



### Notes of Meeting

**Meeting** Roads Authorities and Utilities Committee (Scotland)

**Place of** Meeting held on MS TEAMS

**Date:** Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> June 2024

**Present: -**

<b>Philip McKay (R.A. Co-Chair)</b>		<b>P.McK,</b>	<b>Aberdeenshire Council</b>
<b>Fiona McInnes (S.U. Co-Chair)</b>		<b>F.McI.</b>	<b>Scottish Water</b>
Kevin Abercrombie	K.A.		Aberdeen City Council
Ainsleigh Brown	A.B.		Transport Scotland
Kevin Burns	K.B.		Inverclyde Council
David Armitage	D.J.A.		Aberdeenshire Council
Caroline Auld	C.A.		Network Rail
David Capon	D.C.		JAG UK
David Carter	D.Ca.		South Lanarkshire
Karyn Davidson	K.D.		Vodafone
Jim Forbes	J.F.		CityFibre
Darren Grant	D.G.		SSEN
Julie Greig	J.G.		SGN
Jason Halliday	J.H.		o.S.R.W.C.
Kevin Hamilton	K.H.		Scottish Road Works Commissioner
Keith Allison	K.A.		City of Edinburgh Council
Michelle MacDonald	M.MacD.		Virgin Media / O2
Steven McGill	S.McG.		Energy Assets
Alison Macleod	A.MacL.		Highland Council
Craig McQueen	C.McQ.		Scottish Water
Martin Polland	M.P.		Transport Scotland
Kat Quane	K.Q.		Transport Scotland
David Shaw	D.S.		Ayrshire Roads Alliance
Calum Stewart	C.S.		Glasgow City Council
David Thomson	D.T.		SPEN
James Watson	J.W.		Perth and Kinross Council

**In Attendance: -**

George Borthwick	G.B.	RAUC(S) Secretary
Edwards, Jo	J.E.	Arup Aecom
Helena Lacalle Jimenez	H.L.J.	Arup Aecom

**Apologies: -**

Carlyn Fraser	C.F.	City of Edinburgh Council
Roger Garbett	R.G.	Improvement Service
Michael Grunwell	M.G.	Dumfries and Galloway Council
Owen Harte	O.H.	Virgin Media / O2

**Apologies Continued: -**

Elizabeth MacIver	E.MacI.	Highland Council
Kevin Skinner	K.S.	Scottish Water
Scott Walker	S.W.	North Lanarkshire Council

1. Introduction and Apologies

P.McK. welcomed all to the meeting.

P.McK. indicated that today, Fiona McInnes would complete her two years as the S.U. Co-Chair and on behalf of the RAUC(S) Community he thanked her for all her input to RAUC(S). While she was standing down as the RAUC(S) Co-Chair she had agreed to be the SRWR Steering Group Chair so she would still be providing a valuable service to the Community.

Fiona thanked Philip and the Committee for their assistance over the two years and was looking forward to attending the meetings with a cycle of meetings being held face to face.

Fiona added that the new S.U. Co-Chair was David Thomson from SPEN who would be Chairing the next meeting in October.

P.McK. then informed the meeting that Jim Forbes was retiring in July so this would be his last RAUC(S) meeting. Philip on behalf of the RAUC(S) Community thanked Jim for all his input as a R.A. and S.U. member, Chair and other rolls and wished him a happy retirement.

Jim thanked Philip and the Committee for their assistance over the years and wished the Community well as it went forward.

P.McK. lastly indicated that David Armitage was finally retiring in July and this would be his last RAUC(S) meeting. Philip on behalf of the RAUC(S) Community thanked David for all his contributions to the Community. Philip commented that David must hold the record for being involved with the development of the Register from Mark 1 to the present version and had held all rolls on the various committees.

David thanked Philip and the Committee for their assistance over the years and wished the Community well as it went forward.

2. Presentation

- i. Gazetteer – Getting More from our Data Roger Garbett

P.McK. indicated that R.G. was unable to attend the meeting and his presentation would therefor be postponed to the next meeting.

- ii. “Red Book” Review - Update Jo Edwards / Helena Lacalle Jimenez

P.McK. welcomed Jo and Helena to the meeting and invited them to give their presentation on the DfT review of the Safety at Street Works and Road Works: Safety Code (Red Book).

