



Appendix C

Consultation on draft criteria for assessing
subsidised bus services – appendix of
comments

August 2014

Rebecca Robinson and Sean Davies

August 2014

For further information on the work of the Corporate Research and Intelligence Team, please contact us at:

Living in Lancashire
Lancashire County Council
County Hall
Preston
PR1 8XJ

Tel: 0808 1443536
www.lancashire.gov.uk/profile

Contents

1.	Journey purpose, business growth	1
	1.1 <i>Disagreement with proposed criterion</i>	1
	1.2 <i>Suggested other categories</i>	7
2.	Sustainable economic growth	11
	2.1 <i>Disagreement with proposed criterion</i>	11
	2.2 <i>Suggested other options</i>	15
3.	Impact on carbon emissions	17
	3.1 <i>Disagreement with proposed criterion</i>	18
	3.2 <i>Suggested other options</i>	20
4.	Operational service days	21
	4.1 <i>Disagreement with proposed criterion</i>	21
	4.2 <i>Suggested other options</i>	26
5.	Accessibility – travel choice	28
	5.1 <i>Disagreement with proposed criterion</i>	28
	5.2 <i>Suggested other options</i>	31
6.	Access for older and disabled people	33
	6.1 <i>Disagreement with proposed criterion</i>	33
	6.2 <i>Suggested other options</i>	36
7.	Service usage	37
	7.1 <i>Disagreement with proposed criterion</i>	37
	7.2 <i>Suggested other options</i>	42
8.	Overall	44

1. Journey purpose, business growth

1.1 Disagreement with proposed criterion

Respondents who disagree with the suggested categories and scores were asked why they disagree. All comments are provided below.

The bus transport needs of a rural community are different from an urban community. The chance of an employment starting time and a bus arrival time corresponding is remote. Rural workers use cars to get to & from work because of this and the unreliability of rural bus services. So I would put Education 5, Health etc 4, Shopping 3, Employment 2, Personal 1 for a rural bus service. Proposals OK for urban services.

Services providing access to employment, education and health should all surely have a score of 10

Leisure (Social recreation needs a higher percentage) Most people in employment use own transport. No mention of senior citizens.

The various categories, whilst worthy in themselves, are dealt with in isolation. They should be related to a strategic bus network, which would also be a key component of an integrated transport network. The individual categories would then be sub-divided. In any case most bus services will be "near" a school/health facility/shops so will get similar scores.

Personal/business/leisure as important as health - isolation/loneliness of older people ie score 4.

Personal/business and leisure equally important as health/medical/welfare.

LCC should provide transport as part of the public service requirement for the area. I can name villages that have not seen a bus in years ie Caldervale, Pilling, Winmareigh.

Shopping and personal business and leisure are just as important as the other categories. Particularly if you are elderly and live in a rural area.

In rural areas shopping for the elderly without cars requires 100% need of the bus service. Therefore shopping should be a 4.

It is important to know exactly what metrics Lancashire has used to measure these scores. For example if jobs are seen as more important than shopping for example is this because employment adds more to the economy than shopping. More people access high streets by bus than by any other mode, bringing a combined retail and

leisure spend of £27.2bn (Institute for Transport studies (2012) Buses and Economic Growth). The bus service network review - revised criteria explanation does not go into nearly enough detail on this and it is not clear why access to education has a lower score than accessing employment. Buses are vital for connecting young people to the opportunities that help them to achieve their potential, without easy access to education, young people immediately have increased limitation to achieving their potential.

There should be greater weighting towards Health and Medical. Shopping/Personal Business are important for rural areas, rural isolation for elderly, young people and disabled must be considered. Evening bus service also starts too early. The score can only be a maximum of 10 - this should be removed.

Personal business and leisure should be given higher credence if travel by bus is to form a viable alternative to the car. Passengers depend upon bus services for all or most travelling requirements where they use public transport and the younger classes often depend upon buses for recreational and social purposes, including travel throughout evenings and Sundays. If the option of using buses at these times is not available then the potential is that bus will not be chosen at all as a mode of travel:

I would give health/medical/welfare a higher score

Whilst all are important it is wrong to give a low score to personal business and leisure as there are still many people without a car or indeed those who for a variety of reasons cannot drive and have no access to lifts etc. Taxis are expensive - eg £14 return from Catterall to Garstang Clinic! A distance of one and a half miles!!

The first 3 categories are of equal importance

In tourist areas should 'leisure' be a higher priority?

I think shopping and personal business/leisure should have equal status i.e. be one category rated 3 points. Otherwise there is still a great need to use cars.

I believe that travel costs associated with work should not be subsidised more strongly than for education/medical/accessibility since commercial arrangements can be encouraged in other ways and the other needs largely cannot

I believe the majority of users within my Parish use public transport to access education THEN to attend health/medical/welfare opportunities THEN for shopping. I believe that those wanting to use public transport to go to / return from work would struggle in our community (because of the route & the timetable) and would already have made other arrangements.

Hardly anyone uses the bus service to get to work. I would score personal business and leisure higher and include this in the same category as shopping, which for many people is a leisure activity.

"Leisure" includes tourism which, especially in rural areas, is an important economic activity. Undervaluing tourism access to, say, the Hodder valley and rural Lancashire could degenerate local businesses, increase the carbon footprint of rural economies and deny access to leisure for non-car users and visitors from outside the county. Sunday and Bank Holiday access to, say, Chipping is impossible now - forcing visitors to use cars. This isn't joined-up rural economic planning. We need something like the Dales Bus system.

Bus services are a service provided and subsidised by LCC and should remain so to meet the needs of the outlying communities who have not other forms of transport available. This would isolate these communities even more so if these subsidies are discontinued.

There is a strongly implied judgement here regarding the relative value of each journey purpose specified. I would argue that all are equally valid and it is the need for transport itself rather than the purpose of the journey that is important. I agree that the 40% revenue measure is probably inadequate.

Too high a score is given to employment. Bus usage to/from work is relatively low even on commercial services hence relatively unimportant. Criterion assumes employment is in town centres or business parks, whereas this might not always be the case (agricultural work?) No account appears to be being taken of whether the times of the proposed services passing the various employment/education/health etc facilities are suitable for passengers wishing to use them. Criteria weighting should reflect current usage patterns with highest weighting given to greatest current journey purpose.

Health 4 education 3

I think that people who do not work or don't have families are less likely to have their own transport. Being unemployed or retired, not having children and being in good health does not mean that you should be isolated by a lack of public transport. Journeys for social reasons are just as valid as any others. I feel that the focus should be on the absence of alternatives.

Very much agree

No measure of how many changes of buses between population centres and job opportunities. Eg a person living in East Preston working in West Preston (eg the Docks) has to change buses increasing cost and time.

Personal business and leisure trips should be higher score as they support the economy

The no 75 bus which I believe is under review, provides a lifeline for many elderly people living in the Hardhorn area,--who like me live alone and have no other means of transport...I appreciate the fact that these passengers are not financially viable but nevertheless their needs should be taken into consideration.

Scoring is on a whole done on a reasonable basis, however, I would strongly disagree with the section regarding a route's viability on the total number of passenger journeys across a day/week/month(?). It would be prudent to look at each journey, on each contract, and where journeys with little or no usage are operated, they are withdrawn, even on a route that meets all the criteria, and then you will be able to continue to operate some of the more marginal journeys on other contracts. Passengers loadings can be requested from the larger operators, and if I'm not mistaken you should have the information at your fingertips for the small operators as you look after their ETMs. Having worked in the private sector (albeit sometime ago) you should know to look at individual journeys as opposed to a service as a whole.

Lancaster and surrounding areas ie Morecambe are significantly rural in places and have a high population of older people and those with a disability. It always feels that as a local citizen of Lancaster priority is given to students rather than those who contribute all year round. They should be seen as a place where everyone's Health and Wellbeing is top of the agenda. The new road is being built to help with congestion and there are significant amounts of people who commute to places of work with their car for personal reasons or there are no buses/trains to get them close enough to work. The priorities should be done in consultation with your local population! Local business would want people to be able to access the towns and the events taking place but if there are no buses then trade will drop!

I have an issue with personal business and leisure being rated (1). I often use the bus to get home after a meal out in town, or meeting friends, and there are always lots of people on the buses. And, as I might have had a drink when socialising, I can't drive home, so if there wasn't a bus, I'd need a taxi, which is obviously more expensive.

Shopping is vital to residents in rural areas. There are NO shops whatsoever where I live. Leisure is also important. Cutting buses, including Sunday and evening services adversely affects tourism. Visitors to the many caravan parks in the area rely on buses to access various local attractions as many do not have their own transport. Young people rely on buses to access sports centres, cinemas etc on Sundays and in the evenings. This would be detrimental to local businesses.

