

# Consultation Report

TACTRAN RTIS

Report for TACTRAN

February 2008



## Document Control

Project Title: TACTRAN RTIS

MVA Project Number: C3689100

Document Type: Consultation Report

Directory & File Name: H:\Contracts\Live\C3689100\_TACTRAN\_Travel\_Info\03  
Consultation\Report\TACTRAN TACTRAN RTIS Consultation\_final.Doc

## Document Approval

Author(s): Nazan Kocak, Jana Haspicova and Stephen Canning

Reviewer(s): Neill Birch

Formatted by: Nicola Milne

## Distribution

Issue	Date	Distribution	Comments
1	08/02/2008	Bonnie Sysa	Proof reading
2	08/02/2008	Neill Birch	Initial review
3	11/02/2008	Nicola Milne	Formatting
4	11/02/2008	TACTRAN	Draft for comments
5	29/02/2008	TACTRAN	Final

<b>1</b>	<b>Overview</b>	<b>1.1</b>
1.1	Introduction	1.1
1.2	Structure of This Report	1.1
<b>2</b>	<b>Local Authority Consultations</b>	<b>2.1</b>
2.1	Introduction	2.1
2.2	Key Points From the Consultations	2.1
<b>3</b>	<b>Wider Key Stakeholder Consultations</b>	<b>3.1</b>
3.1	Introduction	3.1
3.2	Key Points from the Key Stakeholder Consultation	3.1
3.3	6 February 2008 TACTRAN Bus Forum Consultation (Perth)	3.10
<b>4</b>	<b>Regional Transport Strategy Consultations</b>	<b>4.1</b>
4.1	Introduction	4.1
4.2	Key Points from the Consultations	4.1
<b>5</b>	<b>SESTRAN Consultation</b>	<b>5.1</b>
5.1	Introduction	5.1
5.2	Key Points From the Consultation	5.1
<b>6</b>	<b>RTIS Objectives</b>	<b>6.1</b>
6.1	Introduction	6.1
6.2	Agreed Objectives for RTIS and RBIS	6.3
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>7.1</b>
7.1	Summary	7.1

## Tables

Figure 6.1	RIS and Proposed Success Measures	6.4
------------	-----------------------------------	-----

## Appendices

Appendix A - The list of participants of local authority consultations

Appendix B - The Standard Consultation Questionnaire

Appendix C - The list of the Key Stakeholders Consultation Respondents

Appendix D – The list of the Joint Consultation Workshop Participants

# Summary

# 1 Overview

## 1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This report provides a description of the process and related outcomes from consultations undertaken to inform the development of the Regional Travel Information Strategy (RTIS) and the Regional Bus Information Strategy (RBIS) for the Tayside and Central Scotland Transport Partnership (TACTRAN).
- 1.1.2 The aim of these consultations was to collate views from the key stakeholders on a range of topics, including the benefits and disbenefits of RTIS and RBIS, issues and 'gaps' in the existing information provision, along with users' aspirations and requirements.
- 1.1.3 The consultation process started in mid January 2008 and comprised:
- a consultation meeting with the constituent local authority officers (representatives of all modes);
  - questionnaire and telephone consultations with wider key stakeholders (including transport providers, user groups, and organisations representing users with difficulties); and
  - a feedback consultation workshop with wider key stakeholders.
- 1.1.4 In addition, relevant material was taken from the existing Regional Transport Strategy Consultation report (March 2007) and SEStran's Study of the 'Potential Benefits in SEStran developing a Bus Passenger Information Strategy' (May 2007). This study included, returned questionnaires from some of TACTRAN key stakeholders, including Stirling, Perth and Kinross and Dundee City councils, public transport operators and national agencies.
- 1.1.5 A wider public consultation was not included in this consultation exercise, as the views of bus and train users in particular, were collected via stakeholders representing these groups.

## 1.2 Structure of This Report

- 1.2.1 In the main body of the text, factual details of the consultations are given, consisting of the type of consultation undertaken, participants, date and place and summaries of the outcomes from each consultation.
- 1.2.2 The remaining chapters of this report detail the following:
- Chapter 2 – local authority consultations;
  - Chapter 3 – wider key stakeholder consultations;
  - Chapter 4 - relevant material from the Regional Transport Strategy consultations;
  - Chapter 5 - relevant material from the SEStran consultation; and
  - Chapter 6 - conclusions.

## 2 Local Authority Consultations

### 2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 Our initial consultation included a workshop with officers of the TACTRAN constituent local authorities. The meeting was held on 23 January 2008, in the Dundee City Council offices.

2.1.2 The aim of the consultation was to:

- collate views on the issues and gaps in the existing travel information provision;
- discuss the benefits/disbenefits of RTIS and RBIS and what needs to be addressed in the strategy; and
- discuss opportunities and solutions for the region.

2.1.3 The list of participants in this workshop is presented in **Appendix A**.

### 2.2 Key Points From the Consultations

#### Existing Travel Information Provision

2.2.1 The existing travel information provision within each local authority area was briefly discussed. Some of the examples which could be presented as best practice in the region were as follows:

- Angus has a scheme to educate/train people with learning, hearing and visual difficulties, to help them use public transport with ease. The scheme is a joint effort, working with the education department. Training/information material is produced which is easy for people with difficulties to access when using buses and bus stops/shelters;
- Dundee developed smart card-based audio information with the help of the local blind society; it also offers a comprehensive website at [www.traveldundeeinfo.com](http://www.traveldundeeinfo.com), and provides city centre ambassadors;
- Angus is aiming to provide 100% bus information coverage at the roadside, available at every bus stop; and
- Perth's "goldline" (Stagecoach services) provides a high standard of travel experience which young people appreciate more.

#### Issues, Problems and Gaps

2.2.2 The existing issues, problems and gaps in the information provision were discussed with the officers. The list below summarises the key points arising from this discussion:

- there is no need to provide more information; rather there is a need to make better use of that which already exists – "we can not afford to duplicate what Traveline and Transport Direct provides";
- information should be accurate, up to date and trustworthy;
- information needs to be coherent;

- tourist boards should be more pro public transport; information for visitors focuses on car use;
- the car should not be the default choice and the cost of running a second car should be communicated;
- there is very little available information regarding taxis – eg an indicative fare scale, taxi numbers at bus stops (in case the bus is missed or does not turn up);
- there is an inconsistency in information standards across boundaries;
- the bus industry is not promoting itself well – publicity with no joint venture / thinking;
- there is old school bus information – why aren't operators putting out enough information? Have they assessed the situation and decided that it is not worth it?
- there are bus stops with no information or inadequate information - basic bus stop information is needed at every stop and should be maintained and properly updated;
- young people do not know how to obtain travel information. An Angus study revealed that young people are the least informed about the information which is available on-line. They are embarking on a project in partnership with Stagecoach to address this; and
- there is a need for information in rural areas where there are often unmarked bus stops. Information should be displayed, perhaps on boards somewhere in the village/town.

### Important Aspects of Regional Transport Provision

2.2.3 Officers felt that TACTRAN's RTIS should address the following:

- travel information, for all modes, needs to be of **high-quality, coherent and comprehensive**;
- information should be more **accessible**;
- the sources of **funding** – information should be affordable and sustainable;
- information should be **tailored to user needs**;
- information should be **user friendly** (eg the visibility of information – there should be adequate lighting at bus stops for reading the timetable);
- there should be a better **focus on young people** as they are the future/potential sustainable transport users;
- **minimum information standards** should be identified for different locations (rural and urban) – there is a need for consistency across the region;
- simple and consistent solutions for **unmarked rural bus stops** should be sought - timetables, maps and 'how to use guides' should be displayed/available at agreed locations. eg village post office;
- there is a need for **widely available** and **low technology** solutions – paper-based bus timetables are still in high demand in Stirling;
- the following should be addressed: **"What will make young people use public transport?"** – eg emphasise "independent travel" for publicity to reach young people;

- **school buses** are important here, as there is an opportunity to give young people a good public transport experience. Young people are the future market for operators;
- information should **cater for visitors**;
- travel to **work** and access to **health guides** should be considered;
- as should access to **airports /seaports**;
- the importance of Travel Information Centres, with **face to face contact**, should be borne in mind;
- a comprehensive package of travel information to be distributed at **key locations** (key employment and housing areas);
- it should be remembered that there may be a **difference in expectations** in different geographic areas – ie rural and urban; and
- information needs to be **ambitious and inspiring** - what needs to happen should be highlighted.

### Opportunities Within RTIS

2.2.4 The following points were highlighted as the opportunities that the RTIS should take advantage of:

- **current and future use of advance technologies** – there is a need to explore high tech and high cost, versus low tech and low cost options;
- [www.dundeetravelinfo.com](http://www.dundeetravelinfo.com) a multi-modal travel information site – can it be the base for regional web-based information?
- the TACTRAN **regional 'liftshare' scheme** which provides a car-sharing database for each of the constituent local authorities – promoting the scheme requires local commitment from the local authorities;
- **personalised travel plans** to patients with their NHS hospital appointments – coordination with NHS Tayside and NHS Fife;
- **student travel packs** for 'freshers';
- new **house buyers and movers packs** - building /housing agencies to provide travel information packs to every house mover;
- through travel plans, new **employee travel information packs** - employers should take responsibility;
- **region-wide Variable Message Signs (VMS)** – might be better to display no message rather instead of irrelevant messages;
- providing cost/fare **comparable travel information** like the one Transport Direct provides;
- **joint working** with the national web-based travel information sites so that they refer to available local/regional websites for localised travel information;
- bus information should show the **full picture** on a route – tendered and all commercial timetables should be combined to show a true picture;
- **smart cards** as a travel purse – TACTRAN ticketing scheme or Scotland wide;

- technology is available but **funding** is the issue – “government will fund it if the will is there”;
- **advertising taxi numbers** at bus stops as a funding mechanism; and
- ‘Snapfax’- like travel information guides for kids.

### The Best Ways to Access Information

2.2.5 It was thought that making things **simple** was the best way to improve access to information. It was also agreed that information should be provided in all formats in order to increase access to it by more of the population:

- phone – almost everybody has a landline or a mobile;
- paper; and
- electronic.

### Key Places to Make Information Available

2.2.6 The consensus was that information in the form of printed material in display racks, or via touch screen kiosks, should be available at least at:

- every library;
- every post office; and
- every tourist information centre.

2.2.7 The message to users should be: “Within TACTRAN, you can get a timetable at every X locations.”

### The Benefits of an RTIS

2.2.8 The main benefits of adopting an RTIS would include:

- consistent and standardised travel information throughout the region;
- coordination between the local authorities and providers;
- simple and straightforward local/regional information;
- efficiency and economics of combining efforts; and
- not generic, but tailored to local needs.

2.2.9 It was agreed that a Regional Journey Planner could provide localised journey planning information which travellers may require, more than the generic travel and journey planning information provided by the national journey planners in Traveline and Transport Direct. For example, local parking information for cars and motorbikes, local car-share opportunities, community transport provided locally and local taxi information.

2.2.10 There was a discussion on what a regional journey planner would provide that a national one does not. It was highlighted that its main role would be to provide **one point of contact** for multi-modal information.

## 2 Local Authority Consultations

- 2.2.11 It was highlighted that an RTIS would provide control over what/how/where information is provided.

### **Aims and Objectives**

- 2.2.12 It was suggested that the objectives of the RTIS should include NTS' Bus Action Plan along with national aspirations.

## 3 Wider Key Stakeholder Consultations

### 3.1 Introduction

- 3.1.1 In order to reflect users' aspirations and requirements, consultation with wider stakeholders was a key part of the consultation process.
- 3.1.2 A structured questionnaire was used to establish the views of consultees. It aimed to:
- seek the views of the potential benefits and disbenefits of an RTIS and RBIS;
  - collate issues and gaps in existing travel information provision;
  - seek comments and agreement on the Draft Vision and Objectives; and
  - seek views on opportunities and solutions for the delivery of travel information, including the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved.
- 3.1.3 The questionnaire was sent to over 200 key stakeholders, including transport providers, health boards, walking, cycling & motorcycle groups, and organisations representing vulnerable groups and people with special needs. The questionnaire was designed to suit the needs of individual consultees. A copy of the standard questionnaire is provided in **Appendix B** and a list of the respondents in **Appendix C**.
- 3.1.4 The distribution of questionnaires was followed up by telephone and where preferred, telephone consultations with the stakeholders were undertaken.
- 3.1.5 Since commissioning, we have been in touch with SDG, the consultant commissioned for the Bus Strategy and Demand Responsive Transport Action Plan, as well as CBP, consultants for the regional Park and Ride Strategy. The aim of this cooperation was to coordinate all consultation efforts and to minimise consultation fatigue.
- 3.1.6 On 6 February 2008, we presented the feedback on our consultation findings and the proposed scope of the RTIS and BIS at the SDG's large-scale consultation event in Perth.
- 3.1.7 The overview of the consultation results and the key themes that emerged from the process are, in turn, presented below.

### 3.2 Key Points from the Key Stakeholder Consultation

#### Potential Benefits of an RTIS/RBIS

- 3.2.1 There is wide consensus amongst stakeholders that the provision of an RTIS and RBIS for the TACTRAN area will be beneficial. Indeed, Travel Dundee note that these strategies are essential elements of travel planning and should be a minimum standard of provision. The key themes to emerge from the consultation were:
- a need for consistency of provision across operators and across local authority boundaries;
  - a need for an enhanced awareness of travel options and promotion of sustainable transport;

- a better integrated and more attractive environment for tourists; and
- an increased involvement of the voluntary sector.

#### **Consistency of Provision**

- 3.2.2 A number of stakeholders noted their concern with the various media and styles through which current transport information is provided; they believed that the key benefit of an RTIS/RBIS is the delivery of a standard 'one stop shop' for the provision of travel information.
- 3.2.3 The Scottish Government notes that the publication of a regional travel information strategy will create consistency of provision across the area, a realisation of minimum standards and will also enhance customer confidence. Indeed, the Scottish Government supports the extension of this process, to cover all seven Regional Transport Partnerships, pointing out that this would create only seven regional standards, as opposed to 32 local standards (if the process was undertaken at local authority level). This philosophy is supported by SEStran, Strathclyde Passenger Transport (SPT) and Stagecoach, who indicate that a strategy which cuts across local boundaries will make it easier for transport operators to conform.
- 3.2.4 NHS Forth Valley has similar views, although perhaps from a different policy perspective. They note that it would be useful to be able to distribute patient information leaflets with accurate travel information from a single source, which would also negate the need to contact operators when reviewing such information.
- 3.2.5 The Traffic Commissioner feels that the RTIS/RBIS would allow better planning of bus services and may attract non-bus travellers to use the bus as a form of cheap, safe and reliable public transport.
- 3.2.6 Stagecoach notes the potential benefits of the RTIS/RBIS as it could create consistency of available information, improvement in the quality and circulation of the information, and a partnership environment.

#### **Enhanced Awareness of Travel Options and Promotion of Sustainable Transport**

- 3.2.7 Many stakeholders see the RTIS/RBIS as a key element in improving awareness of travel options and promoting sustainable transport.
- 3.2.8 The Scottish Association for Public Transport (SAPT) indicates that the key benefit from the RTIS/RBIS is the provision of current travel and timetable information. This view is reinforced by the Scottish Government and by Auchterhouse Community Council (ACC), who indicate that effective promotion of bus and rail timetables (as well as online journey planners) are important in making people more fully aware of their travel options and less inclined to use the car. Stagecoach also feels that travellers would benefit from a greater awareness of interchange options at rail and bus stations.
- 3.2.9 The Cairngorms National Park (CNP) notes that lack of information is a key reason for people not using public transport. They advocate the RTIS/RBIS as a tool for providing high-quality, accessible information, to encourage better links between public transport and recreational opportunities, thus encouraging mode shift.

