

TIGER

RESPONSE TO NafW

POLICY REVIEW OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT

SEPTEMBER 2000

CONTENTS

Executive Summary

1. Introduction and Background
2. TIGER – Current Practice
3. Funding
4. Organisational Models
5. Key NAFW actions to Assist Authorities Delivery of Service

APPENDICES

- A TIGER Terms of Reference
- B Joint Passenger Transport Unit (JPTU) Summary of Roles
- C Role & Responsibilities of a PTA
- D Passenger Transport Authorities (a short history)

FIGURES

1. Existing Functional Arrangements for TIGER
2. Illustrative Possible Future Organisational Structure

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The TIGER consortium welcomes this opportunity to contribute to the debate about the organisational arrangements for managing public transport in the area and would be pleased to make a presentation of its case to the National Assembly.

TIGER considers that the current problems of public transport in the area are the result of years of neglect and under-funding rather than organisational problems. It is not convinced that overall a PTA would be any better placed to deliver the necessary improvements to infrastructure and services than current arrangements, given equal levels of funds.

The measures required involve many parties, the key ingredient is a partnership of equally committed parties. In its two years of existence TIGER considers that it has made substantial progress and established a robust basis for the future. The strength of the partnership is the critical success factor – TIGER has forged these and sees no reason to break them up to start again.

Local partnerships involving those officers, members and the private sector bodies directly affected, provide the best basis for dealing with the complex issues involved. In contrast PTA's would provide a single focus approach to public transport provision.

The emergence of Local Transport Plans provides the local authorities with a fully integrated approach, linking highway, planning, economic development and other responsibilities.

Members of the TIGER consortium wish to develop and strengthen existing successful arrangements and are already developing closer working arrangements with the National Assembly and with the adjacent SWIFT group. They are committed to an inclusive partnership and would welcome closer involvement of the Assembly. The National Assembly is already represented on the TIGER Working Party, but consideration could be given to their representation on the Chief Officer Group or to the evolution of a regular meeting between Assembly and Local members to be briefed on progress, plans and resolve difficulties. The vital role of the Assembly in delivering the TIGER objectives is not underestimated.

This response compares and contrasts a 'top down' approach, such as a PTA, with a 'bottom up' one such as TIGER. It concludes that the apparent benefits of PTA's in England are the result of historic and continuing funding advantages. PTA's are seen as remote, lacking in 'joined up' thinking – views supported by the Audit Commission and observers. **Figure 2** illustrates a potential evolution of the current partnership arrangements to provide a joined up structure for dealing with all public transport issues. This structure involves an evolution from the current successful arrangements to continue to deliver the growing responsibilities effectively, based on

established relationships.

This consortium believes that these arrangements will be capable of delivering the public transport responsibilities. We understand that the WLGA is advocating binding contracts be introduced and whilst we support the concept further discussions will be necessary to determine the details for this.

1.0 INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

1.1 The National Assembly's Environment, Planning and Transport Committee is undertaking a review of public transport in Wales, particularly in the context of their resolution to seek devolution of the power from central government to create Passenger Transport Authorities (PTA). The Assembly recognises however that the necessary primary legislation cannot be amended in the short term but are looking for short and long-term improvements to the current modus operandi.

1.2 This is the collective response of the five Unitary Authorities constituting TIGER (Transport Integration in the Gwent Economic Region), namely Blaenau Gwent, Caerphilly, Newport & Torfaen County Borough Councils and Monmouthshire County Council.

3. The TIGER consortium commenced in January 1998, with the objective of improving the public transport infrastructure network serving Greater Gwent. The need for a partnership, not only of the relevant authorities but also of the operators and others, was recognised from the start. Gwent Consultancy has been commissioned to manage the project on behalf of the consortium. The full terms of reference are attached (**Appendix A**).
4. TIGER was established prior to the publication of the White Paper and the introduction of LTP's and was designed to deal with infrastructure issues. Service issues are equally important and organisational arrangements may need to evolve to meet these service issues requirements. Some illustrative thoughts are attached (Figure 2).
5. Over the last two years TIGER has been developing its strategy for the Gwent area with the benefit of Transport Grant and European funding. Works on the strategy commenced in 1999/2000. In 2000/2001 the consortium were awarded Transport Grant to start works on three packages and continue to manage and develop the strategy. A submission has recently been submitted to the National Assembly for a Transport Grant of £4m for 2001/2002.
6. Most of the initial work of the Consortium has focussed on the development of the bus elements of the strategy. The focus is now shifting to encompass rail and interchange elements. For rail a stronger link with the adjacent SWIFT initiative may be necessary.

