

PUBLIC SERVICE TRANSPORT

DEPARTMENT/SECTION: CHIEF EXECUTIVE / TRANSPORT
CONTACT OFFICER: ASHLEY HOLLAND, TRANSPORT OFFICER

BEST VALUE REVIEW DATE:
 2004/05

DEFINE SERVICE

WHAT: Public Transport Service Provision

WHY: Statutory duty under 1985 Transport Act. To serve the community, improve access and reduce social exclusion.

HOW: Contract Bus Companies, Local Taxi Companies and Central Trains.

WHO: Rutland County Council Transport Department.

CORPORATE PRIORITY: To seek continuous improvement in service quality and responsiveness to the needs of the public.

DEPARTMENT PLANS: Local Bus Service Strategy.

STATUTORY PLANS: Local Transport Plan.

SERVICE POLICIES: Value for money/passenger subsidy criteria.

CROSS CUTTING ISSUES: Community Transport, Concessionary Travel, Mainstream Education Transport

IDENTIFY SERVICE USERS/BENEFICIARIES: The general public.

PARTNERS: Bus Companies, Local Taxi Companies, other local authorities, Council Members, local businesses.

REVIEW OF EXISTING SERVICE (Challenge)

RESOURCES 2000/01: (1999/2000 in brackets) *This salary is held within the Strategic Unit budget	Total budget	LBS £53,400 (53,400) RBG £107,010 (107,010)	Major capital projects / investments	East Midlands Public Transport Information System £37,405 SCA
	Staffing Budget	£14,500 Included in RBG budget £8155* Transport Officer	Changes to purchasing proposals?	None
	Service Charges	Fares charged to public. Approx. £78,000 income on contract services included in LBS Budget Total.	Capital Assets	None
	Forecast Budget for 2001/02	Not available	Number of FTE employees	Rural Bus Grant Admin. 100% Transport Officer 35%
STAFF MANAGEMENT:	Staff training requirements:	Passenger Transport Co-ordinator Certificate.		
	Staff Communication:	Employment Development Programme Team Reviews Team Meetings		

Team Reviews

Dates Held:31.01.2000

Outcomes: Improve communication between Council Departments and knowledge of other department plans, projects and strategies.

Increase joint planning with other LA's and Bus Companies to further external investment and improve service frequency and quality.

Standardise public transport information.

KEY OBJECTIVES FOR 2000/2001

Key Objectives	Criteria for selection
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To develop the bus network through partnerships with commercial operators and neighbouring authorities. Improve service frequency and interchange connections 2. Encourage investment from bus companies and raise operator standards. 3. Promote use of public transport by improving local provision of transport information. 4. Introduce the regional bus enquiry line. 5. Review current fares structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Consultation Staff Consultation Team Review Government Objectives Internal Audit Recommendation

Long Term Objectives

Year 2 – 2001/02	To Continue to develop local bus/regional bus network to provide regular, frequent services and improve connections between services. Work together with Bus Companies to encourage investment in existing commercial routes. Develop regional bus strategy through partnership with neighbouring authorities. Introduce County standard timetable information and develop parish booklets.
Year 3 – 2002/03	Introduce through ticketing to connecting services. Improve bus stop facilities through partnerships with parish councils and bus companies. Investigate possibility of increasing service frequency.
Year 4 – 2003/04	Improve bus access and quality. Eg. Low sulphur diesel. Low floor buses. Work towards achieving a bus/rail interchange.
Year 5 – 2004/05	

SUSTAINABILITY IMPACTS

Social	Reduce social exclusion, link rural villages to towns providing access to essential amenities and social activities.
Economic	Provide access to employment, local business and education .
Environmental	Reduces car travel and damage to the environment.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR 2000/01 (Compare)

INDICATOR	National (N) or Local (L)	Previously an ACPI?	Performance 1999/2000 (estimate)	00/01 BV Target	BV Performance Standard	Mid term 00/01 progress update	1998/99 Outcome (target in bracket)	1997/98 Outcome (target in bracket)
Strategic Objectives (long term)	LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN (Strategic Objectives Included in Plan)	N	No	yes	Statutory Requirement	Statutory Requirement	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Effectiveness	Local Bus Services (Km's per year)(BVPI101)	N	No	Not avail.			-	-
	Council Subsidised LBS	L	No	Not avail.			-	-
	Rural Bus Grant Services	L	No	Not avail.			-	-
	Commercial Services	L	No	Not avail.			-	-
	Local Bus Services (journey's per year)(BVPI102)	N	No	Not avail.			-	-
	Council Subsidised Services	L	No	69,200			-	-
	Rural Bus Grant Services	L	No	9000est.			-	-
	Commercial Services	L	No	Not avail.			-	-
Quality	% of users satisfied with LBS (BVPI104)	N	No	To be assessed			N/A	N/A
	% of users satisfied with local provision of public transport information (BVPI103)	N	No				N/A	N/A
Cost and efficiency indicators	Cost per passenger journey of subsidised Bus Services (BVPI94)	N	Yes (P7)	£2.05			(P7) £4.26	(P7) £3.93
	Local Bus Services	L	No	£0.77				
	Rural Bus Grant Services	L	No	£11.89			N/A	N/A
(Equity) Clarity, fairness and access	% of population provided with an acceptable level of services. (*Population Criteria)	L	No	97.5%			97.5%	78.5%
	Concessionary travel scheme operated	L	No	YES			YES	YES
	Expenditure on publicity (RBG Budget)	L	No	£10,000			£10,000	N/A

Criteria for target selection

--	--

Comparative data – Benchmarking

Benchmarking with?	Other Local Authorities within the East Midlands ATCO Best Value Working Group have been identified although at this stage the are no definite agreements set.
--------------------	--

Comparison with similar LA's/organisations	Cost of service : Higher/similar/lower Not Available Activity: Higher/similar/lower Not Available
--	--

CONSULTATION

Who has been consulted?:	Previous consultation on public transport has taken place since April 1997. Those consulted where: General Public, Bus Operators, Bus Users, Local Businesses, Young People, Voluntary Sector, Parish Councils. Extensive Travel Needs Survey, Staff Travel Survey, Transport Forum, Teentrans Survey, Youth Forum, Youth Council, Parish Groups, Poor evening services, access to activities(youth/Parish/Voluntary Sector), Poor Access to Employment (Youth/Parish), Information Services. Bus Users Satisfied but car users not informed(Youth/Parish), Timetables Unclear. Improve publicity of car schemes and dial-a-rides. Bus Stops. Poor lighting and location. Insufficient number(Parish, Youth). Bus Service. Poor frequency of buses. High Fares(Parish Group), Poor connection of services. (Local Bus Strategy)
Consultation Techniques used:	
Consultation Results/issues raised:	
Future changes to methods used to improve results:	

REVIEW – AUDIT – INSPECTION (Monitoring Performance)

Have you completed a formal review yet?	If yes, complete below. If no, move onto inspection. NO
BEST VALUE REVIEW PROCESS	No Review to Date
INSPECTION	No Inspection to Date
AUDIT	No Audit to Date
EXTERNAL ADVISORS	

COMPETE

What is the current market for the provision of this service?	
What new combinations of services have been suggested?	
Have suppliers/contractors/legal agreements/commercial, business, voluntary sectors/other LAs been negotiated with where appropriate?	
What is the best way to produce the service?	

OTHER INFORMATION:	ASHLEY HOLLAND (TRANSPORT OFFICER) EXT.290
---------------------------	--

QUERIES / CONTACTS:
FOR FULL DOCUMENTATION CONTACT: