

## TAYSIDE AND CENTRAL SCOTLAND TRANSPORT PARTNERSHIP

12 DECEMBER 2017

## GENERAL CONSULTATIONS

## REPORT BY SENIOR PARTNERSHIP MANAGER

This report seeks approval of responses to Scottish Government consultations on Local Bus Services in Scotland – Improving the Framework For Delivery and on The Future of Smart Ticketing in Scotland; asks the Partnership to delegate authority to the Executive Committee to consider and approve Tactran and joint RTP responses to a Scottish Government consultation on Financial Accounting Arrangements for Regional Transport Partnerships; and informs the Partnership of consultation responses approved for submission by the Executive Committee under delegated authority.

**1 RECOMMENDATIONS**

## 1.1 That the Partnership:

- (i) approves the proposed response to Scottish Government's consultation on Local Bus Services in Scotland – Improving the Framework for Delivery, as detailed in Appendix A;
- (ii) approves the proposed response to Scottish Government's consultation on The Future of Smart Ticketing in Scotland, as detailed in Appendix B; and
- (iii) delegates authority to the Executive Committee to consider and approve joint RTP and Tactran responses to Scottish Government consultation on Financial Accounting Arrangements for Regional Transport Partnerships, for submission by the deadline of 12 January 2018.
- (iv) notes the responses to Scottish Government consultations on Free Bus Travel for Older and Disabled People and Modern Apprentices and on Building Scotland's Low Emission Zones approved by the Executive Committee at its meeting on 16 November 2017, as shown in Appendices D and E respectively.

**2 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Scottish Government published consultation on [Local Bus Services in Scotland – Improving the Framework for Delivery](#) on 13 September 2017, with an original date for submission of 5 December 2017. This submission date has been subsequently extended to 12 December 2017 to permit reporting to the Joint RTP Chairs Forum at its quarterly meeting on 6 December 2017 and the Tactran Partnership meeting on 12 December 2017.

- 2.2 The Scottish Government published [The Future of Smart Ticketing in Scotland – A Consultation](#) on 13 September 2017, with an original date for submission of 5 December 2017. This submission date has been subsequently extended to 12 December 2017 to permit reporting to the Joint RTP Chairs Forum at its quarterly meeting on 6 December 2017 and the Tactran Partnership meeting on 12 December 2017.
- 2.3 The Scottish Government published consultation on [Financial Accounting Arrangements for Regional Transport Partnerships](#) on 20 October 2017, with responses to be submitted by 12 January 2018.
- 2.4 The Scottish Government published [Consultation on Free Bus Travel for Older and Disabled People and Modern Apprentices](#) and [Building Scotland's Low Emission Zones – A Consultation](#) with responses to be submitted by 17 November 2017 and 28 November 2017 respectively. At its meeting on 12 September 2017 the Partnership agreed to delegate authority to the Executive Committee to consider and approve responses to these two Scottish Government consultations (Report RTP/17/22 refers).

### **3 DISCUSSION**

#### Consultation on Local Bus Services in Scotland – Improving the Framework for Delivery

- 3.1 Bus services are vitally important to the people and communities of Scotland with around 400 million (three quarters of all public transport) journeys made by bus. However, the sector faces significant challenges with the overall number of passenger journeys decreasing and service cutbacks in some places which can leave communities without a public transport option. Scottish Government believes that the legislative framework governing bus services requires improvement and is consulting on options to do that.
- 3.2 Fundamentally, buses are a local service and work best when they are tailored to meet local needs and circumstances. Central government sets the framework of options for transport authorities to improve bus provision. Within this consultation Scottish Government argues that the current framework can be improved to make it more flexible and viable, whether a transport authority wishes to pursue partnership working, local franchising or even running bus services.
- 3.3 Scottish Government also believes that there is room for improvement in terms of the information that passengers receive to help them plan and make a bus journey and has set out their intentions to require bus operators to share data openly.

- 3.4 The consultation recognises that a collective effort with contributions from central and local government, commercial and not for profit providers and individuals, communities and representative organisations is needed to secure and sustain the bus services required to help grow the Scottish economy, meet the needs of individuals and communities and improve the environment. It notes that legislation alone will not solve problems such as congestion or the challenge of providing cost effective public transport services in more sparsely populated or remote communities. However, Scottish Government believes legislation can help drive and support the actions that are needed, and that the current legislative framework can be improved.
- 3.5 The consultation document sets out the context and detail of the Scottish Government proposals. The answers to the consultation will inform Scottish Government as they refine their thinking and consider the next steps. Responses to this consultation will also help to influence and shape of the regulatory framework for bus.
- 3.6 The Partnership is asked to consider and approve the proposed response, as shown in Appendix A.

#### The Future of Smart Ticketing in Scotland – A Consultation

- 3.7 Scottish Ministers have a vision that *“all journeys on Scotland’s bus, rail, ferry, subway and tram networks can be made using some form of smart ticketing or payment”*.
- 3.8 Smart ticketing is an important element of a modern public transport system and is increasingly prevalent in major cities and countries around the world. It offers a number of benefits for users, transport operators and society including greater choice, less cash handling and promoting a modal shift to public transport. This contributes towards the Scottish Government’s Greener Strategic Objective.
- 3.9 Considerable progress has already been made by both public bodies and commercial operators on delivering smart ticketing in Scotland. This consultation seeks views on Scottish Government’s proposed framework for nation-wide multi-modal smart ticketing and on what more needs to be done to ensure that the Ministerial vision is achieved.
- 3.10 The Partnership is asked to consider and approve the proposed response, as shown in Appendix B.

### Consultation on Financial Accounting Arrangements for Regional Transport Partnerships

- 3.11 The consultation recognises that the Regional Transport Partnerships (RTPs) strengthen the planning and delivery of regional transport and in doing so regularly invest in projects. The RTPs have previously sought clarity on whether the Transport (Scotland) Act 2005 which established the RTPs provides ability for RTPs to record an annual surplus or deficit and to manage reserves. It is recognised that, for financial planning purposes, there is a need to ensure RTPs have the ability to have a surplus or deficit on their Income and Expenditure accounts, and hence the ability to have a General Fund balance to create a reserve.
- 3.12 The Programme for Government, published on 5 September 2017, contains a commitment to a Transport Bill. This presents an opportunity to include a provision to clarify the extent to which RTPs are able to keep a financial reserve.
- 3.13 The consultation seeks views on whether it is necessary to clarify the extent to which RTPs are able to retain a financial reserve and on whether any surplus or deficit carried forward from one financial year to the next should be subject to any limit. Views are also sought on what safeguards local authorities ought to have in limiting their contribution towards the expenses of a RTP. The consultation questions are shown at Appendix C for information.
- 3.14 This consultation was discussed at the RTP Chairs meeting on 6 December 2017, when it was agreed that a joint RTP response, supplementing individual RTP responses, will be submitted to Scottish Government by the deadline of 12 January 2017. At the time of writing this is the subject of ongoing discussion and development with the other RTPs and the Partnership is asked to delegate authority to the Executive Committee to consider and approve joint RTP and Tactran responses, to allow submission to Scottish Government by the 12 January 2017 deadline.

### Consultation on Free Bus Travel for Older and Disabled People and Modern Apprentices

- 3.15 As reported to the meeting on 12 September 2017 (Report RTP/17/22 refers), Scottish Government has sought views on the future sustainability of the current concessionary travel scheme for older and disabled people and on proposals to extend the scheme to include Modern Apprentices, with a deadline for responses by 17 November 2017.

- 3.16 The Executive Committee considered and approved a response to the consultation at its meeting on 16 November 2017 (Report RTP/17/31 refers). The response, amended to include additional comments to explicitly state that Tactran does not support any reduction in the general utility of the concessionary travel scheme by any form of restriction on the current Scotland-wide and all-day travel availability of the concessionary scheme, as agreed by the Executive Committee, is shown in Appendix D, which the Partnership is asked to note.

