

SOUTH WEST OF SCOTLAND TRANSPORT PARTNERSHIP

**Meeting of Friday, 2 February 2024 at 10.30am,
Council Hall, Council Offices, English Street, Dumfries, DG1 2DD
and via Microsoft Teams**

Members of the Board

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| John Campbell (Chair) | - Dumfries and Galloway Council |
| Karen Jackson (Vice Chair) | - South of Scotland Enterprise |
| David Bryson | - NHS Dumfries and Galloway |
| Jim Dempster | - Dumfries and Galloway Council |
| Willie Scobie | - Dumfries and Galloway Council |
| Keith Walters | - Dumfries and Galloway Council |
| Andrew Wood | - Dumfries and Galloway Council |

Future Meetings

22 March 2024

28 June 2024

27 September 2024

29 November 2024

Douglas Kirkpatrick

Lead Officer, South West of Scotland Transport Partnership

SOUTH WEST OF SCOTLAND TRANSPORT PARTNERSHIP

Meeting of Friday, 2 February 2024 at 10.30am
Council Hall, Council Offices, English Street, Dumfries, DG1 2DD
and via Microsoft Teams

1. **SEDERUNT AND APOLOGIES**
2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
3. **MINUTE OF MEETING ON 24 NOVEMBER 2023 – For Approval**
4. **REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2023/24 FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31 DECEMBER 2023 – Recommendation – to note the forecast outturn for the revenue budget as at 31 December 2023.**
5. **CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PROGRAMME 2023/24 UPDATE - Recommendation – to note the update on the Capital Programme for 2023/24 to 2025/26 as outlined in the report.**
6. **STAG UPDATE - Recommendations – (i) note the feedback from Transport Scotland; and (ii) note that the re-opening of rail stations at Beattock, Eastriggs and Thornhill will be included in the forthcoming Regional Transport Strategy Delivery Plan.**
7. **RISK MANAGEMENT – Recommendations – (i) consider and agree the Risk Register for 2024/25 included as the Appendix; and (ii) note that there may be an updated Risk Register brought to a future meeting once the internal audit is complete.**
8. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN MAY DECIDE IS URGENT DUE TO THE NEED FOR A DECISION**

It is recommended that Members of the South West of Scotland Transport Partnership Board agree to consider the following item of business in private and exclude the Press, members of the public and Observers from the meeting given the report contains confidential or exempt information in respect of paragraphs 6, 8, and 9 of Schedule 7A of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973.

9. **ACTIVE TRAVEL FUNDING Report to follow – For Board Members only**

Douglas Kirkpatrick
Lead Officer

Claire Rogerson
Secretary to the Board

SOUTH WEST OF SCOTLAND TRANSPORT PARTNERSHIP

Meeting of Friday 24 November 2023
at 10.30am at Dumfries and Galloway Council Headquarters, English Street,
Dumfries and via Microsoft Teams

Present

Members

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| John Campbell (Chair) | - | Dumfries and Galloway Council |
| Karen Jackson (Vice-Chair) | - | South of Scotland Enterprise |
| David Bryson | - | NHS Dumfries and Galloway |
| Willie Scobie | - | Dumfries and Galloway Council |
| Keith Walters | - | Dumfries and Galloway Council |
| Andrew Wood | - | Dumfries and Galloway Council |

Officials

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Douglas Kirkpatrick | - | Lead Officer |
| Claire Rogerson | - | Secretary to the Board |
| Kirsty Dunsmore | - | Policy and Projects Officer |
| Janet Sutton | - | Finance Officer |

Apologies

| | | |
|---------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Jim Dempster | - | Dumfries and Galloway Council |
|---------------------|---|-------------------------------|

Observers

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|------------|
| Alasdair Marshall | - | MSYP |
| Frazer Smith | - | Stagecoach |
| Graham Whiteley | | |

In Attendance

| | | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------|
| John Campbell | - | A77 Action Group |
| Laura Moodie | - | D&G Bus Users Group |

1. SEDERUNT AND APOLOGIES

5 Board Members present, 1 apology and 1 Board Member not present at the start of the meeting.

John Campbell, Karen Jackson, David Bryson, Willie Scobie and Keith Walters attended at Dumfries and Galloway Council Headquarters,

PROCEDURE – The Secretary confirmed those observers who were present at the meeting, and further advised that since the last meeting Christopher Craig had stood down as an observer to the Board.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

NONE declared.

3. MINUTES OF MEETING 27 OCTOBER 2023

Decision

APPROVED.

BOARD MEMBER – Andrew Wood joined the meeting via MS Teams – 6 Board Members present.

4. PRESENTATION FROM A77 CAMPAIGN TEAM

Decision

The Board :-

4.1 **AGREED** to receive a presentation from the A77 Campaign team; and

4.2 **THANKED** John Campbell for his presentation.

5. REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2023/24 FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 31 OCTOBER 2023

Decision

The Board **NOTED** the forecast outturn for the revenue budget as at 31 October 2023.

6. CLIMATE CHANGE DUTIES – REPORTING 2022/23

Decision

The Board:-

6.1 **NOTED** SWestrans statutory Climate Change Duties Reporting requirements; and

6.2 **AGREED** to submit the 2022/23 Climate Change Duties Report for SWestrans by the deadline 30 November 2023

7. CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PROGRAMME – COMMUNITY BUS FUND / BUS SHELTERS

Decision

The Board **AGREED** :-

7.1 the utilisation of the 2023/24 Community Bus Fund allocation as indicated in paragraph 3.4 of the report; and

7.2 the Bus Shelter Programme as shown at Appendix 1 of the report.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR MAY DECIDE IS URGENT DUE TO THE NEED FOR A DECISION

Decision

The Board **NOTED** that there was no item of urgent business deemed urgent by the Chair due to the need for a decision.

.

REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2023/2024 FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31 December 2023

1. Reason for Report

To provide the Board with an update on the Partnership's 2023/24 monitoring and forecast outturn position based on the period ending 31 December 2023.

2. Background

The Scottish Government and Dumfries and Galloway Council provides revenue funding towards the running of Swestrans. Swestrans receives contributions from partner organisations and requisitions funding from Dumfries and Galloway Council, in respect of payments required for public bus service contracts.

3. Key Points

3.1 The **Appendix** shows the revenue budget summary for SWestrans. The published expenditure budget for 2023/24 of £4,447,289 was agreed by the Board on 31 March 2023. It is vital to the economic wellbeing of the Partnership and its stakeholders that the financial resources are managed effectively, and expenditure and income is delivered in line with the approved budget.

3.2 This report forms part of the financial governance and stewardship framework, which ensures that the financial position of the Partnership is acknowledged, understood and quantified on a regular basis. It provides assurance to the members of the Board that resources are being managed effectively and allows corrective action to be taken where necessary.

3.3 Board Members will note that based on the financial performance to date, it is forecast that a balanced budget will be delivered.

4. Consultations

The Proper Officer has been consulted and is in agreement with its terms.

| 5. Implications | |
|------------------------|---|
| Financial | As laid out in the report |
| Policy | No policy implications from this report |
| Equalities | No equalities implications from this report |
| Climate Change | No climate change implications from this report |
| Risk Management | The monitoring relates to the known risks R04 – Capital funding R06 – Overspending R07 – Revenue funding R12 – Third Party liabilities R14 – Withdrawal of DGC Governance support R15 – Cyber crime |

6. Recommendation

Members of the Board are asked to note the forecast outturn for the revenue budget as at 31 December 2023.

| | |
|--|--|
| Janet Sutton - Report Author Finance Officer Tel: 01387 260105 Date of Report: 5 January 2024 | Douglas Kirkpatrick, Lead Officer South West of Scotland Transport Partnership Cargen Tower, Garroch Business Park Dumfries DG2 8PN |
|--|--|

APPENDIX - Monitoring Report 2023/24 for the period ending 31 December 2023.

