



CHIEF OFFICERS LIAISON GROUP MEETING

Conference Room 3, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh, EH6 6QQ
Thursday 23rd September 2018 – 10:00a.m.

AGENDA

1. **WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
2. **MINUTES**
(a) Chief Officers Liaison Group of 24th May 2018.
3. **AGENDA FOR SEPTEMBER BOARD – Group Discussion**
4. **FINANCIAL REPORTS**
(a) Audited Accounts 2017/18 – Verbal report by Iain Shaw
(b) Finance Officer's Report – Verbal report by Iain Shaw
5. **EXTERNAL AUDIT UPDATE – Verbal report by Jim Grieve**
6. **PROJECTS UPDATE – Report by Jim Grieve**
7. **DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT – Verbal update by Jim Grieve**
8. **INTELLIGENT CENTRALISATION – Group Discussion**
9. **NTS2 UPDATE – Verbal update by Jim Grieve**
10. **RAIL UPDATE – Verbal update by Keith Fiskin/Jim Grieve**
11. **RTS MONITORING – Report by Lisa Freeman**
12. **BUS TRAVEL - FOLLOW UP REPORT – Report by Jim Grieve**
13. **ACTIVE TRAVEL UPDATE – Report by Peter Jackson**
14. **TRANSPORT (SCOTLAND) BILL CONSULTATION RESPONSE –**
Report by Lisa Freeman
15. **AOCB**
16. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**
The date of the next meeting is scheduled for **10:00am on Thursday 8th November 2018, Conference Room 3, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh, EH6 6QQ**

Angela Chambers
Business Manager
Area 3D (Bridge)
Victoria Quay
Edinburgh
EH6 6QQ

16th August 2018

Telephone: 0131 524 5154 or E-mail: angela.chambers@sestran.gov.uk

Agendas and papers for all SEStran meetings can be accessed on www.sestran.gov.uk

**CHIEF OFFICER LIAISON GROUP MEETING
10:00AM THURSDAY 24TH MAY 2018**

Present:

Jim Grieve (JG)	SEStran (Chair)
Angela Chambers (AC)	SEStran
Keith Fisker (KF)	SEStran
Elizabeth Forbes (EF)	SEStran
Peter Jackson (PJ)	SEStran
Lisa Freeman (LF)	SEStran
Graeme Johnstone (GJ)	Scottish Borders Council
Neil Dougall (ND)	Midlothian Council
Kevin Collins (KC)	Falkirk Council
Iain Shaw (IS)	City of Edinburgh Council
Peter Forsyth (PF)	East Lothian Council
Ken Gourlay (KG)	Fife Council
Iain Shaw (IS)	CEC (Treasury)
Lesley Deans (LD)	Clacks Council

Apologies:

Graeme Malcolm (GM)	West Lothian Council
---------------------	----------------------

Ref.		Actions
1.	Welcome and Apologies for Absence	
1.1	JG welcomed the group to the meeting and apologies are noted as above.	
2.	Minutes	
2(a)	Chief Officers Liaison Group – 15 th February 2018 Agreed as a correct record.	
2(b)	DRAFT Partnership Board – 16 th March 2018 (For noting)	
2(c)	DRAFT Integrated Mobility Forum of 27 th April 2018 (For noting)	
3.	Agenda for 22 June Partnership Board Meeting	
3.1	JG advised that many of the items raised in this meeting's agenda will go forward to the Board in June.	
3.2	JG asked the group for any additional agenda items. No additional items were suggested.	
4.	Financial Reports	
4(a)	Unaudited Accounts 2017/2018 IS advised that the accounts for the last year have been completed, indicating a £16,000 underspend. The accounts have now been passed over to Scott Moncrieff for further scrutiny.	

	IS indicated that the accounts would be raised at the upcoming Performance and Audit Committee on the 8 th June, ahead of the Board on the 22 nd June.	
4(b)	Treasury Management Report The purpose of this report is to review the investment activity undertaken on behalf of the Partnership during the first half of the 2018/19 Financial Year.	
5.	Audit Update	
5(a)	Annual Internal Audit Report 2017/2018 JG advised that the internal audit has now been concluded. Actions required regarding governance, relating to Senior Officer absence. Governance procedures have now been updated to articulate how to allow for this situation in the future. The external audit is still on-going. IS offered to contact Scott Moncrieff to confirm their attendance at the June Board, and ask whether they will be providing audit conclusions at that time.	IS
6.	Projects Update	
6.1	LF provided a summary of this report, which updated the Chief Officers on the progress of SEStran's projects.	
6.2	There was a lengthy discussion regarding SEStran's RTP1 project, relating to First East contributions.	
7.	ECOMM 2019	
7.1	KF gave a verbal update on SEStran's bid to host the ECOMM 2019 event, revealing that we had been successful and would be hosting the conference in May/June 2019.	
8.	Intelligent Centralisation	
8.1	JG initiated the group discussion by reviewing what was previously put forward regarding intelligent centralisation at the last Chief Officers meeting.	
8.2	There was a lengthy discussion regarding data collection/gathering, specifically collaborative work/maintenance agreements.	
8.3	JG agreed to further consider what was discussed in the meeting and bring forward new ideas/suggestions to the next meeting.	JG

8.4	JG asked Officers to send proposals to KF for analysis.	ALL
9.	NTS2 Update	
9.1	JG gave a verbal update on the status of the NTS2.	
9.2	The key points are: Cllr Gordon Edgar is on the NTS2 strategy board representing all the RTPs and JG is involved in thematic groups for enabling economic growth and working groups, moving towards centralising data.	
10.	Local Rail Development Fund	
10.1	FK gave a verbal update on the status of SEStran's bids for the Local Rail Development Fund.	
10.2	The regional projects being put forward relate to: Newburgh, St Andrews, Alloa/Dunfermline and Bonnybridge. KF asked the Chief Officers for any updates on regional applications.	
10.2	There followed a discussion about the process.	
11.	ECMA Update	
11.1	JG gave a verbal update on ECMA.	
11.2	The key points of his update are: an executive group will still exist; consortium meetings will continue; suggestion for more vice chairs which will result in a chair/vice chair group; and there will be a secretariat role by combined authorities.	
11.3	JG advised that the next consortium group will take place on the 29 th June.	
12.	RTS Monitoring	
12.1	JG gave a verbal status report on SEStran's RTS monitoring.	
12.2	A table annex was passed round the officers, which listed SEStran's current RTS targets.	
12.3	LF will circulate an electronic version of the document.	LF
12.4	JG noted that SEStran is looking at ways to measure these targets, and has asked the chief officers to put forward potential strategies for discussion at the next meeting.	ALL
13.	NCM Appointments	
13.1	AC advised that we are still waiting for Ministerial approval.	
14.	Community Links Funding Opportunities	
14.1	PJ gave a verbal update on the Community Links Funding Opportunities. The key points of his update are: There is now 100% funding for feasibility and design and there is no maximum award limit so Sustran's are	

14.2	encouraging organisations to put forward as many applications as possible. There was a brief discussion about the process.	
15.	AOCB	
15.1	PF requested representation from SEStran at a consultation event on the 5 th June for East Lothian's local transport strategy.	
15.2	LF agreed to attend on behalf of SEStran.	LF
15.3	AC advised that following the request from some councillors to host Partnership Board meetings centrally, it is likely that the June Board will be held somewhere on George Street, as Edinburgh Council are hosting an event for their city centre transformation on the same day, and have asked that we host the Board at the same venue.	
15.4	AC will keep the Chief Officers updated on this matter.	
16.	Date of next meeting	
16.1	10:00am on Thursday 23 rd August 2018, Conference Room 3, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh, EH6 6QQ.	