#### Building Scotland's Low Emission Zones – A Consultation

- 3.17 This Scottish Government consultation paper sets out proposed arrangements and options to deliver a consistent approach to designing, building and managing Low Emission Zones (LEZs) in Scotland and sought views on a selection of associated issues, with a deadline for responses by 28 November 2017.
- 3.18 The Executive Committee considered and approved a response to the consultation at its meeting on 16 November 2017 (Report RTP/17/31 refers). The response is shown in Appendix E, which the Partnership is asked to note.

### **4 CONSULTATIONS**

- 4.1 The draft and submitted responses detailed in appendices to this report have been prepared in consultation with other RTPs and have been informed by consultation with partner Councils.

### **5 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 This report has no direct resource implications.

### **6 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 This report has been screened for any policy implications in respect of Equality Impact Assessment and no material issues have been identified.

**Niall Gardiner**  
**Senior Partnership Manager**

Report prepared by Niall Gardiner and Eric Guthrie. For further information e-mail [niallgardiner@tactran.gov.uk](mailto:niallgardiner@tactran.gov.uk) or tel. 01738 475764.

## **NOTE**

The following background papers, as defined by Section 50D of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 (and not containing confidential or exempt information) were relied on to a material extent in preparing the above Report:

Report to Partnership RTP/17/22, General Consultations, 12 September 2017

Report to Executive Committee RTP/17/31, Consultations, 16 November 2017

Local Bus Services in Scotland – Improving the Framework for Delivery – A Consultation, Transport Scotland, September 2017

The Future of Smart Ticketing in Scotland – A Consultation, Transport Scotland, September 2017

Consultation on Financial Accounting Arrangements for Regional Transport Partnerships, Transport Scotland, October 2017

Consultation on Free Bus Travel for Older and Disabled People and Modern Apprentices, Transport Scotland, August 2017

Building Scotland's Low Emission Zones – A Consultation, Transport Scotland, September 2017

**Local Bus Services in Scotland  
Improving the Framework for Delivery  
A Consultation**

**Partnerships**

**Question 1** - Do you think that legislation (either via the existing sQP model or another) is required to secure the benefits of partnership working?

Please answer Yes , or No .

Please explain your answer to this question:-

For partnership working to be successful there needs to be benefit to all partners. Whatever the process, whether through legislation or other means, the commitment and input for each partner needs to be understood, clear and agreed at the outset, as do the expected outcomes for all partners and stakeholders, particularly the travelling public. There needs to be a mechanism to ensure partners deliver on their required actions. There should be a choice of options to achieve partnership working with both voluntary and legislative options considered, as one size does not fit all. Legislation should clearly outline the options available to transport authorities and provide a greater choice of options able to be tailored to local/regional needs.

**Question 2** - Do you feel that statutory Quality Partnerships as defined in the Transport (Scotland) Act 2001 provide the right framework for partnership working?

Please answer Yes , or No .

Please explain your answer to this question:-

It is clear from the lack of successful promotion and development of sQPs to date in most parts of Scotland, that the Transport (Scotland) Act 2001 has not provided an effective, flexible or functional statutory framework for partnership working. However, there has been significant and ongoing partnership working between Transport Authorities and Bus Operators over the intervening years, which has resulted in improvements to bus infrastructure and services. These have been, and continue to be, taken forward outside the sQP framework, although it is considered that there should be scope for Transport Authorities to contribute more than infrastructure. It is suggested there is a need for further research into why there has been little uptake in SQPs, what and whether the barriers to these have been in different areas, and what effect this has had on bus service provision, passenger usage and travel behaviour generally, including potentially contributing to or exacerbating transport poverty.

**Question 3** – Do you agree with our proposals for Service Improvement Partnerships as outlined in pages 32-35?

Please answer Yes , or No .

Please explain your answer to this question:-

The increased flexibility and emphasis on partnership working is welcomed and SIPs, in a modified form, could provide one option for partnership working. However, there are significant concerns that the apparent requirement to obtain support from all bus operators via a voting mechanism could increase the risk of nothing happening if agreement can't be reached. There is a significant risk that one

uncooperative partner could cause a SIP to fail, even if this is supported and wanted by the Transport Authority, the majority of operators and, importantly, bus users and the communities to be served and who potentially stand to benefit, or lose out if the proposals are frustrated or fail.

The potentially narrow commercial interest of a single or small number of operators should not hold sway over a Transport Authority's and willing operator partners' ability to progress service improvements if the Transport Authority, the majority of operators and, again most importantly, the travelling public and communities which stand to benefit are in favour.

Should an appropriate form of SIP be introduced consideration needs to be given to what remedies would be available should one or more parties default. There may be a role for the Traffic Commissioner in determining and adjudicating on compliance, including through the "O" Licensing and Bus Service Registration systems.

Whilst it is recognised that the focus of the consultation and these proposals is around the current regulatory framework governing Local Bus service provision and improving partnership working, the core social purpose of public transport must not be overlooked. There needs to be increased recognition of, consideration given to, and emphasis placed upon wider community interests and community outcomes, linked with wider societal objectives around inclusive economic prosperity, social inclusion, environmental sustainability, and other inclusion/equalities outcomes, which good and effective public transport service delivery should be designed to underpin and support (i.e. not simply defined by narrow transport policy outcomes and impacts).

**Question 4** – If a new form of statutory Partnership is introduced, do you agree that statutory Quality Partnerships as defined in the Transport (Scotland) Act 2001 should be replaced (i.e. they would no longer be available as a tool for LTAs)?

Please answer Yes , or No .

Please explain your answer to this question:-

There are sufficient similarities between SIPs (suitably amended and enhanced in line with comments under Q3 above) and sQPs to suggest that both options are not required. However, there needs to be a transition phase to move from one to the other, during which existing sQPs should be able to run their course.

### **Local Franchising**

**Question 5** – Do you think that local authorities should have the power to franchise bus services (either via Quality Contract or another system)?

Please answer Yes , No .

Please explain your answer to this question:-

Tactran believes that one size does not fit all and that a number of options for partnership working should be available to Transport Authorities (i.e. RTPs and Local Authorities) and bus operators. Given current and ongoing trend decline in bus patronage and service delivery in a number of parts of Scotland it is considered essential that franchising is introduced as an option, within a wider suite of options available to Transport Authorities.

**Question 6** – Do you think that the existing Quality Contracts require change to make franchising a more viable option?

Please answer Yes , or No .

Please explain your answer to this question:-

The requirement to demonstrate that QC's are "necessary" for implementing general policies, with little or no clarity around what is meant by "necessary", is a constraint on their implementation. This should be replaced with the requirement that a full appraisal of all options, including assessment of their intended benefits and outcomes (reflecting the comments under Q3 above regarding the role of public transport in contributing to wider National and Local Outcomes – i.e. again not just defined by potentially narrow transport policy objectives, considerations and outcomes) is undertaken to identify a preferred option. Tactran believes that there should be a wider assessment of all partnership options – voluntary, SIP, Franchise, QC and Transport Authority run services (direct or arms' length) through a Strategic Outline Case procedure involving all partners to identify the preferred option for a specific area, with the Government's and locally defined aspirations and requirements for inclusive growth at the heart of the appraisal.

**Question 7- Considering the information on our proposal on pages 38-42**

**Question 7(a)** – Do you think that there should be any consent mechanism for an authority to begin the process of assessment for franchising?

Please answer Yes , or No .

Please explain your answer to this question:-

As outlined in response to question 6, Tactran considers that a Strategic Outline Case considering all options should be undertaken jointly by all partners (Transport Authority and bus operators) and that the preferred option is then identified and taken forward, with the Government's and locally defined aspirations and objectives for inclusive growth at the heart of the appraisal.

**Question 7(b)** – Do you think that there should be a requirement for independent audit of the business case for franchising?

Please answer Yes , or No .

Please explain your answer to this question:-

Yes an audit of the Strategic Outline Case should be undertaken by an agreed independent auditor, to ensure the correct procedures have been followed and buy-in from all parties.