SOUTH WEST OF SCOTLAND TRANSPORT PARTNERSHIP
REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING AS AT 31 December 2023

| | FINAL OUTTURN 2022/23 | PUBLISHED BUDGET 2023/24 | BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS 2023/24 | ADJUSTED BUDGET 2023/24 | ACTUAL EXPENDITURE TO 31/12/23 | PROJECTED OUTTURN 2023/24 | VARIANCE 2023/24 |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|-----------------------------|
| | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ |
| EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | |
| Staff Costs | 138,745 | 249,348 | | 249,348 | 105,841 | 249,348 | 0 |
| Transport Costs | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Administration Costs | 30,854 | 21,153 | 3,318 | 24,471 | 24,471 | 24,471 | 0 |
| Payments | 4,301,098 | 4,128,038 | | 4,128,038 | 2,873,325 | 4,128,038 | 0 |
| Central Support | 44,071 | 48,750 | -3,318 | 45,432 | 0 | 45,432 | 0 |
| Capital Charges | 265,903 | | | 0 | 247,894 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Expenditure | 4,780,671 | 4,447,289 | 0 | 4,447,289 | 3,251,531 | 4,447,289 | 0 |
| INCOME | | | | | | | |
| Scottish Government Funding | 259,250 | 259,250 | | 259,250 | 194,650 | 259,250 | 0 |
| D&G Council Core Funding | 100,000 | 100,000 | | 100,000 | 0 | 100,000 | 0 |
| Other Contributions | | | | | | | |
| D&G Council Requisition | 3,971,517 | 3,909,685 | | 3,909,685 | 0 | 3,909,685 | 0 |
| SPT contribution | 246,051 | 97,322 | | 97,322 | 0 | 97,322 | 0 |
| SBC contribution | 128,220 | 5,400 | | 5,400 | | 5,400 | 0 |
| NHS contribution | 70,000 | 70,000 | | 70,000 | | 70,000 | 0 |
| SRUC contribution | 5,632 | 5,632 | | 5,632 | | 5,632 | 0 |
| Total Income | 4,780,671 | 4,447,289 | 0 | 4,447,289 | 194,650 | 4,447,289 | 0 |
| NET EXPENDITURE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,056,881 | 0 | 0 |

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PROGRAMME 2023/24 – 2025/26 UPDATE

1. Reason for Report

This report provides the Board with an update on the agreed Capital Programme for 2023/24 to 2025/26.

2. Background

2.1 At its meeting on 28 February 2023, Dumfries and Galloway Council agreed a balanced budget. At this meeting there were no changes to the SWestrans Capital Funding identified.

2.2 At its meeting on 6 June 2023, Dumfries and Galloway Council's Communities Committee received and agreed an updated 3 year budget plan (2023/24 – 2025/26) for the Transport Asset Class which includes the capital allocation for SWestrans. This updated budget plan was reported to the Board on 30 June 2023.

2.3 At its meeting on 30 June 2023, the Board agreed its Capital Programme as detailed in Table 1 below:

| <u>SWestrans Capital Programme 2023/24 – 2025/26</u> | Total Budget Allocated 2023/24 | Total Budget Allocated 2024/25 | Total Budget Allocated 2025/26 | Total |
|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| | £ | £ | £ | £ |
| Local Bus Network | 1,126,000 | 0 | 840,000 | 1,966,000 |
| Rail Station Parking | 557,000 | 0 | 0 | 557,000 |
| Active Travel Network | 854,000 | 400,000 | 400,000 | 1,654,000 |
| TOTAL | 2,537,000 | 400,000 | 1,240,000 | 4,177,000 |

Table 1 – SWestrans Capital Programme 2023/24 – 2025/26

3. Key Points – Capital Programme 2023/24 to 2025/26

3.1 Each of the elements of the Capital Programme for 2023/24 is discussed briefly below and we anticipate, at this stage, that close to full expenditure will be achieved in this financial year. **Appendix 1** shows monitoring of the 2023/24 spend to 31 December 2023.

3.2 As previously advised to the Board a project tracker will be included in all capital monitoring reports going forward. The project tracker is included as **Appendix 2** to this report.

Local Bus Network

3.3 The purchase of Ultra Low Emission low floor buses to replace existing leased bus assets is being led by Dumfries and Galloway Council. It is expected that 6 low floor buses will be delivered by March 2024. The agreed bus shelter renewal/replacement programme and associated works continue.

Rail Station Parking

3.4 The construction of Phase 3 (new provision at Sydney Place) is underway and is expected to be complete in March 2024.

Active Travel

3.5 At its meeting on 23 October 2023, the Board were updated on the 2023/24 Regional Active Travel Fund (RATF) projects totalling £1M (£600k SWestrans/ £400k RATF). A summary of current progress on this element of the overall active travel funding is provided in the **Appendix 3**.

| 4. Implications | |
|------------------------|---|
| Financial | Regular reports will be brought to the Board on the progress with the capital programme during 2023/24. |
| Policy | This work fulfils SWestrans policy objectives. |
| Equalities | Provision of good quality infrastructure will enhance travel choice and experience for those with protected characteristics. |
| Climate Change | Provision of good quality infrastructure that enhances opportunity for increased uptake of active and sustainable travel will have a positive impact on climate change. |
| Risk Management | Progression of the Capital Programme relates to two known risks: R02 – Public image. R04 – Capital Funding. |

| 5. Recommendation |
|--|
| Members of the Board are asked to note the update on the Capital Programme for 2023/24 to 2025/26 as outlined in the report. |









| | |
|--|--|
| Grant Coltart / Douglas Kirkpatrick - Report Authors Tel: 01387 260136 Date of Report: 18 January 2023 File Ref: SW2/meetings/2023 | Approved by: Douglas Kirkpatrick Lead Officer South West of Scotland Transport Partnership Cargen Tower, Garroch Business Park Dumfries DG2 8PN |
|--|--|

Appendix 1 - Capital Programme spend to 31 December 2023

Appendix 2 – Project Status Report 2023/24

Appendix 3 - Regional Active Travel Fund Programme 2023/24

| <u>SWestrans Capital Programme 2023/24</u> | Total Budget Allocated 2023/24 | Actual Net Spend 31/12/23 | Forecast Spend to 31/03/24 | Variance 2023/24 | (Slippage to) / Acceleration from 2024/25 | Indicative Budget 2024/25 | Indicative Budget 2025/26 |
|---|---|--|---|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Local Bus Network (SWestrans) | 1,126,000 | 58,877 | 1,126,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 840,000 |
| Rail Station Parking (SWestrans) | 557,000 | 654 | 557,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Active Travel Projects (Swestrans) | 854,000 | 506,364 | 854,000 | 0 | 0 | 400,000 | 400,000 |
| TOTAL | 2,537,000 | 565,895 | 2,537,000 | 0 | 0 | 400,000 | 1,240,000 |

| Project Name | Programme | | | | | Costs | | Brief Project update |
|------------------------|------------------|------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | Current Stage | % Complete | Target Completion Date | Projected Completion Date | Programme RAG  | Costs to date as % of total available budget | Cost to completion RAG  | |
| Local Bus Network | Project underway | 75% | Mar-24 | Mar-24 |  | 5% |  | Contract has been awarded for the purchase of buses which will lead to a full spend, vehicles due to be delivered by March 2024. |
| Rail Station Parking | Project underway | 75% | Mar-24 | Mar-24 |  | 1% |  | A contractor has been appointed for the construction of Phase 3. Construction starts in January 2024 and will be complete by 22 March 2024 to allow full spend to be achieved. |
| Active Travel Projects | Project underway | 75% | Mar-24 | Mar-24 |  | 60% |  | Contracts are underway for all projects. Work is due to be completed by March 2024 and full spend is expected. |

