracking and the associated earth tremors i.e. in Lancashire, DECC made the decision to change regulatory powers which also brought additional powers into the licensing regime i.e. operators need to provide more information about how work is going to be carried out, and need to have a 'frack' plan approved by the Department for Energy and Climate Change. The Government view is that this won't happen or shouldn't happen as there are sufficient regulatory controls in place. There is also planning permission, the Environment Agency permit around water and waste, and the Health and Safety Executive around the integrity of wells. The line from Government is that we should not doubt the efficacy of these separate pollution control regimes, but there is always the unknown.

It is possible to have clarification of the process a company would go through to be able to start drilling. An operator would have to get a license from DECC. There are pre-application discussions with the Environment Agency and Natural England and English Heritage as well as screening for applications. The operator would submit a planning application. Agreement is needed from the surface landowner and validation from the Minerals Planning Authority. The application would also go via the Development Control Committee. If agreement is given, the application goes for DECC for consent. There is an

advisory note about fracking on the Bucks County Council website which includes a flowchart of the fracking process.

<http://www.buckscc.gov.uk/environment/planning/minerals-and-waste-planning-policy/fracking/>

Has the Government set up a committee or governing body to draw together the decisions from the organisations involved in the process? The Government has not set up a committee. The first stage of the licensing is with DECC. This involves a lot of technical work. The Minerals Planning Authority remains in the middle position. The Environment Agency and the Health and Safety Executive work jointly.

Could Buckinghamshire be the first county to have a governance committee which would be able to fast track any applications received for licences? The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning said this could be an idea to consider in the years to come. We need to see what Government is going to put into place. There is the awareness that 'fracking' will take place, and there could be the need to fast track applications. Government could well put this Committee in place themselves. We can ask the question about setting up a committee but it might be re-eventing the wheel.

We seem to be in a situation where there are not the necessary high levels of 'fracking' capability or resource under the ground to make Buckinghamshire a top choice for exploration but there is still the risk of the decision being made for exploration to take place. The Minerals and Waste Strategy for Buckinghamshire is currently being updated but there needs to be a plan in place if any applications are received for licensing. In terms of reviewing the Policies and consulting with Parishes, the concern is that Parishes need to respond to any consultations and they won't. With this in mind, what does the communication plan look like and if an application is received, how are we going to expedite the policies and be in a position to make a decision at Development Control Committee. What does this time line look like? The Cabinet Member for Planning & Environment reiterated that a lot of hoops to go through for an application to be granted. We are not expecting anything before next month with the 2014 Licensing round. This then has to go via Government, following which it will come as a planning application to BCC as the Mineral Planning Authority. We will then ensure that there is the right licensing and permissions from Government and whether we feel we can agree this. BCC resolve about fracking has been firmed up in the Minerals and Waste Strategy. Parishes have to respond to consultations. If you look at the other groups involved in the consultation process, there is another layer of protection before the planning application stage is reached. It has to be acknowledged that fracking and oil extraction has been going on in the UK for a long time for example at Wytch Farm in Dorset. Apart from local people, many don't realise this is taking place. Buckinghamshire is a long way down the list for exploration. It will be incredibly expensive to extract oil and gas from under the ground in Buckinghamshire. By then I am sure that good policies will be in place to protect

Paragraph 9 of the report advises that the 'Replacement Minerals and Waste Local Plan' will undergo its first public consultation later this year. Is it possible to be more accurate about the timescale of the consultation? The Local Development Scheme is a public facing statutory document which sets out our intentions. It is likely that the first consultation setting out issues, and discussion potential options, will take place starting in November 2014. Beyond this a draft plan and policies will be drawn up. Details of the Minerals and Waste Local Development Scheme are on the BCC website which includes a schedule of Proposed Minerals and Waste Development Documents for Buckinghamshire.

<http://www.buckscc.gov.uk/environment/planning/minerals-and-waste-planning-policy/local-development-scheme-2014/>

The nature of the statutory process means that even if consultations begin, and preparation work goes smoothly, it can take four to five years to get to the end of the process which is determined by law and guidance

The Chairman reiterated that communication is very important part of the process. Mr Hannington said in terms of consultations, the aim is to include exhibitions and interactive events, which will give parish and members of the public the opportunity to be more aware and involved in the process and to provide their views.

The Chairman thanked Mr Hannington for the very helpful update.