**Question 7(c)** – Do you think that there should be an approval process beyond that of the local authority itself, before franchising can take place?

Please answer Yes , or No .

Please explain your answer to this question **including (if yes) what kind of approval process:-**

There should be appropriate checks and balances.

## Transport Authority Run Bus Services

**Question 8(a)** – Do you think that transport authorities (including ‘model III’ RTPs) should be able to directly run bus services?

Please answer Yes , No .

Please explain your answer to this question:-

This should be an option considered as part of an overall appraisal. This option should be available to all Transport Authorities – i.e. including **ALL** RTPs.

**Question 8(b)** – Please describe the circumstances in which this might be appropriate:-

It would be for the suggested appraisal process to determine where this might be the preferred option.

**Question 8(c)** – What, if any, safeguards do you think should be put in place to ensure that no operator has an unfair advantage in a deregulated market?

Please explain your answer to this question:-

There should be appropriate checks and balances in place and this would be determined through the suggested appraisal process.

**Question 9(a)** – Do you think that transport authorities (including ‘model III’ RTPs) should be able to set up arm’s length bus companies to operate local bus services?

Please answer Yes , No .

Please explain your answer to this question:-

This should be an option considered as part of an overall appraisal. This option should be available to all Transport Authorities – i.e. including **ALL** RTPs.

**Question 9(b)** – Please describe the circumstances in which this might be appropriate:-

It would be for the suggested appraisal process to determine where this might be the preferred option.

**Question 9(c)** – What if any safeguards do you think should be put in place to ensure that no operator has an unfair advantage in a deregulated market?

There should be appropriate checks and balances in place and this would be determined through the suggested appraisal process.

**Question 9(d)** – What, if any, checks and balances do you think should be put in place for a transport authority looking to set up an arms’ length company to run buses? Please explain your answer to this question.

Tactran supports the principle of Transport Authorities, including all RTPs, being able to directly run bus services or run bus services via an arm’s length company where appropriate appraisal identifies either as the preferred, or most appropriate, option for meeting or enhancing the accessibility needs of their areas/communities. The details of this and the circumstances under which this might be appropriate, including scale and geographic coverage, should be a matter for local/regional Transport Authorities to assess and determine through their own governance processes, in

consultation with the relevant local authorities and/or RTPs and local bus operators, with the ability to implement, based on local/regional needs and circumstances.

## Open Data

**Question 10** – Do you agree with our proposals to require the operators of local services to release open data on routes, timetables, punctuality and fares in a specified format?

Please answer Yes , No .

Please explain your answer to this question:-

Tactran's Travel Information Strategy recognises that open data that is current, consistent, coherent, comprehensive (including routes, journey time, cost and facilities) should be easily available and tailored to user needs and is essential in making travel seamless and encouraging sustainable travel habits.

**Question 11 (a)** – Do you think that data provided by operators should be stored in a central data hub?

Please answer Yes , or No .

Please explain your answer to this question:-

One repository for data which ensures consistency of quality and format is available for all potential users is desirable.

**Question 11(b)** – if you do not support the use of a central data hub how do you think data should be stored/ made available? :-

N/A

**Question 12** – Do you support proposals for transport authorities to have the power to obtain, information about revenue and patronage of services being deregistered, and where appropriate disclose this as part of a tendering process?

Please answer Yes , or No .

Please explain your answer to this question:-

Yes as this follows the recommendations of the 2011 Competition Commissions Local Bus Services Market Investigation.

## Other

**Question 13** – Please provide any other comments or proposals around the regulation of bus services in Scotland that were not covered in the above questions.

Tactran considers that there is a need to appraise all options to identify a preferred option that will deliver the best possible service to bus users, this would include a de-minimum and all options outlined in the consultation including voluntary, SIPs, QC, Franchise, Transport Authority run services (direct or arms' length), with the Government's and locally defined aspirations and objectives for inclusive growth at the heart of the appraisal.

A practical measure which would offer increased flexibility to enable transport authorities to respond effectively to local needs and circumstances would be the inclusion of extended "de-minimis" powers to procure socially necessary bus services through negotiation, subject to demonstration of "best value".

A key issue underpinning the current state of the bus sector, and whatever emerges from this consultation, is the availability of adequate resources and funding to support effective trialling and implementation of any new legislative framework for partnership working and wider bus service delivery. It is essential that the Scottish Government backs its own proposals and the introduction of any new legislative framework by taking shared ownership of the realisation of outcomes, including making resources available to transport authorities to support successful implementation. New legislation must not simply “pass the buck” for fixing the bus system to Transport Authorities, nor place unrealistic expectations or burdens on them.

## Impacts

### Equality

**Question 14** - Are there any likely impacts the proposals contained within this consultation may have on particular groups of people, with reference to the ‘protected characteristics’ listed above?

Please answer Yes , No .

Please be as specific as possible:-

The intention is to improve bus services and infrastructure throughout Scotland. If these aims are achieved there is the potential to impact positively on all groups, but particularly lower socio-economic and other societal groups who rely more on public transport. A key focus must be to arrest and reverse trend decline in bus usage, which in turn is leading to decline in service provision. Mechanisms which can be demonstrated to maintain and regenerate the bus network, and also contribute to making bus services more available, accessible and affordable, will be of particular benefit to older people, disabled people, young people, people experiencing transport poverty and others who do not have access to other means of private transport for access to work, education, training, health and other essential facilities.

**Question 15** - Do you think the proposals contained within this consultation may have any additional implications on the safety of children and young people?

If yes, what would these implications be?

Please answer Yes , No .

Please be as specific as possible:-

Young people are often rely on local bus services for travel and therefore any proposals emerging from this consultation may have a positive or negative impact on the safety of young people, depending upon the eventual outcomes.

### **Business and Regulation**

In our work to improve bus services a Business and Regulatory Impact Assessment will analyse whether the policy is likely to increase or reduce the costs and burdens placed on businesses, the public sector and voluntary and community organisations.

**Question 16** - Do you think the proposals contained in this consultation are likely to increase or reduce the costs and burdens placed on any sector?

Please answer Yes , No .

Please be as specific as possible:-

It would be for the suggested appraisal process to determine what the cost impacts of the preferred option would be.

### **Privacy**

We need to ascertain whether our proposals for improving bus services in Scotland may have an impact on the privacy of individuals.

**Question 17** - Are there any likely impacts the proposals contained in this consultation may have upon the privacy of individuals?

Please answer Yes , No .

Please be as specific as possible:-

### **Environmental**

The Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005 ensures those public plans that are likely to have a significant impact on the environment are assessed and measures to prevent or reduce adverse effects are sought, where possible, prior to implementation.

**Question 18** - Are there any likely impacts the proposals contained in this consultation may have upon the environment?

Please answer Yes , No .

Please be as specific as possible:-

The proposals should have a positive environmental impact, through reduced carbon emissions and improved air quality, if they result in improvements to local bus services and resulting in modal shift in favour of more sustainable travel.

## The Future of Smart Ticketing In Scotland A Consultation

### Questions on Key Issues

#### Key issues on the future of smart ticketing in Scotland

#### Availability of smart ticketing schemes in Scotland

##### What is it?

In addition to individual smart ticketing schemes currently offered by individual transport operators (eg Stagecoach Megarider, SPT Bramble product for Glasgow subway or Lothian Buses Ridacard), our intention is to ensure that there is a consistent smart payment option (epurse) available across all of Scotland and on all main public transport modes, and to ensure that regional multi-modal schemes are fully supported.

##### What does it mean for me?

It would mean that, when fully delivered, at least one smart ticketing or payment option was available for passengers – and would remain available - across all of the main public transport modes in Scotland.

##### What will it cost or save?

It is not intended that Scottish Government should interfere in or influence fares setting, so it will remain a decision (as now) for transport operators about how to price the various smart tickets and products on offer. In terms of the smart infrastructure, most of the elements required are already in place, and it is not envisaged that costs will be routinely passed on, directly or indirectly, to passengers. Transport Scotland will incur a modest cost – estimated at £100,000 per annum – in supporting the national epurse.