1.7 The TIGER consortium's initial view is that £50m (£80m if Ebbw Valley Rail included) is required to redress the lack of infrastructure investment in public transport in the area over recent decades. At current rates of expenditure this represents a 25 year programme, although we are

optimistic that the current government emphasis on public transport will be followed by additional funds and thereby reduce the programme significantly.

1.8 The TIGER consortium is a partnership between various public and private sector interests. **Figure 1** illustrates the current functional arrangements. A Working Party, with representatives from the local authorities, the Joint Passenger Transport Unit,(see 1.9 below) transport operators (bus & rail), consultative committees and NAFW, meets regularly to develop the strategy and determine priorities. At regular intervals a group of senior officers from the UA's meet to consider major policy issues which are then taken to a Steering Group of Local Authority members for final decisions.

1.9 The Joint Passenger Transport Unit (JPTU) (**Appendix B**) was set up on reorganisation by four of the Greater Gwent Authorities to deal with contracted services. Caerphilly manage their own contracted services. The Caerphilly representative also provides a link to the adjacent SWIFT consortium.

10. The consortium approach has had the full support of all parties and considerable strides have been made. It is against this background of a proven successful partnership that we have given objective consideration to the case for a Passenger Transport Executive/Authority in Wales. Serious consideration to the prospect of a PTA in Wales has been limited to South Wales. This is the most densely populated area in Wales, the one we know well and which is well suited to both bus and rail public transport services as a major part of the overall transport network.

1.11 The remainder of this response identifies the needs of the TIGER area, in terms of the funding necessary to meet the consortium objectives, and illustrates the way the organisational structures may develop in order to meet these objectives. Two possible organisational approaches are considered, namely 'top-down', as per a PTA structure, or 'bottom-up', as per TIGER and SWIFT. This response accepts that the TIGER approach may need to evolve to be even more joined-up in response to new transport planning arrangements and legislation.

2.0 TIGER - CURRENT PRACTICE

1. We believe that TIGER is already an example of good practices in 'joined up' working. The organisational structure has ensured that the views and aspirations of all parties are considered and has established a basis for the development of more formal Quality Partnerships.

2.2 TIGER has commissioned a number of innovative surveys and studies. It has prepared the first 'standard' in Wales for the layout of the waiting environment and commissioned the only comprehensive qualitative and quantitative market research. This involved 10 focus groups, 1400 on-bus passenger surveys and 1000 home interviews of infrequent public transport users. This has provided a wealth of evidence on which the developing strategy is based.

2.3 In addition the following major studies have been undertaken:

- Survey of bus stops (1600no.) on strategic routes in Greater Gwent and all routes in Newport

- Development of Bus Stop Design Standard
- Development of Accessibility Model to identify the benefits in time savings of various improvement measures and land-use planning issues.
- Feasibility Study of Bus Priority measures in Newport
- Study of maintenance requirements
- Journey time surveys
- Consultant advice on Marketing, Ticketing and Information
- Consultant advice on establishing Quality Partnerships

2.4 The following studies are planned for this year:

- Strategic study of the rail network in Gwent to set the framework for ongoing studies of new stations, improvement requirements of existing ones and services.
- Completion of bus stops survey work on local routes and accessibility model.
- Completion of work on quality partnerships
- A design/access study of Newport station
- Further work on options for real time information
- Development of the TIGER image.
- Data collection on mode share and service reliability to ensure future progress to be monitored
- Completion of the TIGER Strategy document

2.5 We have not sought to develop either the telephone enquiry or SMART card issues since these are already being progressed by PTI Cymru and the Caerphilly Pilot respectively. Initial consideration is being given to the provision of Real Time Information and a strategy review will be undertaken over the coming months with a view to implementation in 2002/03. One of the options here would be to tie a system into Cardiff's existing system with possible cost and operating efficiencies.