Regional Active Travel Fund Programme 2023/24

| Town (est. Cost) | Action | Progress |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| Dumfries (£300k) | <p>Assess, develop and design a programme of appropriate active travel interventions at junctions/roundabouts across Dumfries town centre.</p> <p>Develop a Multi Modal Transport Model for Dumfries that will be used to identify/assess transport opportunities for LDP3 and other programmes. A separate audit of the model will be carried out by Transport Scotland to ensure accuracy.</p> | <p>Traffic assessment complete.</p> <p>Mirco-simulation model being developed.</p> <p>Public realm life surveys underway.</p> <p>Stakeholder workshop due early February on active travel and road safety measures.</p> <p>Due to be complete in March 2024.</p> |
| Dumfries (£200k) | Develop designs and deliver improvements for active travel access on Irish Street and at the Terregles Street/King Street junction. | <p>Included in package above.</p> <p>Due to be complete in March 2024.</p> |
| Stranraer (£100k) | Develop active travel interventions including the review of the potential contra-flow cycle permeability of one-way streets and a preferred gateway route for pedestrians and cyclists into town from Marina/harbour area to connect with existing facilities and tourism interests. | <p>Feasibility/Concept Stage 0-2 complete.</p> <p>Report due to be circulated to Public / Stakeholders in February 2024.</p> |
| Castle Douglas (£50k) | Develop active travel interventions including the assessment of King Street/Market Street/Oakwell Road Roundabout to realign, improve pedestrian crossing and cycle provision. | <p>Feasibility/Concept Stage 0-2 complete.</p> <p>Report due to be circulated to Public / Stakeholders in February 2024.</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Newton Stewart (£50k) | Develop active travel interventions including a review of links on Goods Lane/Queen Street/Albert Street/Victoria Street | Feasibility/Concept Stage 0-2 complete. Report due to be circulated to Public / Stakeholders in February 2024. |
| Region (£300k) | Develop the prioritised community path links, agreed by the SWestrans Board at its meeting in November 2021, which connect satellite communities to their nearest town and which will provide high quality, safer and more convenient routes to enable a switch from travel by car. | Feasibility/Concept Stage 0-2 underway. Will be completed by May 2024. |

STAG UPDATE

1. Reason for Report

To advise the Board on further feedback received from Transport Scotland on the Strategic Business Cases submitted by SWestrans for the potential re-opening of rail stations at Beattock, Eastriggs and Thornhill.

2. Background

2.1 SWestrans and Dumfries and Galloway Council have aspirations for the re-opening of rail stations at Thornhill, Eastriggs and Beattock.

2.2 In January 2016, Stantec (then PBA) was commissioned by SWestrans to undertake a Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG) pre-appraisal of sustainable transport options for the Thornhill and Eastriggs areas. Beattock Station Action Group (with modest funding support from SWestrans) also commissioned them to undertake a pre-appraisal for the Beattock/Moffat area.

2.3 In July 2016, the outcomes and recommendations from the STAG Pre-Appraisal work were presented to the Board. They identified a range of problems and opportunities for each area, and developed transport options to address these. The Board agreed that STAG Part 1 Appraisal studies would be progressed for Thornhill, Eastriggs and Beattock as each had the potential for a station project to emerge that could support a bid to the Scottish Government for funding.

2.4 In June 2017, the outcomes of the STAG Part 1 Appraisals were reported to the Board and at its meeting in September 2017 the Board agreed to progress with STAG Part 2 (now referred to as the 'Detailed Options Appraisal') studies for the Thornhill, Eastriggs and Beattock areas. Stantec (then PBA) were commissioned to undertake this work.

2.5 In August 2019, the three completed STAG Detailed Options Appraisals, and the Sustainable Transport Options Reports for each of the study areas were signed off.

2.6 In September 2019, the Board agreed that all three final STAG reports, would be submitted to Transport Scotland as the required Strategic Business Cases (SBC) for the potential re-opening of rail stations at Beattock, Eastriggs and Thornhill.

2.7 In December 2019, Transport Scotland advised that these SBCs would not be considered whilst rail stations at these locations were all possible interventions being considered in the Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR2).

2.8 In January 2022, the Governments STPR2 Phase 2 report was published with 45 draft recommendations. The report stated that new rail stations do not form recommendations in STPR2. However, elements may be appropriate to be taken forward at a regional or local level in accordance with the relevant railway processes.

2.9 In January 2022, the Board agreed that the Chair write to the Transport Minister to seek urgent clarification on the status of the three SBCs for Thornhill, Beattock and Eastriggs submitted by SWestrans in 2019 and to seek assurance that these were now being progressed through the relevant railway process.

2.10 In May 2022, a response from Transport Scotland confirmed our understanding of the STPR2 draft recommendations and stated ‘Given that STPR2 has now reported and its draft recommendations published, Transport Scotland is now in position to provide feedback on the submitted reports in line with the response provided in December 2019. Given that all three documents are substantial reports in themselves it would be our intention to provide a consolidated set of feedback which we anticipate should be available in late summer.’ The response also stated, ‘In advance of the specific feedback and as promoter, you may wish to consider whether updates to the reports are required to reflect, for example: changes in transport demand or provision in a study area, including those that have occurred post Covid; new or recently published and relevant national policies, strategies and plans; and recent updates to STAG guidance.’

2.11 In June 2022, the Board agreed to fund the production of three addendums (one for each study area) and that these would be submitted to Transport Scotland to assist in their detailed consideration of the submitted Strategic Business Cases. The addendums were submitted in August 2022.

2.12 A response from Transport Scotland dated 9 June 2023 provided feedback on the three completed transport appraisal reports. The response was shared with Board members at the 30 June 2023 board meeting.

2.13 Transport Scotland concluded that progressing any of the rail stations options is not justified in economic terms or non-monetised benefits and therefore none of the three reports demonstrate a socio-economic case for any of the stations.

2.14 At the 30 June 2023 meeting the Board agreed that clarification should be sought from Transport Scotland regarding feedback on the Business Cases (STAGs), and that the Chair would raise the matter when he meets with the Transport Minister. An email requesting clarification was sent to Transport Scotland on 19 July 2023 and the Chair has raised the matter with the Minister.

3. Transport Scotland Feedback

3.1 On 22 December 2023 SWestrans received feedback/further clarification on each station business case. The feedback received from Transport Scotland is included in this report as **Appendix 1** Beattock Detailed Appraisal Transport Scotland Feedback, **Appendix 2** Eastriggs Detailed Appraisal Transport Scotland Feedback, and **Appendix 3** Thornhill Detailed Appraisal Transport Scotland Feedback.