##### What is the justification for claimed costs/savings?

For the epurse, it is anticipated that this new national smart product will prove popular with passengers, as it has in many other countries.

#### Question 1

**Do you think our intention to have a consistent smart payment option available across Scotland and on all main public transport modes would promote use of public transport in Scotland?**

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------

##### Please explain your answer.

There has to be consistency across the country. A recognised brand would help to increase customer awareness and confidence in the product. In order to maximise the potential afforded by smart payment, a key objective should be the earliest possible introduction of integrated, multi-modal availability. A further objective should be tackling transport poverty where this exists, including supporting those

who do not have access to smart enabled options, technology and infrastructure and supporting and encouraging the delivery of affordable (to the user) integrated ticketing products.

## Transport modes and services to be included in national and regional smart ticketing schemes

### What is it?

As well as the obvious transport modes such as bus and rail, there are a number other transport offerings that could conceivably be included in such smart ticketing schemes. Our intention is that, for now, our smart ticketing plans should be limited to local bus services in Scotland, scheduled rail journeys entirely within Scotland, foot passengers on scheduled ferry services entirely within Scotland, the Glasgow subway and the Edinburgh tram.

Other things such as air services, taxis, coach tours and heritage rail/tram/bus services, as well as peripheral offerings like car hire and cycle hire, and cars and freight vehicles on ferries, are proposed - for now – to be outside of scope.

### What does it mean for me?

By focusing on a manageable number of services and modes, we believe that we will increase the likelihood that our plans can be delivered within a reasonable timescale.

### What will it cost or save?

By focusing on modes that mostly have existing smart infrastructure, additional costs will be kept to a minimum.

### What is the justification for claimed costs/savings?

As well as avoiding spending extra money on widening the scope of smart ticketing, it should also ensure a faster route to delivery.

## Question 2

**Do you agree that the scope of smart ticketing should – for now – be limited to the modes and services outlined above?**

Yes



No



### Please explain your answer.

It is agreed that the initial focus should be on bus, rail ferry, subway and tram and the integration between them. However it is our view that, although a national e-purse (if indeed Transport Scotland remains committed to this) will provide substantial benefits beyond what is currently available and could provide national consistency, there is also a need for appropriate products to be available on any e-purse and, as per the answer to Q1 above, integration between operators and modes with availability of affordable (to the user) and competitive ticketing options/products is key.

## Scheme Compliance

### What is it?

In addition to the provision of a national epurse that is accepted by bus, rail, ferry, tram and subway operators across Scotland, we also envisage a number of regional multi operator, multi modal smart ticketing schemes, based on Scotland's main city regions. These regional schemes could be based on existing regional ticketing legislation provision within The Transport (Scotland) Act 2001.

There are a number of considerations ranging from defining the requirements to take part in national or regional smart ticketing schemes, monitoring and controlling compliance, through to whether and how to apply sanctions for non-compliance by operators – and, indeed, what these sanctions might look like.

### What does it mean for me?

We think that the simpler and more consistent we can make these arrangements the more likely prospective passengers are likely to have confidence in the new schemes. Similarly, from an operator perspective, it will be clearer what is expected of them.

### What will it cost or save?

In terms of the smart infrastructure, most of the elements required are already in place, and it is not envisaged that costs will be routinely passed on, directly or indirectly, to passengers. Transport Scotland will incur a modest cost – estimated at £100,000 per annum – in supporting the epurse.

### What is the justification for claimed costs/savings?

For the epurse, it is anticipated that this new national smart product will prove popular with passengers, as it has in many other countries.

## Question 3 - epurse

<b>a) Are you in favour of a clearly defined national epurse scheme??</b>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------

<b>b) Should all relevant bus, rail, ferry, tram and subway operators be expected to participate in a national epurse scheme?</b>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------

<b>c) Should participation in a national epurse scheme be monitored and controlled?</b>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------

<b>d) Should sanctions be imposed for non-compliance in a national epurse scheme?</b>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------

### Please explain your answers.

Significant investment has already been made in smart infrastructure and investment made in ensuring operators across the country can accept smart Tickets and it is right that these benefits should be maximised. There needs to be consistency across the country in order to maximise success. In terms of the statement “multi-modal smart ticketing schemes, based on Scotland's main city

regions” the 7 RTPs, established under the Transport (Scotland) Act 2005, provide an existing, statutorily established network of regional transport authorities, capable of facilitating regional smart ticketing implementation without potentially establishing new tiers or groupings of unnecessary regional administration or governance.

#### Question 4

<b>a) Are you in favour of a clearly defined multi-modal, multi operator regional smart ticketing scheme?</b>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>b) Should all relevant bus, rail, ferry, tram and subway operators be expected to participate in a multi-modal, multi operator regional smart ticketing scheme?</b>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>c) Should participation in a multi-modal, multi operator regional smart ticketing scheme be monitored and controlled?</b>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>d) Should sanctions be imposed for non-compliance in a multi-modal, multi operator regional smart ticketing scheme?</b>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Please explain your answers.**

It is our view that a partnership approach would work best in ensuring that operators willingly participate in such a scheme and to ensure the success and use of any smart products introduced as a result. However, in instances where a voluntary partnership approach does not work, or is being unreasonably frustrated, there should be some way of addressing noncompliance through the ability of transport authorities (RTPs and/or Local Authorities) to compulsorily require operator participation.

A multi-modal, multi-operator smart ticketing scheme should be a priority for all regions so, in one respect, it is right that compliance is monitored and ensured nationally to avoid inconsistencies across modes and operators and to ensure equal access across the country. However the level that the fares of any multi-operator, multi-modal smart product are set at is a key issue and the public sector cannot set commercial fares.

## Legislation vs voluntary participation or other means of ensuring participation in smart ticketing schemes

### What is it?

New legislation would, on the face of it, be a clear cut and attractive means of specifying what is expected of operators in respect of participation in the national e-purse and regional smart ticketing schemes, and ensuring they have available the appropriate smart ticketing infrastructure.

However, for example, a combination of encouraging voluntary participation, making – for bus – provision of appropriate ticketing equipment a condition of their service registration, or a requirement of the Bus Service Operator Grant might be considered an effective alternative.

### What does it mean for me?

We think that the simpler and more consistent we can make these arrangements the more likely prospective passengers are likely to have confidence in the new schemes. Similarly, from an operator perspective, it will be clearer what is expected of them.

### What will it cost or save?

For those operators – typically a few smaller bus operators and the Scottish ferry industry - who have still to invest in smart ticketing equipment there will be some costs. A new bus smart enabled ticket machine might cost £3,000.

### What is the justification for claimed costs/savings?

Most operators have already invested in, or have plans to invest in, appropriate ticketing equipment, so the cost of achieving full infrastructure provision across Scotland is already largely addressed.

## Question 5

**Are you in favour of new legislation that requires transport operators to participate in national and regional smart ticketing schemes?** Yes  No

### Please explain your answer.

There should be some financial assistance available to smaller operators to assist in the purchase of any new ticket machines, particularly, if participation is going to be mandatory. Administering Transport Authorities should be able to apply sanctions should operators fail to comply with scheme conditions. In addition consideration could also be given to linking, or making BSOG payments contingent upon, participation in regional smart ticketing schemes.

## Governance of smart ticketing in Scotland

### What is it?

A recurring theme in this consultation document is that to deliver interoperable smart ticketing requires a common and proven infrastructure to be in place. Currently that is ITSO, the interoperable smartcard standard in the UK. However, alternative technologies are at various stages of being available and proven. At some point in the future the more progressive transport operators will wish to adopt one or more of these alternatives, while their passengers may increasingly expect to see greater use of, for example, mobile phones and contactless bank cards.

Transport operators have already invested significantly in smart ticketing infrastructure and, understandably, any shift to a newer technology – a further outlay for operators – needs to be carefully planned for, to ensure that systems remain fully interoperable and consistent with passenger expectations.