Projects & EU Exit Update

1. Introduction

- 1.1** The report provides Board Members with an update on key aspects of projects and initiatives progressed in the last quarter and covers the latest position on the process for the UK leaving the EU.

2. RTPI

- 2.1** In August 2018 First Scotland East informed SEStran Officers that the implementation of the First Ticketer based internal RTPI system has not proceeded to plan and that they would like to 'restart' the First link to the SEStran/INEO system running up to end January 2019.

- 2.2** In May 2018 as per First East direction SEStran had instructed mobile data providers MOBIUS disconnect the sim-based data feed from all on bus equipment in the First Fleet. From that point on only scheduled information was being provided by the SEStran RTPI system.

- 2.3** SEStran has confirmed that the data link and the RTPI feed can be restarted and has given costing to First Bus East. As of the writing of this report First Bus East are confirming the number of vehicles that they would like reactivated.

- 2.4** INEO have confirmed that once the sim cards are reactivated the system will restart as before.

- 2.5** SEStran are currently working through several issues with the RTPI feed in the Scottish Borders area. The SIRI feed from the Borders Buses fleet is not integrating as well as hoped, SEStran officers and WYG are working with Borders Buses to try and resolve this.

- 2.6** SEStran and City of Edinburgh Officers are continuing to work on the development of a new content management system (CMS). Early testing has confirmed that the current SEStran equipment is compatible with new software and as a result will be able to display RTPI using the new CMS.

3. Regional Cycle Network Grant Scheme (RCNGS)

- 3.1** SEStran operates the Sustrans funded Regional Cycle Network Grant which seeks to encourage the development of the Cycle Network throughout the Region, in particular functional cross-boundary infrastructure.

3.2 The RCNGS can be used to support feasibility studies, design work, the development of infrastructure and monitoring, as well as supporting innovation and public engagement. Following changes to the guidance, design projects can now be 100% funded. Design projects are classified as anything from the preparation of a strategy to detailed design. Applications will be expected to meet the Community Links guidance, with construction projects requiring 50% match funding.

3.3 There is no maximum award limit for applications, with the focus of this call on projects that can start and finish in the SEStran financial year 2018/19 (April to March).

3.4 Edinburgh Bio Quarter have submitted an application of £163,000 which was approved by the June 2018 Partnership Board. This work will include a detailed design of the active travel corridor. This follows awards for feasibility in 2016/17 and preliminary design in 2017/18.

4. GO e-Bike

4.1 GO E-Bike is regional e-Bike sharing scheme launched in April 2018 by SEStran. CoMoUK (formerly Bikeplus) were awarded grant funding to deliver the first four e-Bike hubs which are currently operating in Fife, West Lothian and Falkirk¹.

4.2 SEStran will be expanding the project in 2018/19, after a successful application to the Low Carbon Travel and Transport Fund for additional funding. £300,000 will be invested into developing six more GO e-Bike hubs across the SEStran region.

5. European Projects Update

5.1 **‘SHARE-North’**² addresses the concept of ‘Shared Mobility’ and looks at the development, implementation and promotion of Car Clubs, Bike Sharing and Car Sharing. The planned living labs will integrate modern technology with activities to support changes in mobility behaviour. The objectives are: resource efficiency, improving accessibility (incl. non-traditional target groups), increased efficiency in the use of transport infrastructure, reduction of space consumption for transport, improving quality of life and low carbon transport.

5.2 The last SHARE-North meeting was held in Drongen on the 3rd-5th of July 2018. The meeting focused on the SHARE-North ‘Manual for Municipalities’. Members of the consortium shared best practice examples of shared mobility across each partner country. These examples will now feature in the final work package output. The next SHARE-North meeting is

¹ <http://sestran.gov.uk/projects/go-e-bike/>

² <http://sestran.gov.uk/projects/share-north/>

scheduled for the 9th – 12th of October, and will be held in conjunction with the next SEStran Integrated Mobility Forum on the 12th of October.

- 5.3 REGIO-MOB³** aims to promote “learning, sharing of knowledge and transferring best practices between the participating regional and local authorities to design and implement regional mobility plans (or Regional Transport Strategies) bearing in mind the stakeholders with regional relevance and contributing to the sustainable growth of Europe”.
- 5.4** SEStran held a formal Dissemination Event on Thursday 22nd March 2018 at Radisson Blu hotel on the Royal Mile, Edinburgh. The Event was attended by the REGIO MOB partners and their political and technical stakeholders, as well as SEStran’s local Stakeholders. The event, which was hosted by SEStran’s Chair, was well attended, and very well received by the European partners.
- 5.5 SURFLOGH⁴** aims to improve the role of logistics hubs in the network of urban logistics in the North Sea Region. <http://northsearegion.eu/surflogh>
- 5.6** SEStran are leading on a work package with Napier Transport Research Institute to create business models for urban freight hubs. In April SEStran attended an innovation workshop in Sweden hosted by the Borås Municipality. Cycling Scotland also attended and presented on the development of e-cargo bike training programs in Scotland.
- 5.7** SEStran will be developing and researching the impact of a last mile delivery solution with e-cargo bikes in the region. The pilot project will be located in Edinburgh and will be exploring a number of last mile/first mile business solutions with a specialist partner working with Scotrail between Glasgow and Edinburgh.
- 5.8** SEStran has identified a pilot delivery partner Outspoken Delivery that specialises in e-cargo bike delivery.
- 5.9 Pursuits** (at application stage) addresses the critical need to ensure that land use and transport planning evolve a step ahead of the smart-mobility transition. This will enable cities and regions to proactively develop Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMP) and steer new mobility and distribution forms rather than just responding to them. SEStran has recently been successful in progressing to the second stage of the application process.

6. Further Initiatives

6.1 Can Do Innovation Challenge Fund

³ <http://sestran.gov.uk/projects/regio-mob/>

⁴ <http://sestran.gov.uk/projects/surflogh/>

6.1.1 The SEStran project proposal for the Thistle Assistance Journey Planner – door to door journey information for people that have difficulty using public transport has been recommended for support through the CAN-DO Innovation Challenge Fund.

6.1.2 The challenge seeks to identify and understand in detail the barriers faced by commuters with protected characteristics when travelling and journey planning. It will explore the extent to which these barriers affect travel plans and modal choices for travelling and to develop an App-based door to door journey planning solution that helps alleviate these barriers.

6.2 Hate Crime

6.2.1 West Lothian, Clackmannanshire and Fife Councils have agreed to pilot the regional hate crime transport charter. A questionnaire was sent to transport operators to gauge their current levels of training with regard to hate crime on their network and their willingness to participate in the charter. In total, 9 bus operators responded to the survey. The working group held a consultative event in Kirkcaldy on the 21st of June 2018 with representative groups and transport operators to co-design the charter. A second consultative event is taking place on the 5th September in Alloa.

7 SEStran Forums

7.1 The next Integrated Mobility Forum is planned for Friday 12th October 2018, and the Logistics and Freight Forum is planned for Wednesday 28th November 2018 at Victoria Quay. Work generated by each forum is currently being progressed to ensure that the forums are productive and continue to be supported by the various stakeholders involved.

8. EU Exit

8.1 The UK is due to leave the EU in March 2019. In July 2018 the UK government published the white paper ‘The Future Relationship Between the United Kingdom and the European Union’⁵.

The white paper outlines the UKs Government approach in a number of key areas, including; trade in goods, customs tariff arrangements, provision on services including financial, co-operation on energy and transport and a new framework for border control.