- 3.2.10 The Ramblers Association Scotland (RAS) and Paths for All Partnership (PAP) also point out that travel information is essential in encouraging people to choose more active and sustainable travel options, particularly walking and cycling, which would lead to economic, social and health gains. Such views are also supported by ByCycle who agree that it is important that people must be aware of all transport options, as well as off-road routes for cycling. Indeed, ByCycle argue that better travel information may encourage mountain-bikers to travel to their start point by a means other than car.

#### **A Better Integrated and More Attractive Environment for Tourists**

- 3.2.11 Visit Scotland note that better travel information will enhance the experience of tourists, particularly by encouraging walking and cycling, which are key strands of the Local Area Tourism Strategies. City Sightseeing Stirling also indicates that greater passenger interaction will engender confidence in public transport, for both tourists and more local visitors.

#### **Voluntary Sector Involvement**

- 3.2.12 The Community Transport Association (CTA) indicates that an RTIS/RBIS would encourage greater involvement of the voluntary sector in transport provision and could potentially lead to increased funding for such organisations. This would present opportunities for greater integration with mainstream public transport. The Perth & Kinross Community Transport Group (PKCTP) agree, noting that a well implemented RTIS/RBIS could also reduce the demands on community transport providers.

#### **Potential Disbenefits of an RTIS/RBIS**

- 3.2.13 While stakeholders appear to strongly support the provision of an RTIS/BTIS, a number of consultees did point out that the implementation of any strategy must be carefully planned and clearly structured. As a minimum standard, it is agreed that any transport information produced should be both easy to read and to understand, as well as matching a level of best practice, an issue raised by the Confederation of Passenger Transport (CPT) and the ACC.
- 3.2.14 DATAG (Dundee Accessible Transport Action) and NHS Forth Valley noted that any RTIS/RBIS should be underpinned by actual transport provision. They point out that poor transport provision, particularly in rural areas and for those with mobility problems, is a greater problem than poor travel information. ByCycle also point out that highlighting the current lack of transport information may detract people from visiting the TACTRAN area.
- 3.2.15 The need for partnership was also raised – SEStran pointed out that the success of the strategy depends on cross-authority agreement, while First ScotRail noted that TACTRAN should avoid replicating Traveline. The CPT reinforces this point by noting that the RTIS/RBIS should not be seen as a replacement for Traveline.
- 3.2.16 The CTA and PKCTP note that the RTIS/RBIS must take account of the community and voluntary transport sector, which provides lifeline services for an estimated 210,000 people throughout the TACTRAN area. The CTA does raise its concern that publicity from an RTIS/RBIS may lead to increased demand and a need for additional funding.

### Existing Issues and Gaps

3.2.17 Stakeholders raised a number of existing issues with regards to current travel information provision within the TACTRAN area, including:

- the need for strategy alignment and partnership;
- poor timetable provision and a lack of standard formats as well as a lack of maps;
- accessibility; and
- lack of interchange information.

3.2.18 Each of these issues is discussed in turn below. However, at a higher level, a number of stakeholders reinforced the point that actual transport provision and access to key services (such as hospitals) is more important than actual travel information itself. This is a particularly relevant issue for those living in rural areas, the mobility impaired and tourists.

### Strategy Alignment and Partnership

3.2.19 A number of stakeholders raised the need for greater partnership working and the alignment of any RTIS/RBIS across different localities and companies. The CPT, SESTRAN and Stagecoach advocate cooperation in the delivery of Traveline and, as mentioned above, wish to realise greater cooperation between regions in providing consistent travel information for the benefit of both tourists and residents alike. SPT also expressed their support for cross-boundary cooperation.

3.2.20 Stagecoach also notes that funding arrangements and responsibilities need to be clearer, with information being provided in an agreed regional format. In addition, Stagecoach points out that operator independence can be an obstacle to delivering consistent information and styles.

3.2.21 The CTA also notes that there is a greater need for engagement with voluntary transport providers. It points out that there is no single point of information covering all of the community transport schemes across the TACTRAN area, with each project serving only their own area and often relying on word-of-mouth for publicity. Indeed, such projects are not included in any transport literature.

3.2.22 ByCycle and the Paths for All Partnership note that there is no consistent information on walking and cycling opportunities, with poor signing also contributing to this problem.

### Timetables and Maps

3.2.23 Stakeholders have raised a number of concerns with current timetable provision. The CTA and City Sightseeing note that timetabling must be better coordinated to avoid long connection times while the ACC and Montrose Port Authority also point out that bus timetables should be available in convenient locations, such as at bus stops, on notice boards and in shops.

3.2.24 Stagecoach notes there are often delays in updating bus stop timetables and web-based information – a particular issue for tourists. Similarly, the SAPT indicates that current bus timetables rarely have end dates, meaning that they are frequently out-of-date. SAPT also believes that major timetable amendments are too frequent and should be limited to two per

year on fixed dates. Visit Scotland echoes this point, noting that it can be difficult to plan projects with a public transport element, due to frequent timetable changes.

- 3.2.25 Visit Scotland feels that timetable provision is fragmented and that the actual timetables themselves are unattractive and difficult to use, especially for tourists. NHS Forth Valley supports this point noting that there is a lack of public transport information related to access to key services, such as hospitals.
- 3.2.26 Stakeholders (most notably SAPT) also indicated that network and route maps are often absent from bus stops and other key locations, making it harder to travel by public transport.

#### **Accessibility**

- 3.2.27 Travel Dundee noted that regional variations in information provision need to be addressed.
- 3.2.28 The Dundee Access Group indicated that it is not often made clear whether services are wheelchair accessible.
- 3.2.29 ByCycle also felt that there is insufficient information on cycle provision on buses and trains – ie spaces available, booking requirements, frequency, costs, availability of cycle carriage on buses etc. ByCycle believe that such poor cycling provision leads many cyclists to see no alternative to the car when travelling. PAP indicated that travellers should be informed of sustainable transport options, particularly walking and cycling, which should be included in all types of transport information provision.
- 3.2.30 The CTA pointed out that concessionary travel passes still could not be used on voluntary sector community transport services. Therefore members with concessionary pass holders still have to pay to use these services. Moreover, the current legislation only allows community transport organisations to carry members of their own organisation. They thought that local residents who are eligible should be able to access any services that are in their area.
- 3.2.31 The PKCTG raised the need for additional funding for transport information for community transport groups.

#### **Interchange**

- 3.2.32 The Traffic Commissioner and Travel Dundee both noted that there is a lack of information about onward connections, particularly when the connection involves travelling with a different provider or on a different mode of public transport.
- 3.2.33 Similarly, the ACC noted that travellers need information on where they can park their cars when connecting with public transport, be that bus, train or aircraft. There was also a general agreement amongst stakeholders that onward connections should be well publicised so as to encourage mode shift away from the private car.