3.2 Transport Scotland has provided the following risk statement to reflect their conclusion from each review:

“IF the promoter chooses to progress proposals in the absence of as yet unidentified benefits and costs, THEN proposals cannot be supported by Transport Scotland, RESULTING IN no progression to the rail pipeline”.

3.3 Officers have discussed the Transport Scotland feedback with Stantec who were commissioned to undertake the STAGs and would comment as follows:

- The studies were undertaken in 2018-19. Many of the points raised could have potentially been addressed with earlier feedback.
- The emphasis of each of the studies was on the wider range of positive social impacts associated with improved connectivity which were identified in the appraisals.
- We were required to submit individual business cases for each study area with these to be assessed as standalone appraisals. Therefore, the point about each of the appraisals being affected by the others is not material.
- SMART Transport Planning Objectives (TPOs) have significantly evolved since these studies were undertaken in 2018-19. Agreeing these is now a much more robust and challenging process. However, when the studies were produced the TPOs developed were consistent with the process in place at that time and were in effect 'signed-off' by Transport Scotland with the original Case for Change (pre-appraisal). It is unhelpful to compare a more recent approach to TPOs against the approach that was in place in 2018-19.
- Logic maps were not part of the appraisal in 2018-19.
- The quantified analysis undertaken was considered proportionate to the scale of the proposals and reflected the budget available – some of the noted 'omissions' relate to very detailed points which would have little material impact on the appraisal (e.g. general station operating costs).
- Project resources precluded detailed costing of station and infrastructure options, a proportionate approach benchmarking costs was used.
- Station costs have increased significantly in recent years – but the costs used in the reports reflect the costs of recent builds at that time.
- Some points of detail are noted which would have little material impact on the appraisal (e.g., freight paths and volume of overnight traffic).
- Many of the points listed about 'lack of clarity' around issues will reflect the proportionate approach taken.

3.4 The ambition to re-open rail stations at these locations remains a priority within our Regional Transport Strategy 2022-42 (RTS) which was agreed at the June 2023 Board meeting. However, for any station reopening to get the necessary support/funding significant work will need to be undertaken to provide an acceptable socio-economic case. Any such work and budget to undertake it will need to be identified within the RTS Delivery Plan which will be brought to the Board as soon as Ministerial approval of the RTS is confirmed.

| 4. Implications | |
|------------------------|---|
| Financial | None. |
| Policy | No change in policy. This work fulfils SWestrans and Dumfries and Galloway Council policy objectives. |
| Equalities | Opportunities to enhance travel choice and experience for those with protected characteristics will emerge from the study findings. |
| Climate Change | Opportunities for modal shift will emerge from study findings. |
| Risk Management | The completion of STAG studies relates to two known risks: R02 – Public image R05 – Failure to progress RTS Delivery Plan |

5. Recommendations

Members of the Board are asked to:

5.1 note the feedback from Transport Scotland and;

5.2 note that the re-opening of rail stations at Beattock, Eastriggs and Thornhill will be included in the forthcoming Regional Transport Strategy Delivery Plan.

Douglas Kirkpatrick/Kirsty
Dunsmore - Report Author

Date of Report: 18 January 2024
File Ref: SW2/meetings/2024

Approved by: Douglas Kirkpatrick
Lead Officer
South West of Scotland Transport Partnership
Cargen Tower
Garroch Business Park,
Dumfries, DG2 8PN

Appendix 1- Beattock Detailed Appraisal Transport Scotland Feedback

Appendix 2- Eastriggs Detailed Appraisal Transport Scotland Feedback

Appendix 3- Thornhill Detailed Appraisal Transport Scotland Feedback

Beattock and Moffat Sustainable Transport Options Appraisal - Transport Scotland Feedback

General

Comments which materially impacted the conclusions presented in our letter of 09 June 2023, as representative of the 'Detailed Options Appraisal' stage in accordance with the STAG process, are set out below.

This feedback is provided as a supplement to our letter of 09 June 2023, and as a direct response to your request for additional feedback in your email of 19 July 2023 and our subsequent telephone discussion.

The provision of this feedback does not alter the conclusion of our review, namely that *“the findings of the reports do not provide the strength of evidence necessary for an SBC for any of the rail stations options at Beattock, Eastriggs and Thornhill, to justify progressing any of these options further... However, I would note that the appraisals have included consideration of other multi-modal transport options, i.e. bus-based options, in each of three areas which could potentially meet the Transport Planning Objectives”*.

The Socio-Economic Case

As noted in our letter, the appraisal fails to demonstrate the “socio-economic case” of the proposed rail station. This reflects the lack of a compelling case presented across the full breadth of appraisal criteria, which fails to offset the acknowledged position that the station options do not “stack up” economically. Furthermore, the appraisal clearly demonstrates there is no prospect for the provision of a rail service at the proposed station location.

For the station option, the appraisal outcomes demonstrate a negative impact against the Economy and Environment criteria and a weak performance against the Safety criteria. Considering the station’s location of “up to 1km from the furthest properties in Beattock” and 4.5km from Moffat, there is insufficient evidence to support the anticipated significant benefit against the Accessibility & Social Inclusion criteria. Further, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate how the acknowledged negative impacts on the fragile bus network will result in an overall significant benefit.

Comments are also provided below regarding the lack of SMART Transport Planning Objectives and clear links to the problems, issues, opportunities and constraints unique to the study area, and for which a rail station is purported to address.

Taken together, this equates to the lack of a “socio-economic case”.

Deliverability / Public Acceptability

Willingness to serve

The lack of willingness to serve by existing cross-border operators is noted, as are the outcomes of the notional timetabling exercise which identified *‘that it has not been possible to offer a plausible train service using the existing (May 2018) train services’*. The outcomes further state *‘There may be opportunities to provide train services that could call at Beattock, but this will be in the longer term and part of a wider requirement, as envisaged in the Scotland Route Study’*. There is currently no such Stirling-Carlisle service but there is a proposal to run a Stirling-London via Carlisle service. It is unclear whether such a service, if it were to run, would be interested in making rural stops. The identified operational feasibility constraints indicate that there is no scope for a stopping service to call at Beattock, without which a rail station would be redundant.

Economic Appraisal

Demand Forecasting

The Beattock appraisal is one of three undertaken by SWestrans for the South-West Scotland region. This appraisal considers only the existing station usage and catchment of Lockerbie and estimated usage / catchment of Beattock. There is no acknowledgement that a new station at one or both of Eastriggs / Thornhill may impact the catchment of Lockerbie and / or Beattock stations.

No scenarios / sensitivity tests have been developed or applied to test outcomes beyond the core scenario. In the absence of these, it is not possible to understand what the external factors are that would need to happen for a station at Beattock to be considered as the best Value for Money intervention in this area.

Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)

For option 6 (Rail Station) £123k shuttle-bus operating costs have been identified, but excluded from the BCR. General station operating costs also appear to be unquantified / excluded from the Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA).

Section 2.5.5 and table 6.6 mention fragility of the bus network and potential impacts of abstraction to rail from option 6 (Rail Station). These disbenefits are unquantified / excluded from the CBA. Transport Scotland acknowledges the fragile bus network in the area and recognises the importance of carefully considering future impacts on it.

Transport Planning Objectives (TPOs)

Whilst we note the TPO mapping to problems illustrated in figure 3.2, the link between the TPOs, problems / opportunities / issues / constraints and the resultant options could still be made more clear e.g. a Logic Map and supporting narrative would demonstrate the relevance of the TPOs to the identified problems / opportunities / issues / constraints, the scale of change being sought, the suitability of the proposed interventions and the anticipated immediate and longer term outcomes / impacts. Furthermore, the TPOs require further “SMART-ening” to fully articulate the change being sought and ensure their measurability. This is essential for both the appraisal of the options and the (potential) ability to monitor and evaluate post-implementation.