It therefore seems important that public transport operators should play some role in decision making, or at least advising, moving forward, probably working in partnership with Scottish Ministers and other public bodies. The best way of approaching governance of both smart ticketing infrastructure and national and regional smart ticketing schemes is therefore a key consideration.

### What does it mean for me?

From a passenger perspective an orderly and planned migration to newer technologies, as these emerge, will ensure that all of the benefits of smart ticketing and payment are retained, and remain easy to use and understand.

From an operator perspective, investment decisions can be planned for and, collectively, a migration to newer technology platforms can be implemented in such a way that passengers are both able to benefit from technology advances and remain confident and informed about the integrity of the smart offering.

It seems essential that governance arrangements are in place to oversee all of this, and that these arrangements are effective as well as – as far as possible – establishing, representing and implementing the consensus view of transport operators in Scotland, regardless of mode or size.

### What will it cost or save?

It is not envisaged that governance arrangements will place any burden on costs for either the passenger, the public purse or for operators.

### What is the justification for claimed costs/savings?

No costs to consider.

## Question 6

**To ensure delivery of a consistent approach to meet the expectations of passengers now and in the future, should we establish a single governance group so that the technology implemented across Scotland for smart ticketing schemes is controlled?**

Yes  No

**Should such a governance group be established formally and supported by legislation?**

Yes  No

**Should such a governance group have a role in advising on development, implementation or administration of smart ticketing schemes?**

Yes  No

**Are there any other areas that a governance group should have a role in?**

Yes  No

**Please explain your answers.**

If participation is going to be mandatory and requires new legislation, then the governance and monitoring of this should also be formalised.

Membership of this group will however be a key issue and representation of the different issues and requirements of the different regions across Scotland and of the transport modes, all scheme administering Transport Authorities and main operators or operator bodies should be included.

It is agreed that ITSO should currently form the basis for interoperable smart ticketing. However, the role of other emerging technologies such as contactless bank card payment, mobile phones etc needs to be recognised and embraced. The governance group could assist in providing a consistent approach to trialling and introducing new payment technologies throughout the country. For example it is understood that First in Aberdeen has successfully introduced contactless payment on buses, which has proven to be popular in the city. Any approach to a national smart ticketing scheme needs to facilitate, not stifle, this kind of complementary development led by operators.

**Are there any other issues you wish to raise which are not covered above?**

**The Scottish Government welcomes any further comments and suggestions on smart ticketing schemes or governance, and how these might be improved or made more sustainable.**

## Question 7

Do you have any other comments about any of the issues raised in this consultation?

Yes  No

If so, please use the box below to provide details.

**My comments:**

It must not be overlooked that a number of schemes have already emerged, including the successful ABC scheme, currently serving part of the Dundee City travel to work area. Legislation needs to be flexible enough not to unnecessarily stifle such commercial initiatives, whilst providing an option for transport authorities to proactively encourage and, where necessary, require introduction of and participation in smart ticketing schemes which benefit the travelling public and encourage increased usage of public transport.

### Part 3 - Assessing impact

#### Equality

- 1 In considering possible changes to the delivery of smart ticketing in Scotland the public sector equality duty requires the Scottish Government to pay due regard to the need to:
  - eliminate discrimination, victimisation, harassment or other unlawful conduct that is prohibited under the Equality Act 2010;
  - advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not; and
  - foster good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic.
- 1.1 These three requirements apply across the 'protected characteristics' of:
  - age;
  - disability;
  - gender reassignment;
  - marriage and civil partnership;
  - pregnancy and maternity;
  - race;
  - religion and belief; and
  - sex and sexual orientation.
- 1.2 At this early stage it is difficult to determine whether significant effects are likely to arise and the aim of the Scottish Government is to use this Consultation process as a means to fully explore the likely equality effects, including the impact on children and young people.

- 1.3 Once completed the Scottish Government intends to determine, using the consultation process, any actions needed to meet its statutory obligations. Your comments received will be used to complete a full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) to determine if any further work in this area is needed.

#### Question – Equality Impacts

Are there any likely impacts the proposals contained within this Consultation may have on particular groups of people, with reference to the ‘protected characteristics’ listed above? Please be as specific as possible.

If the proposals and/or their arrangements for implementation placed unreasonable burdens on operators, this could impact on the viability of local bus services, particularly those run by smaller operators who may find it difficult to cover any increased costs associated with participating in either an e-purse or regional smart ticketing scheme. This could have a negative impact if it results in the withdrawal of services, potentially impacting on all protected characteristics, particularly older people, disabled people, young people, women and other groups who may, or typically, rely more heavily on public transport, including those living in more rural areas and/or otherwise experiencing transport poverty.

#### Question – Children and young people

**Do you think the proposals contained within this Consultation may have any additional implications on the safety of children and young people?**

See response above.

#### Business and Regulation

- 1.4 A Business and Regulatory Impact Assessment (BRIA) will analyse whether the policy is likely to increase or reduce the costs and burdens placed on businesses, the public sector and voluntary and community organisations.

#### Question – Business impacts

**Do you think the proposals contained in this Consultation are likely to increase or reduce the costs and burdens placed on any sector? Please be as specific as possible.**

This very much depends on how the proposals are introduced and whether there are any unreasonable cost burdens for operators relating to participation in an e-purse or regional smart ticketing scheme. Any costs associated with the purchase of new infrastructure will likely be more difficult for smaller operators to absorb and could therefore have a negative impact on the viability of their operations.

#### Privacy

- 1.5 A full Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) will be conducted to ascertain whether our proposals on delivering a consistent approach may have an impact on the privacy of individuals.

- 1.6 At this early stage it is difficult to determine whether significant privacy effects are likely to arise and the aim of the Scottish Government is to use this Consultation process as a means to fully explore the likely privacy effects.

#### Question – Privacy impacts

**Are there any likely impacts the proposals contained in this Consultation may have upon the privacy of individuals? Please be as specific as possible.**

No

**Financial Accounting Arrangements for Regional Transport Partnerships  
Consultation Questions**

Number	Consultation Question
1	Do you think that it is necessary to clarify whether a Regional Transport Partnership is able to build up, and carryover, a financial reserve from one financial year to the next? Please use the box below to provide details.
2	Should there be a limit to the amount of surplus that an RTP may carry forward into the next financial year? Please use the box below to provide details.
3	Should safeguards be provided to limit the financial liability of local authorities towards RTP expenses? Please use the box below to provide details.
4	The Transport (Scotland) Act 2005 applies only specific local government finance provisions to Regional Transport Partnerships. Are there any other local government finance provisions which could usefully be applied to the RTPs? Please use the box below to provide details.
Equality Impacts	Are there any likely impacts the proposals contained within this Consultation may have on particular groups of people, with reference to the 'protected characteristics' listed above? Please be as specific as possible.
Children and Young People	Do you think the proposals contained within this Consultation may have any additional implications on the safety of children and young people?
Business Impacts	Do you think the proposals contained in this Consultation are likely to increase or reduce the costs and burdens placed on any sector? Please be as specific as possible.
Privacy Impacts	Are there any likely impacts the proposals contained in this Consultation may have upon the privacy of individuals? Please be as specific as possible.