### Vision and Objectives

3.2.34 There was broad agreement with the set 'Vision' and objectives amongst stakeholders. However, consultees provided a number of comments on the Vision:

- the Montrose Port Authority suggested that better integration with rail services is pursued;
- the CTA agreed with the 'Vision' but noted that the proposed model is not socially inclusive as it ignores modes of transport for those with mobility problems, those with a lack of transport provision, and those isolated from the commercial transport mix;
- the ACC noted that the line 'by being easily read and understood' should be added to the Vision;
- SAPT noted that an objective should be added to cover interchange between routes and modes;
- ByCycle indicated that the Vision should also refer to travel for leisure, recreational and health purposes. In addition, they suggested that an objective should be added along the lines of 'to help facilitate multi-modal travel within the region';
- PAP noted that the Vision should read '...which is socially inclusive, **encourages health gain**, enhances economy...';
- City Sightseeing suggested that the objectives should include text on how to engage with operators and how information systems can be used to address other transport issue, such as congestion and inefficient operation;
- the DATAG noted that for the RTIS/RBIS to be 'socially inclusive', bus service provision has be inclusive and in place for all residents;
- Scottish Government indicated that the vision should note that 'greener and healthier' travel choices benefit the economy;
- Scottish Natural Heritage welcomed emphasis on sustainable travel and modal shift to sustainable modes. They noted that the RTIS/RBIS should highlight sustainable travel options to natural heritage destinations and links to the Core Paths network; and
- The PKCTG said they would prefer the Vision to read 'regional transport information provision which helps connect **individuals to services and communities** across the region and beyond'. They noted that the aims should reflect an ambition to connect all those with a transport need to a service that will meet that need in an economic and efficient manner. The PKCTG also noted that the objectives only relate to timetabled bus services.

## Opportunities and Solutions

### Enhancing Existing Provision

- 3.2.35 Stakeholders raised a number of areas where additional travel information could be provided that would be of benefit to their organisation/members, including:

- better integration between modes;
- promotion of bus use and more widely publicised timetable and fare information;
- enhanced walking and cycling information; and
- provision of a public transport handbook.

### Inter-Modal Integration

- 3.2.36 A number of stakeholders raised the need for better integration between different modes of transport (particularly bus and rail) and across local and regional boundaries. NHS Forth Valley also advocated the use of 'real time' travel information, so as to encourage bus use amongst travellers.

### Promotion of Bus Use

- 3.2.37 Numerous consultees noted that bus timetables, fares and route maps should be more widely available and better maintained, particularly at bus stops and online. The Traffic Commissioner also pointed out that the name of the operator providing a service and their telephone number should be printed on all timetables. The Scottish Government also suggested that Traveline information should be provided at every bus stop, showing timetables, interchange opportunities and advertising changes to services. The CNP also suggested promotion of bus use through the provision of bus travel discounts when a person parks their car and switches to the bus.
- 3.2.38 The CTA (with regards to community transport) and Scottish Government also noted that better information should be provided on service accessibility.

### Walking and Cycling

- 3.2.39 Stakeholders also advocated the need for better information about walking and cycling opportunities. Such provision would include information on walking and cycling routes, cycle storage, accessibility to public transport for bikes and better signposting. The consultees felt that there are opportunities for partnership working and that information could be disseminated in the form of leaflets, maps and online advice. Of particular importance is the need to publicise the Core Paths network and their access to the wider transport network.

### 'How to...' Handbook

- 3.2.40 Visit Scotland and the Scottish Government suggested the provision of a 'How to...' handbook, detailing information for all public transport, walking and cycling options within the TACTRAN area. This view is similar to that supported by the PKCTG who are seeking a TACTRAN-wide community transport booklet.

### Location of Travel Information

- 3.2.41 Stakeholders believe that travel information must be made widely available and targeted at all groups of society. They suggested a range of locations where travel information could be provided, including:

- via the internet, telephone and text message-based services;
- railway and bus stations/stops;
- tourist information centres and tourist accommodation;
- public services and amenities – local authority offices, community centres, shops, health centres, leisure centres, libraries etc;
- Park and Ride sites; and
- 'real-time' information boards.

### Form of Travel Information

- 3.2.42 Stakeholders put forward various suggestions as to the form that travel information should take and advised working in partnership in the preparation and delivery of such information. Suggestions included:

- interactive web-based facilities, such as Traveline;
- leaflets, posters and maps;
- telephone enquiry (with a freephone Traveline number) and text message-based systems;
- a 'Getting Around' CD (Visit Scotland);
- 'real-time' information boards;
- literature targeted at workplaces to encourage sustainable travel; and
- Braille and alternative language translations.

- 3.2.43 A number of consultees restated the point that information should be prepared by working in partnership and should be accessible to all groups in society.

### Production, Distribution and Funding of Travel Information

- 3.2.44 There was a general consensus that the production, distribution and funding of travel information should be undertaken in a partnership environment involving TACTRAN, local authorities, transport operators, the NHS and community groups. The general consensus was that funding should largely come from TACTRAN, local authorities and, to a lesser extent, transport operators. Stakeholders generally supported a prominent role for operators in producing and distributing travel information. It was also felt that community groups and organisations like the NHS should assist in disseminating travel information as widely as possible.
- 3.2.45 SPT currently supports RTPI in Glasgow City and considering promoting the extension of it to the rest of its region. This may benefit TACTRAN residents travelling between the two regions. The responsibilities should be shared between the partnerships when dealing with cross-boundary travel information.

### Improving Access to Current Information

3.2.46 Stakeholders advanced a number of ideas to encourage better use of existing data, including:

- easily navigable internet-based resources, especially better use of Traveline Scotland, Transport Direct, and well kept local authority and operator websites;
- consultation with local groups and residents to identify and rectify current issues;
- employment of new technology, such as 'real-time' information;
- a publicity campaign, with a strong focus on sustainable travel options and the provision of more visually attractive and accessible travel information (timetables, maps, leaflets, information boards etc);
- better timetables and maps, including 'locality maps' at key interchange locations;
- e-mail-based 'user group';
- wider distribution, including at key local services and facilities;
- 'on-demand' travel information; and
- youth education on travel choices.

### Best Practice

3.2.47 Stakeholders identified areas of best practice that TACTRAN should aim to research and, where possible, replicate, when preparing the RTIS/RBIS. These include:

- Stirling Dial-a-Journey;
- Fife coast walking and cycling signing;
- Dundee 'real-time' bus information system;
- Fife Council's "How do I get to..." leaflets;
- The Cairngorms Explorer is an example of how to link days out with using the bus;
- Lothian Buses service maps;
- indicative travel time information between the service points advertised at bus stops and stations – London; and
- flexible route planning and travel information at hospitals – Dundee.

3.2.48 SESTRAN noted that there should be considerable research in transport information and that best use should be made of both good and bad experiences in other areas.

### Legislative Framework

3.2.49 The Traffic Commissioner pointed out that it has a statutory power, that can be enforced, which requires operators to co-operate with local transport authorities (Councils/SPT) in the provision of timetable information. The registration procedures require 14 days pre-notice to local authorities/SPT. The notification procedures and times in the Regulations are there to assist in giving time to authorities, Traveline and the public, to know when services are going to run or be terminated. These procedures will move into electronic form - a pilot for that purpose has recently concluded and roll out will commence in the near future.

- 3.2.50 For electronic bus registration to be 100% accurate, local authorities must fully commit to keeping the bus stop numbering up to date, especially when new developments are built – without up-to-date bus stop numbering, information strategies are at risk. The powers given in sections 33-35 of the 2001 Act should be implemented in the near future, as the powers are there to allow for more effective information for the public. For instance, the Traffic Commissioner has been working with SPT and the leverage of sections 34 and 39 has proved fruitful.