TPO2 also veers in to being solution led. TPOs should articulate the change being sought without including the solution which in this case is ‘providing public transport connectivity’. This is counter to the fundamental premise of an objective-led, transport appraisal.

Based on the above, we are unable to fully comment on the performance of options against the TPOs in their current form. However, this does not change our overarching position in that the appraisal outcomes demonstrate a lack of evidence in support of the “socio-economic case” across the full breadth of the STAG criteria. Notwithstanding this, we note that Table 5.2 states that for option 6 ‘*note that the Sunday timetable was not developed for the appraisal*’, whilst the TPO is presented as enabling travel across the day and across the week.

Other Considerations

In addition to the comments noted above which materially impacted the conclusion of our review, we note the below areas of the submission which were lacking in terms of detail required of a Detailed Appraisal:

- Practical implications of stakeholder's priority ranking of proposed SW rail stations is not made clear
- It is unclear whether the 'notional' timetable used to appraise the rail station option is inclusive or exclusive of a call at Lockerbie
- Mismatched baseline data e.g. some from Census 2001, some from Census 2011, some more recent still, some output area level, some intermediate zone
- Lack of clear rationale for revised option scoring from original appraisal to addendum revisions
- Lack of consideration of the station's "up to 1km from the furthest properties in Beattock" and 4.5km from Moffat against Accessibility criteria
- Lack of consideration of impacts of free Under 22 bus travel
- Lack of Appraisal Summary Tables / Option Summary Tables
- Lack of Monitoring & Evaluation
- Apparent lack of consideration of proposed development in Do-Minimum / reference case
- Lack of evidence to support statement that *poor connectivity to colleges / universities* is contributing to lower attainment levels
- Lack of exploration of links between *poor transport connectivity* and worsening deprivation levels

As scheme promoter, it is of course for SWestrans to determine appropriate next steps. The below risk statement reflects Transport Scotland's conclusion from our review

"IF the promoter chooses to progress proposals in the absence of as yet unidentified benefits and costs, THEN proposals cannot be supported by Transport Scotland, RESULTING IN no progression to the rail pipeline".

Eastriggs Sustainable Transport Options Appraisal - Transport Scotland Feedback

General

Comments which materially impacted the conclusions presented in our letter of 09 June 2023, as representative of the 'Detailed Options Appraisal' stage in accordance with the STAG process, are set out below.

This feedback is provided as a supplement to our letter of 09 June 2023, and as a direct response to your request for additional feedback in your email of 19 July 2023 and our subsequent telephone discussion.

The provision of this feedback does not alter the conclusion of our review, namely that *“the findings of the reports do not provide the strength of evidence necessary for an SBC for any of the rail stations options at Beattock, Eastriggs and Thornhill, to justify progressing any of these options further... However, I would note that the appraisals have included consideration of other multi-modal transport options, i.e. bus-based options, in each of three areas which could potentially meet the Transport Planning Objectives”*.

The Socio-Economic Case

As noted in our letter, the appraisal fails to demonstrate the “socio-economic case” of the proposed rail station. This reflects the lack of a compelling case presented across the full breadth of appraisal criteria, which fails to offset the acknowledged position that the station options do not “stack up” economically.

For the station option, the appraisal outcomes demonstrate a negative impact against the Economy and Environment criteria and a weak performance against the Safety criteria. There is also insufficient evidence to demonstrate how the acknowledged negative impacts on the fragile bus network will result in an overall significant benefit against the Accessibility & Social Inclusion criteria.

Comments are also provided below regarding the lack of SMART Transport Planning Objectives and clear links to the problems, issues, opportunities and constraints unique to the study area, and for which a rail station is purported to address.

Taken together, this equates to the lack of a “socio-economic case”.

Economic Appraisal

Demand Forecasting

The Eastriggs appraisal is one of three undertaken by SWestrans for the South-West Scotland region. This appraisal considers only the existing station usage and catchment of Gretna / Annan and estimated usage / catchment of Eastriggs. There is no acknowledgement that a new station at one or both of Beattock / Thornhill may impact the catchment of Gretna / Annan and / or Eastriggs stations.

No scenarios / sensitivity tests have been developed or applied to test outcomes beyond the core scenario. In the absence of these, it is not possible to understand what the external factors are that would need to happen for a station at Eastriggs to be considered as the best Value for Money intervention in this area."

Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)

Section 2.5.5 and table 6.6 mention fragility of the bus network and potential impacts of abstraction to rail from option 6 (Rail Station). These disbenefits are unquantified / excluded from the Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA). Transport Scotland acknowledges the fragile bus network in the area and recognises the importance of carefully considering future impacts on it.

For option 6 (Rail station), bus service integration costs and impacts appear to be un-quantified / excluded from the CBA. General station operating costs also appear to be un-quantified / excluded from the CBA. It is best practice that these are included/considered and this would likely mean that the BCR would be further eroded.

Transport Planning Objectives (TPOs)

Whilst we note the TPO mapping to problems illustrated in figure 3.2, the link between the TPOs, problems / opportunities / issues / constraints and the resultant options could still be made more clear e.g. a Logic Map and supporting narrative would demonstrate the relevance of the TPOs to the identified problems /

opportunities / issues / constraints, the scale of change being sought, the suitability of the proposed interventions and the anticipated immediate and longer term outcomes / impacts. Furthermore, the TPOs require further “SMART-ening” to fully articulate the change being sought and ensure their measurability. This is essential for both the appraisal of the options and the (potential) ability to monitor and evaluate post-implementation.

TPO2 also veers in to being solution led. TPOs should articulate the change being sought without including the solution which in this case is ‘providing public transport connectivity’. This is counter to the fundamental premise of an objective-led, transport appraisal.

Based on the above, we are unable to fully comment on the performance of options against the TPOs in their current form. However, this does not change our overarching position in that the appraisal outcomes demonstrate a lack of evidence in support of the “socio-economic case” across the full breadth of the STAG criteria.

Cost to Government

£8m and £11m are noted as representing the lower / higher range of assumed station costs. The rationale for costs in 5.6.40 includes ‘*The train service at Eastriggs is not intense and the night offers a period which is largely train free*’. There is in fact an hourly service in each direction and there are numerous freight paths overnight as well as between passenger services on the line. Further, P.3.1 states that ‘*There are still a lot of freight paths, but these are largely for coal traffic which will dwindle to nil by 2025 due to UK Government policy to phase out coal fired power generation*’. The assumption that freight paths will be removed by 2025 due to the reduced need to transport coal is not in line with the Scottish Government freight policy, in fact the position is that there is to be a greater shift toward rail freight in order to achieve Net Zero ambitions.

Engagement from Network Rail in A.6.2 states that ‘*This section of the route has ‘closed boxes’ meaning that infrastructure improvements or more signallers would likely be required in order to deliver a new station*’. This has not been included in costing.

O.5.6 states the proposal for 101m length (4-car) platforms, the specification upon which costing has been developed. This differs from most modern platforms which would be built to accommodate 6-cars.

Considering the above the costs to government have been underestimated or are not realistic as presented.