**Free Bus Travel for Older and Disabled People and Modern Apprentices  
Consultation Questions**

**Questions on National Concessionary Travel Scheme**

<b>Question 1</b>			
<b>Do you think we should retain the existing age Eligibility criteria for the Scheme?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>No</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <p>The need to consider the long-term sustainability of the scheme is acknowledged. However, the proposed focus solely on revision to the age-threshold for eligibility as the most effective means of addressing long-term sustainability without apparent regard to, or comparative assessment against, possible wider economic and societal impacts and costs which could arise from “unintended consequences” of measures targeted primarily at reducing scheme eligibility and costs, is fundamentally questioned.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the theoretical “no better/no worse off” assumptions underpinning current operator reimbursement mechanisms, there is concern that any reduction in eligibility and subsidy could result in significant reductions in existing bus patronage, leading in turn to real reductions in net operator revenue income compounding the current effects of general trend decline in bus patronage, in turn leading to possible further contraction of the commercially operated bus network and/or additional pressures on already stretched public transport authority budgets at a time when local authority finances are also under ever increasing pressure.</p> <p>The consultation references concerns over current decline in general bus usage (para. 2.16 refers) whilst the information contained in the consultation paper on concessionary travel indicates that, despite underlying demographic trends, the actual number of pass holders and the number of concessionary journeys made has been relatively “flat” over recent years, suggesting that increasing scheme costs are being driven more by fares inflation, linked with continuing reference to adult single fares, which tend to be the most expensive fare offering, as the basis for calculating operator revenue foregone.</p> <p>The consultation refers frequently to targeting the scheme on those in most need. The scheme currently delivers wide-ranging benefits including access to essential local or regional services and facilities such as employment, education, health, social and leisure facilities, whilst supporting achievement of other economic, environmental, social and health &amp; wellbeing outcomes. All of these benefits, for both concessionary and non-concessionary passengers, would be threatened if revisions to scheme eligibility resulted in contraction in the scale and availability of the overall bus network. Consequently any change to current scheme eligibility and funding should only be implemented based upon a thorough analysis and understanding of potential wider impacts on the bus industry/network, the public sector, and associated wider economic, environmental and societal costs and impacts.</p>			

Question 2				
Are you in favour of raising age eligibility to female State Pension age in this way?	Yes		No	X
<b>Please explain your answers:</b> See response given to Q1 above. Raising the age of eligibility in one step would appear to be at odds with the Scottish Government's claimed support for WASPI (section 2.24 of consultation refers).				

Question 3				
Are you in favour of raising age eligibility to female State Pension age gradually over time?	Yes		No	X
At what rate?	By 1 year per year		By half a year per year	X
<b>Please explain your answers:</b> For the reasons outlined in answer to Q1 and Q2 above Tactran does not support raising the age threshold in isolation from a full assessment and understanding of the wider costs and implications of any "unintended consequences". However, should the Scottish Government resolve to implement changes to the qualifying age threshold, these should be implemented in the manner which imposes least disadvantage for those affected and in the manner which is likely to minimise the potential for impacting adversely on the sustainability and availability of the wider commercially operated and publicly supported bus network which the wider travelling public rely on, and which may come under threat of reduction or withdrawal as a result of any cost-saving measures.				

### Questions on free bus travel for Modern Apprentices

Question 4				
Are you in favour of providing free bus travel to Modern Apprentices?	Yes	X	No	
Should this be targeted at Modern Apprentices under Age 21?	Yes		No	X
Is there a better way to provide support to help with the travel costs of Modern Apprentices?	Yes	X	No	
<b>Please explain your answers:</b> Extension of the availability of free travel to young people seeking entry to employment and training is supported in principle. However, as with the current scheme for older and disabled people, the benefits to these users will be limited to the accessibility afforded by the available local bus network. As indicated in answer to Q1 above, there is concern that significant reductions to wider scheme eligibility, funding and usage could result in contraction in the bus network, potentially reducing/inhibiting the intended benefits of this proposed extension. Any such impact is likely to be more acute in rural areas, where bus networks and public transport services are generally more limited and relatively expensive, potentially compounding existing transport poverty and inequalities for the wider travelling public/communities.  More generally, the equity and policy coherence of advancing proposals to extend the scheme to include free travel for 16 – 21/24 year-olds when seeking to withdraw these benefits from older people in the 60 – 66 age range, at a time when economically active older people may also be facing the prospect of having to work				

much longer including potentially having to re-train in later life to secure a decent living/pension, is also questioned, as is the principle of funding extension of benefits to Modern Apprentices from savings generated by withdrawing existing benefits from older people, which appears to lack policy consistency in terms of equality of opportunity for Modern Apprentices and other economically challenged citizens.

**Question on companion cards for disabled children under age 5**

<b>Question 5</b>				
<b>Are you in favour of providing a companion card for disabled under 5s where this is needed?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>No</b>	
<p><b>Please explain your answer:</b>            Whilst recognising that all young children require assistance and accompaniment when travelling by public transport this additional assistance for families with disabled children who may be required to make multiple journeys for health and welfare reasons is supported.</p>				

**Other Comments**

<b>Question 6</b>				
<b>Do you have any other comments about the issues raised in the consultation?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>No</b>	
<p><b>Comments:</b>            As outlined in answer to Q1 above, any change to concessionary travel eligibility and associated funding should only be implemented if under-pinned by a comprehensive analysis and understanding of wider economic, environmental and societal costs and impacts, including potential “unintended consequences” particularly any negative impacts upon the existing commercially operated and publicly subsidised bus networks.</p> <p>Transport Scotland should review the reliance on adult single fares as the principal reference for determining “no better/no worse off” in negotiations/agreements with operators. Based on information contained in the consultation paper these current reimbursement assumptions appear to be the main driver of increasing costs. Adult single fares are relatively expensive for occasional users and may have a disproportionate influence on user behaviour in any expansion or reduction to scheme benefits and costs, including acting as an inhibiting effect on bus patronage.</p> <p>As indicated above, Tactran does not support implementation of revisions to scheme eligibility based upon a narrow consideration of potential cost savings to the concessionary travel budget. However, should the Scottish Government press ahead with revisions to eligibility, any net savings generated should be re-invested in measures designed to ensure maintenance and improvement of the bus network, including measures aimed at addressing the current general decline in bus usage. The commercial bus network is shrinking and services funded by public transport authorities are also reducing. A bus pass without a decent bus service is of limited value.</p> <p>See also answers to questions in Part 3 and Annex C below.</p>				

## Questions on Assessing Impact

### Question – Equality Impacts

Are there any likely impacts the proposals contained within this Consultation may have on particular groups of people, with reference to the ‘protected characteristics’ listed above? Please be as specific as possible.

#### Comments:

Previously stated concerns relating to potential “unintended consequences” arising from reductions in scheme eligibility and costs/subsidy have the potential to impact on all public transport users/communities and, therefore, all “protected characteristics”.

Increasing the age threshold will have obvious impacts on older people within the affected age ranges/categories through loss of anticipated benefits. This is likely to have additional gender impacts as women, including those over age 60, are generally more likely to be reliant on and have increased propensity to travel by public transport and will, therefore, be more heavily impacted by any increase in the qualifying age threshold.

### Question – Children and Young People

Do you think the proposals contained within this Consultation may have any additional implications on the safety of children and young people?

#### Comments:

Any revision which results in a reduction in public transport usage and availability is likely to increase reliance on, and usage of, the private car for essential and non-essential travel, leading to the potential for increased traffic congestion, air pollution and reduced road safety within communities.

### Question – Business Impacts

Do you think the proposals contained in this Consultation are likely to increase or reduce the costs and burdens placed on any sector? Please be as specific as possible.

#### Comments:

As indicated in earlier responses reducing concessionary travel funding has the potential to increase the financial burden placed on bus operators, leading to reductions in commercial public transport provision and/or additional pressures on public transport authority budgets for delivery of socially necessary bus services.

The consultation paper highlights the existing influence of the scheme in improving older people’s access to a range of services, facilities and social networks, including many trips which may not have previously been made, with attendant economic, social and health & wellbeing benefits. A proportion of these trips which support and are of economic benefit to various sectors of the wider economy – e.g. health, leisure, tourism, retail etc. – have the potential to reduce.

### Question – Privacy Impacts

Are there any likely impacts the proposals contained in this Consultation may have upon the privacy of individuals? Please be as specific as possible.

#### Comments:

None currently envisaged.

## Questions on options not favoured by the Scottish Government

### Annex C - Options not favoured by the Scottish Government

The Scottish Government is not minded to adopt the following options:

1. Requiring card holders to make a small financial contribution towards the cost of each concessionary journey.
2. Levying an annual charge for access to free bus travel.
3. Restricting use of a bus pass during peak travel times.
4. Having a cap on the value of individual journeys which can be free.