#### 3.3 6 February 2008 TACTRAN Bus Forum Consultation (Perth)

- 3.3.1 We organised a joint consultation workshop with SDG who are undertaking TACTRAN's Bus, Demand Responsive and Community Transport Strategy and CBP, who are undertaking TACTRAN's Park and Ride Strategy.
- 3.3.2 The benefits of this exercise for our commission were to present the methodology applied to RTIS and RBIS development, as well as the key consultation findings which would shape its development. This presentation aimed to create an additional debate regarding bus information provision, within the concept of infrastructure and service provision.
- 3.3.3 After the presentations from the consultants, the participants were divided into five groups to discuss the existing issues, problems and gaps related to bus, DRT and CT provision within the region. They also discussed the draft objectives (and their priorities) which were put forward by SDG and the possible solutions and opportunities within the region. The list of participating organisations can be found in Appendix D.
- 3.3.4 It was not a surprise that the participants felt that information, infrastructure and service provision go hand in hand. The key findings of the group discussions reinforce our main consultation findings. These include:
- providing information to potential hail and ride **passengers in rural areas**;
  - too much **information** but not in the **right format**;
  - providing **re-assurance** – information provision to tell people what has been done and what facilities are available;
  - information on those services providing **low-floor buses** is not comprehensive - users are not confident that the bus they wish to use can accommodate them, or if they will be able to make a return journey using a low floor bus;
  - introduction of **good quality** shelters, accessible bus stops, improved information and safety features at bus stops;
  - **visibility** of information - information should be located in a position, so that users can actually read it;
  - **multi-modal** information at bus stops;
  - providing **joint timetable** information;
  - **'real time' information** at bus stops to increase the quality of journey experience – greater need to know when the next bus is coming at bus stops with infrequent services;

### 3 Wider Key Stakeholder Consultations

- expectation of information to be **easily available** but it is not – the culture of information and marketing needs to change; and
- **Demand Responsive Transport** (DRT) services should be properly reflected in information provided by Traveline.

3.3.5 There was a general consensus that information provision should be **centralised**; it should be **diverse** but **consistent**; all information should feed into a centralised service – one point of contact for the public. It was agreed that this should however build on what is already there, rather than starting from scratch. However, it was thought that the role of Traveline in providing information was not sufficiently recognised. Information on what is out there is critical – some participants thought that Traveline was not particularly usable.

3.3.6 It was suggested that it was important to clarify who is **leading co-ordination function** as the councils were not doing it so well. Therefore it was thought that TACTRAN could step in to help.

# 4 Regional Transport Strategy Consultations

## 4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 A number of issues and concerns, as well as gaps in the travel information provision in the TACTRAN area, were also raised in various consultation workshops during the development of a Regional Transport Strategy. These consultations included local authority workshops, wider stakeholder workshops and focus groups, and a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) group workshop.
- 4.1.2 A summarised outcome of these events, related to the travel information provision in the region, is presented below. All information has been taken from the Regional Transport Strategy Consultation report (March 2007).

## 4.2 Key Points from the Consultations

### Promotion of TACTRAN Region as a Tourist Destination, All Year Round

- 4.2.1 Tourism was seen to be the major future economy for the TACTRAN area. Stakeholders felt the following should be done:
- promotion of integrated transport options for tourists, including integrated ticketing, should be increased;
  - the availability of information on public transport for tourists, including fares information, should be improved;
  - there should be an increase in the promotion of sustainable transport to tourists – there is a need to look abroad for best practice and implement policies which educate people that there are alternatives;
  - road signage throughout the region should be improved; and
  - promotion of other tourist areas should be increased to reduce the parking pressures at certain locations.

### Information at Car Parks

- 4.2.2 Cairngorms National Park noted that:
- it should be ensured that all car parks have public transport, walking and cycling options clearly displayed so that cars can be left in the car parks.

### Promotion of Walking and Cycling

- 4.2.3 A strong consensus was that the promotion of walking and cycling must be increased. This could be achieved via:
- education, including cycling training and 'Safe Routes to Schools' programmes – although it is necessary that the facilities are in place first and routes are safe and enjoyable;
  - more maps and visual information; and

- an increase in the promotion of regional commuter and recreational cycling and walking routes.

#### **Public Transport Information**

The following views were expressed by the stakeholders:

- there is a need to advertise/provide/promote integrated ticketing and information on integrated travel;
- there is a need for better promotion of coach services;
- integrated transport should be accessible from the front door – there is a need to consider time/distance to travel to public transport;
- increase public transport information at sites including car parks, and pre-travel 'real-time' information on the web and at travel termini/stops;
- Traveline should be used more extensively;
- there is a need for more information related to concessionary travel;
- the need for good quality travel information should be endorsed, but that which already exists should not be duplicated;
- there is a need for more visual information - eg maps of public transport system and relevant maps at bus stops; and
- there is a need to look at timetables available to railway users (some timetables do not show local trains from eg Perth to Glasgow or Edinburgh).

4.2.4 In addition, limited daytime and evening public transport options in rural areas were highlighted.

#### **Information at Interchanges**

4.2.5 Some stakeholders noted that:

- standard information panels for all modes of transport should be at all stops and termini.

#### **Accessibility of Public Transport for People with Special Needs**

4.2.6 Stakeholders representing vulnerable groups pointed out issues regarding:

- the attitudes of bus and taxi drivers towards disabled travellers – and that best practice training was required across the region; and
- the need to retain paper, audio and face-to-face information provision for people with disabilities, or those not information technology literate.

### Travel Information at Hospitals

4.2.7 Health-related stakeholders highlighted that there was:

- a lack of public transport information at hospitals for staff, patients and visitors;
- a need for promotion of green travel planning, car-sharing and public transport for the staff; and
- a need for more information regarding non-emergency transport (eg under what condition an ambulance would be provided and what other options were available).

### Individualised Journey Planners and Personalised Travel Planning

4.2.8 A few points were made regarding individualised journey planners and personalised travel planning (PTP) in the respect that:

- PTP can be highly successful and good at changing behaviour/travel patterns, but is costly;
- there is a need for a combination of information systems and individualised journey planning - if someone is not comfortable with technology, the service has to be provided on a face-to-face basis; and
- Traveline journey planners should be utilised.

### Cross-Boundary Partnership Work

Stakeholders, and in particular, neighbouring Regional Transport Partnerships noted that:

- TACTRAN needs awareness of other regions and routes running in close proximity to its boundaries;
- 'Real Time' Information (RTI) provision currently exists on services crossing through the TACTRAN area into the HITRANS area. This provides an opportunity for the partnerships to work together, to ensure passengers at all points on routes benefit from the availability of up to the second, accurate service information; and
- HITRANS and TACTRAN should work together with the bus operators providing cross boundary services, to develop statutory Quality Bus Partnerships. This would deliver improvements such as commitments to service frequency, accessible vehicles, improved infrastructure facilities, bus priority measures and better information.

### Greener Business Travel

4.2.9 Many stakeholders noted that businesses need to encourage the use of greener transport.

### Technology Issues

Stakeholders highlighted that the following could be considered:

- WIFI internet access installed on buses;
- instant ticketing/internet – one-stop shop; and
- technology for mobile phone services in the TACTRAN area could be improved to ensure teleservices for ticketing and 'real time' transport information work.

### Advertising Sustainable Travel Options

4.2.10 Advertising campaigns, as a mean to promote sustainable travel options, were seen by many as important, but by a few as unnecessary and a national, rather than regional issue. Stakeholders' comments included that:

- the campaign to change attitudes and behaviour needs to be long-term;
- work with TV, press, radio, businesses and the whole community is required;
- awareness campaigns are of doubtful value, if the product being promoted is not attractive; and
- expensive advertising campaigns need large expensive surveys to be carried out so that the effectiveness can be measured.

### Powered Two Wheelers

4.2.11 Representatives of motorcycle groups expressed that there is a need to:

- encourage the use and awareness of PTWs (Powered Two Wheelers - Moped, Scooters and Motorcycles) as a sustainable form of travel and a first choice after the car; and
- include PTWs in travel plans - consideration needs to be given to benefits and disadvantages of this mode, so that measures can be taken to reduce vulnerability of this mode and increase attractiveness by promoting best practice.

### Car-Sharing

4.2.12 Stakeholders noted that actions should be taken to:

- promote car-sharing; and
- widen and develop lift-sharing across the region, using the experience of [dundeliftshare.com](http://dundeliftshare.com).