7 TRADING STANDARDS: JOINT SERVICE DELIVERY MODEL

Martin Phillips, Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Amanda Poole, Trading Standards Manager, BCC and Steve Ruddy, Surrey County Council, were welcomed to the meeting.

Ms Poole began by explaining there is a slight discrepancy in the covering report and business case. Paragraph 5 of the report advises 'the cashable savings (removing 10% of generation)'. This figure should be 11% as stated in the business case.

In terms of developments since the proposed plans to create a Joint Trading Standards Service with Surrey County Council were presented at the May meeting of the ETL Committee, a Project Board has been set up to oversee the development of the joint service. Membership of the Project Board includes the Members and Officers from each of the two Local Authorities. Some of the more contentious areas of the joint service have been taken to the Project Board for discussion and debate i.e. the governance structures and preferred options for the Joint Service. The Board meets on a monthly basis. Legal advice can be sought between meetings if required. The Inter-Authority Agreement is the legal document which underpins the Joint Committee. Detailed discussions have taken place to discuss the financial and legal aspects of the joint service. Engagement has also taken place with members and officers.

During the update, the following questions were asked.

There are two governance models in the report. What was the thought process behind these models? Ms Poole explained that the two governance models in the report are Joint Committee and Lead Authority Merged Services. Initially a variety of governance models were looked at i.e. could Trading Standards be its own Trust and delivery vehicle which was separate to the County Council and could contract services. Unfortunately there are complications around regulated services such as the employment of staff where a private delivery of this vehicle is not allowed. North Tyneside is part of a wider group of services where some Trading Standards staff are seconded. The Barnet model is also part of a wider group where there is joint contracting between the Local Authority and Capita. Whilst this was felt to be theoretically and practically possible, it would take longer to deliver this model and would not bring in benefits. It was also felt that the Joint Committee model was more Authority managed.

In comparison to BCC, Surrey County Council is larger by half. The staffing levels are also different. How can assurance be given to BCC staff that the plan is to TUPE them over, taking into account future budget reductions and that they are not the first on the list if any redundancies were to be made. Mr Ruddy explained that the model is designed to be a partnership; hence the Joint Committee model which would deliver services locally and generate efficiencies. Any cuts to overheads would be governed through the Joint Committee i.e. policies. It is difficult to imagine a scenario or reason why the joint services and partnership would be unbalanced.

Ms Poole said her understanding is that legally it would not be possible to target one set of staff over the other. The two groups of staff come together and would all equally be affected if there were redundancies. Following concern expressed from a small number of staff, we are in the process of meeting all staff groups to talk about proposed changes to Terms and Conditions. Staff will be given the option to change Terms and Conditions but this is not compulsory. If redundancy from a particular Authority is a continuing concern, the possibility of enshrining this in the Inter-Authority Agreement could be looked into.

How do you look at where staff training and experience comes from? Is there a pool for recruitment in Surrey and Bucks? Mr Ruddy said in terms recruitment, we are still talking about local service delivery. There is still the need to recruit locally i.e. to vacancies based in Aylesbury or Redhill rather than looking to recruit all new posts in either location. Having said this, one of the benefits of working in this way might be having legal specialism or administrative support in one place as vacancies arise.

Where do you see efficiencies can be obtained and how are you going to be driving this forward and what protection will be given to Trading Standards in Buckinghamshire? The Cabinet Member for Community Engagement said one of the advantages of a joint service is the added expertise of staff members which Bucks residents could tap into as staff numbers would increase from 23 to 70. In terms of savings, different models are being looked at. The preferred option at the present time is a model whereby we take on the Trading Standards business from small Authorities such as Berkshire and we get paid to do so. Having a larger Trading Standards service makes us a more important player in the national programme and gives us an increased saleable expertise to other Authorities. Combining back office functions such as HR and wages etc. may be looked at but there are not massive savings to be made by combining back office staff such as HR. The figures show that over three years, the total savings for both Authorities is approximately £660,000. The aim is deliver a better Trading Standards service for the residents of Buckingham.

In terms of Bucks residents being able to tap into a wealth of knowledge, how will local requirements be controlled and how will the required expertise be provided? Ms Poole said if a positive decision is reached, the aim would be to fully create the Joint Service to enable a go-live from 1 April 2015. BCC Trading Standards staff would be employed by Surrey County Council as from 1 April 2015. It is anticipated that Joint Committee will set the joint priorities for the service based on the priorities from both Councils. Cabinet effectively controls the requirements.