There are an increasing number of pensioners - and unemployed people - in the area, and access to public transport ought to be available to them.

Do feel that PB & L should feature higher in the chart.

The categories and scoring are unnecessary. Whatever reason any person uses the bus to travel maybe very important to them... It is a public service. Lower prices are needed to encourage paying customers to abandon the car. Waddington to Clitheroe 2 people £3.40 - Taxi door to door £4.00

It is irrelevant for what purpose the bus is being used, a retired elderly person's reason for bus use is as important for someone going to employment. Surely the emphasis should be to get more people on buses whatever their reason for using it and to reduce the amount of cars on the road. The reason people do not use the bus if they do not have a bus pass is because of the cost of journeys.

Supported services not serving employment or education areas, may connect with other bus services that do serve employment and education sites. It would be better to relate customers in terms of customers per hour as a minimum rather than over a year. It would be better still to relate the objective analysis per journey not just by service, so well used evening and Sunday journeys may be retained, even if not over 7 days but specific to the day that custom requires the service.

Shopping and leisure may need a higher score to account for areas that are intended to attract tourists.

Stalmine Parish Council does not disagree with the categories but feels that health/medical/welfare should be given greater weight as we have a high proportion of elderly residents who have no other way of accessing these services other than by public transport and a higher weighting should be given where there is no reasonable alternative

In rural communities, disabled and elderly people can feel totally isolated without a bus service. Their purpose may be to go to the library, attend a church service, visit relatives in hospital, or play a game of bowls. All these are life enhancing events for old people , and their lives are diminished without them , yet they don't count on your scoring system .

In practice it will be very difficult to assess the proportion of journeys made for each purpose listed. The value given to leisure journeys should reflect the fact that these journeys help to support jobs in the leisure industry as well as the quality of life of the bus user. Very few fare payers make unimportant journeys by bus because of the costs involved, so its unlikely that any journeys are 5 times as important as others. Shopping journeys by older people to buy food may be absolutely essential and leisure journeys help them to stay fit and active playing an important role in preventing the need for expensive healthcare.

Not enough services and do not beging early enough.

I can see that the suggested scores try to give a way forward for cutting some services, but there is a disparate range of issues and it is difficult to see how this can really give an overall picture of the need or value of one service compared with another, even if one agreed with the criteria. For example - Why is a trip to a healthcare facility for an old person more important than a trip to a sports ground or swimming pool for a young person (bearing in mind our aims to reduce obesity in young people)? - Why should a trip to a healthcare facility for an old person be more important than a trip for social reasons (bearing in mind our aims to combat social isolation and attendant mental health issues)? - Is a shopping trip for someone who might otherwise have no access to healthy food options less important than access to further education?

The consultation does not state how each of these criteria are going to be assessed and this will be essential to know since local based knowledge will better inform of local circumstances e.g. Rossendale is the only borough with no hospital or rail service. It is therefore essential for some services to continue as travel outside the borough, particularly to access health and employment will be essential to Rossendale residents. The criteria was difficult to assess since all scoring categories listed were in some way linked to employment anyway, as education, health, shopping, leisure etc., generate employment. Whilst it was difficult to differentiate between the scoring criteria the Consultation Working Group would suggest different journey purpose weightings as follows: Employment 4 Education 4 Health/medical/welfare 4 Shopping/personal business 3 Leisure 3 However, the working group still notes that no information has been provided to indicate whether there will be further consultation on each individual bus route, where local knowledge can be used in assessing and scoring.

It seems to me that it will be very hard to assess the different number of journeys made for each purpose listed. Leisure journeys help to support jobs in the leisure industry so should count toward employment in any scoring..

Accessibility - alternative distance of 800 metres too far for older/disabled people. Suggest no more than 250 - 400 metres. Daily evening score too low at 1; suggest 2, to allow for evening workers. Health criteria should be a 5, given the need to access hospitals, etc for those who are older/disabled. Serving an employment area needs to be clearer - is this within a certain number of metres? I would suggest within 400 - 500. Suggest the scores for concessions are revised so that 33-50% = 4 and less than 33% = 2

The criteria do not take into account the public transport needs of the Bretherton area

Whilst I agree that employment and education are the most important, I think a higher weighting should be given to leisure, particularly in respect of younger people. In places like Barnoldswick it is important, especially in the evenings that younger people are able to travel outside of the town for leisure activities as we are on the edge of the Borough and County and the leisure services are not concentrated here but are better in places like Colne and Burnley.

Rural buses in my area are at wrong times of day for accessing employment but are heavily used by pensioners and also tourists

Your whole transport policy sucks. There is rail infrastructure in Rawtenstall yet you continually choose to ignore it. The only motorway out of the valley is total gridlock daily yet you are more concerned about buses for education and health/medical/welfare.

Where does rurality and ability to access other transport methods feature?

The Town Council considers that the importance of the suggested criteria to local residents is difficult to measure and not relevant to the provision of public transport, particularly to isolated areas

There are plenty of services which travel on major roads to get people to and from work etc. There is no harm in walking 100 yards to the bus stop. I have walked 1 mile to get my bus in the past.

Not sufficiently weighted towards leisure usage . Not allow for demographic changes . No mechanism for future needs

1.2 Suggested other categories

Respondents who thought other categories should be included were asked what those other categories should be. All comments are provided below.

Sport

Link to other parts of transport network

As Q2 Senior citizens

Services which link residential areas to railway stations to encourage less use of cars for personal transport. I suggest Skelmersdale Concourse to Up-Holland railway station should be served by a bus route over Pimbo Estate and a 100 yard walk.
Score 4

Contribution to strategic bus network - 10. It is very important that bus services have wider links integrated ticket provision - 10. For same reasons. This is a real barrier to journeys involving more than one operator.

Consider where older people live

Once a week services for essential appointments and visits to other members of the family - score 10.

Community transport - door to service for those that cannot access public transport for a variety of reasons.

The health benefits of a bus service. Does the bus service wider health benefits to the local community by taking people out of social isolation and encouraging an active lifestyle?

Shopping and Personal Business should be separated. Also the scores above are different from the criteria document.

Travel by young people. Welcome recognition of older persons - not sure if concession would include young people. If it does great, if not it could do with being recognised. Young people often have to rely on public transport as they don't drive or own cars.

We would find it difficult to support the higher mark for Employment as compared with Education as one feeds and often goes alongside the other. We would prefer to see equal weighting of 5 for both. We cannot see where active citizenship/engaging with local government/democracy comes as these don't seem to be stated explicitly? Most people need to deal with local authority services at various times of life and often the more vulnerable the resident, the more regularly they need to have contact with such services and the less likely they are to have digital means of accessing them. Buses are a crucial means of accessing such services and engaging with local democracy.

I think that the categories may be a little too restrictive. For instance, there is no point having a good service in the daytime if there is no early or late service to enable passengers to travel both to and from their destination. This is particularly valid in respect of early journeys at the weekend. Nowadays people tend to have more varied working, and social, patterns and will not use public transport unless it provides what they need.

For some people - the infirm, elderly, low income the bus is a lifeline - this could be described as 'well being'.

Access to national transport links . 2

Tourism by visitors to the area

A regular bus service is a lifeline for the elderly as both a social and a way of maintaining their independence, which must relieve other social services, I'm not sure how you'd classify this but a high score would be warranted.

Retired people to get out

Providing access where other services cannot be accessed due to main roads not being crossable by blind and other mobility impaired people or where we cannot tell where we are on a route on a main road but could if it were on local roads. Remember, many passengers can't get to bus stops unless you provide the walking environment and crossings for them to do so

A lot of elderly people are lonely and their quality of life is effected when the bus is taken away. I would say that an elderly person going shopping is just as important as a 20 year old travelling to work. Not to the economy but to society.

New category: Recreation which would cover everything from vists to a swimming pool or a library or the theatre and adult education and organisations such as the WI, the Scouts and local sports clubs. priority 6

Tourism

Affordability and reliability

I disagree with categorising the journey purposes so am not about to suggest more!

Services should be weighted positively if they form part of a strategic network i.e. evening or Sunday additions to a commercial daytime trunk service.

Show connections with rail/bus where appropriate

Number of bus changes necessary between likely destinations.

Is there an alternative route if no that should be 2 or 3 piont

General coverage/accessability

1 Provision of real-time information 2 Onboard wifi Not sure what score but in this order

Health and Wellbeing, Socializing with friends/family or attending local run events.

Leisure can be slightly deceiving to some people, visiting family and friends, social outing

Current popularity of services run

Forget categories lets market the service more. Create more of a joined up service for paying customers. Reasonable monthly pass rates..