It is worth noting on page 95 “The UK Government will work with the devolved administrations to ensure that processes are put into place which reflect the devolution settlements and provide for appropriate input from all parts of the UK.” The white paper does not outline what those processes will look like or how they will be implemented.

⁵https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/725288/The_future_relationship_between_the_United_Kingdom_and_the_European_Union.pdf

The EU has yet to provide a formal response negotiations will continue in August and September 2018. European Union leaders will discuss Brexit when they next meet in the Austrian city of Salzburg on September 20th.

9. Recommendations

9.1 Members are invited to note the content of the report.

Jim Grieve
Head of Programmes
August 2018

Policy Implications	None
Financial Implications	None
Equalities Implications	A number of the projects will address the agreed actions of our Equality Outcomes 2017-2021.
Climate Change Implications	A number of the projects seek to promote and pilot a number of innovative actions to increase use of sustainable mobility.

Regional Transport Strategy Monitoring

1. Introduction

- 1.1** In August 2017, SEStran presented a paper on the potential future monitoring of the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS). Following completion of a desk based study it was apparent that the monitoring framework for the RTS must be refreshed. It was acknowledged that SEStran's targets should be 'SMART' (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Time Bound), based on the Economy, Accessibility, the Environment and Health and Safety, headlines.
- 1.2** It was proposed that the framework needed to be updated so that it could be safeguarded for the future, but it would require changing nearly all existing targets so that it could be more tailored towards how SEStran and its Partner Authorities operate today. The proposal of accessible, realistic and usable smart targets would allow SEStran and its Partners to monitor effectively and to determine the level of data handled.
- 1.3** It is obvious that the RTS monitoring requires supporting qualitative and quantitative data from our partner authorities. Previously, this included a regular update item on past agendas and it is proposed that this be reintroduced with significant items at each meeting, and a submission once a year of written information on progress for the SEStran Annual Report. Collective reporting will offer a qualitative approach to monitoring to support some of the key actions in the SEStran Region and demonstrate a partnership approach to delivery of the RTS.

2 Data Availability

- 2.1** Due to changing data availability and in response to government strategies and guidelines, some amendments to the indicators used and the approach to monitoring are required. An example previously given was the Scottish low emissions strategy performance indicators, which may need to be reflected in the RTS. However, it is understood that maintaining the continuity of monitoring is also important, and any adjustments will seek to achieve this.
- 2.2** In the past, SEStran used data modelling as a way of monitoring objectives and therefore, most of the targets set are heavily reliant on this method. However, data modelling, through the use of external consultants, is costly and if done on a regular basis is extremely resource intensive. These targets depend on far too many variables and can therefore not reasonably be monitored and available data is often set at a national level, rather than a regional level. Other targets in the strategy were very unlikely to have numerical data available and therefore could only be monitored using a narrative and providing qualitative evidence.

3 Work to date

- 3.1** SEStran has undertaken a desk based study to analyse the Regional Transport Strategy framework to identify how monitoring can be carried out in relation to the objectives and targets. Through this review process, key themes were identified; financial costings, a lack of data available at a regional level and outdated targets. These themes – especially those that have multi-criteria – are factors which affect SEStran’s ability to monitor targets accurately and successfully.
- 3.2** In previous reports, SEStran Chief Officers agreed that the current RTS Monitoring Framework was not best value use of resource nor fit for purpose and as outlined in the current RTS. Chief Officers also agreed that there should be a wholesale re-development of the RTS Monitoring Framework, and that there should be a standing verbal item should be included at each meeting and; written updates on key actions on the progress the four main objectives of the RTS for inclusion in future SEStran Annual Reports.

4. Next Steps

- 4.1** SEStran has drafted a proposed new monitoring framework for discussion. The new framework will require additional input from each Local Authority Partner.

Recommendations

- 5.1** Chief Officers are invited to provide comment on the monitoring framework;
- 5.2** Agree to supply the appropriate data on agreed performance indicators.

Appendix 1 – RTS Monitoring Review Table

Lisa Freeman
Strategy and Projects Officer
 9th August 2018

Policy Implications	Proposed re-development of RTS Monitoring Framework and implications for RTS delivery.
Financial Implications	Proposed savings from significantly reduced data modelling by external consultants.
Equalities Implications	None.
Climate Change Implications	None.

Appendix 1 – RTS Monitoring Table

RTS Targets for 2020 <small>Note: Targets relate to the RTS 2015-2020 Refresh.</small>	Smart Indicator	17/18 Baseline (where possible or 2016)	Current 18/19 Baseline	Key Activities undertaken in 18/19	Indicator/ Result	Additional Comments	Status ↓ ↑ ↔
Economy Objective 1.1 - to maintain and improve labour market accessibility to key business/employment locations							
Relative to 2007, achieve a 10% increase in (public transport) labour catchments (within 30 minutes and within 60 minutes) for selected locations. For communities defined as most deprived by the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD), improve access (by public transport) to employment by an average of at least 10% after 15 years.	Labour market catchment population accessibility by public transport to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edinburgh City Centre • Gyle & Edinburgh Park • Edinburgh Airport • Livingston • Glenrothes • Leith • Edinburgh Royal Infirmary • SAC Bush Estate/ Science Park 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SHS Data • Lowest 10-20% SIMD • NEET Data Zones 		
Economy Objective 1.2 – to maintain and improve connectivity to the rest of Scotland, the UK and beyond							
Increase number of daily coach/rail/air services to regional/national/international destinations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number & frequency of direct rail and coach/bus services per day • Number of domestic & international flight destinations 	Edinburgh Airport had 12.3 million terminal passengers in 2016. Terminal passenger traffic by destination, 2016 ¹ : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Scottish Airports: 121,740 • Other UK Airports: 5,066,027 • Europe: 5,905,754 • North America: 310,681 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edinburgh Airport monitoring data • ORR / Network Rail 		

¹ <https://www.transport.gov.scot/media/41863/scottish-transport-statistics-2017-with-correction-to-table-214.pdf>

Appendix 1 – RTS Monitoring Table

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rest of world: 263,856 <p>There were 4,640,000 cross-border journeys starting or ending in the SEStran region in 2015-16.</p> <p>There were 40,570,000 journeys within Scotland in 2015-16.²</p>					
Economy objective 1.3 – to support other strategies, particularly land-use planning, and economic development							
Demonstrable progress in collaborative working between SEStran, planning authorities, economic development agencies and other appropriate stakeholders.	This will be revisited following the NTS2 Review.						
Economy Objective 1.4 – to reduce the negative impacts of congestion, in particular to improve journey time reliability for passengers and freight							
Reduce time lost in congestion on trunk road network after 15 years (stabilise after 5 years); Reduce car mode share for the journey to work; Reduce car users reportedly affected by congestion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car availability (car owning households) Delays to bus services Reduce proportion of car driver journeys which are reportedly affected by congestion between 0700 and 0900. Reduce routine freight journey times 	In 2016, 42.2% of all people aged 17+ drove every day, 14.3% drove at least 3 times per week, 6% drove once or twice per week. ³			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SHS Travel Diary Scottish Transport Statistics (Transport Scotland) Bus companies/ Traveline Logistics and Freight Forum 		

² <https://www.transport.gov.scot/media/41863/scottish-transport-statistics-2017-with-correction-to-table-214.pdf>

³ <https://www.transport.gov.scot/media/41863/scottish-transport-statistics-2017-with-correction-to-table-214.pdf>