Who directs the overall requirements to carry out specific operations? Mr Ruddy explained that there will be one service which links in with partners and delivers services locally. There will be a Joint Management team which reports to the Joint Committee. There will also be mechanics in place to report to Select Committee for scrutiny. There will be a single management team to deal with practical decisions on a day to day basis. Staff will be employed by Surrey but Buckinghamshire and Surrey will both be paying for a joint service. The whole point of this is a partnership approach to the Joint Committee.

If staff are TUPE'd, the concern is over time the make-up of the Board will become one rather as there will not be Buckinghamshire staff and Surrey staff as part of the joint venture. How can it be ensured that Bucks priorities are managed jointly and fairly? Ms Poole said the Board is anticipated as being similar to the BCC Project Board. Membership will include representation from the Joint Committee and Senior Officers from both Councils. The Senior Officers wouldn't be the staff that are TUPE'd over. They would be a Bucks employee and hold the Board to account. This would be the long term intention. Details of the Joint Committee and Board are shown on page 41 of the agenda pack

There has already been a reduction in the number of Trading Standards staff in Buckinghamshire. Why hasn't the possibility of a Joint Trading Standards service been

considered before now? The Cabinet Member for Community Engagement explained that conversations about the possibility of a joint service have been taking place for a long time. In order to protect the Trading Standards service in Bucks, work needs to take place with another Authority to enable the service to become more efficient and generate income. Better expertise would make the service more saleable to other Authorities. Details of the expertise within Surrey County Council Trading Standards are to be circulated to Committee Members.

Action: Steve Ruddy/DSO

The Joint Trading Standards Service will be a saleable item but Surrey will benefit not Bucks. The Cabinet Member for Community Engagement said that the income generated will be pro rated according to investment.

Ms Poole explained that the underpinning Inter-Authority Agreement sets out the percentage distribution of any income the Joint Service model makes. A copy of the Inter-Authority Agreement is to be circulated to Committee Members.

Action: Amanda Poole

The Committee is looking for reassurance that Bucks will be an equal partner in the Joint Service and the benefits accrued by selling services to other organisations. Mr Ruddy explained that this issue has been discussed with the finance leads from Bucks and Surrey. Investment is on a two thirds/ one third ratio. The income and savings generated are also shared on that basis.

If we are going sell Trading Standards services to other counties, is this going to be provided from existing resources or are we going to be taking on their resources as well? The Cabinet Member for Community Engagement said selling Trading Standards to other smaller Authorities is an aspiration. If the service was expanding and service were being provided for other Authorities, expansion of the service would be looked at.

The figures shown at the top of page 36 of the agenda suggest an income generation of £400, 000 but there is no explanation of how this will be achieved. Ms Poole referred Members of the Committee to tables on pages 49/50 of the agenda which shows anticipated income generation opportunities and saving opportunities broken down into themes and potential areas for financial savings.

Paragraph 4 on page 28 of the agenda refers to the duration of the agreement and the Project Board currently recommending 5+10 years. Could you clarify 5+10 years? Mr Ruddy explained this wording is as such as a 5 year minimum contract plus 10 years was envisaged. Following discussions with Legal and Finance teams, the decision was made of an initial contract of a minimum of 5 years. In terms of any agreements, a minimum of 12 months' notice need to be given. In effect we are saying that we need to create a partnership of a minimum term of 5 years which will continue indefinitely with a 12 month termination period. The 10 years becomes redundant. This will need to be firmed up as part of the Inter-Authority Agreement. The views of the Members of the Committee are welcomed on the length of the agreement.

The Chairman summarised the key concerns of the Committee;

- Clarity that Buckinghamshire is robustly and fairly represented on the Joint Board
- Clarity on the direction of being TUPE'd and that Buckinghamshire representation is clear
- Concerns are that a draft of the Inter-Authority Agreement has not been seen by Committee and ensuring that the agreement covers issues such as contract time, TUPE'd staff, staff retention and recruitment
- The split of profile and loss and who would pick up the loss
- How local priorities are represented at the Board

The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Ms Poole and Mr Ruddy for attending the meeting.

8 TRANSPORT FOR BUCKS INQUIRY: PROGRESS UPDATE

Ruth Vigor-Hedderly, Cabinet Member for Transportation, Gill Harding, Service Director, Place, Mike Freestone, Interim Contract Manager and Yogesh Patel, Business Improvement Director, Ringway Jacobs and Lee Mercers, Ringway Jacobs were welcomed to the meeting.