It is irrelevant to have categories, any valid reason to use the bus instead of the car has to be a plus point

Age of the residents that the bus serves. (4)

Some way of indicating the degree of reliance on buses - i.e. is the bus your only way of travelling.

Attending social and sporting events , staves off loneliness and social isolation in the elderly. See above.

Services that would reduce carbon emissions if car users switch from car use

Areas where the existing provision is wholly inadequate

Tourism 5

Rurality. Also, principally in many rural areas are a high number of elderly and vulnerable people who's needs would not score high based on the above - as they depend on public transport, but not for employment or education. Public transport can be a lifeline to many of these people

Visitor economy

2. Sustainable economic growth

2.1 Disagreement with proposed criterion

Respondents who disagree with the suggested options and scores were asked why they disagree. All comments are provided below.

Should also include health and education

The category focuses on "employment areas". This is fine for defined areas (industrial estates, town centres etc) but doesn't work for home workers, carers etc. Suggest "employment opportunities".

Duplication of services managing clusters - who lives there

You are ignoring people in rural, isolated areas who aren't travelling to work or city centres.

Again how does the council define what an "employment area" is? It is likely that a lower proportion of jobs within rural areas will be within "employment areas" but not less valuable to the people that work there or the smaller local economies that rely upon them. It is also not clear what happens to the scoring when it increases. Some services will be used for well in excess of 1000 journeys to employment areas. Going from 499 to 1001 trips makes 4 points difference yet going from 1001 trips to 2000 or 3000 or more makes no points difference.

This criteria does not consider people using buses to travel to education and health/medical appointments.

While agreeing that employment areas need servicing at appropriate times, we have concerns about what might be identified as an employment area and would encourage LCC not to take too narrow a view of what constitutes an employment area. Lancashire offers many varied volunteer training and employment opportunities in forest and wildlife conservation, coaching and refereeing and various outdoor skills, little of which takes place in conventional business parks or city centres. Bus passengers rely on services to help them lead a full life and many will use volunteer opportunities to step from education to work or from work to active retirement.

These routes which provide the critical mass of access to work employment required by this criteria to score highly are routes where a commercial bus service is more likely to be viable and so it may not necessarily be appropriate that such service should score highly for receiving subsidation.

Same as previous answer. Buses are used more so for leisure and discretionary journeys and not all employment takes places in obvious centres. For example, somebody may work in a pub in the evening and use the bus for travel to work there. How would this be picked up by the criteria ?

This is far too simplistic. The situation is far more complicated than you seem to present.

Many out of town business parks have no accessibility for blind people and are dangerous for others due to cars dominating all parts of the landscape, lack of footways etc. They should have to provide access for all to benefit from subsidy and already benefit from free parking unlike town centres
Most places of employment are geared to cars and most people actually enjoy the commute in their car.

No 5 around Ormskirk is a life line to people & pensioners wishing to shop and meet.

This shows an unrealistic bias in favour of business trips. Very few people go to work by bus. Buses from suburbs and rural areas to town and city centres are important and if given suitable priority could wean customers away from excessive use of their cars. In country areas the "feeder" bus service for the first mile or two of a journey is all-important. If this is missing or doesn't run at suitable times passengers will either not travel at all or use a car.

Although many business park diversions seem to be under-used.

Its not necessarily about the number - its about the direct nature of the journey from main areas of residential so the time penalty of bus travel is not too great a disincentive. No point lots of buses throughout the day going round the houses, for example.

Again, this is concentrating on the relative value of the journey purpose which I disagree with.

Attempting to achieve "sustainable economic growth" by means of bus services for employment suggests that modal shift is an objective of the subsidy. In times of austerity priority should instead be given to providing services for those without alternative transport. Modal shift can come later. This criterion also assumes that employment takes place only in certain identified types of location and assumes that the employment locations served are correctly linked to the places of residence of potential users.

Score should not be given on current usage but potential usage

Hospitals

Rural areas have less people than city centres therefore require bus services

The 40% weighting given to "Priority Themes" should be increased. to 60%

I think that disabled and elderly people should gain more points than those using the service for employment. The working population appear to have and use cars for work, as they have more disposable income, and are keen to use their cars for convenience.

Speaking from experience operating to employment areas in general is fruitless, with the exception of AM & PM peaks. the buses can be put to better use during the day time off peak, rather than carrying fresh air around an industrial estate.

Bus services should serve the whole community and therefore this doesn't just include employment! 75% of visually impaired people are not in employment yet still engage in their communities and need buses for other reasons to keep them independent and healthy. The same for older people. We should be looking at being a healthy town offering good public transport links not cutting them again! Many of the buses in certain areas you cannot get on because of the students! Have student buses separately!

The bus service needs to visit areas where it is difficult to get to i.e isolated housing/estates its not how many trips but when and at what times. A two hourly subsidised service going on later at night is more use than an hourly one finishing early evening.

I have reservations about this method of scoring because if there are only one or two services a day on a particular route they are likely to generate less trips. I may use a bus service where I have more flexibility in choosing when to use it but never use one that runs twice a day. You need a way to count the potential bus users you miss. I realise it is difficult to measure.

Lets not focus on just employment

Why focus on business use, there should be an emphasis on any reason for bus usage, rural bus services are as important particularly for the elderly, vulnerable and low income families who do not access to their own car.

Considering the large number of people attending part-time employment I feel that basing this on how many trips made is not the best method of calculation.

Bus services provide connectivity, commercial services may carry customers from supported services to employment and education sites.

Social cohesion requires more than just employment issues. Enabling an elderly person to travel to their weekly voluntary work in a charity shop, for example, benefits

not just the person travelling, but society as a whole. Withdrawing that route and preventing an important weekly event in that persons life can produce major depression and serious health consequences , with financial cost to the NHS and to Social Services.

It seems arbitrary to differentiate between people who use the bus to get to work depending upon whether they work within an 'employment area' or not. It is likely that a lower proportion of jobs within rural areas will be within 'employment areas' Some services will be used for well in excess of 1000 journeys to employment areas. Going from 499 to 1001 trips makes 4 points difference yet going from 1001 trips to 2000 or 3000 or more makes no points difference.

Access to employment is important but the review should be about is identifying all needs and working out how to meet them more efficiently -To find alternative ways of meeting the needs of those on low use routes ie on demand rather than providing regular bus services. Currently this is available for those with high mobility needs, but should be extended to other groups. -It seems arbitrary to differentiate between people who use the bus to get to work depending upon whether they work within an 'employment area' or not. It is likely that a lower proportion of jobs within rural areas will be within 'employment areas' -Some services will be used for well in excess of 1000 journeys to employment areas. On the current proposed guidelines, going from 499 to 1001 trips makes 4 points difference yet going from 1001 trips to 2000 or 3000 or more makes no points difference.

We support the principle that the service should support employment but are concerned about the frequency being the scoring factor. We have a regular but infrequent service and do not feel that the area should be penalised if other areas have a more frequent service

There isn't enough information here to effectively respond. In relation to the number of trips, is it per day, per week, per year? How is it being measured? There are very few business parks in Rossendale (and none where transport is provided to/from directly for workers), however, the majority of the population is exported out of the Rossendale to employment areas. Therefore, the working group feel that this criterion does not effectively capture the transportation of workers to adjoining boroughs for employment purposes.

It seems arbitrary to me to make a difference between people who use the bus to get to work depending upon whether they work in an employment area or somewhere else. It is likely that a lower number of jobs in rural areas will be in employment areas. this then discriminates against rural bus services

Comment - within 400 to 500 metres of an employment area

The criteria do not take into account the needs of the Bretherton area

Rural services direct to business parks instead of town centres? Connecting buses can provide access instead

So, transportation giving vital links between smaller rural communities would score very low? Is it not these services that need the subsidy to keep them going, as due to the size of these communities the income base for the bus companies is far lower. With larger cities and towns you have higher throughput and income, making them more sustainable and in need of less subsidy. How does this support economic growth or stability in rural communities - allowing them to continue to live and work and support their local community

The Town Council considers that there is a need to provide public transport for all residents

I am basically talking about the 84 which travels up and down Alexandra Road, Thornton. It passes my house every half hour. This is far too often as the bus travels EMPTY virtually all the time, both ways.

Visitor economy eg: for walkers - a bus going one way

2.2 Suggested other options

Respondents who thought other options should be included were asked what those other options should be. All comments are provided below.

It may show up in usage figures, but I am sure that rural bus services serving an employment area would not be as widely used, so should not have as high a priority as urban services.

Sit about

Leisure facilities, tourism score 4

Village connect - Score 10

Please see Q6. These theme only takes into account economic growth - weighting should also be given to others.