Use the box below to provide comments on these or any other way in which you believe the long-term sustainability of concessionary travel could be achieved, as well as other comments you may wish to make for improvements to the scheme.

#### Comments:

Options 1 and 2 above are considered to be worthy of serious consideration on the basis that they offer the potential to generate cost savings with an ability to offset the impact of these on operators (either directly or indirectly) through creation of an income stream(s) from the introduction of modest charges to users, thus reducing the potential for “unintended consequences”. Both of these options could be implemented on the basis of retaining free travel for eligible disabled groups, in line with the stated “most in need” objective, whilst introducing a relatively modest charge for those qualifying on grounds of age.

Option 3, restricting use of a bus pass during peak travel times is not supported, nor is any reduction in the current general utility of the card, which enables free travel at all times throughout Scotland, by placing any travel time or geographic restrictions on current availability.

Option 4, placing a cap on the number or value of journeys made, is not supported for the reasons of administrative and user complexity outlined.

**Building Scotland's Low Emission Zones  
A Consultation  
Consultation Questions**

Number	Consultation Question
1	<p><b>Do you support the principle of LEZs to help improve Scottish air quality? Please be as specific as possible in your reasoning.</b></p>
	<p>Tactran is supportive of the general principles of LEZs, delivered as part of a sustainable transport strategy.</p> <p>Within the Tactran area there are 3 Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA): the whole of Dundee, Perth central area and the trunk road route through Crieff. Our Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) sets an objective to meet or better all statutory air quality requirements in the Tactran region and, in addition, has incorporated a number of Scottish Government's "Cleaner Air for Scotland" (CAFS) actions into the Tactran RTS Delivery Plan.</p> <p>It is recognised that the timescale for introducing LEZ's into Scotland's four biggest cities by 2020 and into all other AQMAs by 2023 is extremely challenging given the requirements of National Modelling Framework (NMF) and associated National Low Emission Framework (NLEF), combined with regulatory/legislative requirements, funding needs and stakeholder involvement. It is important that due consideration is given to a realistic timescale for effective implementation, including in particular consideration of the costs and impacts upon the bus industry and other providers of more sustainable transport options.</p> <p>As noted above it is important that LEZ's are not introduced in isolation and are aligned with Economic Development Plans, Local and Strategic Development Plans, Local and Regional Transport Strategies and takes cognisance of the review National Transport Strategy, as well as forming an integrated solution which could include such measures as traffic management, bus priority, park &amp; ride/choose, active travel, etc. for any given AQMA.</p> <p>It must also be recognised that cities are ever evolving and any LEZ must take into account future infrastructure and economic developments. For example the Central Waterfront Development at Dundee, the Cross Tay Link Road in Perth, and other proposals contained in both the Tay Cities and Stirling &amp; Clackmannanshire City Deals, will have significant influence on the future prosperity of the respective cities and city-regions as well as their relevant AQMAs.</p>

<b>2</b>	<b>Do you agree that the primary objective of LEZs should be to support the achievement of Scottish Air Quality Objectives? If not, why not?</b>
	The overall objective should be the betterment of quality of life for all people living, working, and visiting cities, of which supporting the achievement of Scottish Air Quality Objectives is a primary objective. There needs to be a balanced approach recognising that LEZ's are one option in delivering air quality improvements, with other options such as traffic management, bus priority, and park & ride/choose, active travel, etc. also available.
<b>3a</b>	<b>Do you agree with the proposed minimum mandatory Euro emission criteria for Scottish LEZs?</b>
	Tactran is in agreement with the minimum mandatory Euro emission criteria and that it should be applied consistently across all Scottish LEZs.  Also see answer to Q14 regarding CO2 emissions.
<b>3b</b>	<b>Do you agree with the proposal to use the NMF modelling in tandem with the NLEF appraisal to identify the vehicle types for inclusion within a LEZ?</b>
	As with any modelling, its purpose is to provide the decision makers with enough information to make an informed decision. Therefore, although it is agreed that NMF modelling and NLEF appraisal should be used, there will be other factors that also need to be considered.  The NMF modelling that is currently being undertaken provides information on broad brush policy decisions e.g. which vehicle types are to be included in a LEZ. However, this needs to be combined with suitable traffic modelling to ensure there are no unintended consequences i.e. traffic diverts onto other roads to avoid LEZ and causes air quality and other issues on diverted routes.
<b>3c</b>	<b>Should emission sources from construction machinery and/or large or small van refrigerated units be included in the LEZ scope, and if so should their inclusion be immediate or after a period of time?</b>
	Recognising the importance of these types of vehicles in supporting economic growth and activity they should be exempt initially and phased in over time, where a need to do so has been identified. There may also be difficulties in enforcing these emission sources.
<b>4</b>	<b>What are your views on adopting a national road access restriction scheme for LEZs across different classes of vehicles?</b>
	Tactran agrees that a national penalty scheme for LEZs that is consistent across all LEZs in Scotland should be introduced.  Care will need to be taken to ensure the driving public are aware of the need for an LEZ, to ensure the penalty scheme is not seen as another "road user tax".

<b>5</b>	<b>What are your views on the proposed LEZ hours of operation, in particular whether local authorities should be able to decide on LEZ hours of operation for their own LEZs?</b>
	Tactran agrees with the Scottish Government's preference for LEZs to operate continuously, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, all year round, throughout all Scottish LEZs for general consistency and public/road user familiarity.
<b>6</b>	<b>What are your views on Automatic Number Plate Recognition enforcement of LEZs?</b>
	<p>Tactran agrees with the Scottish Government preference for ANPR to monitor and enforce LEZs, as this will provide the most complete enforcement. However, there are cost implications in setting up and maintaining this facility that will require to be fully funded.</p> <p>Other benefits in terms of traffic data collection could assist with the business case for such equipment.</p>
<b>7a</b>	<b>What exemptions should be applied to allow LEZ to operate robustly? Please be as specific as possible in your reasoning.</b>
	<p>Tactran agrees that exemptions of the type identified within the document could be merited and will need careful consideration and only allowed where there is good reason and where it does not undermine the LEZ objectives.</p> <p>Mention is made of consideration of equality and socio-economic factors to ensure that LEZs do not create unintended consequences for society. One of the exemption examples regarding shift working states evidence will be required from the vehicle owner that no alternative public transport options exist. There is significant risk to equality in this regard not just for shift workers. In general within city/urban areas, public transport is available, but in rural areas there is very often inadequate or no public transport option. Many rural hinterland areas surrounding cities have populations which have lower socio-economic demographics, but rely on access to the city to provide employment and other essential services and social needs. People, particularly those suffering from transport poverty, in these areas could suffer disproportionately as they may not be able to afford vehicles with the required Euro engine standard to access a LEZ, and there may be no public transport alternative available. Consideration would need to be given as to whether public transport options can be made available, for example Park &amp; Ride/Choose, prior to a LEZ being introduced, with funding implications an additional consideration.</p>
<b>7b</b>	<b>Should exemptions be consistent across all Scottish local authorities?</b>
	Tactran agrees that exemptions should be consistent across all Scottish Local Authorities for general consistency and public/road user understanding and familiarity.