2.6 Progress in the two years of existence has therefore been considerable and the strategy for future years been set. Good relationships have been established with private sector partners and, as the strategy evolves and Quality Partnerships develop, the momentum should increase.

2.7 The main concern for the five local authorities remains funding. Historic funding of infrastructure and service support has been inadequate. This issue is considered further below.

3.0 FUNDING

3.1 In the limited time available it has not proved possible to do a complete comparison between funding of English PTA's and funding in the TIGER area. The following table however illustrates the substantially higher level of investment in infrastructure and services currently found in PTA's (Figures for 1999/00)

Area	Population	Concessionary Travel	Supported Bus Services	Rail +LRT	Total Revenue	Capital
All Wales	2,800	10,000 (3.57)	7,360 (2.63)	75,000 (26.80)	97,000 (36.60)	10,000 (3.57)
All PTA's	11,028	195,000 (17.68)	53,300 (4.83)	216,200 (19.60)	651,000 (59.11)	78,400 (7.11)
TIGER	450	*1,180 (3.08)	*1,044 (2.73)	?	?	**2,000 (4.44)

Figures in thousands (£ per capita)

* excludes figures for Caerphilly (per capita figures adjusted)

** figures for 2000/01. Capital expenditure 1999/00 was £0.

4.0 ORGANISATIONAL MODELS

Introduction

4.1 The functions necessary to support thriving public transport services for the populace of an area are numerous. The product for a single public transport journey consists of six individual elements:

- Enquiry
- Walk
- Wait
- Ride
- Walk
- Image

The passenger is only satisfied with the journey if all six elements are right for them. This in turn requires joined-up input from many departments of the local authority and the different public transport operators.

2. **Appendix C** lists the functions of a PTA and compares them with the current modus operandi in the TIGER area. This also clearly illustrates the numerous organisations involved in providing the product. **Appendix C** also demonstrates the complex relationships a PTA would have to develop in order to fulfil its functions. It also highlights the diverse roles and responsibilities and confirms the absolute imperative for a strong partnership of equals.
3. A true partnership maximises the effectiveness of the resources of each partner or stakeholder and needs to establish mutual objectives and methods of solving and resolving problems. It needs open communications and commitment to clear mutually shared goals with the risks and rewards shared, such that a win/win situation is created. This is not achieved by the imposition of any particular organisational structure but by the agreement of the stakeholders. This section now goes on to consider the two basic organisational models, namely **'bottom-up'** and **'top-down'**.

Bottom-up Models

4.4 The TIGER approach is 'bottom up'. The current TIGER structure relies on all the UA partners being equal and equally committed. The strengths of the current arrangement are that they have been voluntarily entered into, continue to be supported by all parties and are starting to deliver the product. The TIGER consortium is proud of the progress made to date and confident of its continuing potential. It recognises however that there are a number of ways the current structure could be further developed.

4.5 Current organisational arrangements may need to evolve to reflect developments of the LTP and legislation and could include the bringing together of consideration of capital and revenue spending, links with adjacent (SWIFT) area and with the National Assembly. These are considered in more detail below.

Capital/Revenue

4.6 Revenue support is managed by the JPTU (and Caerphilly), cleansing and maintenance are managed directly by the UA's, whilst Gwent Consultancy manages TIGER related capital investment issues. The joint TIGER committee set policies in consultation with stakeholders via the project organisation. The JPTU, Gwent Consultancy and the Authorities already work closely together. The local authorities keep operational arrangements under review to maximise the effectiveness of service delivery. They recognise that a closer organisational structure might provide some efficiencies of administration, better use of the technical and management skills and career development opportunities. The grouping together of functions is essential for small authorities but some of the larger authorities can provide many of the functions satisfactorily themselves, although they may need to avail themselves of communal services at times. Any new organisation will need to respect these differences and it will be for the authorities to evolve an organisation that suits them all.

TIGER/SWIFT Linkages

4.7 The two catchment areas are very different; SWIFT serves Cardiff and the Valleys. TIGER serves a more diverse area around Newport with links to Bristol and Cardiff.