Areas with lower employment options but substantial volunteering opportunities should be added, with scores of 1-3, depending on the number of places available at any one time - more if the opportunities are specifically vocational.

Distance from any other public transport ie railway stations, the further away from these the more the bus link should be maintained.

As highlighted in my answer to the previous category

Hospitals and medical centres will require servicing

Connections with railway stations.

Access to shop mobility schemes and help points where assistance can be gained

Pensioners needs, who do not have a vehicle it costs £7.00 to travel to Liverpool one stop down the line and you get a Merseyside rail pass which will take you to Ormskirk for free. It costs £2.00 on the bus from Aughton into Ormskirk one way for paying customers .

Bus services that serve villages and rural areas and take passengers to local market towns. These would add to sustainable economic growth by bringing customers into the town centres and boosting the local economy. Such services need not be frequent - one or two days per week to fit in with local market days - but should be reliable and convenient. Consultation with potential users is essential. Score 8

Country parks and major car-based tourism attractions: you can no longer access Beacon Fell by bus, for example.

Universities

Consider priority routes (as used to be the case) between key economic centres / hubs, in addition to 'stopping' service.

Is it possible that your parameters could assess other options available to people in their area - however defined? It is possible that in cases where there is no appropriate alternatives (and by appropriate I mean affordable as well as accessible): rather than supporting the operating costs of a large, relatively empty bus, the council could look at stimulating and supporting community based solutions? There are examples of communities (eg expressing concerns at PACT or parish council meetings) which have decided to solve their own issues by coming to an agreement with an operator and getting guarantees that residents will "use it or lose it".

A high score should be given to services that currently perform well in terms of passenger use, irrespective of journey purpose. A high score should be given to services (or part-services) that form part of a strategic interurban network

Potential usage ie if frequency and fares are good

Pensioners using bus services

How many bus changes to get from major areas of deprivation to employment areas. (this should be negative for routes which require more than one bus).

Score should be determined on the basis of the outcome ie Health and Wellbeing as well as the other priorities

Buses which serve rural villages are vital as many villages have no shops or amenities. Residents, particularly elderly, the young and those on limited incomes have no access to cars which means they are totally dependant on public transport.

Limited TOKENS for use in Taxis say 20 per month a high score.

Isolated areas score at least 2

Any bus usage should be encouraged and although business use should be encouraged, rural buses are a lifeline to the elderly, vulnerable and low income familie.

Stop close to either an educational establishment or a medical centre/ hospital

Lack of alternative means of transport, rural isolation in the villages, lack of facilities such as libraries and day centres in rural areas

Link up community venues eg libraries, top score

The need to measure transportation outside the area for employment purposes.

Areas where the existing provision is wholly inadequate, a high score should be allocated

Out of town shopping parks should be included because these are also employment areas which can often be difficult to access by public transport. They should attract the same scores as town and city centres.

Business base (people employed?) as a percentage of local population. This way rural communities also have a chance of sustainability with a local transport system that supports them

Visitor economy

3. Impact on carbon emissions

3.1 Disagreement with proposed criterion

Respondents who disagree with the suggested options and scores were asked why they disagree. All comments are provided below.

This should have no bearing on whether a service is used

What is a congestion hotspot? Most areas of town centres could be so called - it depends on individual perception. That definition should be removed. AQMA's are defined so are OK.

Encourage public transport more smaller buses?

Every road is toxic, so is all buses. We need electric buses, trams, trolley buses.

Investigations into using smaller more eco-friendly buses should be undertaken.

Introduce more flexible bus services rather than cut a complete service.

We believe that congestion areas should be given higher priority (5) as this is a clear way of reducing emissions and improving traffic flow for other vehicles, thereby having additional carbon impact.

Congestion hot spot equals unreliable service

Rural areas will not be hotspots but still require transport

Many rural areas have no issues with pollution or air quality. For rural communities it is about providing links to hubs for work, education (including evening classes) and leisure so that cars are not needed

I'm unclear what you are asking. Does it get a good score if it is near an AQA/congestion hotspot or a bad score?

Once again this criterion appears to require modal shift for its justification as unless bus services attract patronage from previous car drivers (and not just car passengers) they will add to Air Quality management and congestion problems. In any case as subsidised bus services are generally infrequent and operate largely outside peak traffic times their impact is negligible, rendering this criterion far less important than any other. It should be removed.

People will use bus services rather than car if service and cost is good

These criteria have very little importance to passengers who have no alternative transport.

Rural areas will suffer again

Passenger demands should outweigh this option.

Traffic is horrendous in Lancaster so this would not be a fair score to allocate as hopefully the new road will start to address some of the traffic problems and then should change the air quality due to the amount of traffic.

Not too convinced this should be a criteria.

Not a priority

It is the last consideration when travelling by bus, people want to get from A to B using a reliable service

If buses are serving areas of compacted population/urban centres, then the air quality will inevitably be poorer in those areas. Secondly, you absolutely cannot reduce congestion by removing buses from those areas. If anything, the number of buses should be increased to force people out of cars!

Lets have low emission buses.. cut cars not buses

With the Ribble Valley being an area of high air quality issues, it is of utmost importance to get people out of their cars and onto the bus, and low carbon emission buses would be the way to go in the future.

I think this will disadvantage rural areas where bus services are so vital to the elderly

Air quality in our area not a significant problem , we do not have significant levels of air pollution

This would appear to discriminate against rural areas where there are no Air Quality Management Areas and congestion hotspots

Supporting public transport that runs through quality areas is essential to improving air quality.

Unless buses operating in Air Quality Management Areas meet the most stringent carbon emission targets they could be adding to pollution levels. Whilst it is laudable to try and tackle congestion hotspots by improving / increasing public transport it will only be of benefit if linked to bus priority measures.

Yet another way to penalise rural areas. Many of these high emission areas are already well served by other transport links. Your proposed policies seem to be written

to drive support to areas that will see full buses anyway - is this really a service that would need to be subsidised?!

Diesel is always going to be a problem (in this area) Rural community produces tractor fuel emissions

3.2 Suggested other options

Respondents who thought other options should be included were asked what those other options should be. All comments are provided below.

Lancashire gets all the old buses from other large cities (mainly Stagecoach) in particular. Eg The 42 service, runs museum examples.

Bus priority schemes in planning should be added to the consideration of these services as there would be a multiplier effect for any service using a bus priority area. It had been clearly demonstrated that car users are more likely to switch to bus use if a suitable scheme is in place to speed the journey. If hybrid or electric buses are also required, this would have a major impact on carbon emissions in congested areas. We would suggest adding 2 services using a priority scheme and an additional 2 for any service using non-polluting vehicles.

Use of newer "greener" vehicles? Low score, but still taken into account?

Whether it will make a rural area isolated and therefore impact negatively on the residents lives

Appalling lack of bus priority measures in Lancashire. County Council seems to do very little in this respect to ease congestion for public transport. A few yards here and there makes no difference. It needs to be bold to make public transport attractive to more people. It would also be interesting to know how the scores have been arrived at.

Use of hybrid vehicles, 3, use of electric vehicles, 5

Distance may be included - which COULD impact on this community as we are very rural.

Congestion traffic hotspots could score, say, 2. Why divert buses into congested sites?

Vehicle accessibility

Areas with cycle lanes, cycle friendly junctions and well maintained roads should have a lower score.

In order to reduce busy peak time car traffic a selection of later journeys can make the difference between bus & car. The volume of traffic on the corridor, the higher it is the higher the score to retain the bus service.

Some criteria which takes account of rural deprivation

Night buses. You think people stop working after 9:30 pm. There is no public transport in the rossendale valley from rawtenstall to Bacup after 21:23. You can't plan for leisure activities because you can't get home. It's the business traffic route in the valley yet you fail to serve the community.

Journey length - rural communities often need very long journeys to get to employment areas. Such bus journeys also have a high impact on lowering car emissions but will not feature in your scoring

Allowance for rural communities

4. Operational service days

4.1 Disagreement with proposed criterion

Respondents who disagree with the suggested options and scores were asked why they disagree. All comments are provided below.

Evening services are essential for rural areas in order to access education, health and employment opputunities.

The times of operation are not defined. What is daytime and what is evening? There is no link to an integrated system - for instance with heavily used long distance trains Evening (ie up to say 9pm) are important, for example, in hospital visits and completing long jouirneys.

7 day working week - isolation/loniess. Faith discrimination - getting to "church" Sunday and assuming christianity. Sat night leisure.

You are ignoring Sundays - leisure,tourism and religious services.