The Cabinet Member for Transportation thanked the Chairman and Members of the Committee for the opportunity to introduce team members and provide an update on Transport for Bucks.

The Chairman asked for an overview of work that has taken place.

The Cabinet Member for Transportation reported the following.

'I was appointed as Cabinet Member for Transportation on the 1st April 2014. I was fairly familiar with the contractor, Ringway Jacobs (RJ) and had some idea of how BCC worked as RJ as the client. I was also very aware of public dissatisfaction which related to the day to day delivery of the front line operational side of Ringway Jacobs and BCC as the client.

In April, I instructed Gate One, an independent consultant to carry out a full health on the contract between RJ and BCC which included transparency of the findings. The contract was five years old and legislation had changed considerably over the past five years.

In terms of the Localism Act, it was important to empower Members, officers and public to have an opinion and voice and to put forward new ideas to the client and contractor.

Gate One were instructed on a 6 week contract. Bart Smith was the appointed as the consultant for the review.

Whilst the health check of the contract was being undertaken, we still had to "keep the show" on the road, in respect of the day to day operational delivery.

The decision was made to go "back" to the old way of working.

Amersham depot was re-opened with David Molyneaux appointed as interim manager. The Handy Cross depot was re profiled. Wayne Pickford been appointed as the interim manager. Tim Fowler has been appointed as the interim Manager for depot at Griffin Lane. An open evening is taking place at the depot on the 1st October during which new way of working will be demonstrated.

The new way of working allows the depots to have a wider range of freedom to be able to understand the need for change in each area they cover. This is important as each area is so diverse; one size does not fit all. The LATs are based in at the depot in the area they represent.

Benefits of local delivery include:

- a cost effective approach due to a higher volume of skilled operatives in one area at any one time
- visible impact which creates confidence in the local communities
- a more effective approach in terms of scheduling, simplifying the programme for ease of understanding

- a personal approach and higher level of ownership will allow the LAT to take responsibility and to be held to account
- KPIs will be set in each depot at local level allowing better management of the process in terms of monitoring the output locally.

The area based approach has allowed for:

- multiple operations within traffic management has resulted in reduction in road disruption in terms of a 60% reduction in road closures. The overall saving will be applied back into the operational daily delivery.
- a better collaborative working mechanism for the local councillors, allowing them to track repairs and mutually agree work taking place within their wards.
- Row, LATs, inspectors, gang area team leaders and managers are based in the local depot, focusing on an effective and efficient way of operational delivery for the highway.

I hope that this gives you a clear understanding of what we have achieved over the past four months’.

Mr Patel explained that he is the Business Improvement Director for Ringway Jacobs and is leading the work on the transformation in the TfB contract which encompasses actions identified through the various other reviews and audits carried out of the last year. In terms of how the transformation has been structured and the key work-streams, a clear governance structure has been set up to try to distinguish business as usual in parallel to changes that need to be made to the internal processes and procedures etc. of the organisation. A Transformation Board has been set up which meets on a monthly basis. There is also a Transformation Steering Group which meets on a fortnightly basis. Membership includes representatives from the Senior Management Team from BCC and RJ.

There are eight work-streams which encompass actions identified during the reviews and audits by Gate One and Tom McCabe; Organisation Structure/HR; Communications; Culture; Values/Efficiencies; Customer Journey; Information Flow; Contract Review; Strategy & Policies.

Organisational structure is about the move towards an area based structure. This process would involve consultation at the top tier, clarification of roles, responsibilities, communication lines, accessibility and governance.

Communication needs to become part of business as usual in terms of key stakeholders being kept informed. This could be in the form of weekly internal bulletins or monthly member bulletins.

Culture Change – going forward, the ways of working need to be aligned. Buckinghamshire County Council is a member-led organisation. How this impacts on contracts needs to be taken into account. There is also the issue of making sure the right skills set is in place.

Value and Efficiency – work is taking place to capture what is already being done in terms of demonstrating value for money and going forward, ensuring this is in line with contracts. This includes clarity about what benchmarking and market testing means and how productivity fits in with risk and innovation in this type of contract.

Customer Journey – this includes how engagement takes place with members of the public and how issues are identified and dealt with effectively and efficiently.

Information Flow – this is not just customer information. It is also about finance, asset, condition and programme information and how this all relates to an efficient and effective way

of working where data is entered and analysed at a single point which can be turned into knowledge and pro-active decision making.