4.8 SWIFT's initial strategy was almost entirely rail focussed whereas TIGER perceived benefit in upgrading bus infrastructure initially. There have also been debates as to whether the TIGER and SWIFT consortia should coalesce. Such an organisation would involve eleven unitary authorities, many different operators and it was feared that some of the partners, particularly the more local, small operators, would lose their focus in this larger pond and their commitment would go.

4.9 The preferred approach to date, particularly whilst TIGER has been determining its underlying strategy, has been to rely on Caerphilly to provide the necessary links to ensure that lessons and ideas are passed on and duplication of research effort is avoided. This linkage has been completely informal to date and there may be some merit in forging more formal arrangements under the South East Wales Transport Forum (SEWTF). This could include strategy and policy formation. Moreover it is known that SWIFT have not had the benefit of the free-standing project management afforded to TIGER and there may be a case for the two organisations having the benefit of combined professional project management and technical advice.

TIGER/NAfW Linkages

4.10 The consortium recognises the key contribution by the National Assembly makes to the TIGER strategy. TIGER was conceived in advance of the setting up of the National Assembly but it was always recognised that Central Government support in the shape of funds, organisational framework, legal and policy direction would be essential to sustain the initial vision. This remains the case today.

4.11 The National Assembly have been represented on the TIGER working group at officer level

from day one and the officers responsible for Transport Grant and ERDF have been kept fully informed and involved and have been very supportive. The previous Assembly Secretary –Peter Law- was given a briefing presentation in October 1999 and a similar briefing of the current Assembly Secretary – Sue Essex –

is planned for this Autumn. An attempt was made last Autumn to give Assembly Members a similar briefing but it proved impossible to co-ordinate sufficient diaries. There are therefore very real and positive linkages at officer level between TIGER and the National Assembly.

4.12 Central Government has three crucial roles to play, namely providing the funds from general taxation, setting the legal and organisational framework for provision of services by operators and setting the policy framework which supports the role of public transport viz a viz private vehicles. The way these roles are delivered on the street is legitimately the role of the local authority who can co-ordinate the public transport role with the implications for all the other societal issues at the local level.

4.13 Transport Authorities whether UA's or a PTA are pivotal to the new transport agenda. Deregulation means that authorities' opportunities to address many quality issues are severely constrained. Partnerships are vital. Furthermore, in order to achieve the desired shift away from the car and the desired casualty reduction targets a carrot and stick approach across the authorities' responsibilities is required. They need to promote bus lanes and they need to be enforced. These propose policies and measures designed to get the right balance between restricting cars to town centres and potential damage to retail trade, to give public transport needs early consideration in relation to planning issues. These are questions of balance and sustainability and are appropriate for decisions at the local level by the Unitary Authorities.

4.14 A further advantage of the current arrangements are the links to Newport Transport, the local authority owned bus operator in Newport. Similar arrangements occur in Cardiff (Cardiff Bus) and Caerphilly (Islwyn Transport). The current links ensure that the TIGER and JPTU can influence the operating company and vice versa to the benefit of all. The consortium is concerned at the way private industry is moving towards a monopoly situation where prices will inevitably rise. It sees considerable benefits in maintaining public sector providers.

4.15 **Figure 2** illustrates tentatively how the above thoughts may produce an organisational model which keeps the benefits of the local partnerships of SWIFT and TIGER, maintains functional flexibility for each UA, whilst formalising the links at political level and with the National Assembly. The precise relationships between the several bodies would need discussion to ensure all parties perceive a benefit to their objectives.

The Top-Down Model

4.16 The proposal of the Assembly resolution is that they would take the powers to themselves to create Passenger Transport Authorities (PTA). They recognise that the necessary primary legislation will not be amended in the short term but are looking for short term and long term improvements to the current modus operandi. The National Assembly is unlikely to be able to put a PTA in place in

less than five years – five years when current arrangements need to be supported, enhanced/developed and adequate funding provided.

4.17 A PTA is simply a single purpose authority set up to promote public transport alone. The top-down model run by the National Assembly as Central Government has proposed, would be unique in the UK. The current Passenger Transport Authorities (PTA's) are all run by consortia of local authority members.

4.18 For information, the background to the current PTA's is attached at **Appendix D**. It is often thought that a prime advantage of PTA's is their powers to raise funds. However these powers are no longer available. They now have to submit their bid proposals to their local councils each year and then, following the annual grant assessments, they negotiate the amount each authority will provide.