Appendix 1 – RTS Monitoring Table

	<p>Annual change in trunk road network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forth Bridge approaches • Kincardine Bridge approaches • A8/M8 – Ballieston to Hermiston Gait • M9 – from M8 junc at Claylands to M9 Spur • A1 – Macmerry to junction with A720 • A720 City Bypass 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freight companies • Liftshare data 		
Accessibility Objective 2.1 – to improve access to health facilities							
<p>Reduce the proportion of zero-car households with poor access (>60 minutes travel by public transport) during various time periods and to defined key hospitals by 50% over the period of the RTS (15% after five years).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency of using car to visit GPs • % within 20 mins of a primary health care facility by public transport • % of non-car owning households who have no public transport access or cannot access any hospital within 60 mins public transport journey • % of non-car owning households who have no public transport access or cannot travel within 60 mins by public transport to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BGH 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patient travel surveys • Staff travel surveys • Community transport providers • Census Data • SHS data • Equalities & Access to Healthcare Forum • Lowest 10/15/20% of SIMD health data zones 		

Appendix 1 – RTS Monitoring Table

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dunfermline Queen Margaret ○ Victoria Hospital ○ Ed. Western General ○ Royal Hospital for Sick Children ○ ERI ○ St John's Hospital ○ Forth Valley Royal Hospital ○ Dundee Ninewells ○ Perth Royal Infirmary ○ Dumfries & Galloway Infirmary 						
Accessibility Objective 2.2 – to improve access to other services, such as retailing, leisure and education							
Reduce the proportion of zero-car households with poor access (>45 minutes travel by public transport) to defined further education colleges, job centres and regional shopping centres by 20% over the period of the RTS (7% after five years).	Proportion of 16-24 year olds and total population more than one hour from a Further Education college or university by public transport.					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Census data • Scottish Transport Statistics • SHS 	
Accessibility Objective 2.3 – to make public transport more affordable and socially inclusive							

Appendix 1 – RTS Monitoring Table

<p>1. By, or before the end of the RTS, monitor the implementation of all DDA requirements regarding accessible buses and all public transport complies with the requirements of the Equalities Act 2010</p> <p>2. Identify high fare anomalies in the SEStran area by the end of the RTS period, relative to 2007</p> <p>3. Increase the distribution & awareness of the Thistle Assistance Card</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DDA Compliant routes • Perception of bus fares at good value • Distribution of the Thistle Card 	<p>In 2017, 1,865 Thistle Assistance Cards were distributed.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPT, Passenger Focus data • Bus registration data • SHS 		
<p>Environment Objective 3.1 – to contribute to the achievement of the UK’s national targets and obligations on greenhouse gas emissions</p>							
<p>Progress should be made at the SEStran level towards the Scottish Government’s aspirational national traffic reduction target of a return to 2001 traffic levels by 2021, and the Scottish Government’s emissions targets.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in traffic levels • Change in petrol and diesel consumption • % increase in ULEVs and EVs 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passenger Focus data • SHS data • Scottish Transport Statistics • DVLA 		
<p>Environment Objective 3.2 – to minimise the negative impacts of transport</p>							
<p>To minimise significant effects on areas designated for, or acknowledged for, their biodiversity interests (including protected species), landscape and/or cultural heritage importance, from interventions in the RTS.</p>	<p>Redundant – covered by other objectives.</p>						
<p>Environment Objective 3.3 – to promote more sustainable travel</p>							

Appendix 1 – RTS Monitoring Table

<p>Aim to increase mode share of sustainable modes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand Go e-bike project and monitor use Usual method of travel from SHS Travel Diary Number of car club members Number of Tripshare journeys Rail station use Bus patronage data 	<p>Transport Focus (2017):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> First Scotland East: 89% very/fairly satisfied with the bus journey / Stagecoach East Scotland 91%.⁴ 160 million bus passenger journeys 2016-17⁵ <p>In 2016, 31% of all people aged 16+ did no walking as a means of transport in the previous seven days.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bike Plus data Scottish Transport Statistics SHS Data Car Club stats Liftshare data Network Rail 		
<p>Environment Objective 3.4 – to reduce the need to travel</p>							
<p>To stabilise and reduce the number of trips per person per year made using motorised modes, by 5% over the period of the RTS.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of adults working from home Number of trips using motorised transport 	<p>Traffic on major roads 2016 (million vehicle kilometres)⁶</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clackmannanshire: 323 East Lothian: 910 Edinburgh: 3,088 Falkirk: 1,649 Fife: 2,982 Midlothian: 687 Scottish Borders: 1,268 West Lothian: 1,840 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SHS data SHS Travel Diary 		
<p>Environment Objective 3.5 – to increase transport choices, reducing dependency on the private car</p>							
<p>Linked to mode share Objective 1.4 Targets for mode share (reduce the negative impacts of congestion in particular to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequency of driving Proximity to public transport (bus stops and rail stations) 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SHS Scottish Transport Statistics 		

⁴ <https://www.transportfocus.org.uk/research-publications/publications/bus-passenger-survey/>

⁵ <https://www.transport.gov.scot/publication/scottish-transport-statistics-no-36-2017-edition/chapter-2-bus-and-coach-travel/#Table2.2b>

⁶ <https://www.transport.gov.scot/media/41863/scottish-transport-statistics-2017-with-correction-to-table-214.pdf>

Appendix 1 – RTS Monitoring Table

<p>improve journey times reliability for passengers and freight).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Households living within 6 mins walk time to the nearest stop ● Perceptions and use of public transport 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Passenger Focus data 		
<p>Safety and Health Objective 4.1 – to improve safety (reducing accidents) and personal security</p>							
<p>1. By 2020, to cut the number of killed by 40% and seriously injured casualties by 55% and child killed by 50% and seriously injured by 65% from a 2004-2008 base. There is also a target to reduce the slight casualty rate by 10%.</p> <p>2. Over the period of the strategy, a 20% reduction (7% after five years) in pedestrian and cyclist KSIs per trip made (using SHS data for trip making).</p> <p>3. Over the period of the strategy, a five percentage point improvement in the perception of the safety of travel by bus in SEStran (currently around 85%) using Scottish Government</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Number of KSI casualties, child, pedestrian and cyclist KSIs ● Perception of safety on public transport from SHS 	<p>Number of people killed in road accidents (2016)⁷:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clackmannanshire: 0 ● East Lothian: 3 ● Edinburgh: 9 ● Falkirk: 1 ● Fife: 10 ● Midlothian: 8 ● Scottish Borders: 12 ● West Lothian: 7 <p>Number of people seriously injured in road accidents (2016):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clackmannanshire: 14 ● East Lothian: 30 ● Edinburgh: 168 ● Falkirk: 51 ● Fife: 87 ● Midlothian: 36 ● Scottish Borders: 69 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Local Authority data ● Key reported Road Casualties Scotland – Accidents and Casualties by Police Force Division and Local Authority ● Scottish Transport Statistics 		

⁷ <https://www.transport.gov.scot/media/40042/sct09170291561.pdf>

Appendix 1 – RTS Monitoring Table

<p>Bus Satisfaction monitoring data (two percentage points after five years).</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Lothian: 42 • 370 pedestrians killed (provisional 2017 figure)⁸ • 171 pedal cyclists killed (provisional 2017 figure) • 2 children killed by transport (provisional 2017 figure) • 152 children seriously injured (provisional 2017 figure) <p>In 2016, 93% of users agreed with the statement “feel safe/secure on bus during day”, 70% of users agreed with the statement “feel safe/secure on bus during the evening”.⁹</p>					
<p>Safety and Health Objective 4.2 – to increase the proportion of trips by walk/cycle</p>							
<p>Linked to mode share Objective 1.4; in addition, over the period of the strategy, a 5% point increase in walking and cycling mode share for all trips, SEStran wide. Cycling Action Plan for Scotland has a vision of 10%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of bikes in households, trips by bike and on foot by purpose from SHS data 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SHS data 		

⁸ <https://www.transport.gov.scot/media/42306/sct04185220761.pdf>

⁹ <https://www.transport.gov.scot/publication/scottish-transport-statistics-no-36-2017-edition/chapter-2-bus-and-coach-travel/#Table2.2a>

Appendix 1 – RTS Monitoring Table

of all journeys will be by bike by 2020.							
Safety and Health Objective 4.3 – to meet or better all statutory air quality requirements							
To contribute to meeting the national targets for air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the number of AQMAs designated in each Local Authority • Number of sites exceeding National Air Quality Standards/ number of AQMAs in region • Annual increase in traffic • Number of LEZs • Change recorded within LEZs 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEPA • Local Authority data • FoE data from annual survey 		
Safety and Health Objective 4.4 – to reduce the impacts of transport noise							
No quantitative target							

Item 12. Bus Travel in South East Scotland – Follow up

Bus Travel in South East Scotland – Follow-up

1. Introduction

- 1.1** This paper follows the presentation and discussion of the Bus Travel Discussion Paper to the Partnership Board on Friday 22nd June 2018. This paper will highlight the main discussion points and consider proposed actions.

2. Discussion

2.1 Open Data in the Bus Industry

- Bus policy should be plan/development led and there is a need to link transport and planning together.
- SEStran should find out what Open Data is available.

2.2 Smart Ticketing in the SEStran Region

- There is a need to bring all modes together under smart ticketing.
- Could SEStran provide regional or local ticketing strategies to provide further options to customers?
- SEStran should encourage new bus operators to enter the market and minimise barriers to make it easier to run services at the required level.
- SEStran should work to minimise the barriers to smart ticketing.

2.3 Tackling Rising Congestion

- Research is required to inform new strategy/policy to tackle congestion.
- The lack of parking at park and rides is an issue and disincentivises the public from using bus/rail to commute into Edinburgh.
- SEStran should play an active role in driving a regional solution
- Free city centre parking, outside of the controlled area needs to be addressed to prevent parked cars in residential areas.
- The new Edinburgh City Centre Low Emissions Zones, which are being brought into play in 2020, could contribute to the reduction of single occupancy car journeys in the SEStran region.
- There is a need to reduce the need for travel e.g. focus on home working or internet conferencing.
- SEStran could play a vital role in starting the debate on congestion charging, however such schemes could hit rural communities the hardest.
- Can we change our mindset and remove cars from our town centres? We must, however, be cognisant of the potential impact on economic development within our town and city centres.

2.4 Option of Intelligent Centralisation

- Under the new Transport Bill (Scotland) proposals, there may be an option for SEStran under the proposed BSIPs.

- The East Lothian Bus Charter is a good example of standards expected by the public and the council and bus operators. This can be shared with SEStran's IMF Forum and could be developed on a regional basis to set common standards across the region for bus operators.
- SEStran could share best practice and lessons learned from other Local Authorities within our region. E.g. experiences with consultations / operators changing routes and services.
- Sharing intelligence is key to success.

2.5 Equality of Access to Bus Services

- SEStran should address the implications from operators removing lifeline services.
- Service Level Agreements with community transport operators could bridge the missing link from commercially run services. SEStran could research this and propose a paper for debate.

2.6 Young People and Bus Travel

- There have been innovations in the Netherlands offering a Spotify-type subscription service for young people to use public transport. Could we link this to the yTravel project for young people? Or could this be offered for older people?
- SEStran should work with schools to understand young people's travel habits and what could attract young people to public transport.
- SEStran should engage further with Community Planning Partnerships.
- Take account of the variety of rural and urban areas and related local issues.
- Must take into consideration how bus services can help to address isolation and loneliness.

3. Proposed Actions

3.1 It is proposed that SEStran holds a meeting with bus operators to follow up on the discussion points above and in **Appendix 1**. Chief Officers, transport operators, community transport representatives and Partnership Board members would be invited. The agenda for the meeting would be the bus paper which was presented to the Partnership Board and the issues that have been highlighted in subsequent discussions. It is proposed that this meeting would be held in the Autumn 2018.

3.2 The Scottish Parliament's Rural Economy and Connectivity Committee is gathering the views of individuals and organisations on the Transport (Scotland) Bill proposals. There is Call for Evidence due Friday 28th September 2018 and an online survey available here: <https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/s/TransportScotlandBill2018/>. SEStran will be using Board and meeting discussions to respond to both the Call for Evidence and the online survey.

7. Recommendations

7.1 That the Officers note and discuss the content of the report.

Appendix 1: A Discussion Paper by Barry Turner, Non-Councillor Board Member

Catriona Jones
Projects Officer
26th July 2018

Appendix 1: A Discussion Paper by Barry Turner, Non-Councillor Board Member

This paper follows on from the report considered by the Board on 22nd June. When I was chairman of RELBUS we produced a paper outlining what we thought needed to be done to improve bus services and we concluded that action fell within four categories each beginning with the letter I. They are Involvement, Integration, Innovation and Information. I found that the actions described in the report to the Board for the most part also fitted into these categories. I have identified here other actions that might be added to form a comprehensive package that could make a real difference. The order of the categories reflects my thinking on a logical order in which the issues and possibilities should be approached if we were undertaking an exercise, i.e. Ask, Act and Tell. However, the four categories don't have to be part of a specific process but should be ongoing side by side. We really should be doing something on each all the time in order to achieve progress.

Involvement

This is about asking people what they want from their bus services. Provision should always be about satisfying passenger needs and not about what might be operationally convenient or most profitable.

The report in 3.6 looks at assessing the needs of young people and this is an important consideration for the reasons set out in the report. As I said at the meeting surveys should also be undertaken with the elderly in the light of issues around loneliness and social isolation that have been highlighted in recent studies as the report says in 3.5. Bus services made accessible to the elderly in locational and physical terms and in terms of destination offered can have a very positive impact in these respects. In addition, there should be ongoing surveys of existing and potential users to ascertain whether their needs are being met. My concern with what the report says about open data in 3.1 is that it seems to be about finding out what people are doing, that is how they currently use services. It is just as important to find out what they are not doing and why. Why are people not using buses and what would make them change their mind? It's not only about the services themselves but also about the convenience of using buses; things like access to and information at stops and the availability of shelters.

Integration

This is about offering the seamless journey in terms of integrated ticketing, routes and timetables so that public transport becomes easier to use and can better compete with the private car.

There is a move towards the seamless journey as far as ticketing is concerned and smart ticketing has been focussed upon at a number of Board meetings. Contactless payment systems should be the aim as stated in 3.2 of the report. In London this has made travel for visitors like myself so much easier though as the report says there is an issue over clarity of pricing. Potential users need to know what they are paying. A move towards greater integration of services is not apparent and the report is silent on the matter. The organisation of bus services and lack of relationships between many of them in the competitive environment is often difficult to understand and is I believe a deterrent to their use. Though there is no obvious and workable

solution with the current operational regime Government appears to be waking up to the issues. Some progress has been achieved in East Lothian especially through timetables of supported services being related to those of commercial services wherever possible. However, across the region there are still problems around better integrating bus and rail services even though there is an obligation upon Scotrail to move forward on this. SEStran should perhaps look into the problems and offer assistance.

Innovation

This is about adapting and extending existing provision to meet needs and about providing services in new ways particularly to reach the more isolated communities. It is also about what can be done to create a better environment in which buses can operate.