### General Comments

4.2.13 In addition a few general points were made by stakeholders, including:

- TACTRAN should not replicate what is already being done, but should have an overview, share learning from good practice and maybe provide some minimum standards;
- TACTRAN needs to decide what role it wants to have. If it would like to be heavily involved, then the local authority role would have to be eliminated, not replicated;
- people need more than local or regional information – it has to be national or international, which ties-in to other areas to provide a seamless transport experience;
- if the infrastructure is not provided and maintained, then measures relating the promotion of sustainable transport options will not have as great impact;
- there is a need for integration and user-friendliness of travel information, including more visual information, which is remembered better than a text; and

it will be difficult to persuade people to change their travel attitudes and behaviour; and focus should be on school education.

## 5 SESTRAN Consultation

### 5.1 Introduction

- 5.1.1 In May 2007, JMP consultants undertook a study for the SESTRAN transport partnership of the 'Potential Benefits in SESTRAN developing a Bus Passenger Information Strategy'.
- 5.1.2 The study included consultations with a range of stakeholders, including some of TACTRAN's local authorities and wider key stakeholders. The relevant stakeholders for our study were:
- TACTRAN, Stirling, Perth & Kinross and Dundee City councils;
  - neighbouring local authorities and partnerships, including Clackmannanshire, Fife and SPT;
  - public transport operators and representatives, including First Group, Stagecoach and Confederation of Passenger Transport; and
  - other national agencies and regulatory bodies including Scottish Government, Transport Scotland, Traffic Commissioner and Traveline.
- 5.1.3 All stakeholders were sent a structured questionnaire seeking respondents' views on the benefits and disbenefits of a region-wide Bus Passenger Information Strategy (BPIS), as opposed to local authority-specific ones, and whether they foresaw any problems with the introduction of such a strategy.
- 5.1.4 The findings of the consultation are provided below.

### 5.2 Key Points From the Consultation

#### Benefits of a Region-Wide BPIS

- 5.2.1 The benefits of a region-wide Bus Passenger Information Strategy were as follows:
- benefits to passengers through standardisation of information, with particular benefits arising on services crossing local authority boundaries, or on routes served by more than one operator;
  - an increase in passenger understanding of, and hence confidence in, bus services;
  - economies of scale in the preparation of strategies;
  - economies of scale in the provision of information, as the same standard of information will be provided in more locations;
  - an increased scope for acceptance and adoption of best practice;
  - avoids divergence of strategies;
  - increases opportunity to invest in understanding the benefits which different types of information can bring;
  - it is likely to encourage those that do not presently provide high-quality information to adopt higher standards;

- it saves operators having to negotiate with numerous Local Authorities or deal with a variety of standards;
- there is a clarification of responsibilities;
- local authority boundaries do not necessarily accord with transport network boundaries, and this minimises conflicts within the region; and
- there is potential for a better fit between the stated strategy and national aspirations.

#### Disbenefits of a Region-Wide BPIS

5.2.2 The views regarding disbenefits of a region-wide Bus Passenger Information Strategy included:

- loss of local control, but benefits were felt to outweigh the disbenefits of a region-wide strategy; and
- the potential for some duplication of effort with the production of a region-wide strategy.

#### Problems and Risks Associated With Developing a Region-Wide BPIS

5.2.3 The following comments were received:

- there is a possible perceived threat to local authority “independence”;
- there may be high costs/lack of resources to deliver requirements of the strategy;
- there is a risk of abortive work or disrupting established relationships/information provision;
- there may be a diminution of information quality in those areas presently benefiting from high-quality provision, or operators that already provide high-quality information being relatively penalised;
- a stronger strategy could lead to cross-boundary “information conflicts” (at the juncture with other RTPs) becoming more significant;
- the strategy may not reflect the diversity of the region, and so may not be fully inclusive;
- there may be challenges for negotiation with so many authorities and operators;
- it may be necessary to discard information systems already in place;
- there may be possible conflicts between differing aspirations;
- the possibility of a lack of local knowledge of those delivering regional information;
- the need for local authorities to enforce requirements that are seen to have been set by others;
- there may be a potential for confusion between the regional and adopted local information strategies;
- there is a risk that this could delay the preparation of some Councils’ strategies; and
- there is a risk of only setting out the minimum requirements, rather than pushing for enhancements.

## 6 RTIS Objectives

### 6.1 Introduction

- 6.1.1 During the consultation process, we sought the opinions of TACTRAN, the constituent local authorities and the wider key stakeholders on a draft vision statement, aims and a set of draft objectives (these can be seen in Appendix B, the Standard Consultation Questionnaire).
- 6.1.2 In general, there was a consensus that these were appropriate and relevant to the strategies. However, it was agreed that there was no need for a separate vision statement or aims to be formulated for the RTIS or RBIS, as these are already addressed in the Draft Regional Transport Strategy (RTS).
- 6.1.3 The updated and agreed sets of objectives are presented in the remainder of this Chapter.

#### RTS Vision

- 6.1.4 *"A transport system, shaped by engagement with its citizens, which helps deliver prosperity and connects communities across the region and beyond, which is socially inclusive and environmentally sustainable and which promotes the health and well-being of all."*

Draft TACTRAN Regional Transport Strategy (2007)

#### RTS Objectives

- 6.1.5 The overarching objective for each theme, and related supporting sub-objectives, are set out below. These objectives have guided the identification of options and packages of measures which have been considered and assessed in the development of the RTS. Highlighted in **bold red text** are those RTS sub-objectives with particular relevance to the Information Strategy development.

#### **Economy: To ensure transport helps to deliver regional prosperity.**

- 6.1.6 Related sub-objectives:
- 1 To ensure that transport infrastructure and services in the region help deliver economic growth, particularly in key business and employment sectors;
  - **2 To improve the efficiency, reliability and integration of the movement of goods and people; and**
  - 3 To address issues of peripherality associated with the TACTRAN area.

#### **Accessibility, Equity and Social Inclusion: To improve accessibility for all, particularly for those suffering from social exclusion.**

- 6.1.7 Related sub-objectives:
- **4 To improve access to employment;**
  - **5 To improve access to public services, including health and education;**
  - **6 To improve access to retail, recreation and leisure facilities;**

- 7 To reduce severance and social and economic isolation caused by transport, or by a lack of it; and
- **8 To improve the accessibility and inclusivity of the transport system.**

**The Environment: To ensure that the transport system contributes to safeguarding the environment and promotes opportunities for improvement.**

6.1.8 Related sub-objectives:

- 9 To contribute to the achievement of the Scottish national targets and obligations on greenhouse gas emissions;
- 10 To promote a transport system that respects both the natural and the built environment; and
- **11 To promote a shift towards more sustainable modes.**

**Health and Well Being: To promote the health and well being of communities.**

6.1.9 Related sub-objectives:

- 12 To help meet or better all statutory air quality requirements in the TACTRAN area; and
- **13 To promote a culture of active and healthy travel.**

**Safety & Security: To improve the real and perceived safety and security of the transport network.**

6.1.10 Related sub-objectives:

- 14 To improve transport-related safety; and
- **15 To improve real or perceived levels of personal security on the transport network.**

**Integration: To improve integration, both within transport and between transport and other policy areas.**

6.1.11 Related sub-objectives:

- **16 To improve integration of all transport modes;**
- 17 To ensure integration with land-use planning; and
- **18 To ensure a fit with other relevant national, regional and local strategies and policies.**

## 6.2 Agreed Objectives for RTIS and RBIS

- 6.2.1 We developed a single to cover both Travel and Bus Information Strategies to simplify the objectives (making them more memorable and targeted) and to demonstrate how the two strategies nest within one another.
- 6.2.2 Objectives are **SMART** - Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Timed. Sometimes there can be a “tension” between the desire to set memorable and succinct objectives, and making them SMART. Our experience suggests that the best way of reconciling these tensions is to produce an aligned set of indicators/targets which amplify and illustrate the thrust of the more succinct objectives.