19. Their main advantage would now appear to be their single-minded focus on providing quality public transport services, without the distractions of the wider remit a multi-purpose authority has. In England they have now been in existence for over twenty years and the apparent benefits are there to be seen in the major English conurbations. However this may have been achieved under earlier and more helpful funding and legislative regimes and it is interesting to note that despite the apparent advantages, the percentage of travel on public transport in these areas is not dissimilar to that in Newport and Cardiff. This may have something to do with the density of the services provided by the local authority owned companies and/or with relative income levels.
20. Over the years, particularly the early years, the English PTA's appear to have had considerable funds and a large proportion of their budgets have been used to support more generous concessionary fares. For example in Manchester OAP's and 16-18 year olds can make integrated cross city trips for a flat rate fare of 37p. Large concessions are expensive.
21. The disadvantages of a PTA are that they are remote from the people and potentially at odds with the wider responsibilities of the local authorities. For example in Newport the consortium are currently preparing proposals for bus priority measures along one of the main radials (Chepstow Road). This is involving numerous facets of local highway authority responsibilities (junction design & capacity, parking provision, provisions for loading, pedestrians and cyclists). It also involves a major brownfield site redevelopment which has certain access requirements in order to be viable and which is contributing money to elements of the improvements. These are the responsibility of the Economic Development team. There are also a number of planning issues involved. The project is controversial and its success will depend on close working of numerous officers with differing responsibilities and the active support of members of Newport Council. This support has been cultivated through a long process of policy development. Such support would prove much more difficult to achieve and then be less robust to criticism if it were the responsibility of an imposed body in Cardiff.
22. The Audit Commissions recent document 'All Aboard' touched on similar areas of concern:

"Uncertainty about whether value for money is being obtained from public subsidy prompts questions about the appropriateness of current arrangements to oversee much of that expenditure. The PTAs were established in a different era – when their executives actually ran many services

themselves – and may need modernisation. The six PTAs and their Executives employ 3,000 staff and cost around £18 million per year, though they fulfil what is primarily a purchasing role. These organisations, and the few direct services that they still provide (Tyne and Wear Metro and various tunnels and ferries), have not been exposed to the competitive tendering regime that secured economies in other parts of local government. The PTA members come from the constituent metropolitan district councils; there is no direct link with local electors and alignment with other service objectives can be weak. For example, in one area, millions of pounds are spent by the PTA

on concessionary fares for the elderly while other services for older people are being cut because of budget constraints. Some local government officers question whether a single-service precepting authority can balance competing local priorities, and point to the absence of an overarching framework to direct resources to where they are most needed".

23. The clear message here that an imposed organisational structure may not be able to deliver the complex requirements as well as a partnership. It would also be a retrograde step to reintroduce a Wales wide authority in Public Transport when the Reorganisation of Wales sought to introduce local authorities with full responsibilities for actions in their areas. In Greater Gwent they have chosen to work in partnership with neighbouring authorities on a number of fronts including public transport, but the responsibility remains with individual authorities.
24. As part of the research for this response we contacted a number of officers working inside and alongside PTA's and some consultants with experience of working for PTA's. A representative selection of their comments is attached at **Appendix E**. The comments suggest that there is no clear advantage to be gained from having a PTA. However, although there is a consensus that they have been able to deliver more funding, at least historically, there is also concern as to their effectiveness and efficiency in using these monies. There are also clear indications of additional political tensions between them and the local authorities they serve. They seem to have been able to promote major rail or light rail projects better than bus service development. The benefit of having one body to co-ordinate matters is recognised although it is suggested that the bottom up model already operated by the Consortium could achieve this.

5. KEY NAFW ACTIONS TO ASSIST AUTHORITIES' DELIVERY OF SERVICE

5.1 The delivery of a good public transport service depends on a number of co-ordinated actions by various bodies to provide a seamless and quality product. The NafW has a key role to play in three key areas, namely funding, regulation, policy and Wales wide issues such as Information.