This is where some of the real opportunities lay. I look first at rising congestion levels and their impact on bus services and bus patronage as covered in 3.3 of the report. Congestion charging may be a solution but it hits the poor hardest and those who can afford to do so simply pay the charge. Central London seems to be more congested now than it was before charging was introduced. Bus lanes have a role but they have to be enforced and there remains the problem that the lanes tend to end some distance from busy junctions in order to avoid traffic chaos. A workplace parking levy is another solution offered but again this favours the better off, and in any case it is not necessarily workplace parking that is the cause of so much peak congestion given its fairly limited supply. In Edinburgh I would say that a significant proportion of the peak commuter traffic parks on street outside controlled parking areas. Remove this option in a phased way by schemes that disallow parking by other than local residents for an hour mid day - and enforce them - and traffic would be significantly reduced in my view. It would make buses quicker and more efficient in the peaks thus allowing more buses to be available to cater for the new demand created. This is stick actually facilitating the carrot.

It is the speed of buses that puts many people off using them. For example it takes a very long time to travel from Musselburgh into Edinburgh because for the most part the buses stop everywhere, often as a consequence of other buses blocking the stops. I have two more suggestions applicable to Edinburgh and possibly elsewhere. Introduce more express buses peak and off peak and introduce a request stop system so that buses will only stop at certain multi-route stops if requested to do so. It would need to be made clear in publicity and at the stops that buses will only stop if hailed or the bell is rung.

Moving on to intelligent centralisation covered in 3.4 of the report, inequalities in public transport fares is an issue as the report says and a centralised approach is needed to address this. A centralised approach could have other applications not least in the pursuance of best practice across the region. The report looks at equality of access to bus services in 3.5. There is a great awareness of the disparity in service levels between urban and rural areas and particularly the issue of providing services to the most remote communities to help tackle social deprivation. Much is being done across the region by different local councils but there is not much in the way of

a common approach based on best practice and trying something new. West Lothian for example has a taxi bus service which might be a solution elsewhere and East Lothian is trying something similar in one location. Community transport is another option based upon resources that already exist in some rural communities. There was support at the Board meeting for some kind of brainstorming workshop on these issues and the various possibilities for tackling them in order to adopt a common approach and achieve greater consistency across the region. We need to arrange it.

There is much to be said for achieving a common approach to issues through the adoption of jointly agreed policies, collaborative measures and through developing the sharing economy as indicated in the report. Community transport is just one aspect. The report also refers to the expansion of car sharing. A collaborative initiative in East Lothian is the Bus Passenger Charter jointly produced by RELBUS, the council and the operators. It sets out the expectations of passengers and the responsibilities of the council and operators. It is a good example of working together for the common good and something like it should perhaps be universally adopted in the region.

Finally under the heading of innovation there is the question of new and adapted services. This takes me back to the involvement heading. The number of times I have heard people say 'If only there was a bus to such and such a place' or 'if only that service ran a little later'. Surveys could test the degree of interest in changing services to meet such needs and the changes made could actually increase bus patronage. And let's not forget the importance of providing bus services to new housing development, something that I don't think is high on the developers' priorities. If a bus service is there at the outset then there's a good chance that people will use it provided that it is frequent and attractive. If it is not there car use will become established. It's down to the local authorities to see that it happens.

Information

This is about making sure that people know through a variety of means what public transport is available, how to access it and what it will cost them. It's also about making sure people know who is responsible for running particular services and how they can make complaints or suggestions.

We can do all sorts of things to make the service better but if we don't tell people what's available and by whom in ways that they can access that information we will not get more people using those services. Real Time Passenger Information has been a great innovation accessible on phones, at stops and places where people congregate. We must not rely solely on new technology because many elderly people do not use it, but we certainly must make the most of it if we want to get young people on board. The balance at present is about right and new avenues for information are being explored all the time. We should not, however, underestimate the value of simple, old fashioned measures like up to date timetables at all bus stops. Disseminating information should not be just about the services themselves but other things affecting bus use like clarity of pricing, hailing buses and the Passenger Charter all referred to above.

BARRY TURNER

JULY 2018

Active Travel Update

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report is to update Chief Officers on Active Travel activities within the partnership and the desire to offer assistance to partner authorities in specific projects.

2. Regional Cycle Network Grant Scheme (RCNGS)

- 2.1 SEStran operates the Sustrans funded Regional Cycle Network Grant which seeks to encourage the development of the Cycle Network throughout the Region, in particular functional cross-boundary infrastructure.
- 2.2 As previously detailed SEStran has received an application from Edinburgh BioQuarter for the detailed design of an active travel corridor.
- 2.3 Following changes to the guidance with design projects now 100% funded, SEStran are investigating options for feasibility and design of a number of strategic routes across the region. The anticipated outcome of this would be design documents that can be taken forward to construction, as funds become available.
- 2.4 SEStran invites and encourages its partnering authorities to propose projects that may not be currently seen as a local priority but could have regional significance and could be taken to construction ready stage to attract funding in future.

3. GO e-Bike

- 3.1 The project is being rolled out in 4 locations this financial year: West Lothian, Forth Valley and Fife (Buckhaven and St Andrews). The aim of the project is primarily to introduce e-bike sharing schemes to communities, particularly those affected by transport poverty and disadvantage.
- 3.2 In June 2018, CLEAR Buckhaven launched their scheme with the attendance of local elected representatives. CLEAR staff have been given additional training for the use of their cargo e-bike, through the partnership with cycling Scotland.
- 3.3 In St. Andrews the installation of two GO e-Bike stations has been completed with an anticipated launch at the end of August. The Transition St. Andrews team have been delivering cycle training sessions to staff, in preparation for use of bike in the autumn term.

4. Low Carbon Travel & Transport Challenge Fund

- 4.1 In January 2018, SEStran applied to Transport Scotland's 'Low Carbon Travel & Transport Challenge Fund' (LCTT) to receive a grant of £400,000, with a commitment of £200,000 from SEStran to expand the GO e-Bike project.
- 4.2 Following the Ministerial announcement of the Fund on 8th August 2018, SEStran were awarded a grant of £300,000 with a commitment of £100,000 from SEStran. This will allow the expansion of GO e-Bike to a further 6 hubs across the region.
- 4.3 This funding will be utilised in work over a period concluding December 2019.

5. Staff Resource

- 5.1 As well as offering funding and applying for funding, SEStran is keen to assist partner authorities with specific projects, particularly in respect of active travel. An example comes from the work SEStran did in supporting East Lothian Council in drafting their active travel strategy.

6. Recommendations

- 6.1 That the Chief Officers note the content of the report and propose potential projects to be taken forward in partnership with SEStran.

Peter Jackson
Active Travel Officer
3rd August 2018

Policy Implications	Increased spending on sustainable travel projects will increase clarity of policy
Financial Implications	Contained in existing budget and will deliver significant increase in active travel projects.
Equalities Implications	Targeting areas of disadvantage will improve social inclusion
Climate Change Implications	Increased spending on low carbon transport will encourage modal shift to more environmentally friendly modes

Transport (Scotland) Bill

1. Introduction

- 1.1** The purpose of this report is to inform Chief Officers of the recent Transport (Scotland) Bill¹ introduced by the Cabinet Secretary for Finance and Constitution, Derek Mackay MSP, in the Scottish Parliament on 8 June 2018.
- 1.2** The Bill is now within the first stage of the parliamentary process, in which the Rural Economy & Connectivity Committee has launched a consultation survey, which seeks stakeholder views about the Bill.