Jo reported that Arup Aecom had been appointed by the DfT to carry out a review of the Red Book revising / updating it as may be necessary to accommodate changes in Legislation and practise.

The scope of the review and update was to: -

- Clearly state where requirements are mandatory or advisory.
- Reduce ambiguity within the text and in relation to other relevant legislation, codes and advice notes.

- Fully comply with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 (TSRGD).

The project had received input from HAUC UK who had carried out an initial review and had submitted draft revised sections for a new version of the Code.

The objective of the review is to: -

- ensure the Safety Code upholds safety standards, and accurately enables S.U.s, and R.As to safely carry out the signing, lighting and guarding of road works on roads;
- ensure the safety of all road user groups, including pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians where they encounter road works;
- identify where guidance applies to specific countries i.e England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland.
- To have the draft code ready for public consultation this year. It is hoped that this will still be achievable despite the potential delay due to the Election.

The review programme is: -

- Phase 1 – In January / February collect information and list the issues to be addressed. This phase included – a review of the issues list which groups had submitted then identify any other relevant issues before organising meetings to discuss the lists
- Phase 2 – In March / April / May commence drafting with a workshop to prioritise issues. In June July and August collect feedback on the early drafts. This Phase included – holding a workshop and AECOMArup drafting the content. HAUC groups carried out a review and provided feedback. DfT then reviewed the proposed document prior to AECOMArup finalising the draft document.
- Phase 3 – During September to December the code will be finalised ready for publication. In October the Code will be subject to Ministerial review ready for public consultation in November. The Public Consultation will be held over 8 weeks prior to the Document finalisation and publication.
- The plan is to have the initial draft ready for comment by the Chairs and Co-Chairs by 28<sup>th</sup> June and this appears to be on track.

The key changes are: -

- Active Travel – This will improve safety provision for pedestrians, cyclists and vulnerable road users including: -
  - Develop hierarchy for footway users e.g. pedestrians, users with prams, disabled on foot (including those with partial or no site) and those in wheelchairs (manual or powered) and mobility scooters.
  - Shuttle widths to prevent unsafe overtaking
  - Site set up considerations
- Mobile and short duration works – developing definitions and decision hierarchy. This topic is liable to require more comment to ensure it covers the required methods of working while meeting the requirements of the Legislation.
- Unattended sites – aligning the frequency of checking these sites across the 4 nations

- Vehicle markings and PPE – consistency across 4 nations
- Fixing of ramps and signs – provide clarity on the term ‘fixed’ for consistency.
- Information boards – inclusion of additional information
- Improve navigation – structure and formatting of the Code for ease and consistency of use.

F.McI. commented on the increasing requests for Manual Traffic Control to be used on sites often with no option allowed to use either preset or intelligent installations. Experience with intelligent systems have indicated that they are more efficient in dealing with traffic flows. There is also the safety and cost of operatives. These issues should hopefully be clarified in the new Code.

This is a matter which R.As will wish to comment on as they need to meet the network conditions for road users.

D.C. said that the review and the draft will be extensively discussed in the English Community. He added: -

- The intelligent signals were a major step forward in managing the traffic flows on site.
- There was an increasing number of Authorities asking for manual control in England and the requests should only be made when there was good reason. The facility should be provided to allow temporary signals to be used when the flows drop off e.g. between rush hours,
- The document should have a good simple index to sign post the information available.
- The wind issue relating to using for instance sandbags has been updated.

Other issues raised were: -

- The criteria for choosing the correct size of signs should be set to avoid them being too large for the available space but large enough to be read.
- The document needs to be available on site so should be large enough to be read on site but small enough to be carried in the safety jacket pocket. Comment was made that these factors should be accommodated including an appendix. D.C. commented that it was an obvious code to be available on a smart phone or tablet.

P.McK. thanked Jo and Helena for their presentation and asked them to send the slides to the Secretary for circulation. **Action - Secretary**

3. Minutes of previous Meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> February 2024 and any Matters Arising  
a) Accuracy

The minutes of the last meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> February 2024 were agreed with the following changes: -

- Craig McQueen should be added to the sederunt.  
C,McQ, was concerned that there were no Actions on the discussions on the Section 120 Protected Road Status in Item No. 4av Gazetteer Group.

Scottish Water and SGN had received accounts from the Agent for the route for costs relating to their plant within the AWPR. The plant had been dealt with prior to the

construction of the road and to part of the route being designated as a protected road only after the completion of the project.

This matter requires to be discussed, and the Item needs to be revised. The following wording should be added: -

This matter will be raised with the Coordination Working Group who will report back to RAUC(S). Please pass any comments to F.McI. **Action – F.McI. / D.S.**

There have been other sites so the Working group is already aware of the problem.

K.Q. asked to be kept informed of the discussions.

b. Action Tracking Review

The discussions on the content of the Action Tracking Summary are recorded on the schedule.

bi. Dial Before You Dig Contacts

The previously circulated paper was taken as read. It had been issued to record the proposal to create a list of Representatives within the Community who could be contacted by D.B.Y.D. applicants who have had no response about plant in the area of the proposed works.

I,R, asked for comments on the paper to be passed to him within two weeks. **Action - All**

4. RAUC(s) Working Group Reports

a) Reports from Working Groups as follows: -

ai. Coordination W.G.

D.S. reported on the previously circulated paper as follows: -

The Group are continuing to meet monthly.

The review is continuing with 3 Advice Notes incorporated into the draft revised document.

Some items will be raised for discussion at the National R.A. Meeting to be held shortly.

aii. Inspections W.G.

J.G. reported as follows: -

Condition Survey (recording road condition prior to commencing works) –

Due to the addition of section S2.10 (Works in Deteriorated or Distressed Areas) and the addition to the 6-year warranty it was agreed a guide should be provided to assist both RA's and SU in a consistent approach.

The new survey document has been drafted for consideration by the Community. It will be circulated to the Members for comments.

Both the SROR and the o.S.R.W.C. will review the document and give their comments.

aiii. SROR Working Group

The Group has set up a panel to consider A9 trials and innovation.

Now that the Code has been in use in the Community for some time the Group is looking to carry out a review with the users to get their comments on its suitability.

P.McK. pointed out that at present there were several surveys out in the Community so timing to get the best responses should be considered.

K.Q. commented that as this is a Ministerial Code major changes should be avoided for the present and other ways of dealing with any revisions considered.

Drafting of a note on Environmental Waste will be raised.

The Commissioner had met with the Chair of SEPA and had raised the topic of dealing with coal tar products. He had requested a contact for discussions on this matter. When he has any information, it will be passed to the Co-Chairs of the SROR W.G.

aiv. National Coring Working Group

The Group is meeting fortnightly.

The membership of the Group is currently up to date. J.W. has replaced Ian Jones as R.A. Co-Chair and I.D. has replaced Steve Scanlon as the S.U. Co-Chair.

Thanks was recorded to the two Co-Chairs for their input to the Group and to the wider operation of the Community. All wished them a happy retirement.

A review was ongoing on the Advice Note with the Milestones being revised first. The rest of the A.N. will be checked and redrafted where necessary.

The Areas are changing from 5 to 4 to match the current RAUC(S) Areas. The R.As should agree the Lead Authorities for the programme. This will be raised at the National R,A, meeting. **Action - All R.As / D.C.**

J.F. raised the matter of coring the narrow trenches which were being used more widely by the Telecom Sector. This topic had been discussed at the last meeting and the view was that the 50mm cores may be sufficient.

As the next RAUC(S) meeting will be Face to Face consideration should be given to the offer from SGN to bring along 50mm and 100mm cores for inspection. J.G. indicated that there appeared to be a close match between the two sizes.

av. Gazetteer Group

The previously circulated Report was taken as read.

avi. SRWR Steering Group

A sub-group is required to review the use of VAULT by the Community. The Steering Group will provide the Chair, but the Community will be asked to provide the members. This is a substantial project. D.C offered his assistance on this Review.

VAULT is an ideal source of data especially out with working hours when dealing with emergency works. This will not remove the need to use plant detection equipment and safe digging methods.

VAULT should be the main source of plant data and issues to be addressed are: -

- Method of recording the use of the system including time, date and user details. This is essential to meet any internal or HSE investigations at a later date.
- Agreement is needed for a data upload timetable to meet health and safety requirements. New plant should probably be recorded on VAULT as soon as the Organisation's systems can deliver the data in accordance with business and management processes.

The topic of uploading the data to meet the HSE requirements should possibly be considered by the PDG. NUAR have been discussing their national plant record system with the HSE and RAUC(S) should consider being involved in these discussions.

K.Q. suggested that a SSI could be used to set a time for the data to be recorded on the system. The symbology used in VAULT should remain the responsibility of the Community.

The view was expressed that a lot of work had been done already and it was a excellent facility which must be fully introduced as soon as possible as the main source of data for the community. There are savings to be made in time and resources (no need to produce paper plans etc). Tablets and mobiles are now being provided to squads so the technology is available.

b) Working Group Recruitment

The Schedule was taken as read. R.A Representatives are need on the SROR W.G. and SRWR Steering Group. This will be raised at the National R.A. meeting.

**Action – All R.As / D.C.**

bi. Working Group Remits

The previously circulated paper indicating the Working Group Remits was taken as read and the Chairs were asked to keep the information on their Group up to date.

**Action – W.G. Chairs**

5. Area RAUC's Action Reports

The previously circulated Report was taken as read with the following comments: -

EAREA RAUC – Report from J.W.

As per the report with no other issues to be raised.

NAREA RAUC – Report from A.MacL.

As per the report with no other issues to be raised.

SAREA RAUC – Report from D.C.

D.C. reported on the last meeting as follows: -

As per the report with no other issues to be raised.

WAREA RAUC – Report from J.F.

As per the report with no other issues to be raised.

6. RAUC(S) Business

a) Safety – Issues for consideration

The meeting noted that Bulletins were being issued via the Secretary when he receives them.

This was an Item to be noted by all and provides an opportunity for any health and safety issues to be raised for discussion by the Community.

b) Environmental Issues

This was an Item to be noted by all and provides an opportunity for any environmental issues to be raised for discussion by the Community.

The Commissioner had spoken to the Director of the Sustainable Scotland Network regarding the project relating to Climate Change. This Group is looking for more information about Roads matters and the view was that an R.A. Representative would be welcomed to discuss this matter further. D.C. indicated that he was involved with a road to net zero project so would be happy to assist in this project.

A proposal was made that RAUC(S) should maybe set up a Working Group to deal with this issue. Discussions would focus on the materials, transport and processes. The alternative would be to have this topic on the Agendas for the all the existing Working Groups.

Organisations have staff dealing with net zero so they may be a resource to be tapped into for working group participation. J.G. commented that she was meeting with SGN Staff dealing with this subject and would be happy to extend her involvement to assisting on a RAUC(S) Group. She is currently monitoring the savings on reinstatements by using 30 /10 material and she would provide information on the results in due course. **Action – J.G.**

The Commissioner will arrange a meeting with the Sustainable Scotland Network and invite D.C. to be involved. **Action – The Commissioner / D.C.**

c) Guarantee Period Recording on the Register

The previously circulated paper was taken as read with the following comments: -

- The proposed paragraph to be used in the text box of the Notice was agreed as a temporary solution.
- The depth field drop down could possibly be used if the Register can be converted to accommodate the guarantee periods on the Notices. If this is possible it will be a searchable field which will be essential for the management of the Notices. A Change Request is being submitted for this variation which appeared to be the best solution in the short term. It will not auto set the guarantee period against the works. **Action – F.McI.**

d. Dispute Resolution

The previously circulated paper was taken as read with the following comments: -

- Future reports on the result of a dispute panel hearing should have more detail on the reason and background to the dispute.
- The Secretary was asked to set up a register for the Disputes to allow for quick checking on whether the matter being raised had been dealt with previously. **Action – Secretary**

e. RAUC(S) Constitution (including Meeting Formats)