How do people get to places in the evenings

Our labour market is completely changing. Over 8 million people now work part time across the UK and 1.5 million people work on zero hours contracts. A lot of people now work on Sundays, particularly in rural areas, and the tourist industry also benefits from Sunday services. Returning home from weekend work or daytime activities often requires travel later in the day than may be assumed. Evening should therefore be defined as after 19:00 rather than after 18:30. The subsidised bus journey is often the last leg of the journey home from work etc. University lectures, hospital appointments, after-school clubs etc regularly go on until 6pm and these people as well as those commuting to work by train need time to get to the bus station without finding that the first connecting service home has been deemed an evening service and cut.

As previously stated the evening service starts too early - why is daytime prioritised - more weighting should be given to evening services. Examine if daytime services are most important - is early morning and after school to early evening not more important.

Evidently areas of employment need to be well-served but the drop in weighting for evening and weekend journeys seems to ignore current working patterns, the needs of employees who work shifts such as health and social care workers and the fact that many young people starting out in employment will be working unsocial hours:- if they are unable to access the place of work, they will not be able to accept or sustain the job, which would have a larger impact on the public purse. It is clear that people on lower incomes rely heavily on bus services to enable their job to be viable.

This criteria favours employment which involves a typical 9-5, Monday-Friday work pattern, but a growing number of employers require much more flexibility than this, particularly where the business works on a shift basis.

Evening and Sunday services on corridors with strong daytime commercial elements are crucial to enhance daytime elements. Having the option of later buses home for example is key to people choosing to use commercial journeys earlier on in the day and to them making the conscious choice to pick bus as an overall option. Strong corridors should arguably have greater priority for the addition of supported evening and Sunday journeys. Supported evening journeys often help the success of the daytime operation by providing people with a total equivalent to the car.

Evening & Sunday services should be maintained between main centres if the demand is there.

Buses at evening and weekend are needed for subsidy. Daytime journeys should be financially sound.

To those that have - more shall be given. What a flawed system you are using! With shopping and other activities now seven days a week it is about time that Sunday

services were augmented. This is an outdated argument on which you base your assessment - perhaps you remember Beeching's cuts to the railway system in the 1960s - and how many of those closed lines/stations have had to be brought back into use - or proposed to reopen in the future.

Sunday and evening services are just as important when the only alternative is car use. During the week, young people attending after-school activities (sport, drama etc.) are disadvantaged if they do not have a willing parent to collect them by car. The same applies to activities (eg. sports clubs) held on a Sunday. Having a reliable bus service at leisure times would encourage people to make use of restaurants, theatres, cinema etc. without having to take the car.

Agree but it is also important to check with the users what times they require the service

LCC needs to address weekend and bank holiday access to rural areas. There are no bus services to the Hodder valley on Saturdays now. Bank Holidays (say, Royal occasions) mean that the countryside is out of bounds for non-car users in Lancashire whereas they are actively encouraged in Yorkshire. I hate extra bank holidays since the best parts of Lancashire are inaccessible then. How about, for example, a Dales Bus type service from Preston to Slaidburn via Chipping on Sundays and BHs with improved marketing?

Leisure time outside the working day

A recent Age UK Lancashire study showed that people feel most trapped in their homes/villages on Sundays; my own mother-in-law (who lives in Ingol in Preston so, not exactly a village) can not get to her church on Sunday in Ribbleson because, not only does the orbital bus service only operate on a reduced timetable, it also only operates on a third of its usual route. Imagine this in a rural area or where a physical impairment complicates matters even further.

It appears that a decision has already been made to remove evening and Sunday services despite the public reaction arising from last time this was suggested. Agreed however that alternative services should be taken into account as proposed. Sunday is no longer the "day of rest" it used to be. People work, shop and travel for every other reason on a Sunday and it should be given the same importance as the other days of the week. It makes no sense to treat it differently in the modern world. Subsidised buses should be evenings and Sundays if a bus can't pay in the day it should be scrapped

MF and Saturdays should be split. Saturday timetables should not be a straight copy of the MF one. Passenger demands and patterns do not mirror each other. For example, why should a journey need to operate via a business park or industrial estate on a Saturday? This will only detract from the routes usage. In addition to this route timing should be looked at as MF peak running times transferred across on to

Saturday timetables is also a detraction to the service, and in some cases no adhered to leading to early operation, resulting in an unreliable service which after a time nobody will use as it cannot be relied upon.

Not everybody works 9-5

Evenings and Sundays are important too.

If we only stick to those times the Council will be socially isolating a huge number of people and this is discrimination. The knock on effect of not being able to access buses in the evenings or Sundays is awful and doesn't lend itself to being a citizen and engaging in all activities. Lets not forget that businesses do open on Sundays and people still want to go out and use them.

I think there are less options on an evening, and I think this should be up the priority. As previously mentioned I often take the bus home after meeting friends in town, or for a meal out, and may have a drink so can't drive. I could take a taxi, but they are expensive, so the bus is my best option. And the buses I get area always busy. I'd also question not including Sunday - I understood that this was now the second busiest shopping day of the year. I would prefer a less frequent daytime service (except rush hour) to maintain evening and Sunday services.

Sunday services are essential. As mentioned previously, many visitors and local residents rely on buses in order to use leisure facilities. Loss of this business would seriously damage the local economy. Elderly people need bus services on Sundays in order to visit their families and friends as it is often the only day that families can spend time together.

Do feel that Friday & Saturday services are penalised by this 6 day restriction.

The major concern is early and late services these are the priority difficulties.

Companies unable to gain funding to provide alternative services may be penalised

Why reduce or have no bus services on Sundays, a time when a big proportion of the population do not go to work and spend time travelling and visiting places. Prices for Sunday services should be lower to encourage usage especially for families.

Again just to mention that part-time work is often only available over the weekend and so I would like to see more emphasis on weekend services

Daily evening services should have a priority as high as Sunday daytime services, to cater for people who frequently attend commitments such as employment, education or hospital/family visits in the evenings, for whom taxi travel may be unaffordable and for whom walking/cycling/driving alone at night may be potentially hazardous.

I have a friend with two handicapped children, who rely on the Sunday bus service to be able to have a family day out. She is a single parent with 2 jobs , and Sunday is her only day off work. Without a Sunday bus service that family would be isolated in Brinscall , no chance of a cinema trip , or a visit to Mc Donald's for the children .

A lot of people now work on Sundays, particularly in rural areas, and the tourist industry also benefits from Sunday services. Often far more people benefit from a supported Sunday service in a more populated area than a weekday service in a sparsely populated area and yet the number of users is already given very little weight in this proposed scoring system. Returning home from daytime activities often requires travel later in the day than may be assumed. Evening should therefore be defined as after 19:00 rather than after 18:30 (and if the buses go at say 18:15 and 19:15, the 19:15 remains important) The subsidised bus journey is often the last leg of the journey home from work etc. University lectures, hospital appointments etc regularly go on until 6pm and these people as well as those commuting to work by train need time to get to the bus station without finding that the first connecting service home has been deemed an evening service and cut.

Many people work on Sundays, particularly in rural areas, and is often in low paid work, eg care and nursing The tourist industry also benefits from Sunday services Returning home from daytime activities often requires travel later in the day than may be assumed. Evening should be defined as after 19:30 rather than after 18:30. The subsidised bus journey is often the last leg of the journey home from work etc. lectures, hospital appointments etc regularly go on until 6pm Commuters to out of town by train , and those who require more than one bus service need time to get connections.

Clarity is required on whether a service can score against all 3 categories if it meets all 3 criteria. Members would suggest changing the weighting for Sunday daytime to 1 and daily evening to 3. This is because the working group feel that getting people home from work, especially from adjoining areas, is particularly important in this location.

Sunday services are vital for jobs in rural areas where the number of tourist jobs are often higher.

Comment - daily evenings should be a higher priority for evening/night workers

Strongly agree if this will reflect the needs of the Bretherton area

As I agree the day time service from Monday to Saturday is the most important, I believe that the evening service is also vital to be able to access employment and leisure in distant places like Barnoldswick.

Services operating on Monday to Friday daytimes, where no alternative commercial service is available, should be given the highest priority. In the main Saturday services

carry less passengers for employment and medical purposes. Additionally the family car is generally available at weekends for shopping trips etc.

There's plenty of buses during the day, apart from rawtenstall to todmorden on a Sunday where you offer nothing. It's the nearest railway station to where I live yet I can't get to or get home on a Sunday.

Key here are the words - no other commercial alternative is available

Rural community - we have nothing else! A bus going through the village 2 hourly (if the drivers remembers which side of River Lune to travel up/down otherwise it can be 4 hourly service!

4.2 Suggested other options

Respondents who thought other options should be included were asked what those other options should be. All comments are provided below.

Evening services and Sunday services

Contribution to integrated transport - 5. Define times of "daytime" and "evening"

Church services on the 42 route. Medical centres, Hospitals, Sports centres, Holiday destinations - score 10.