2. Transport (Scotland) Bill

- 2.1** The Bill addresses a number of Scottish Government commitments from the 2017-18 Programme for Government². The Bill aims to empower Local Authorities and enable them to implement future commitments as set out in the Programme for Government. The Bill is structured into the following six parts which will be considered within its consultation:
- 2.2**
- Part 1 – Low emission zones: makes provision in relation to the creation and enforcement of low emission zones in Scotland.
 - Part 2 – Bus services: ensures that local transport authorities have viable and flexible options to improve bus services in their areas.
 - Part 3 – Ticketing arrangements and schemes (“smart ticketing”): makes provision enabling the Scottish Ministers to specify a national technological standard for the implementation and operation of smart ticketing arrangements and providing local transport authorities with additional powers to develop and deliver effective smart ticketing arrangements and schemes.
 - Part 4 – Pavement parking and double parking: introduces prohibitions on parking on pavements and double parking.
 - Part 5 – Road works: enhances the role of the Scottish Road Works Commissioner (SRWC) and the wider regulation of road works.

¹ <http://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/Bills/108683.aspx>

² <https://www.gov.scot/Resource/0052/00524214.pdf>

- Part 6 – Miscellaneous and general: includes providing Regional Transport Partnerships (Transport Partnerships) with more financial flexibility and improves the governance of Scotland’s canals.

3. Financial Implications

3.1 The Bill gives legal clarity to Regional Transport Partnerships to create and carry forward financial reserves across the financial year-end, as with local authorities currently. This change aims to make it easier for the Regional Transport Partnerships to manage their year-end finances by enabling them to hold a balance of funds.

3.2 This change removes any perceived need for Regional Transport Partnerships to have a zero balance at the end of each financial year which will benefit the planning and delivery of projects.

4 Consultation and survey

4.1 As the Bill is in the initial stages of the parliamentary process, future papers are likely to be brought forward for comment.

4.2 Annex 1 of this report contains the provisional response to be provided on behalf of SEStran. Appendix 2 are the questions asked within the online consultation for Officer consideration.

5. Recommendations

5.1 Officers are invited to comment on the proposed response to the Transport (Scotland) Bill Consultation.

Appendix 1 – **Transport (Scotland) Bill Proposed Consultation Response**

Appendix 2 – **Transport (Scotland) Bill Consultation Survey Questionnaire**

Lisa Freeman

Strategy and Projects Officer

10th August 2018

Policy Implications	The Bill could result in a number of policy changes
Financial Implications	As a result of the Bill, RTPs would be able to carry forward financial reserves across the financial year-end.
Equalities Implications	None
Climate Change Implications	None

Appendix 1 – Proposed Transport (Scotland) Bill Consultation Response

SEStran

Established by the Transport (Scotland) Act 2005, SEStran is the statutory Regional Transport Partnership covering the eight local authorities in the South East of Scotland including: Clackmannanshire, Scottish Borders, East Lothian, West Lothian, Midlothian, Fife, Falkirk, and City of Edinburgh Council. SEStran welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Transport (Scotland) Bill Consultation.

Low Emission Zones (LEZs)

SEStran supports the principle of LEZs, if they are delivered as part of a wider local or regional sustainable transport strategy. It must be clear what the LEZ is designed to achieve, as they will have a significant impact on the region. Many residents working in neighbouring councils work in the Capital. Therefore, any LEZs should be seen in that context, and should not be viewed in isolation. LEZs should be implemented alongside complementary measures that encourage the uptake of active travel and reduce the number of single occupancy vehicles. The Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) recognises that transport must play its part in the reduction of emissions and improvement of local air quality. Many SEStran RTS measures are aimed at reducing car single occupancy travel and encouraging sustainable travel behaviours.

As stated in the Bill, LEZs will enable Local Authorities to possess powers to restrict the access of vehicles which are not compliant to certain emission standards from entering specified districts. SEStran would agree that LEZ regulations ideally should be consistent across all LEZs in Scotland. However, it is understood that local decision making may dictate the need for flexibility to fund schemes' maintenance.

Care will need to be taken to ensure that the public are aware of the need for an LEZ, to ensure the penalty scheme is not seen as another "road user tax". This would require a consistent marketing campaign and promotional materials across Scotland, ahead of implementation. This should be considered along with the provisions made within the Bill regarding the provision of signs, ANPR cameras and the enforcement of schemes. Sufficient investment must be made in further active travel initiatives and infrastructure in order to make an LEZ work. Funding and support must also be made available to ensure that public transport operators within the region are able to operate within the city's LEZ.

SEStran is currently represented on the steering group for Edinburgh's LEZ. In this group SEStran aims to provide a regional perspective, alongside best practice examples. Including, last mile logistics research from the SURFLOUGH¹ EU project, and shared mobility examples from the SHARE-North² EU project. Overall, SEStran

¹ <http://sestran.gov.uk/projects/surfloagh/>

² <http://sestran.gov.uk/projects/share-north/>

welcomes the proposals outlined within the Transport Bill. However, as previously mentioned, this should not be viewed in isolation, and financial support should be provided to Authorities so that these commitments are able to be met accordingly.

Bus Services

Bus Service Improvement Partnerships (BSIPs)

The Bill offers the opportunity to create BSIPs. Like SPT, other RTPs could provide a supportive role in the creation of BSIPs where cross-boundary routes to be considered. SEStran welcomes this opportunity, however, as the Bill currently stands, without considerable financial support and buy-in from the operators, the creation of further BSIPs could prove costly and largely unused. More support in this area must be considered, if falling bus patronage numbers are to be improved. SEStran, currently a model 1 partnership could not be empowered to 'contribute' to a BSIP but could assist in facilitating.

Franchising

With regards to the franchising powers considered for transport authorities, SEStran is in principle, supportive of this option. As in other Cities across this UK, this could result in improved services and an increase in patronage. However, this change would require a great amount of research and assessment of all routes, fares and their viability. This would be an extremely costly exercise, and cost benefits should be fully considered before being entered into.

Information

SEStran welcomes the provisions in the Bill which would require bus operators to share information on routes and timetables. SEStran has continued to champion the implementation of bus real-time information throughout the SEStran Region and has seen its benefits across both urban and rural communities. However, SEStran would emphasise that data provided by operators should be openly available, and of a high standard, which can provide future improvements in passenger information services.

SEStran supports the powers that require operators varying or withdrawing services to provide detailed information to authorities, as this will allow authorities to understand the reasons for service withdrawal and provide them with strategic oversight on whether the authority is able to replace the service.

Ticketing Arrangements and Schemes (Smart Ticketing)

SEStran welcomes, in principle, the provisions of the Bill in relation to Smart Ticketing. Significant investment has already been made in smart infrastructure and further investment made in ensuring operators across the country can accept smart tickets, and it is right that these benefits should be maximised. SEStran has invested over

£150,000 over the past 2 financial years, in kitting out smaller operators in the region with new ticket machines. ITSO is already widely considered as the UK standard, and is used across the Scottish National Concessionary Scheme, ScotRail and most bus operators. Another national standard would be costly to implement, so focus should be placed on the 'smart' solutions already in use within the market.

SEStran also believes that the establishment of a new Advisory Board and the requirement of Local Authorities to produce annual reports on ticketing would be unnecessary and an onerous task on an already stretched staff resource. In addition to this, the provisions made towards Ministers having powers to direct Local Authorities to implement ticketing schemes, seems unnecessarily excessive. Local Authority budgets and demand will determine the viability of a potential scheme, having Ministerial oversight would be unlikely be able to change these factors.