The previously circulated paper was taken as read with the following comments: -

- As a requirement of the Constitution, the Community had been asked for any suggested changes to the existing version.
- Only one Area had submitted a response which had been reviewed by the Co-Chairs. Based on the small return the recommendation was that no change should be made. This was agreed by the Committee.
- Thanks were recorded for the work of the EAREA.
- Due to the difficulties of providing venues with a hybrid facility, the Committee agreed to remove that requirement from the Constitution covering face to face meetings. This will be actioned, and the revised document passed to the Secretary for posting on the Web Site. **Action – D.C. / J.F. / Secretary**
- Where a hybrid facility can be provided it can be offered or a dial in facility can be offered. This would be beneficial for the NAREA Meeting where travel to the venue is a problem.
- There should be one face to face cycle per year and this year it will be the September / October meetings. Next year it would be the May / June meetings.
- D.S. will revise Advice Note No. 30 and D.C. / J.F. will revise the Constitution. **Action – D.S. / D.C. / J.F. / Secretary**
- Meeting Venues should be chosen to be convenient for attending via public transport.
- The location of the venue should be circulated as early as possible to allow for travel planning.
- The RAUC(S) Meeting attendance will continue to be as per the Constitution.
- The face-to-face meetings could be longer to accommodate discussion on critical Items.

## 7. HAUC UK and Associated Subgroup Reports

### a) HAUC UK Report

The previously circulated Minutes of the HAUC UK meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> April were taken as read with the following comments: -

- There was a delay in the review of the Red Book which was giving a bit more time to get the content of the document correct.
- The Election is also causing a delay in the TAG Review, but it is still hoped to complete the project and introduce the revised processes by early 2026.

The question bank is being updated and the testing Organisations have indicated their agreement with the changes.

- Diversions Code – Section C is already out for consultation with sections E and F ready to follow. The equation for the calculation of betterment has been revised by D.J.A. and is ready for agreement. The draft has been subject to a language review.

Concern has been expressed about the professional attitude to documentation and the use of social media.

### b) HAUC UK Working Group Representatives

There were still vacancies on the Working Groups and the Area Chairs were asked to try to find Representatives from their Area who have an interest in the relevant topics and would be prepared to put themselves forward to represent Scotland. **Action – Area Chairs**

The vacancies are: -

TAG Group – R.A. Representative required

Reinstatement Group - R.A. Representative required

Records Group – S.U. Representative required. This Group is not meeting at present.

As D.J.A. will be retiring in July there is a need for a R.A. Representative on the Diversions Group to work with K.Q. on this project. K.Q. indicated that she would as always do her best to represent Scotland on the Group but she would welcome the support of a R.A. Representative.

This matter will be raised at the National R.A. meeting but an indication of the time and input needs would be a help to attract the R.A. Members. **Action – D.C.**

c) TAG Report

As above.

d) Diversionary Works

As Above.

e) Safety at Road Works

As Above.

## 8. Standing Reports

### a) Scottish Road Works Commissioner

The Committee received the report as follows: -

- ai. Commissioner Advice Paper 9- Roads (Scotland) Act- Sections 60, 60A and 61B
- aii Commissioner Advice Paper 10 – Requirements to Receiving Notifications on the SRWR
- aiii A9 Trunk Road (Dunkeld) Traffic Delays

The previously circulated papers as above were taken as read with the following comments: -

- Advice Paper 9 had not changed very much since the earlier circulation abut it had been reviewed and agreed by the Legal Team.
- Advice Paper 10 will be published on 1<sup>st</sup> July 24.
- Advice paper 11 – This document provides clarification on the use of Standard Works and Major Works indicating the criteria which should be used.

### Compliance Powers

The Compliance Officers continue to focus on L.A. Signing, Lighting and Guarding using video surveys with records to date as follows:

- 20 Authorities visited
- 311 Sites observed

- 97 sites with non-compliant SLG
- Average of 6 sites visited / hour

Commissioner webinars continue for L.As to raise awareness of compliance powers around SLG issues, noticing requirements and gazetteer issues. Forthcoming events are planned for 5 June and 19 June.

The Webinars very successful with good discussion with the attendees.

### **SRWR Gazetteer**

Every authority required to provide a Gazetteer for the last deadline made a submission which makes two quarters in succession with 100% success. The Commissioner thanks all Authorities for their efforts to achieve this.

### **Annual Performance Reviews**

Annual Performance Review letters were issued to all Organisations on the 23<sup>rd</sup> / 24<sup>th</sup> May. Please respond to the oSRWC if any actions are required by your Organisation.