Less frequent scheduled evening services particularly in rural areas.

Mon-Sat daytimes before 7pm (4 points)

Early morning, after school to early evening services should have a weighting. Market days and Saturdays are also important.

A score of between 1-3 should be able to be allocated for areas of significant numbers of shift workers or low-paid/youth employment.

Limited Sunday service in rural areas

People in rural area's still require evening and Sunday services

Sunday and off peak services

Sundays

A rail service should not be duplicated by a bus service except for replacement purposes.

Services that reflect hours of operation of facilities they serve should be counted, ones that do not specifically get people to and from them at the right time should not be allocated points

Include evening and Sunday services score 3

Weekend access to rural tourism destinations.

The best bet in getting people to employment is surely promoting and properly incentivising the carshare/liftshare scheme (shared wheels?). Doing so could alleviate some of the getting to and from work issues - perhaps decent incentives for joining and being active in that scheme are required rather than relying on peoples' innate altruism? What about a properly financed wheels2work scheme for apprentices?

Evening and Sunday services that are part of an otherwise commercial strategic network should be highly scored

Bank Holidays-particularly in ANOB

Is there any coverage? If not, a high score
Evenings and Sundays

Sundays and evening need to be considered, we should be looking forward not just a budget cuts!

An additional weighting for these two services where they feature a need - Friday & Saturday..

Add in Sunday services .. everyone is off work..

Where community activity is specific to a day or time of day, this should be included as not all patronage is driven by daytime requirements. Such as hospital visting in the evening, even if 1 or 2 evenings per week. Attendance at educational centres in the evenings etc

Rural isolation- not everyone has a car at their front door , or lives within walking distance of leisure and social activities .

Bank holidays - score of 4

Mon-Fri before 7pm (4 points)

We feel that evening and weekend services where there is no other option should also be allocated a score

We would suggest increasing the weighting for daily evening for the reasons outlined above.

Mon-Fri before 7pm (4 points)

Areas where the existing service is wholly inadequate

The options should be : Monday to Friday daytimes - score 5 Saturday daytimes - score 4 Sunday daytimes - score 3 Monday to Saturday evening - score 2 Sunday evening - score 1

Sunday buses and night buses

5. Accessibility – travel choice

5.1 Disagreement with proposed criterion

Respondents who disagree with the suggested options and scores were asked why they disagree. All comments are provided below.

Bus and rail are rarely alternatives, other than for people living near rail stations, and rail rarely serves local needs. More over in Lancashire, unlike some other areas. NOW card holders do not get free local rail travel. Bus should be compared with bus.

Ridiculous - we have no alternatives NO TRAINS!

Campaign for Better Transport welcomes the fact that Lancashire CC are conducting some accessibility mapping and the same methodology should be used to assess the ability to access places of education, health services and employment. It is not evidently clear if the same methodology is being used across the board, and if it is not could lead to some potentially misleading results. This will also be potentially very hard to assess, as "alternative public transport" is also not clearly defined. Also if the alternative is a commercially run bus service the legislation currently means that a bus operator only has to give 56 days to the Traffic commissioner to withdraw a service. So mapping will need constant updating and reviewing and there are currently no assurances if and how often Lancashire will do this. Also in reality small parts of routes will have alternatives at limited times, or alternative public transport will involve a long journey into an alternative centre and back out again and it's not clear whether

that would count as an alternative or not, and how such situations can be meaningfully scored. Availability of alternatives is a really important issue but the key measure ought to be an estimate of the proportion of travellers for whom a reasonable alternative exists, rather than the outcome hanging on whether for example an excellent alternative is 750m or 850m away?

We feel we must challenge the '8' score on this criteria. Rural services and evenings should be included - only daytime services mentioned.

While it's reasonable to expect services with easy alternatives to receive a lower score, a one hours interval between services is generally at the edge of people's tolerance. Except at certain times, a 2 hour interval is enough to form a barrier for the majority of people who may wish to use a service. It causes enormous problems for people trying to plan a doctor's appointment or interview if the whole day is taken up travelling or waiting to travel, and the disruption caused by a single bus not being able to operate, for whatever reason, is catastrophic. We would therefore suggest that both the 2-hour options should be weighted as 5 or 6.

800m radius can be a long way for elderly, infirm or disabled members of the public wishing to use public transport

Do you realise how far 800m is? Try it out with a walking frame or a wheelchair!
800m is too far for many users

Does this mean as the drowsy glues or by road?

Mobility impaired people cannot access many bus stops due to lack of road crossings, landmarks a blind person can find and cannot stand for long enough. You need to give points where services meet these needs, rather than purely basing it on distance and time, remember the impact of one cancelled or late service
I object to the criteria, too vague and open to very wide interpretation.

Assuming that alternative services are actually operating: e.g. lack of Sunday service on the Preston-Ormskirk railway.

To a point - other criteria (i.e. access to employment / retail / education) greater priorities than everyone get's a bus service.

800 metres is a long way if you can't walk well. Again, this should be on need for transport rather than arbitrarily cutting off at 800m. Is the exclusion zone along the entire route or is a subsidy nixed even if there is only one point of congruence along its length?

Basically agree, but likelihood of use from areas without alternatives should be taken into account. There is usually a good reason why areas are left unserved by public transport - lack of demand!

I disagree with the 800m radius. I think this is too far for the elderly to walk to get alternative public transport.

500m radius would be more appropriate for older people

For the elderly and disabled, 800 metres may prove impossible to walk. After all, DLA and PIP are awarded on being able to walk 50 metres. Again, able-bodied working age people would have the option of walking 800 metres.

What alternatives? In Lancaster and Morecambe there is a train service which at best in one per hour and is certainly not within 800 meters of all routes.

What other considerations are being considered about alternative public transport. There could be a number of reasons people do not use alternative transport, ie Leyland buses for example I find the drivers ignorant, do not allow time for passengers to sit before setting off, so I avoid them. In the past Preston bus provided my route with an excellent service but through service wars it lost out.

Needs to be careful... 800m in terms of "as the crow flies" could be extremely misleading.

Train connections in the Ribble Valley are not as accessible and convenient as the bus services

As previously stated assess patronage by hour or journey rather than the whole service.

800m is a long way for elderly people

This will be really hard to assess, as in reality small parts of routes will have alternatives at limited times, or alternative public transport will involve a long journey into an alternative centre and back out again and it's not clear whether that would count as an alternative or not, and how such situations can be meaningfully scored. Availability of alternatives is a really important issue but the key measure ought to be an estimate of the proportion of travellers for whom a reasonable alternative exists, rather than the outcome hanging on whether for example an excellent alternative is 750m or 850m away?

This is a good idea in theory but in reality other transport solutions may only exist at limited times, and alternative public transport may not be travelling to same points as bus route. Availability of alternatives is a really important issue but the key measure ought to be an estimate of the proportion of travellers for whom a reasonable alternative exists, not for example an excellent alternative is 750m or 850m away?

Availability of alternative public transport solutions is a really important issue but the measure ought to be an estimate of the number of people for whom a reasonable alternative that they can use exists, rather than the outcome hanging on whether for example an excellent alternative is 750m or 850m away?

Distance too great, suggest 250 to 400 metres to cater for older/disabled people

Again the situation in places like Bretherton needs to be factored in

Rural areas not serviced by trains etc should receive priority

see previous question - we have no other form of public transportation through the village

5.2 Suggested other options

Respondents who thought other options should be included were asked what those other options should be. All comments are provided below.

I think it should need alternative reliable public transport. Unreliability is a curse on particularly rural bus services, where the next bus may be 2 hours later!

Journey could not be made on foot or by bicycle by a typical user (5 points). Where there is no alternative public transport service, a key consideration is whether it would be viable for a typical user to undertake the journey by walking or cycling instead. This depends mainly on distance, but also on availability of safe routes, away from busy roads and close to appropriate cycling infrastructure. It should also consider whether the journey is in daytime or often after dark, the proportion of older users etc. This is not currently included at all in the assessment.

Evening and rural services.

We would suggest that the topography should be considered in addition to the distance of 800m so that the option of walking 800m (difficult enough for some) would be added to if that journey involves hills, difficult crossings of roads or junctions or impediments to people with mobility issues. These could receive a degree of difficulty from 1-4.

Census information should be taken into account of age, etc.

Access to car?

Private monopoly bus companies are skimming the cream and should be made to cross subsidise some services for the public good.