Pavement Parking

In principle, SEStran is supportive of the provisions regarding responsible parking within the Bill. Members within the SEStran Equalities and Access to Healthcare Forum have continued to express their concerns and experiences in regard to irresponsible parking. It is welcomed that the Government is bringing such legislation forward to help vulnerable pedestrians such as the disabled, elderly and parents with small children. However, it is understandable that there is still concern over how Local Authorities will manage this new power, in times of budget constraints. Enforcement will be a new issue for each individual Authority to manage. Additional resources must be made available to support these new powers if they are to succeed. There is also the additional issue of areas (such as residential or near schools) where pavement parking has been established as a preferred alternative, to allow access of other vehicles (such as public transport or emergency services). Further, costly, assessment work of the road network would need to be conducted by the Authority to establish areas to be excluded from the legislation. The practicalities of enforcement will also be challenging, particularly for short duration offenders.

Road Works

SEStran welcomes the provisions in relation to Road Works and those that will strengthen the powers of the Commissioner. These additional powers will help to promote compliance and set the requirement for reinstatement quality plans, ensuring that organisations meet the required standards when executing road works.

Miscellaneous and general, including RTPs and Scotland's Canals

SEStran welcomes the provisions made in relation to RTP finances. It is welcomed that this will bring RTPs finance rules in line with their Local Authority partners. This

will enable the Partnerships to hold a balance of funds and reduce risk in the implementation of projects. This change would allow RTPs have flexibility to work on projects that will cover more than one financial year and consider planning for the longer term.

Conclusion

In principle, SEStran welcomes the Bill and considers the provision within it a positive step in Transport Policy development. However, without suitable levels of financial support, a number of the provisions made within the Bill will be unlikely to come to fruition. The targets set out within the Programme for Government were indeed ambitious, and without the correct supporting conditions, this Bill may fall short in achieving this. These provisions cannot be viewed in isolation. Further considerations should also be made towards the needs of the travelling public, and whilst some of these provisions address a number of issues faced by our most vulnerable community members, more could be done to improve transport delivery to meet their needs.

Appendix 2 – Transport (Scotland) Bill Consultation Survey Questionnaire

Part 1 – Low Emission Zones

The Bill would grant Scottish Ministers the power to approve all LEZs and to set national rules for their operation. Do you support or oppose these proposals? Please choose the option which most closely matches your opinion.

	Strongly Support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	No Opinion
Scottish Ministers must approve all LEZ proposals						
Scottish Ministers will have the power to specify certain types of vehicle that will be exempt from any LEZ scheme, e.g. emergency service vehicles						
Scottish Ministers' will be able to order a Council to review a LEZ and direct it to implement changes following that review						

The Bill would grant Councils the power to set the rules governing the operation of individual LEZs. Do you support or oppose these proposals? Please choose the option which most closely matches your opinion.

	Strongly Support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	No Opinion
Councils must specify a grace period of between 2 and 6 years for residents (1-4 years for non-residents) following the introduction of a LEZ, during which penalties will not be levied						
Councils will be able to suspend a LEZ for an event, held in or near the zone, that it considers to be of national importance						
Councils can grant exemptions from LEZ requirements for individual						

vehicles, or types of vehicle (up to one year)						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

How might the LEZ proposals in the Bill be improved? Please summarise any suggested improvements that you would like to see made in the box below:

--

Part 2 – Local Bus Service

The Bill would provide Councils with the following powers, aimed at improving local bus services. Do you support or oppose these powers? Please choose the option which most closely matches your opinion

	Strongly Support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	No Opinion
Provide bus service(s) where no commercial service is provided						
Work in a formal partnership with commercial operators to improve services						
Specify all aspects of local bus services, which will be provided by commercial operators following a tendering exercise						

The Bill would require bus operators to share information on routes, timetables and actual running times with third parties - to make it easier for passengers to know when their bus will arrive and how much it will cost.

How best could your Council or bus operator improve the ways it provides timetable and route information? (Please put the following options in an order were 1 is your favourite idea and 5 is your least favourite)

- Bus Operator Website (4)
- Bus Operator App (3)
- Bus Stop Real-time displays (1)
- Bus Stop Paper timetables (2)
- Paper timetables (5)

Do you think the proposed changes to bus regulation in the Bill could be improved? If so, could you briefly summarise the changes you would like to see made in the box below:

--

Part 3 – Smart Ticketing

	Strongly Support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	No Opinion
National technological standard for smart ticketing						
National Smart Ticketing Advisory Board						
Requirement for local authorities to produce annual reports on use of ticketing powers						
Power for Scottish Ministers to direct local authorities to implement schemes						

What are the reason(s) behind your answers above?

--

Part 4 – Double parking and parking on the pavement

Do you support or oppose the proposed prohibitions on:

	Support	Oppose
Pavement Parking		
Double Parking		

The Bill proposes a number of exemptions to the prohibition on pavement parking and double parking. These are:

- Emergency service vehicles responding to an incident
- Vehicles used in undertaking road works
- Bin lorries
- Postal service vehicles
- Vehicles used by medical practitioners responding to an incident
- Vehicles being used for deliveries
- Vehicles in a parking place
- Vehicles parked at the direction of a police officer
- Vehicles parked for the purpose of saving a life/similar emergency

- Vehicle parked to provide roadside assistance

It is worth noting that the Bill requires vehicles that benefit from an exemption to only use it where it is unavoidable and for the shortest time possible to complete the task in hand (with a limit of 20 minutes on vehicles being used for deliveries).

Overall, do you support or oppose the proposed exemptions? Please choose the option which most closely matches your opinion.

	Strongly Support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	No Opinion
Overall view of proposed exemptions						

Do you have any concerns about the proposed exemptions, or wish to see additional exemptions added? If so, please briefly summarise what change(s) you would like to see made and why you think these are necessary.

The Bill would allow local authorities to exempt any footway from the prohibition on pavement parking, as long as it has had regard to any guidance issued by Scottish Ministers. Do you support this proposal?

Support	
Oppose	

What are the reason(s) behind your answer above?

Part 5 – Road Works

The Bill would give the Scottish Road Works Commissioner, and Commission staff appointed as inspectors, the power to inspect roads works, documents etc. to establish the facts in possible cases of non-compliance with road works related legislation that falls within the Commissioners remit.

The Bill would grant the Commissioner, and Commission staff, new powers to investigate and take enforcement action against organisations that failed to comply with statutory road works requirements.

Do you support or oppose these powers? Please choose the option which most closely matches your opinion.

	Strongly Support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	No Opinion
New statutory duty on local authority road works to meet fencing and lighting requirements						
Ministers can issue a code of practice for safety at local authority road work sites						
New statutory requirement for local authority road works to be supervised by a suitably qualified person						

Do you have any comments or concerns about these proposed powers? If so, can you briefly summarise them below?

N/A – This would be a matter for individual Local Authorities to consider.

The Bill would create place new duties/requirements on those undertaking road works. Do you support or oppose these powers? Please choose the option which most closely matches your opinion.

	Strongly Support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	No Opinion
New requirement for actual commencement and completion date notices to be placed in the Road Works Register within a prescribed period						
Anyone undertaking road works, or works to a road (except roads authorities) must have either a site specific, or general road reinstatement quality plan in place						

Do you have any comments or concerns about these proposed powers? If so, can you briefly summarise them below?

--

Part 6 – Regional Transport Partnership Finance and membership of the Scottish Canals Board

Do you support or oppose these proposals?

Support	
Oppose	

What is the reason for your answer?

--

The Bill would expand the size of the Scottish Canals board, increasing the number of members appointed by Scottish Ministers from "between one and four" to "at least 4 but no more than 9". The aim being to allow the appointment of members with a wider range of skills and experience than at present. Do you support or oppose this proposal?

Support
Oppose

What is the reason for your answer?

--

Do you have any other comments about the Bill, particularly any changes you would like to see made? If so, please briefly summarise these in the box below.

--