### **Commissioner Improvement Plans**

Currently the following organisations remain on improvement plans, Aberdeen City Council, Aberdeenshire Council, BT, City of Edinburgh Council, Dundee City Council, Lothian Broadband, Midlothian Council, Moray Council, Netomnia, Perth & Kinross Council, Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution and SP Energy Networks and Trooli Ltd.

The next Improvement Plan submissions are due on the 11<sup>th</sup> October 2024.

### **Updated Codes/Guidance**

Updated version of the Penalties Code (v.1.5) and Advice Note 30 (v.1.1) have now been published on the website at: -

<https://roadworks.scot/legislationguidance>

### **Transport (Scotland) Act Changes**

Transport (Scotland) Act changes to the SRWR for Unidentified (now Unexpected) Buried Objects, Compliance Notices and Commissioner Observations are now live on the register.

Organisations should now be recording details of assets discovered during works and monitoring the Register for Commissioner communications.

The legislative requirement for all Undertakers to have submitted a data set to Vault came into force on 1 April 2024.

Compliance Notices will appear on a new Task Summary list on the Register for assessment.

Commissioner Observations will appear as Works Comments against the works and will appear in the Work Comments Awaiting Assessment Task Summary List on the Register, alongside other Works Comments.

### **Inspection Estimates 2024 / 25**

All S,Us and R.As should have agreed the estimates for inspections to be carried out in the current year e.g. 2024 / 25.

The PDG will be reviewing the regulations relating to qualifications for the different levels of operatives who may attend sites. The view is that not all require to have full accreditation.

### **c) Scottish Government**

The previously circulated paper was taken as read with the following comments: -

The batch diagram had not been issued this cycle as there was no changes to be commented on since the last round of meetings.

### **Electric Vehicles**

Charge Point UK and M.O. have been directed to Scots for discussion on Electric Vehicle facilities and developments. There is also potential for these Organisations to give presentation to RAUC(S).

### **Roadworks Reform and related Legislation**

- The first part of the legislation relating to VAULT is now in force and it is mandatory to supply plant data plans to VAULT, and the existing requirement to report apparatus which is in the wrong location has been updated to fall within the same broad requirements – these changes should not affect Organisations already submitting data to VAULT.
- The second part of the legislation will give more detail on the information which will be required. This will be informed by the responses received from a planned consultation on plant information. We hope to prescribe information on the basis of safety and efficiency. While information about site experience directly from road workers is being sought, the corporate views of Organisations are also welcome. To make sure your sector is represented, or for details on the consultation please contact Ainsleigh Brown. The consultation will be issued in July via the Secretary and the results will be analysed and provide input to the discussions at the P.D.G.

**Action – A.B. / Secretary**

### **Qualification Tickets**

- The desire would be to have a National Code coveringing England Scotland Ireland and Wales. The DfT have opted for a review for England and Wales only so the Scottish Government / Community will need to decide how they want to proceed once the results of the DfT review is completed. There is currently no timetable for the review to be completed but it may be up to a year.
- With S.U.s working on both sides of the Border there is a need for a common approach to the Regulations and question banks should be common.
- One option to be considered is to have the final regulations common to both S.U. and R.A. operatives.
- The decision has to be made on which qualifications various levels of operatives need in order to carry out their works and visits to sites e.g. operatives involved in T.M. should only require modules relevant to these operations. The accreditation held by an Operative must be relevant to their duties.
- The regulations have been common in Scotland and England since 2016 and this should be the case going forward. The view was that the regulations

should only be common to S.U.s and R.As if it was relevant / sensible to do that.

- Any consultation / review must consider all aspects of the regulations and draft a new versions which will avoid problems going forward.
- It was noted that R.As operate to a different definition of “Works” in two different Acts.

9. A.O.C.B.

No A.O.C.B. Items were raised.

10. Dates of Next Meetings

**RAUC(S) Agenda Setting Meeting:      Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2024**

**RAUC(s) Meeting:                              Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2024**

**Future Meeting Dates: - Will be tabled at the October meeting but will mirror the dates in 2024 unless there is a need to change them**

**RAUC(S) Agenda Setting Meetings**

**RAUC(s) Meetings**

The meeting closed at 12.20