Deliverability / Public Acceptability

Discussion of *affordability* is lacking in some instances e.g. there is no discussion as to whether the £8-11m estimated costs for option 6 (Rail Station) are considered affordable, nor how / where this would be funded. There is also no discussion as to ongoing affordability i.e. operation / maintenance costs etc. These are essential elements in considering the business case of any transport intervention.

Potential Timetable

Engagement from Network Rail in A.6.2 states that '*The section of the route towards Gretna is single tracked which could introduce issues in terms of timetabling*'. The appraisal states that the current timetable could accommodate the additional stop with minimal changes but the analysis does not include freight paths.

G.8.19 states '*The retiming of existing services, at either the northern or southern end of the GSWL route to allow for a call at Eastriggs station presents clashes with other train paths and would require a comprehensive re-planning of all the services on the route, and at the southern end has the potential to destroy a number of published connections. However, a potential reduction in unnecessary pathing time, increases in the generic line speed, the potential for new trains (as noted in the Scotland Route Study) or improvements made as part of the Abellio ScotRail franchise agreement offer alternative opportunities for the introduction of a stop at Eastriggs*'. The impact of skipped calls and wider network delays do not appear to have been accounted for within the appraisal.

Other Considerations

In addition to the comments noted above which materially impacted the conclusion of our review, we note the below areas of the submission which were lacking in terms of detail required of a Detailed Appraisal:

- Practical implications of stakeholder's priority ranking of proposed SW rail stations is not made clear
- Mismatched baseline data e.g. some from Census 2001, some from Census 2011, some more recent still, some output area level, some intermediate zone
- Lack of clear rationale for revised option scoring from original appraisal to addendum revisions
- Lack of definition / quantification of 'older school children
- Lack of clarity regarding 'key destinations', their relevance, and their impact on TPO appraisal

Transport Scotland

- Lack of evidence to support TPO scoring where only a minor scale of change is anticipated
- Conflicting information regarding how many people participated in different engagement activities
- Lack of consideration of impacts of free Under 22 bus travel
- Lack of Appraisal Summary Tables / Option Summary Tables
- Lack of Monitoring & Evaluation
- Apparent lack of consideration of proposed development in Do-Minimum / reference case
- Lack of evidence to support statement that *poor connectivity to colleges / universities* is contributing to lower attainment levels
- Lack of exploration of links between higher attainment and outward migration and worsening deprivation levels
- Apparently conflicting information presented regarding levels of employment accessibility

As scheme promoter, it is of course for SWestrans to determine appropriate next steps. The below risk statement reflects Transport Scotland's conclusion from our review

"IF the promoter chooses to progress proposals in the absence of as yet unidentified benefits and costs, THEN proposals cannot be supported by Transport Scotland, RESULTING IN no progression to the rail pipeline".

Thornhill Sustainable Transport Options Appraisal - Transport Scotland Feedback

General

Comments which materially impacted the conclusions presented in our letter of 09 June 2023, as representative of the 'Detailed Options Appraisal' stage in accordance with the STAG process, are set out below.

This feedback is provided as a supplement to our letter of 09 June 2023, and as a direct response to your request for additional feedback in your email of 19 July 2023 and our subsequent telephone discussion.

The provision of this feedback does not alter the conclusion of our review, namely that *“the findings of the reports do not provide the strength of evidence necessary for an SBC for any of the rail stations options at Beattock, Eastriggs and Thornhill, to justify progressing any of these options further... However, I would note that the appraisals have included consideration of other multi-modal transport options, i.e. bus-based options, in each of three areas which could potentially meet the Transport Planning Objectives”*.

The Socio-Economic Case

As noted in our letter, the appraisal fails to demonstrate the “socio-economic case” of the proposed rail station. This reflects the lack of a compelling case presented across the full breadth of appraisal criteria, which fails to offset the acknowledged position that the station options do not “stack up” economically.

For the station option, the appraisal outcomes demonstrate a negative impact against the Economy and Environment criteria and a weak performance against the Safety criteria. Considering the station’s location of 1.5km from the centre of Thornhill, there is insufficient evidence to support the anticipated significant benefit against the Accessibility & Social Inclusion criteria. Further, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate how the acknowledged negative impacts on the fragile bus network will result in an overall significant benefit.

Comments are also provided below regarding the lack of SMART Transport Planning Objectives and clear links to the problems, issues, opportunities and constraints unique to the study area, and for which a rail station is purported to address.

Taken together, this equates to the lack of a “socio-economic case”.

Economic Appraisal

Demand Forecasting

The Thornhill appraisal is one of three undertaken by SWestrans for the South-West Scotland region. This appraisal considers only the existing station usage and catchment of Sanquhar and estimated usage / catchment of Thornhill. There is no acknowledgement that a new station at one or both of Beattock / Eastriggs may impact the catchment of Sanquhar and / or Thornhill stations.

The proposed station location is 1.5km from the centre of Thornhill. Demand forecasting / revenue modelling does not appear to account for any interchange penalty which results from the requirement to access the station by any another mode.

No scenarios / sensitivity tests have been developed or applied to test outcomes beyond the core scenario. In the absence of these, it is not possible to understand what the external factors are that would need to happen for a station at Thornhill to be considered as the best Value for Money intervention in this area.

Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)

For option 6 (Rail Station) £145k shuttle-bus operating costs have been identified, but excluded from the BCR. General station operating costs also appear to be unquantified / excluded from the Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA).

Section 2.5.5 and table 6.6 mention fragility of the bus network and potential impacts of abstraction to rail from option 6 (Rail Station). These disbenefits are unquantified / excluded from the CBA. Transport Scotland acknowledges the fragile bus network in the area and recognises the importance of carefully considering future impacts on it.

Transport Planning Objectives (TPOs)

Whilst we note the TPO mapping to problems illustrated in figure 3.2, the link between the TPOs, problems / opportunities / issues / constraints and the resultant

options could still be made more clear e.g. a Logic Map and supporting narrative would demonstrate the relevance of the TPOs to the identified problems / opportunities / issues / constraints, the scale of change being sought, the suitability of the proposed interventions and the anticipated immediate and longer term outcomes / impacts. Furthermore, the TPOs require further “SMART-ening” to fully articulate the change being sought and ensure their measurability. This is essential for both the appraisal of the options and the (potential) ability to monitor and evaluate post-implementation.

TPO2 also veers in to being solution led. TPOs should articulate the change being sought without including the solution which in this case is ‘providing public transport connectivity’. This is counter to the fundamental premise of an objective-led, transport appraisal.

Based on the above, we are unable to fully comment on the performance of options against the TPOs in their current form. However, this does not change our overarching position in that the appraisal outcomes demonstrate a lack of evidence in support of the “socio-economic case” across the full breadth of the STAG criteria.

Cost to Government

£8m and £11m are noted as representing the lower / higher range of assumed station costs. The rationale for costs in 5.6.31 includes ‘*The train service at Thornhill is not intense and the night offers a period which is largely train free*’. There is in fact an hourly service in each direction and there are numerous freight paths overnight as well as between passenger services on the line. Further, P.3.1 states that ‘*There are still a lot of freight paths, but these are largely for coal traffic which will dwindle to nil by 2025 due to UK Government policy to phase out coal fired power generation*’. The assumption that freight paths will be removed by 2025 due to the reduced need to transport coal is not in line with the Scottish Government freight policy, where our position is that there is to be a greater shift toward rail freight in order to achieve Net Zero ambitions.

Engagement from Network Rail in A.5.2 states that ‘*this section of the GSWL has ‘closed boxes’ meaning that infrastructure improvements or more signallers would likely be required in order to deliver a new station*’. This has not been included in costing.