### Information Strategy Objectives

- 6.2.3 The Regional Information Strategies will contribute to the delivery of the RTS through their emphasis on<sup>1</sup>:

#### Economy

- 1 - information which improves the reliability and integration of people movements around the region [*Economy, 2*];

#### Accessibility, Equity and Social Inclusion

- 2 - information which demonstrates accessibility to the transport network and key locations for everyone [*Accessibility, 4,5,6,8*];

#### Environment

- 3 - information which contributes to a shift to more sustainable travel [*Environment, 11*];

#### Health and Well-Being

- 4 - information tailored to promote active and healthy travel options [*Health, 13*];

#### Safety & Security

- 5 - information that contributes to traveller’s perceptions of safety when using the transport system [*Safety, 15*];

#### Integration

- 6 - information that contributes to integrating the multi-modal/multi-operator regional transport network into one coherent transport system. [*Integration, 16*]; and
- 7 - ensuring that information provision supports/complements other national, regional and local strategies and policies [*Integration, 18*].”

- 6.2.4 The attainment of these objectives can be measured by reference against the following indicators, in each case testing the future standards obtained against the existing situation as a benchmark. Where possible, the Success Measures have been aligned with the

<sup>1</sup> With links to the RTS Objectives and Sub Objectives noted in square brackets

monitoring proposals associated with the RTS Indicative Delivery Plan – these are annotated with an asterisk.

**Figure 6.1 RIS and Proposed Success Measures**

Proposed RIS Objective	Proposed Success Measure
1 Information which improves the reliability and integration of people movements around the region.	Percentage of passengers expressing satisfaction with information availability (before/during/after their journey). <sup>2</sup>
2 Information which demonstrates accessibility to the transport network and key locations for everyone.	*Proportion of public transport network covered by 'real time' information.
3 Information which contributes to a shift to more sustainable travel.	*Public transport ridership as a proportion of total travel. *Number of participants in car-sharing schemes.
4 Information tailored to promote active and healthy travel options.	*Percentage of active mode (walk or cycle) trips made by TACTRAN residents.
5 Information that contributes to passengers' perceptions of safety when using the transport system.	Percentage of surveyed passengers expressing a view that they were satisfied they could complete their journey safely (with particular reference to information availability). <sup>3</sup>
6 Information which contributes to awareness of an integrated multi-modal/multi-operator regional transport network.	*Proportion of public transport network(s) participating in integrated ticketing and timetabling scheme(s).
7 Ensuring that information provision supports/complements other national, regional and local strategies and policies.	No obvious indicator available.

<sup>2</sup> This requires an ongoing monitoring regime to be implemented.

<sup>3</sup> This requires an ongoing monitoring regime to be implemented.

# 7 Conclusions

## 7.1 Summary

- 7.1.1 This report presented the findings consultation to inform the development of the RTIS and RBIS. Overall, the consultees were supportive of RTIS and RBIS development. It was thought that such strategies would provide consistent, coherent, comprehensive and up-to-date information, tailored to local needs, for all transport users.
- 7.1.2 There was a strong consensus among the wider stakeholders that the strategy would facilitate travel by public transport in the TACTRAN area. Indeed, consultees believed that the RTIS and RBIS would be able to address a number of the information problems currently faced by travellers, including poor timetable and map provision, inconsistent standards, poor accessibility and a lack of information on interchange options.
- 7.1.3 In terms of delivering the strategy, there appeared to be strong stakeholder support for a region-wide package of transport information measures, with a targeted roll-out of new transport information, focusing on all groups of society and using appropriate media to appeal to each group. It was also widely agreed that the potential exists to make better use of existing travel information sources, most notably Traveline, and for the replication of best practice in delivering the strategy.
- 7.1.4 Importantly, there was a general consensus that partnership between all levels of government, transport operators and community groups is essential in funding, producing and delivering a robust strategy.

### Who is Likely to Adopt the Regional Bus Information Strategy (RBIS)

- 7.1.5 There were no concerns regarding the RTIS; however, some local authorities have reservations regarding the RBIS. Therefore, it is important to address these concerns during the development of the RBIS.
- 7.1.6 Stirling Council does not have an existing BIS and is keen to adopt the TACTRAN RBIS, instead of producing a local one. Dundee City Council has a draft BIS but it is prepared to adopt the TACTRAN RBIS.
- 7.1.7 Angus and Perth & Kinross both had some reservations in adopting the RBIS. Angus Council may keep their adopted local BIS, as they think that it is their statutory duty to provide a local BIS. Perth & Kinross Council also has a draft local BIS, but it would like to adopt the regional one, subject to confirmation at a later date.

### Challenges

- 7.1.8 The following challenges were highlighted in the delivery of RTIS and RBIS:
- **funding** - small operators may find it difficult to contribute towards the cost of providing information;
  - **politicians** - are they willing to sign up for a regional strategy and its funding requirements; and

- **priorities in investments** – not one solution for all (rural versus urban, different services, different modes).

# Appendix A – Participants of the Local Authority Consultation Workshop

## 1.1.1 Participants of the local authority consultation Workshop

- Niall Gardiner – TACTRAN CPO;
- Merry Scott – TACTRAN Travel Planning Officer;
- Natalie Higgen - Stirling C;
- Dorothy Walker – Stirling C;
- Lesley Millar – Angus C;
- Neil Gellatly – Dundee CC;
- Ewan Gourlay – Dundee CC;
- Bill O'Driscoll - Perth & Kinross C;
- Frank Will – Perth & Kinross C;
- Chic Haggart - Perth & Kinross C; and
- Andrew Warrington - Perth & Kinross C.

# Appendix B – The Standard Consultation Questionnaire

22 January 2008

**Jana Haspicova**  
Stewart House  
Thistle Street  
North West Lane  
Edinburgh  
EH2 1BY

Direct Dial +44 (0) 131 240 8906  
Fax +44 (0) 131 220 6087  
jhaspicova@mvaconsultancy.com

Dear Stakeholder

### **TACTRAN REGIONAL TRAVEL INFORMATION STRATEGY AND REGIONAL BUS INFORMATION STRATEGY CONSULTATION**

MVA Consultancy has been commissioned by TACTRAN to develop a Regional Travel Information Strategy (RTIS), which will include a separate Regional Bus Information Strategy (RBIS).

This is one of the four transport sub-strategies of the Draft Regional Transport Strategy currently commissioned by TACTRAN. A further Bus Strategy, a Park & Ride Strategy and a Walking and Cycling Strategy are being taken forward by other consultancy firms (SDG, Colin Buchanan and Atkins respectively) and you may have already been contacted by them for information.

By developing a RTIS, TACTRAN are aiming to achieve a consistent and coherent approach to the provision of **travel information across all modes** in the area. This will improve and simplify the information available to travellers across the TACTRAN area, for all travel in the area, including that across local authority boundaries and between TACTRAN and other Regional Transport Partnership (RTP) areas.

A separate RBIS will specify and define an agreed set of common **bus information standards / guidelines** to be applied consistently and coherently across the TACTRAN area, where areas share similar characteristics.

As a key stakeholder of TACTRAN, we are keen to ensure that you are given the opportunity to **participate fully in the strategy development process** and that your views are included, understood and reflected in these strategies.

We have therefore attached a questionnaire to obtain your views on this matter. Due to the tight timescale of the study, we would be grateful if you could return your responses by emailing [jhaspicova@mvaconsultancy.com](mailto:jhaspicova@mvaconsultancy.com) or by calling 0131 240 8906 by Tuesday, 29 January 2008. Alternatively, you can return it to the above address by post.

If you wish to further discuss any of the issues, please do not hesitate to contact us. Your views are important to us.

Yours sincerely,

Jana Haspicova

## CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Note: Please write your comments underneath each question.

### The RTIS will cover the following modes:

- car (including parking information, Park & Ride, etc);
- bus (including interchanges, Park & Ride, etc);
- rail (including interchanges, parking, access, etc);
- motorbikes (including parking, scenic routes, etc); and
- walking and cycling (including streetscape / signing, routes).