2. **Funding** - The last thirty years have been characterised by under-investment in public transport. Over the last two years central government has indicated its desire to reverse this and early indications are encouraging in respect of capital funding. However, the delivery of the TIGER strategy needs substantial funding levels to be maintained and certainly increased. There is a major backlog of infrastructure works to reach PTE standards. Expenditure on infrastructure in 99/00 was £0. A shortage of complementary revenue funds to maintain the network of supported services remains a serious concern. Allied to the foregoing are the difficulties of maintaining public transport infrastructure such as stations and bus stops. With increasing demands on their budgets local authorities have found themselves unable to provide sufficient funds to maintain this non-statutory service.

3. **Regulation** – The National Assembly should seek to assume all the outstanding DETR transport powers and ensure that quality partnerships are introduced under the new Transport Act.
4. **Policy** – The National Assembly has a key role to play in defining and promoting co-ordinated planning, economic and transport policies for Wales. Indeed its first national strategic plan ‘Better Wales’ already does this. Local Transport Plans provide the means of implementing these policies and of identifying good practice at the local level, and the lower UAs to deliver these policies in a consistent, efficient and co-ordinated manner.
5. The National Assembly also needs to take the lead in promoting sustainable policies and in influencing public attitudes, considering the introduction of public transport audits for new schemes and developments and generally encourage public transport initiatives in relation to trunk road issues.

APPENDIX A

TIGER

(Transport Integration in the Gwent Economic Region)

TERMS OF REFERENCE

To develop a strategy for the development of an efficient, convenient, affordable and environmentally beneficial public transport network for the Greater Gwent area (Blaenau Gwent, Caerphilly, Monmouthshire, Newport and Torfaen) which concentrates on the corridors radiating from central Newport and which is capable of attracting an increased share of the market for daily travel.

In particular the strategy should seek, in the most cost effective manner, to ensure that the following key objectives are met.

- a. that the most appropriate mix of public transport modes for each corridor is identified;
- b. that all public transport links along these corridors will be able to fully realise their potential and maximise their contribution to the economy of the Greater Gwent region;
- c. that the growth in car use along these corridors can be controlled and the environmental impact of congestion can be reduced by the introduction of a high quality, image conscious and more sustainable network based on a public transport product which is able to offer seamless accessibility throughout.
- d. that the network is supported by complementary land use and transport policies such as restricting the supply of parking, increased enforcement of traffic orders, park and ride, segregated bus priorities, selective vehicle detection and favourable traffic management;
- e. that the existing public transport infrastructure is fully utilised and improvements made to ensure that the network is attractive, safe, convenient and competitive with the car in terms of cost and time;
- f. that existing public transport proposals, such as those to investigate the potential for the reopening of the Western Valley Line for passenger services or for a new railway station for the LG site, are co-ordinated within the wider context;
- g. that the network is capable of maximising the modal split towards public transport by 2010;
- h. that the best opportunities for public transport to fully realise its role in meeting future travel demand be utilised;
- i. that the maximum efforts be made to secure Challenge, Transport Grant and European funding, in partnership with the private sector operations;
- j. that a management structure is established capable of taking decisions (Members Steering Committee), co-ordinating progress (Chief Officers Group) and developing ideas (Technical Group*).

The TIGER strategy is being developed to promote measures to meet the above objectives. It is a 20 year strategy which will include measures to improve bus and rail facilities, bus priorities, integration between bus/rail and other modes, improved travel information and ticketing.

***Note: The Technical Group is known as the Working Party**

APPENDIX B

JOINT PASSENGER TRANSPORT UNIT (JPTU) SUMMARY OF ROLES

The JPTU was established in 1996 during Local Government reorganisation. Its task is primarily to undertake the management and procurement of socially necessary bus services covering the former Gwent County Council area (comprising Blaenau Gwent, Monmouthshire, Newport and Torfaen). The Unit also administers the area-wide Gwent Concessionary Fare Scheme. The key objective in establishing the Unit was to continue to co-ordinate Council support for services in the area for reasons of achieving service delivery benefits and value for money. Blaenau Gwent act as the 'Host Authority' employing the Unit's staff and providing accommodation, facilities and central support services. The costs of the Unit are recharged to the constituent authorities on an agreed apportionment basis.