Contract Review – this includes looking at the contract to see if there are areas that need to be amended to suit the new way of working. This includes scope. There could be areas of activity currently in the TfB contract which are not necessarily appropriate for BCC to carry out through the contract. Similarly there may be activities that are currently carried out in the BCC environment that may be more suited within the TfB contract. All of this work is taking place as a joint activity with BCC. Around this is the clarity of the governance structure of how the contract operates and making sure the performance incentives such as KPIs are aligned and have a measureable outcome.

Strategy and Policies – ensuring that detailed strategies and policies around technical issues such as potholes are aligned to the way the contract operates, to BCC objectives and the 5 year vision and individual business plan activities and Task Orders.

Consistent across these work streams is a review of processes, people issues, systems and tools that support these processes and people.

During discussions, the following questions were asked.

The update given is wide ranging and informative about the areas being investigated. Unfortunately there was no mention of the timescale of the review and they are going to come to some kind of conclusion. Mr Patel explained that there was a timescale of about six months. The review started in July. The main bulk of the work will be completed by the end of the calendar year. Work around culture change will continue as this needs to be embedded.

It has become apparent that there were flaws in the management of the previous contract with Ringway Jacobs. It has to be questioned when the contract was extended, were there flaws in this process? The Cabinet Member for Transportation said it would be inappropriate for her to provide an answer to this question as neither herself or the current team were in place when the contract was extended. This can be discussed with the Chief Executive and Strategic Director, BCC.

Why did RJ not carry out a review of the processes in place and keep up to speed with the changes that were occurring without the original report of the Environment Select Committee and the change of Cabinet Member. Surely a proactive contractor should do this as a matter of course? The Cabinet Member for Transportation said this was a very valid question. The contract is a two way street. As part of the transformation process, there is now a different portfolio holder and management teams in place. This question needs to be addressed to the Chief Executive. There is an element of lessons to be learnt. The short forensic analysis is being carried out to satisfy that we are back on track and there is nothing untoward. Once approved, the report can be shared with the Committee.

Action: Cabinet Member for Transportation/DSO

A meeting is to be arranged with the Chief Executive and Strategic Director, BCC and the Chairman of the ETL Select Committee to discuss historic issues about the previous RJ contract and value for money.

Action: Policy Officer

There are currently interim managers in place in the Handy Cross and Griffin Lane depots. When will permanent managers be appointed to enable stability? Mr Patel reported that the consultation process has been completed on the top tier management team. In terms of the HR process, the vacancies for depot managers will be advertised this week and recruitment will take place in the following few weeks. The aim is to have appointments at Area Manager level by the end of September.

The Cabinet Member added it is very important to have stability and confidence in the depots. The two interim depot managers are very experienced members of staff. They have previously been in manager posts and have been elevated to their current role.

There will inevitably be savings as a result of the reviews taking place. Who is going to benefit from these savings? The Cabinet Member for Transport explained that she is looking to bring any savings back into the local delivery which is absolutely fundamental as budgets have been cut and Central Government is not funding as it was. Details of the savings in Transportation portfolio and the re-investment are to be circulated to Committee members when available.

Action: Cabinet Member for Transportation/DSO

One concern is that LATs and Depot supervisors do not appear to be aware of the Capital Maintenance Programme (CMP) for their area. How can this be rectified? The Cabinet Member for Transportation said she was disappointed to hear this as the CMP and schedule of the programme of works has been emailed to Members. This can be resent. All LATs' should be aware of CMP work which is being carried out in the infrastructure at any time. This will be followed up with the Acting Manager. The depot in Griffin Lane will not be fully operational until 1 October 2014. In terms of daily operation, Members can go into the depot to look at scheduling etc. LATs will have the opportunity to embrace and empower new ways of working and opportunities.

Mr Patel said that one of the key important work-streams is information flow. This is not just the CMP. It is any works going on in any particular area and a transparency of the process. This requires clear systems and for processes to be more robust than they may be at the moment.

Ms Harding added that the County Council is on a journey to improvements. The Cabinet Member for Transportation and team members should be advised of any concerns or issues so they can be addressed.

When the ETL inquiry into TFB was first started, it was felt that work took place very much in silo i.e. BCC, TfB and the Cabinet Member. Work has taken place to create confidence, clarify understanding and give a clear picture of what would like to be achieved and how the process will be taken forward. The team are to be complimented on the work that has taken place so far.