I think it should be considered what time any alternative public transport stops running in the evening. The score for this should possibly be 6

Accessible info at stops and on bus for blind people, lbus talking buses etc

Consult the public where no services are currently available and find out what is needed/wanted. Consider subsidising community-led alternatives like the shared taxi service set up in Scorton after the Garstang super 8 was discontinued, Such alternative service should at least allow the use of NOW cards and other concessions,

Accessibility? To me that means ease of access rather than "there's another one over there, just in-front of that kilometre".

Greater use of the School/ Shopping etc combination- particularly from villages

A simple distance is too crude a metric - if it's 800m via lit wide pavements then it's very different from 800m via rural busy road with narrow unlit footpaths

Look at alternative public transport ie park and ride for those that can. More trains!

Current popularity of services

The options should also consider accessibility to travel choices in the evenings, especially for remote areas.

Availability - or lack of it - of schemes like Community Cars . In my ward, Wheelton and Withnell, there are no volunteers to operate the Community Cars scheme currently

Journey could not be made on foot or by bicycle by a typical user (5 points) Where there is no alternative public transport service, a key consideration is whether it would be viable for a typical user to undertake the journey by walking or cycling instead. This depends mainly on distance, but also on availability of safe routes, whether the journey is in the daytime or often after dark, the proportion of older users etc. This is not currently included at all in the assessment.

Needs careful consideration -but more refined criteria to do with alternative provision for HOW MANY people

We would suggest the need to consider topography and climate. 800m is a long way, especially when it's uphill you can't just look at a map in determining this. In the previous consultation the 'reasonable alternatives' suggested were unreasonable

owing to the topography of this area, climate and not having alternatives such as trains, cycleways etc.

Again the situation in places like Bretherton needs to be factored in

6. Access for older and disabled people

6.1 Disagreement with proposed criterion

Respondents who disagree with the suggested options and scores were asked why they disagree. All comments are provided below.

Young people with no access to cars should also be given high priority. It should be noted that not all eligible people will have/or want to have ENCTS passes. Are all buses usable for the disabled?

Whilst Campaign for Better Transport agrees with this approach and feel it is right that older and disabled passenger's needs are strongly considered. If this criterion is retained, the options should be amended to refer to absolute numbers of concessionaires rather than percentages, and the scores amended to that total number of passengers is the most significant consideration.

Viability is often an issue for commercial services which are used by large numbers of concessionary pass holders as it appears that the reimbursement system doesn't actually refund the whole cost to operators as was originally envisaged, and subsidy is therefore welcomed.

Equal weight should be give to all passenger types. Why would a higher score be given to routes with more oaps then fare paying passengers? Shouldn't it be the other way around?!

The only problem with ENCTS passes is that no direct revenue comes from the passenger but is subsidised by the government who would be better to be subsidising the bus service directly in a idea world.

Paying passengers are the future growth market plus ENCTS may be withdrawn at anytime.

Agree with the gist of this but let's not forget younger people - not all can afford private transport.

Bus services are not just for those with passes. Those of us who work are also entitled to a bus service & in fact need more regular services as we are less flexible with timings

It's impossible to gauge this accurately. There may be services with an apparent low use by pass holders but that would be because the buses are not frequent enough at the moment to enable use by these people. Older and disabled people can't be expected to hang around for ages between buses and, therefore, will try to find alternatives, such as relying on friends/family for lifts.

Strongly agree. The bus services, both commercial and subsidised depend on people using their bus passes. Without them we would soon have no bus services at all. Score for this should be 10

Subsidy should be more about economic activity, links to centres. Some subsidised services that then just have non-paying passengers are effectively being double subsidised.

As this is based on the need for transport rather than the purpose of the journey, I agree. However, in Lancashire, there is a scheme for younger people accessing transport for education, training and employment (I forget the name of the scheme but it was around £5M p.a. budget allocation), young people should be included in this criteria just as highly valued as the older and disabled people mentioned.

I speak as a concessionary pass holder, but the fact of using a pass does not imply lack of alternatives. From personal observation a high proportion of pass use is by holders that do have alternatives available or who are making journeys they would not make if they had to pay. Quite often the young working-class person paying a (high) fare is less well-off than many of the affluent middle-class passholders. Some of us do feel guilty sometimes. It would be wrong to continue services used by passholders on a discretionary basis at the cost of others used by farepayers.

bus services should prioritise workers with a goal to reduce car use

However, a nominal charge, say, 50p would not be unreasonable

Subsidised busses should focus on those with low or no income and getting to work that's what busses were intended to do with free passes allowing oaps and disabled to use spare seats on viable busses not have services designed for them both have alternatives and money to pay for them so focus on needs of workers and those going to training school or college

I do not think a pass should be the criteria, any older or vulnerable person and those with a disability should be given a priority.

Not if those who score higher will benefit whereby other services that perhaps have a low score due to passengers who use the service may lose out.

You cannot ignore those who are non-disabled

If you are in a village and the only one disabled then what?

Living in a rural village in Ribble Valley it is obvious from using the local bus service 7, 7a and 7b that this service is critical to the older and disabled passenger and their only means of transport to Clitheroe.

Pass holders should not be given priority on popular services when some pass holders have been left with no service at all.

It is not clear why use of buses by older/disabled people is given so much importance relative to say teenagers or non-car owners who may be equally dependent upon the service. Even if you take the view that these users should be prioritised, in the proposed assessment scheme, whether the proportion of concessionaires (older/disabled) is 50% or 51% would be treated as being as significant as whether the service has 10,000 journeys in total or well over 100,000. If someone is paying for their journey then that is a good indicator that it is an important journey and, given current fare levels, not one that can easily be made by more affordable means. If this criterion is retained, the options should be amended to refer to absolute numbers of concessionaires rather than percentages, and the scores amended so that total number of passengers is the most significant consideration.

Use of buses by older/disabled people is not necessarily more important relative to teenagers or non-car owners who may be equally dependent upon the service. In the proposed assessment scheme, the proportion of concessionaires (older/disabled) is more important than actual numbers which is not helpful in real terms to the numbers of people affected. (eg 50% or 51% would be treated as being as significant as whether the service has 10,000 journeys in total or well over 100,000.) People paying for their journeys should be treated as a good indicator that it is an important journey and, given current fare levels, not one that can easily be made by cheaper means. If this criterion is retained, the options should be amended to refer to absolute numbers of concessionaires rather than percentages, and the scores amended so that total number of passengers is the most significant consideration.

Why is the use of buses by older/disabled people given more importance than that of young people or adult non-car owners who may be equally dependent on using public transport.

Comment - higher scoring for 33-50% concessions at 4 rather than 3 and 2 for less than 33%

Again the situation in places like Bretherton needs to be factored in

I agree that serving the needs of elderly and dialled people is essential, however the same weighting should be given to younger people.

6.2 Suggested other options

Respondents who thought other options should be included were asked what those other options should be. All comments are provided below.

3x1 Day please eg AM, Middle of the day, Evening all each way

Young people with no access to cars should also be given high priority. It should be noted that not all eligible people will have/or want to have ENCTS passes. Are all buses usable for the disabled?

Community transport with a high score of 4

Young people

Numbers can also be a blunt instrument and some services may be less viable to run than others regardless of the bald numbers of individuals using the service. Perhaps it might be useful to also look at the proportion of concessionaires to fare-paying passengers as this is sometimes the critical factor in terms of the viability. Services carrying less than 50% concessionaires would have a lower score than those with 60% or higher.

Rural communities still need a service

Younger persons, low income families without private transport

If a service is used by working people it may need to be subsidised up to 7pm to allow workers to make connections to get home.

Are specific measures taken that provide extra access, such as accessible information for blind people, accessible bus stops, are the stops located where people can actually get to them safely and find them?

Children going to school score 7

Connectivity with networked public transport such as national rail services.

Young persons scheme as above.

Consideration should be given to the socio-economic make-up and relative wealth of areas served.

Prams and small children should also be given special consideration.

The amount of paying customers has to be key

Just a general comment. Being a very regular bus user there is a tendency for 'younger' members of society to use taxis. As such serving the older community is to be applauded.

I think there should be a flat rate fare of 50pence after 9am for all pass holders. I use the bus every day as a disabled passenger and I don't see why i take priority as for the scoring well how about 0?

There should also be consideration (maybe as a separate criterion) for people who potentially commit to using subsidised evening services by purchasing DayRiders or other season tickets.

School services

Criteria that take into account numbers rather than proportions of journeys

We would suggest increasing the points for this section.

7. Service usage

7.1 Disagreement with proposed criterion

Respondents who disagree with the suggested options and scores were asked why they disagree. All comments are provided below.

Funds should be made available for those rural areas which have no alternative public transport.

Biased against rural areas

With new builds going on especially in rural areas it is hard to gauge how many people would use a bus if it was there.

There may be only a very few passengers but if we have no car we need a bus service.