The manager of the JPTU is responsible directly to the Director of the Environment and Development at Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council, and also reports to the client officers responsible for transport in the three other constituent authorities. The Unit has an estimated annual budget in the region of £2.49 million for 2000/01

The responsibilities of the Unit are to:

- Advise the constituent client officers on public transport policy/strategy formulation and the assessment of need/eligibility;
- Provide attendance at groups such as the South Wales Rail Forum, ATCO, and TIGER, along with responses to industry consultations;
- Manage and administer the Councils' networks of socially necessary bus services including co-ordination,

tendering, payments and monitoring;

- Administer the Council's concessionary fare scheme and issue of bus passes (the latter currently subcontracted to the Post Office);
- Promote public transport through marketing and related initiatives, including publicity;
- Administer grants for community transport services.

Since the Transport Act and deregulation of the bus industry in 1985, prior to Compulsory Competitive Tendering and Best Value initiatives, Councils have had a statutory duty to consider value for money in the way it delivers services. The existing joint working is undoubtedly the mechanism for the participating council's to deliver this obligation. The arrangements:

- Retain local control and accountability in terms of assessing local needs and adherence to the policies set by the individual authority for what is, in the most part, essentially local services funded by local chargepayers;
- Provides economies of scale in terms of staffing requirements and cost benefits, balanced against local control and accountability, including monitoring and information services;
- Provision of a facility for an emergency response, if appropriate, to commercial or subsidised services being withdrawn at short notice;
- Reduce conflicts in demand, within the sub-regional, that might occur through procurement by individual local councils. Similarly, the potential for operators playing 'off one client against another' is reduced;
- Reduces the number of cross boundary negotiations and agreements, again, balanced against the need for local control and accountability. (NB however big the area there will always be a boundary and associated issues).
- Make more effective use of specialist skills and expertise, combined with the benefits of shared experience;
- Provide consistency in service and contract specification across the sub-region;
- Improve service continuity at route and network level;
- Give Council's more influence in negotiations through being able to control specifications and contracts across a wider area;
- Have the potential to derive the maximum benefits from integration with school transport;

Whilst individually, the participating Councils do not have their own dedicated capability, may have to compromise on contract specifications, and also have their financial flexibility slightly restricted, there are no overall disadvantages. Obviously, the existence of several budget holders adds a complexity to financial arrangements but this is a small price to pay given the advantages.

APPENDIX C

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES of PTE's	Current Position in TIGER area
1. Social bus services and contracts	JPTU + Caerphilly
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Subsidise rail services 	SRA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Operate Dial-a- Ride facilities (Community Transport etc) 	UA's + CTA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Concessionary and free travel schemes 	JPTU + Caerphilly
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Public transport information and travel centres 	Not currently provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Run telephone enquiry service 	PTI Cymru
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Public Transport policy advice to PTA and district councils 	TIGER / UA's / JPTU
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Issue passes (for blind / disabled) 	UA's/
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Co-ordinate and promote multi modal tickets 	Not currently provided (Limited provision by Operators)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide and operate bus stations 	UA's + Private Sector
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide and maintain bus stops and shelters 	UA's + (Commercial advertisers under agreement)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Invest in bus and rail improvements 	TIGER/SRA / UA's / Operators / Railtrack
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Promote public transport awareness 	TIGER/UA's/Operators/NAfW

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marketing and promotional campaigns 	TIGER/UA's/Operators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deal with comments, queries and complaints 	JPTU / UA's / Operators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 year and 20 year Public Transport Strategy (with PTA) 	TIGER 20 yr strategy UA's via LTP's (5yr only) 15Year UDPS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with Shadow Strategic Rail Authority and partners 	TIGER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnerships with L A's ,NHS Trusts, operators etc 	UA's / TIGER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality Partnerships 	TIGER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PTE invest in new bus shelters 	TIGER/UAs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus operator provide new low floor easy access buses 	Operators/UA's
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LA provide bus priority/ demand management measures 	TIGER/UA's
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prioritise areas/ network for upgrades and improvements 	TIGER / UA's/SEWTF
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential Park and Ride sites and new rail station sites 	TIGER/UA's
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operate station car parks (hence promoting Park and Ride) 	TOCs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide experimental services to/from new developments 	UA's/Developers/Community Councils
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Own and operate transport services 	Newport(Newport Transport) Caerphilly (Islwyn Transport)

PTE's do not:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manage rail tracks 	Railtrack