### Q1 If you currently provide any travel information regarding the above:

Who is it for? (eg general public, specific groups / users)	
What type? (eg timetables, maps, guides)	
In what form? (eg printed, electronic, audio)	
How is it distributed? (eg travel centres, internet, public buildings, directly to users)	
Who is responsible for funding? (your organisation, or other org/body)	

### Potential Benefits / Disbenefits

### Q2 What potential benefits do you expect from the introduction of a RTIS and RBIS and how important are they for your organisation / members?

### Q3 What potential disbenefits (if any) do you envisage from the introduction of a RTIS and RBIS and how important are they for your organisation / members?

## Issues

**Q4 What are the key issues, problems and gaps in the existing travel (and bus) information provision within the TACTRAN area for your organisation / members?**

## Vision and Objectives

**Q5 Bearing in mind the key issues, problems and gaps which you identified above, would you agree / disagree with the following draft vision, aims and objectives of the RTIS and the RBIS? (Please suggest any objectives that you think should also be included)**

### Draft Vision

*'Regional transport information provision which helps connect communities across the region and beyond, which is socially inclusive, enhances economy and promotes environmentally sustainable travel'*

### Draft Aims of RTIS

- to achieve a consistent and coherent approach to the provision of highquality travel information across all modes for all users and at all journey stages in the area; and
- to improve information and access to information which is available to travellers across the TACTRAN area, for all travel in the area, including that across local authority boundaries and between TACTRAN and other RTP areas.

### Draft Objectives of RTIS

- to enable all travellers in the region, including those making trips to/from places outside the region, to make informed choices about their travel which will result in more travellers choosing sustainable modes of transport;
- to improve their travel experience within and across the region;
- to ensure that all groups in the community have wider access to good travel choice information; and
- to improve the effectiveness and value-for-money of transport in the region.

### Draft Objectives of RBIS

- to help achieve national, regional and local transport objectives;
- to increase the use and accessibility of bus travel by ensuring that accurate and comprehensive bus information is available to existing and potential passengers at all stages of any bus journey;
- to define the 'required' levels of information and identify how this can be best provided;
- to identify and define the roles and responsibilities of TACTRAN, constituent local authorities and the transport providers, in respect of information provision in the TACTRAN area (including cost and delivery);
- to minimise severance and social and economic isolation caused by insufficient bus information; and
- to demonstrate the ease with which interchange can be made.

### Opportunities and Solutions

**Q6 What additional travel information would you like to be provided for the benefits of your organisation / members?**

**Q7 Where (at what location) would you like travel information to be provided for the benefits of your organisation /members?**

**Q8 How (in what format) would you like travel information to be provided for the benefits of your organisation /members?**

**Q9 Who do you think should be responsible for the provision of travel information?**

:	eg your organisation, TACTRAN, transport operators, local authority, other
Production of travel information	
Distribution	
Funding	
Other (please specify)	

**Q10 How do you think that we can increase/improve access to the wealth of information already available?**

**Q11 Can you identify any best practice examples from the region?**

Thank you for your comments and feedback. Your input is greatly appreciated and will help to shape the development of the final TACTRAN Regional Travel Information Strategy and Regional Bus Information Strategy.

**Data Protection:** Your details and answers will be kept on a database and used only for the purposes of this consultation; they will not be used for any other purpose.

Paper versions of this questionnaire, including a **large print version** are available by telephoning **0131 220 6966** during office hours.

If you require a translation or assistance in completing this questionnaire, please do not hesitate to contact the TACTRAN team on 0131 220 6966.

# Appendix C – List of Key Stakeholder Consultation Respondents

1.1.1 To date, there have been 24 respondents to the consultation exercise, namely:

- Auchterhouse Community Council, Angus;
- ByCycle;
- Cairngorms National Park;
- City Sightseeing Stirling;
- Citylink and Megabus;
- Community Transport Association;
- Confederation of Passenger Transport;
- CTC Right to Ride Network;
- DATAG and Dundee Community Transport;
- Dundee Access Group;
- First ScotRail;
- Montrose Port Authority;
- NHS Forth Valley;
- Paths for All Partnership;
- Perth and Kinross Community Transport Group;
- Ramblers Association Scotland;
- Scottish Association for Public Transport;
- Scottish Government Bus, Freight and Road Division;
- Scottish Natural Heritage;
- SESTRAN;
- SPT;
- Stagecoach Bluebird, East Scotland;
- Traffic Commissioner;
- Travel Dundee; and
- Visit Scotland.

# Appendix D – Bus Forum Workshop

## 1.1.1 Participants of the Bus Forum Workshop

- Age Concern Scotland
- Angus Access Panel
- Angus Council
- Angus College
- Confederation of Passenger Transport / Passengers' View
- Crieff Travel
- CTA (Community Transport Association)
- Dial a Journey
- Dundee accessible Transport Action Group (DATAG)
- Dundee City Council
- Dundee College
- First
- Hitrans
- Loch Lomond and Trossachs national Park
- NHS Forth Valley
- NHS Tayside
- Perth and Kinross Community Transport Group
- Perth and Kinross Council
- Scottish Citylink
- Scottish Government
- Scottish Pensioners Forum
- SEStran
- Stagecoach
- Stirling Council
- Travel Dundee

**MVA Consultancy provides advice on transport and other policy areas, to central, regional and local government, agencies, developers, operators and financiers.**

**A diverse group of results-oriented people, we are part of a 350-strong team worldwide. Through client business planning, customer research and strategy development we create solutions that work for real people in the real world.**

**For more information visit [www.mvaconsultancy.com](http://www.mvaconsultancy.com)**

#### **Birmingham**

Second Floor, 37a Waterloo Street  
Birmingham B2 5TJ United Kingdom  
T: +44 (0)121 233 7680 F: +44 (0)121 233 7681

#### **Dubai**

PO Box 123166 Dubai, 803 - 805 Arbift Tower  
Baniyas Road, Deira, Dubai UAE  
T: +971 (0)4 223 0144 F: +971 (0)4 223 1088

#### **Dublin**

First Floor, 12/13 Exchange Place  
Custom House Docks, IFSC, Dublin 1, Ireland  
T: +353 (0)1 542 6000 F: +353 (0)1 542 6001

#### **Edinburgh**

Stewart House, Thistle Street, North West Lane  
Edinburgh EH2 1BY United Kingdom  
T: +44 (0)131 220 6966 F: +44 (0)131 220 6087

#### **Glasgow**

Seventh Floor, 78 St Vincent Street  
Glasgow G2 5UB United Kingdom  
T: +44 (0)141 225 4400 F: +44 (0)141 225 4401

#### **London**

Second Floor, 17 Hanover Square  
London W1S 1HU United Kingdom  
T: +44 (0)20 7529 6500 F: +44 (0)20 7529 6556

#### **Lyon**

11, rue de la République, 69001 Lyon, France  
T: +33 (0)4 72 10 29 29 F: +33 (0)4 72 10 29 28

#### **Manchester**

25th Floor, City Tower, Piccadilly Plaza  
Manchester M1 4BT United Kingdom  
T: +44 (0)161 236 0282 F: +44 (0)161 236 0095

#### **Marseille**

76, rue de la République, 13002 Marseille, France  
T: +33 (0)4 91 37 35 15 F: +33 (0)4 91 91 90 14

#### **Paris**

12-14, rue Jules César, 75012 Paris, France  
T: +33 (0)1 53 17 36 00 F: +33 (0)1 53 17 36 01

#### **Woking**

First Floor, Dukes Court, Duke Street  
Woking, Surrey GU21 5BH United Kingdom  
T: +44 (0)1483 728051 F: +44 (0)1483 755207

**Email: [info@mvaconsultancy.com](mailto:info@mvaconsultancy.com)**

#### **Offices also in**

Bangkok, Beijing, Hong Kong, Shenzhen and Singapore

**mvaconsultancy**