O.5.6 states the proposal for 101m length (4-car) platforms, the specification upon which costing has been developed. This differs from most modern platforms which would be built to accommodate 6-cars.

Considering the above the costs to government have been underestimated or are not realistic as presented.

Deliverability / Public Acceptability

Discussion of *affordability* is lacking in some instances e.g. there is no discussion as to whether the £8-11m estimated costs for option 6 (Rail Station) are considered affordable, nor how / where this would be funded. There is also no discussion as to ongoing affordability i.e. operation / maintenance costs etc. These are essential elements in considering the business case of any transport intervention.

Potential Timetable

Timetable assumptions do not take account of freight paths.

The appraisal assumes that the train would travel between Sanquhar and Thornhill in 10mins, but the Sectional Running Time (SRT) given in P.2.2 is 15mins. This SRT is labelled both Start - Stop and Start - Start so it is unclear whether the 15mins includes dwell time or not, but either way it will be over 10mins.

G.8.17 states *'The re-timing of existing services, at either the northern or southern end of the GSWL route to allow for a call at Thornhill station presents clashes with other train paths and would require a comprehensive re-planning of all the services on the route, and at the southern end has the potential to destroy a number of published connections. However, a potential reduction in unnecessary pathing time, increases in the generic line speed, the potential for reduced calls at other stations or improvements made as part of the Abellio ScotRail franchise agreement offer alternative opportunities for the introduction of a stop at Thornhill'*. The impact of skipped calls and wider network delays do not appear to have been accounted for within the appraisal.

Considering the above the disbenefits to other rail users have been underestimated or are not realistic as presented.

Other Considerations

In addition to the comments noted above which materially impacted the conclusion of our review, we note the below areas of the submission which were lacking in terms of detail required of a Detailed Appraisal:

- Practical implications of stakeholder's priority ranking of proposed SW rail stations is not made clear

Transport Scotland

- Mismatched baseline data e.g. some from Census 2001, some from Census 2011, some more recent still, some output area level, some intermediate zone
- Lack of clear rationale for revised option scoring from original appraisal to addendum revisions
- Lack of clarity regarding 'key destinations', their relevance, and their impact on TPO appraisal
- Lack of evidence to support TPO scoring where only a minor scale of change is anticipated
- Lack of clarity around bus / rail timetable integration
- Lack of clarity around before / after bus timetables
- Lack of consideration of station's 1.5km distance from centre of Thornhill against Accessibility criteria
- Lack of clarity regarding the type of journey, and therefore problems issues / opportunities / constraints the rail station option is anticipated to address
- Lack of consideration of impacts of free Under 22 bus travel
- Lack of Appraisal Summary Tables / Option Summary Tables
- Lack of Monitoring & Evaluation
- Apparent lack of consideration of proposed development in Do-Minimum / reference case
- Lack of clarity regarding handling of biased data identified in Travel-to-Work analysis
- Lack of clarity regarding attainment levels vs *poor connectivity to colleges / universities* which appears to contradict causal relationship suggested in other SW studies

As scheme promoter, it is of course for SWestrans to determine appropriate next steps. The below risk statement reflects Transport Scotland's conclusion from our review

"IF the promoter chooses to progress proposals in the absence of (as yet) unidentified benefits and costs, THEN proposals cannot be supported by Transport Scotland, RESULTING IN no progression to the rail pipeline".

RISK MANAGEMENT

1. Reason for Report

To update Members of the Board on SWestrans Risk Register for 2024/25.

2. Background

At the beginning of each calendar year SWestrans Board agree the Risk Register for the upcoming year. At its meeting on 27 January 2023, the Board agreed an updated Risk Register for 2023/24.

3. Key Points

3.1 Risk identification is an ongoing task. Effective risk identification requires arrangements for gathering evidence about new issues, existing issues and important changes that may pose future risks.

3.2 Risk assessment involves considering the likelihood of an event occurring and its potential impact. As this involves predicting future events, it naturally carries some degree of uncertainty and is based on judgement (preferably based on available evidence).

3.3 The 'Risk Matrix' shown below is used to establish a risk rating. The matrix is colour coded; green to indicate an acceptable risk rating, and red to indicate an unacceptable risk rating. The boundary between the two areas is referred to as the "risk appetite line". All risks placed above the "risk appetite" line, coloured red in the diagram, must be planned and managed in some way.

| | | Risk Matrix | | | | |
|------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| Likelihood | 5 Almost Certain | Yellow | | Red | | |
| | 4 Likely | Yellow | | Red | | |
| | 3 Possible | Green | Yellow | Yellow | Red | |
| | 2 Unlikely | Green | Green | Yellow | Yellow | Red |
| | 1 Almost Impossible | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Yellow |
| | | 1 Negligible | 2 Minor | 3 Moderate | 4 Major | 5 Severe |
| | | Impact | | | | |

3.4 Risk Treatment means taking action to reduce, as far as possible, the risk or its likely impact. Four general strategies are available: transfer, tolerate, treat or terminate the risk. Risks above the "risk appetite" line may require "treatment". The purpose is not necessarily to eliminate the risk, it may be, to reduce the likelihood and/or impact should

it occur. Risks above the tolerability threshold will need to be regularly monitored and reported on, as appropriate.

3.5 Officers have reviewed the existing Risk Register and have provided a draft for 2024/25 for agreement included as the **Appendix**. It is intended for the Risk Register to be a fluid document which can be added to or indeed risks removed from throughout the year.

3.6 SWestrans is currently being audited by the Council's Internal Audit team which may result in risks being identified that are not currently on the Risk Register. If any new risk is identified or existing risks need amendment following completion of the audit an update will be brought to a future Board meeting in 2024 for agreement.

| 4. Implications | |
|------------------------|--|
| Financial | There are no direct financial implications from this report. |
| Policy | Policy implications are included within the Risk Register |
| Equalities | No equalities implications from this report |
| Climate Change | No climate change implications from this report |
| Risk Management | A current Risk Register is critical for managing risk |

| 5. Recommendation |
|--|
| Members of the Board are asked to: |
| 5.1 consider and agree the Risk Register for 2024/25 included as the Appendix and; |
| 5.2 note that there may be an updated Risk Register brought to a future meeting once the internal audit is complete. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Report Author: Kirsty Dunsmore Tel: 07734 073391 | Approved by: Douglas Kirkpatrick Lead Officer South West of Scotland Transport Partnership Cargen Tower Garroch Business Park Dumfries DG2 8PN |
| Date of Report: 17 January 2024 File Ref: SW2/Meetings/2024 | |

APPENDIX – SWestrans Risk Register 2024/25

SWestrans Risk Register 2024/25



| Code | Risk Title | Risk Description | Potential Effect | Internal Controls | Current Risk Rating | Approach | Related Actions | Target Risk Rating | Managed By | Assigned To |
|------|--------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|----------|-----------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| R01 | Restructure | Restructure or dissolution of RTPs by Scottish Ministers | Compromises continuity of delivery of transport functions and Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) | Use of performance management to demonstrate the effectiveness of the existing structure | Unlikely/ Major (Medium) | Tolerate | | Unlikely/ Major (Medium) | Lead Officer | Lead Officer |
| R02 | Public Image | Poor public perception of SWestrans | The credibility and authority of the organisation is undermined | Use of Council Communications Unit to manage press relations and to present a positive message Use of appropriate media channels to proactively deliver information on SWestrans activities | Possible/ Moderate (Medium) | Tolerate | | Possible/ Minor (Medium) | Lead Officer | Public Transport Officer |

| Code | Risk Title | Risk Description | Potential Effect | Internal Controls | Current Risk Rating | Approach | Related Actions | Target Risk Rating | Managed By | Assigned To |
|------|---------------------|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|----------|-----------------|--------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| R03 | Strategic Direction | Change in Dumfries and Galloway Council (DGC) and/or Scottish Government strategic priorities | RTS is out of alignment with National and Local strategic priorities SWestrans resources are redirected to non RTS activity | Strategies Mapping and Alignment Exercise Annual monitoring and review of RTS RTS is realigned with revised DGC and Government strategic objectives if appropriate | Possible/ Moderate (Medium) | Tolerate | | Possible/ Minor (Medium) | Lead Officer | Team Leader |
| R04 | Capital Funding | Loss, reduction or inability to spend capital funding | Projects within the Capital Programme are compromised The Capital Programme includes purchase of buses, bus infrastructure, Rail Station parking and Active Travel projects | Use of Business Plan to project future years requirements Close working with DGC Adjustment of Business Plan to revised funding profiles | Possible/ Major (High) | Tolerate | | Possible/ Minor (Medium) | Lead Officer | Team Leader |

| Code | Risk Title | Risk Description | Potential Effect | Internal Controls | Current Risk Rating | Approach | Related Actions | Target Risk Rating | Managed By | Assigned To |
|------|----------------------|--|---|--|--------------------------|----------|--|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| R05 | RTS Delivery | Failure to progress the RTS Delivery Plan | Delivery of the RTS is not progressed as anticipated | Performance Management Framework | Unlikely/ Minor (Low) | Tolerate | | Unlikely/ Minor (Low) | Lead Officer | Team Leader |
| R06 | Overspend | Expenditure commitment exceeds available budget | Funding is not available to meet obligations Third party action could sue | Financial management processes are provided by DGC | Unlikely/ Major (Medium) | Tolerate | | Almost Impossible/ Minor (Low) | Lead Officer | Lead Officer |
| R07 | Revenue Funding | Loss of revenue funding due to public sector funding pressures | Procurement of socially necessary local bus services is compromised | School and Local Bus Review 2024 | Likely/ Severe (High) | Treat | Regular reports on sustainability | Likely/ Moderate (High) | Lead Officer | Lead Officer |
| R08 | Bus Contracts Prices | Contract prices increase | Existing bus network is unsustainable within current budgets Multiplier effect of reducing network | School and Local Bus Review 2024 | Likely/ Major (High) | Treat | Regular liaison meetings with local bus operators Review industry costs to determine future trends Tenders based on known need | Likely/ Moderate (High) | Lead Officer | Lead Officer |

| Code | Risk Title | Risk Description | Potential Effect | Internal Controls | Current Risk Rating | Approach | Related Actions | Target Risk Rating | Managed By | Assigned To |
|------|-------------------|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|----------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| R09 | Loss of Staff | Loss of Lead Officer | Operational management of SWestrans is compromised | Interim arrangements would be put in place pending appointment of replacement | Possible/Major (High) | Treat | Identify where interim responsibility lies in partnership with DGC Succession planning | Possible/Moderate (Medium) | SWestrans Board | Secretary to the Board / Team Leader |
| | | Loss of Team Leader, Policy and Projects Officers, Public Transport Officer, Public Transport Assistant | Lack of resource to fulfil SWestrans functions | Initiate recruitment to replace | Possible/Moderate (Medium) | Tolerate | Lead Officer or Team Leader will assume interim responsibility | Possible/Moderate (Medium) | Lead Officer | Lead Officer |
| R10 | Procurement | Failure to comply with procurement regulations | SWestrans is exposed to potentially costly litigation | Procurement advice and support is provided by DGC | Almost Impossible/Severe (Medium) | Tolerate | | Almost Impossible/Severe (Medium) | Lead Officer | Team Leader |
| R11 | Contract Disputes | Contracts are poorly drafted | Disputes with contractors and potentially costly litigation | Contract law advice and support is provided by DGC | Almost Impossible/Major (Medium) | Tolerate | | Almost Impossible/Minor (Low) | Lead Officer | Team Leader |

| Code | Risk Title | Risk Description | Potential Effect | Internal Controls | Current Risk Rating | Approach | Related Actions | Target Risk Rating | Managed By | Assigned To |
|------|--|---|--|--|--------------------------|----------|--|------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| R12 | Third Party Liabilities | Legal action is brought against SWestrans by third parties for any reason | Potentially costly litigation | Potential liabilities are transferred to other bodies wherever possible Legal advice and support is provided by DGC | Unlikely/ Major (Medium) | Treat | Ensure insurance cover is adequate | Unlikely/ Minor (Low) | Lead Officer | Team Leader |
| R13 | Lack of bus operators and drivers | Can lead to monopoly of the market and operators prices high due to lack of competition and bus drivers | Contract not sustainable as too costly | Ensure good relations with all local bus companies | Likely/ Major (High) | Treat | Regular liaison meetings with local bus operators to identify areas of concern Annual review of local market conditions | Likely/ Minor (Medium) | Lead Officer | Public Transport Officer |
| R14 | Withdrawal of DGC governance and financial support | DGC no longer supports the work of SWestrans so have to procure services from other sources | Risk in interim period from withdrawal to appointment of staff or new providers Potential high cost of this | Ensure continued good relations with DGC by informing of the work of SWestrans | Unlikely/ Minor (Low) | Tolerate | | Unlikely/ Minor (Low) | Lead Officer | Lead Officer |

| Code | Risk Title | Risk Description | Potential Effect | Internal Controls | Current Risk Rating | Approach | Related Actions | Target Risk Rating | Managed By | Assigned To |
|------|-----------------|--|--|--|-----------------------------|----------|--|------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| R15 | Cyber Crime | Cyber-attack on digital systems which results in compromised security, reduced business resilience and increased opportunity for fraud | Risk of system failure and impaired organisational function Potential data breach | SWestrans digital systems are owned and managed by DGC SWestrans receive regular communication/ advice from the Scottish Government's Cyber Resilience Unit | Possible/ Major (High) | Treat | Regular liaison with DGC's Business and Technology Solutions team operators to identify areas of concern, risk and raise staff awareness of possible threats | Possible / Moderate (Medium) | Lead Officer | Team Leader |
| R16 | Data Protection | Failure to comply with data protection regulations | SWestrans is exposed to potentially costly litigation Reputational risk | Data protection advice and support is provided by DGC | Possible/ Moderate (Medium) | Treat | Staff training and awareness Full review of business procedures Full regulation compliance including a review of GDPR requirements | Unlikely/ Moderate (Medium) | Lead Officer | Team Leader |

| Code | Risk Title | Risk Description | Potential Effect | Internal Controls | Current Risk Rating | Approach | Related Actions | Target Risk Rating | Managed By | Assigned To |
|------|------------|--|---|--|---------------------------|----------|---|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| R17 | Pandemics | Impact of any pandemic on the work of SWestrans and the effect on public transport network | <p>Disruption to transport network</p> <p>Disruption to staff availability</p> <p>Failure to provide socially necessary transport to the most vulnerable in our communities</p> | Liaise with partners and stakeholders to minimise potential impact | Possible/ Major (High) | Treat | Identify areas of concern at earliest opportunity | Possible/ Minor (Medium) | Lead Officer | Lead Officer |