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage trains 	TOC's
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specify rail service routes 	SRA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide highway capacity for bus priority measures 	UA's
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have responsibility for Highways 	UA's
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Control planning economic and social policy framework 	UA's
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look after highways 	UA's

APPENDIX D

Passenger Transport Authorities (a short history)

The first PTA's were established under the 1968 Transport Act. The first four were established in Merseyside, Greater Manchester, West Midlands and Tyne & Wear. Glasgow was added in 1972. PTA's determined the policy and the PTE executives (PTE) undertook the delivery of the policies. The PTAs were appointed directly by the Minister of Transport. The Transport Act introduced capital and revenue grants for public transport operations and although they did not take over British Rail operations in their areas they were given access to grants to subsidise socially necessary services and hence ended up being responsible for most commuter lines in their areas. In most cases the PTE also owned the local bus operator.

The original structure only lasted 6 years. Following the 1972 Local Government Act, which established the new metropolitan authorities e.g. Greater Manchester County Council (GMC), the PTA's were run by the new metropolitan counties. Two new PTE's were established in South and West Yorkshire.

The new metropolitan counties were based on travel to work areas and introduced a new era of integrated transport

planning. Highway and public transport planning for the first time in these areas came under one authority.

The metropolitan counties were abolished in 1986. Control of the PTA's then passed to the new Unitary Authorities. The Authorities boards now being composed of elected Members drawn from each authority. Typically PTA's boards have two members drawn from each authority who determine policies to be carried out by the Executive which is composed of Officers.

The PTE's were forced to divest their bus operations following the 1985 Transport Act. Some such as GMPTE used the money from their sale to pay for new light rail systems. PTA's now have no direct funding powers relying on bidding and negotiation with their constituent authorities for their funds.

Today PTEs are still responsible for:

- Concessionary Travel schemes (significantly more generous than elsewhere)
- Revenue Support for socially necessary Bus & Rail* Services
- Capital Expenditure on Infrastructure, including planning and promotion of new schemes
- Maintenance of capital assets

*PTEs have control of the revenue support for local rail services in their area

APPENDIX E

Comments received re English PTAs

As part of the research for this paper we have spoken to people within the PTA's, in local authorities within PTA boundaries and with consultants with experience of working in PTA areas. The following is a representative collection of their comments:

In transport planning and logistics terms a PTE makes good sense since it deals with journey to work catchment areas and recognises that trips cross artificial local authority boundaries.

PTA's have generally been more successful in promoting new innovative (light) rail projects than improving bus services – this reflects the nature of their powers. Items like the Manchester metro would have been less likely to progress under small authorities although with a County Council it might have done so.

The PTE has little influence over the quality of the commercial bus services in the PTE area. They also struggle to maintain quality of rail services.

An independent body is required to promote cross boundary initiatives, however there is no reason why Gwent

Consultancy or an expanded JPTU couldn't fulfil this role.

One single body to integrate all public transport modes can be very successful and can get Public Transport needs catered for at earliest stages for developments. The main advantage is the single focus although this may antagonise local authorities with their wider responsibilities.

Co-operation between PTA and local authorities varies from OK to worrying

Co-operation is normally poorvery political....

Co-operation generally very good but occasionally an authority wants to do its own thing. Obstacles are overcome through good relationships and several joint committees.

There are tensions between local authorities and PTA as a result of the single focus versus multiple responsibility issue.

PTA's have probably been able to deliver more than would otherwise have been the case as they have access to more expertise than is available to a smaller authority. Have been able to involve major bus operators to the extent that they are investing £30m over 3 years towards infrastructure projects.significantly more money has gone into public transport as a result of PTE's existence.

Don't think that districts and residents get value for money from their PTE's. They do not seem to answer to anybody and it is hard to measure their performance.

*Local authorities generally now support PTA rather than doing it themselves although after 30 years it is difficult to imagine doing it otherwise. **Some local authorities would channel monies into education or infrastructure....***

Cost of setting up and running a PTA needs careful consideration. Funding is now sorted out after DETR grant settlements in December each year, by negotiation between authorities.

Rail funding is available through the Metropolitan Railway Grant which is reimbursed each year by central government albeit on a reducing scale in line with franchise support cut backs.