Other parts of the contract such as devolved services have not been mentioned. There still needs to be some aspect of oversight on areas such as grass cuttings etc. The Cabinet Member for Transportation reiterated that BCC is a member led Authority and will remain so. There needs to be complete communication between the depots and local ward members as local members are the voice and method of communication for local residents and communities. In terms of weed spraying and grass cutting services being devolved, Localities are visiting all parishes to discuss any issues and concerns. This has been successful in so far as there are certain areas in Buckinghamshire who wish to undertake grass cutting. This has to be cost effective and viable for me to sign off and to ensure that we are current with Health and safety issues and what services are being devolved is legal because ultimately we are the Highway Authority. We are proactively looking at addressing the issue of weed spraying but there are limitations in the types of chemicals that can be used. This now goes back to each depot. Each manager will be held to account for the grass cuttings and weed spraying in terms of the finish and quality etc.

Mr Freestone explained that from the client side, he has been in post since the end of April as the Interim Contract Manager. Work has taken place to strengthen the client team to give it

depth and gravity and more ability to challenging, checking and confirm what Ringway Jacobs are delivering through the TfB contract. My role is to lead the team and the challenge and to ensure that we are getting the right output for the right costs in the right way. This includes looking at contract administration overall and to make sure this works. The back office administration process of monthly monitoring has been slimmed down and made less complicated. The process now works better. The Operations Manager is assisting with this work. He is out in the depots 3-4 days a week checking and challenging what is being done as well as offering guidance. The philosophy of this contract is that the client is not a director – the client is the checker. A Quality Manager has been appointed. There is also a Contract Support and Compliance Officer who deals with the monthly applications for payment. There are robust challenges in place. Additional monitoring also gives the ability to do things more coherently in the future. The Works Quality Consultant is out on site, checking the quality of delivery and output from RJ.

The report backfills some of the details about past issues. The Transformation programme has swept up a lot of these issues. Over 80% previous activities and plans have been resolved and signed off. There is an audit trail to demonstrate this. The remaining issues are high level i.e. looking at the construct, scope and governance of the contract etc. which are being dealt with now

Ms Harding reassured Members that day to day work continues at the same as the review work taking place. As part of the future shape structure, we were keen to have good people in post be that on an interim basis. As the new client team is introduced, there will be an overlap with the current and any new clients team that may come into place.

Is it possible to have a timeline of when the management structure of the depots will be finalised? Discussions are currently taking place about the management structure. It is hoped that this will be finalised in 4-6 months. An update of the management structure at the depots is to be circulated prior to the January meeting of the ETL Select Committee.

Action: Cabinet Member for Transformation

The 4 year plan is to be circulated to ETL Committee members.

Action: Cabinet Member for Transformation

The update at the January meeting should include information about the following;

- Client teams
- Value for money and benchmarking. The timeline in terms MTP progress for 2015 has slipped significantly. This needs to be evidenced.
- Clarification of efficiencies
- Why the contract was renewed so many times
- Was the contract extended correctly or in the new ways of working, does the renewal of a contract have to be earned
- Scope of the contract and negotiations
- Who leads the MTP process in the client team?
- Innovation and progress
- How savings are being reinvested?

The Chairman thanked the Mrs Vigor-Hedderly, Gill Harding, Mike Freestone, Interim Contract Manager and Yogesh Patel for attending the meeting.

9 PUBLIC TRANSPORT INQUIRY UPDATE

The Chairman reported the following.

During the two day ETL Public Transport inquiry sessions, evidence was received heard from Senior Officers, the Strategic Client, Commissioners and Providers, contractors of public and passenger transport, Commercial Bus Operators, the Passenger Transport Executive, non-traditional transport providers, Community Transport providers, healthcare transport providers and Transport User Groups. This included information about the taxi token scheme, public transport and economic growth and employment, assessing transport needs and solutions and sustainable travel schemes. A number of themes have emerged from the evidence sessions.

A further meeting is taking place on the 16 September to discuss the findings and the draft report. The report will be presented at the October meeting of the ETL Select Committee for agreement, following which it will be taken to the November meeting of Cabinet.

10 COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

Members of the Committee NOTED the Work Programme.

Members of the Committee AGREED that the item on S106 Developer Contributions should be moved to the November meeting.

11 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is due to take place on Tuesday 14 October 2014 in Mezzanine 2, County Offices, Aylesbury. There will be a pre-meeting for Committee Members are 9.30am.

Future meeting dates for 2014

Tuesday 18 November

Proposed meeting dates for 2015

3 February	21 July
17 March	8 September
14 April	6 October
19 May	17 November
23 June	

CHAIRMAN