<b>8</b>	<b>What are your views on LEZ lead-in times and sunset periods for vehicle types shown in Table 2?</b>
	Tactran is supportive of LEZ lead-in times and sunset periods. As outlined within the document, Belgium and France as well as other UK LEZ's have adopted a 4 year lead in time. Given this experience Scotland should adopt a similar timeframe.
<b>9</b>	<b>What are your views about retrofitting technology and an Engine Retrofitting Centre to upgrade commercial vehicles to cleaner engines, in order to meet the minimum mandatory Euro emission criteria for Scottish LEZs?</b>
	<p>The short timescales proposed for introduction of LEZs will be challenging and lead fleet and bus operators to retrofit vehicles, rather than pursue a programmed purchase of newer cleaner vehicles once current vehicles are time expired. This in the long run could lead to extending the life of older, more polluting vehicles, rather than new low emission vehicles.</p> <p>The views and compliance capacity of fleet (freight and passenger transport) and local bus operators, regarding cost and timing of LEZ introduction and compliance, in both the short and longer-term, should be sought and considered before implementation.</p>
<b>10</b>	<b>How can the Scottish Government best target any funding to support LEZ implementation?</b>
	<p>Any LEZ introduced would need to be fully funded by the Scottish Government, including the set up costs, additional infrastructure (direct and indirect), enforcement regime and on-going running costs. Additionally, expert personnel support, either through consultants or the provision of additional funding to employ staff, is required to support the development of a Business Case and other associated elements of the National Low Emission Framework process.</p> <p>It should be noted that although a LEZ is likely to be implemented within one local authority area, it will have influence on the population of a wider catchment, regionally and nationally, for private car drivers and commercial vehicles as well as bus operators.</p> <p>Bus operators will also require significant financial assistance for low emission vehicles and additional/increased funding support and incentives, along the lines of the Green Bus Fund, are likely to be required from Government to encourage the early and increased uptake of cleaner private and commercial vehicles.</p>
<b>11</b>	<b>What criteria should the Scottish Government use to measure and assess LEZ effectiveness?</b>
	<p>Tactran agrees with the Scottish Government proposal to utilise the existing network of air quality sensors and diffusion tubes, in tandem with NMF model datapoints, to evaluate the effectiveness of LEZ actions.</p> <p>In addition it is assumed that ANPR enforcement could provide valuable</p>

	<p>information on number of vehicles, vehicle km and vehicle types entering and moving within LEZ zones. This would allow further correlation between vehicle trips and air quality, to assess whether the LEZ is having the desired outcome or whether there are factors other than traffic emissions affecting air quality.</p> <p>There may also be a need to assess impact on city centre economic performance (either positive or negative) as part of this assessment.</p>
<b>12</b>	<p><b>What information should the Scottish Government provide to vehicle owners before a LEZ is put in place, during a lead-in time and once LEZ enforcement starts?</b></p>
	<p>Tactran is supportive of the Scottish Government proposal to use the Scottish Air Quality website as the central repository for information related to LEZ, with clear links to local authority and RTP websites.</p> <p>In addition to clear information on the LEZ locations and geographical boundaries, hours of operation, vehicles' applicability, etc., during lead-in times clear information on the objectives of LEZ, the alternatives considered and the full package of measures being put in place will be required to ensure buy-in and supportive compliance from the general public.</p> <p>Once LEZ's are in place, vehicle owners must have very clear information as to whether their vehicle is suitable to enter the LEZ or if not, what the alternatives are. Again clear links to local authority and RTP websites would be beneficial as they provide advice and information on sustainable and active travel alternative to car use.</p>
<b>13</b>	<p><b>What actions should local or central government consider in tandem with LEZs to address air pollution?</b></p>
	<p>Tactran agrees that LEZs should operate in a complementary manner with existing and future transport and placemaking policies and action plans, in order to support delivery of the CAFS 2020 compliance target and achievement of other national, regional and local strategy/plan objectives and outcomes.</p> <p>This holistic approach will ensure the need for LEZs are considered alongside complementary measures such as freight consolidation centres, traffic management, parking policy, park &amp; ride/choose, active travel, promotion of public transport etc. These need to be consistent with the relevant National, Regional and Local Transport Strategies, as well as Local and Strategic Development Plans, Economic and Health &amp; Wellbeing Strategies etc.</p>
<b>14</b>	<p><b>How can LEZs help to tackle climate change, by reducing CO2 emissions in tandem with air pollution emissions?</b></p>
	<p>Tactran recognises that LEZs will also contribute towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions.</p>

	<p>However, there is a concern that by specifying a higher Euro engine standard for diesel compared to petrol engines, this may result in a greater number of lower standard petrol engines vehicles being driven with consequences on greenhouse gas emissions. It is understood that although diesel engines have a more detrimental effect on air quality, petrol engines are more damaging to CO2 greenhouse gas. It is suggested that a more “equal” minimum standard of diesel and petrol engines, which recognise and reflect the relative climate change and air quality impacts of petrol and diesel engines should be set.</p> <p>Linked to the above comment, Tactran notes and welcomes the Scottish Government’s proposal to work with local authorities, Regional Transport Partnerships and other partners and stakeholders to evaluate the scope for urban-wide low emission zones with a specific focus on climate change (CO2) emissions, as well as air pollution more generally. However, if all urban areas are to become low emission zones in their entirety, this is in effect a national low emission zone, as at one time or another, the vast majority of vehicles will enter an urban area. Given this, it may be simpler and more effective/efficient to introduce a nation low emission scheme. Tactran looks forward to further discussion with Scottish Government in this regard.</p>
<b>15</b>	<b>What measures (including LEZs) would make a difference in addressing both road congestion and air pollution emissions at the same time?</b>
	<p>Tactran welcomes the Scottish Government’s proposal to incorporate congestion management into all stages of LEZ design and operation. As outlined in the document this encompasses technology solutions such as low carbon vehicles and demand management measures to reduce congestion and increase urban traffic speeds. Promotion of public transport, active travel, reducing the need to travel, travel planning, car clubs and providing information on alternative to private car use all have a contribution to reducing emissions and are integral to Tactran’s RTS and current priorities for RTS delivery.</p>
<b>16</b>	<b>Do you have any other comments that you would like to add on the Scottish Government’s proposals for LEZs</b>
	<p>As part of monitoring LEZs it would be useful if research could be undertaken on the economic impact of introducing a LEZ. For example for a city centre LEZ, will it be seen as an impediment to accessing the city centre or will the placemaking benefits of improved air quality be seen as an attraction?</p>
<b>17</b>	<b>What impacts do you think LEZs may have on particular groups of people, with particular reference to the ‘protected characteristics’ listed in paragraph 5.2? Please be as specific as possible in your reasoning.</b>
	<p>LEZs are likely to have beneficial health effects on people who reside within LEZ zones, particularly the young and old benefiting from better air quality.</p>

	<p>However, there is concern that LEZs will impact disproportionately on the less affluent in society, as those more affluent are able to afford vehicles which meet LEZ Euro engine standards.</p> <p>Lower socio-economic groups may not be able to afford LEZ compliant vehicles and will therefore need alternative transport arrangements to access employment, health, social and leisure requirements. In general, in urban areas buses provide this alternative. However, in many rural hinterlands, people who rely on access to cities do not have access (availability, frequency and possibly financial) to a suitable bus service to provide alternative transport and could therefore be excluded from accessing employment, training, health, social, leisure and other opportunities. Other measures such as park &amp; ride/choose may need to be introduced and funded.</p>
<b>18</b>	<b>Do you think the LEZ proposals contained in this consultation are likely to increase or reduce the costs and burdens placed on any sector? Please be as specific as possible in your reasoning.</b>
	<p>The proposals have the potential to increase cost burdens on bus operators, fleet owners and the general public by requirement for upgraded vehicles. There is a concern that additional cost burdens on bus operators must not lead to the “unintended consequence” of contraction/withdrawals in the overall bus network, with wider socio-economic and environmental impacts in communities which are directly and indirectly affected/covered by LEZs.</p> <p>There will be an additional and ongoing cost burden on Local and Scottish Government for implementation, maintenance and enforcement of LEZs, including the introduction and maintenance of complementary measures such as ongoing monitoring and delivery and ongoing operation of measures such as park and ride/choose.</p>
<b>19</b>	<b>What impacts do you think LEZs may have on the privacy of individuals? Please be as specific as possible in your reasoning.</b>
	No comment
<b>20</b>	<b>Are there any likely impacts the proposals contained in this consultation may have upon the environment? Please be as specific as possible in your reasoning.</b>
	There may be pollution, noise and road safety implications in areas surrounding LEZs as a result of traffic and parking displacement.