It seems to me that the bar has been set too high in relation to passenger journeys. The scoring could be re-defined to reflect the case for smaller communities (see next Q) This might also assist the retention of rural bus services.

If services are used, they are needed no matter how many passengers. Join up services. Use mini buses etc.

How can you use that as criteria eg university services are bound to be well used if you consider the no. of people carried by bus in Lancashire every year - it's millions.

There are other ways of calculating how well used a service is. Calculating per passenger miles for example can be a good indicator as busier services in urban areas will carry more passengers for shorter distances, whereas in more isolated areas less people will use buses but travel greater distances.

We feel this criteria is not valid. The number of people are included but not the number of journeys a bus makes on a particular route - this could be every 10 minutes or every hour. The cost per passenger is also required.

Need to be careful of the time frame for usage. May need to check results after promoting the services.

We believe that this approach will not entirely capture the need for the service to be retained and subsidised. There may well be services which are lifelines for small communities that would be useful beneficiaries of subsidy when those with 100,000+ passengers may be able to run commercially.

Rural services are essential and do not have high usage

Tendered services in the main have lower patronage hence why they are tendered
Its underuse journeys that need funding.

Sometimes a service is just needed and more profitable routes should support this.

See my previous remarks re; Dr Beeching! Allocating a score in this way is spurious and not robust. You surely can't be serious!

This criteria is very strongly biased against rural areas with low population

This is a real chicken & egg situation. Numbers of passengers might be low because the buses are infrequent. By restricting them further you can't possibly improve the numbers using the service. It would only be a fair comparison where everyone had

access to equally frequent services. Where I live, a bus once every two hours does not make an attractive alternative to using the car.

You should measure modal shift rather than usage and encourage operators to show how they could increase usage over current levels. Is 100000 journeys not too many for subsidy? You should lower that upper limit as far as you can to encourage commercial services where possible and consider more part subsidy options for specific non-commercial measures

I believe people do NOT currently make full use of the bus service currently provided because of inadequate timetabling, route and high cost and have already made other arrangements to car-share (for instance) - this does NOT account for usage in the future if a BETTER service was provided.

The number of passengers carried taken alone can be misleading. You need to consider other criteria eg timing, frequency and reliability of service

How are these counted? Some bus drivers undercount pass holders, I suspect, especially on services which cross boundaries into ITA areas. Merseytravel-supported bus drivers are notoriously relaxed about passes. Transdev employ inspectors who are much stricter. Do you compensate for local Spanish practices?

We live in a very sparsely populated rural area but the bus service is vital for some people

Risk using a retrospective proxy. Doesn't factor in potential; housing growth; employment / education change ...

Does that mean that the higher the passenger number the more you will support it or the lower the passenger numbers the more you will support it? Quantity over quality does not address need and, as previously stated, there are potential alternatives to supporting the costs of a large, relatively empty passenger vehicle.

Agreed: This approach results in maximum passenger numbers for the available subsidy

Routes serving small villages and remote areas may only have a low number of passengers but be the only transport in the area.

Rural areas have less passengers than city areas and will suffer

passenger number fluctuates so this should be taken into account

I strongly believe that those with the greatest need should have priority over service provision, and that, just because an elderly or disabled person may bring in less income to the bus companies, due to concessions and the fact that they may use

busses less frequently because of varying illness, that they should not be penalised for this, as they have the greatest need of accessible and nearby public transport.

As previously mentioned the review should be done by journey. A route that may not meet the reviews' criteria on a whole, when looked at, at journey level, may on having, for example, the first/last journey of the route then meet the criteria. You have the information - use it.

Few people = no service?

Will you also consider the size of bus used for busy routes as my experience is that buses in and out of Preston at busy times get very crowded

A bus service - even twice daily - is more important to an isolated small community with NO other links, than to a larger group that has other transport links.

If this happens then in Lancaster the students will once again get priority! There will be some routes that have lesser numbers of passengers but provide a lifeline to those using it.

While a service that carries no passengers at any times is obviously pointless, simply counting heads is a very blunt and often misleading measure of value. At the least, the total number of passengers should be examined relative to the total potential of the served area. It's important to avoid a feedback where a low-usage service is reduced and thus becomes less attractive, promoting even lower use and eventual closure.

The problem is that the bus may be a lifeline for a few people in a remote area. The value of that is hard to define!

Some rural areas may have a small population, but this cannot be allowed to result in vulnerable people with no access to other means of transport being cut off. outlying areas already have limited services and any reduction would isolate the elderly and those without caes etc.

Numbers are not too critical. Service the parts that others cannot is a greater need.

The few are just if not more important than the many

It's irrelevant how many people use services, if people catch a bus they need the service. Service information should provide when that service is required and accomodate around that for example, my service Stagecoach 3 Penwortham is very busy from 7.30 - 9.15 am Mon - Fri and 3.45 - 5.00 pm Mon - Fri, particularly during college term times, during those journey times people have to stand and passengers are left at stops along the journey, this indicates to me that my service needs double

deckers at those peak times and a mini bus the remainder of the day and when colleges close in the summer.

As I said earlier in the questionnaire buses that are 'obscure' and only run twice a day are less likely to be popular with bus users because of their inflexibility. I use public transport exclusively and believe that if you combined little used routes with a stronger awareness, marketing campaign you can drive up usage.

Lets market the service .. run it like a business dont give up because we are not busy

I do not agree with how you intend to score this - rural services may not carry large numbers of passengers but are vital to perhaps a smaller number of passengers.

Assess per operating hour or by journey.

there are areas of the county where there is no 'back-up' type of provision for older or disabled people so number of users may be an inadequate criterion.

Do numbers count? For the people using the service it is vital.

Stalmine Parish Council disagrees on the basis that, whilst the number of passengers may not be high, public transport is often the only means of transport for those in rural areas

The rural bus services are providing a public service , and are always going to be serving a small number of residents, but are nonetheless important and valued , but are less likely to ever be profitable than routes within towns.

lower numbers in rural areas, but the need of the bus will be high to combat social isolation

The numbers of user of a bus service is the best indicator of how useful it is, yet this only contributes $5/23 * 60\% = 13\%$ to the overall assessment. This should be significantly increased.

The numbers of user of a bus service is the best indicator of how useful it is, yet this only contributes $5/23 * 60\% = 13\%$ to the overall assessment. This should be significantly increased

This would appear to discriminate against rural routes where the bus is the only transport available for many and therefore a lifeline but where numbers may not be high

The criteria isn't adequate enough. It should be linked in with the percentage of the population as it is prejudicial towards larger areas with more existing services (see other options for more information).

The score for this should be higher - the number of people using a service is the most important sign that it is needed.

In areas where existing services are inadequate it will take time to build up passenger numbers

I agree that the number of passengers is important, however I believe that in places that are off the beaten track access to public transport is equally important.

Rural services may carry fewer passengers but are a vital lifeline

The reason you've no passengers is because you don't offer a suitable timetable

A subsidised service should not be based on passenger numbers but on service 'need' - which can be measured on your previous scoring methods. The whole point of subsidising a service is to help ensure a service becomes sustainable - if there are high passenger numbers the need for subsidy should be substantially diminished

The Town Council considers that there is a need to provide public transport for all residents

Unrealistic volume

7.2 Suggested other options

Respondents who thought other options should be included were asked what those other options should be. All comments are provided below.

Tap into government funds connecting links to main centres eg Liverpool.

This is a rather crude assessment. On some services on a particular day or at a particular time there is heavy usage but at other times there is not eg rural bus services on market days? "Number of bums on seats "per journey" would be a finer assessment".

Redefinition - More than 100,000 journeys p.a - 7. 50,000 journeys p.a - 6. 30,000 journeys p.a - 5. 20,000 journeys p.a - 4. 10,000 journeys p.a - 3. 5,000 journeys p.a - 2. Less than 5,000 journeys p.a - 1.

Keep as many services going as possible. Ask the operating companies they record all bums on seats - or do they? I have examples where now cards are not counted (Stagecoaches and Preston Bus and Blackpool transport)

Per passenger miles - 5+miles = 5 points.

Rural areas - more weighting to services that extend at several miles into rural areas. The further the service travels out of the town/city centres, more weighting should be given.

A means of measuring the social cost to the community as a result of the withdrawal of the service would be helpful in deciding whether additional weighting is warranted, Bus Users UK is asking the Dept for Transport to identify guidelines and best practice for this work in the near future.

seasonal flows if poor use at certain times of maybe not operate the service.

Social inclusion

Public/community lifelines shouldn't be based on numbers carried alone. Please try and look at the wider picture. This is going back to the 'profit motive' again.

There should be rewards for increasing usage over time

subsidised services should collect revenue from the passengers even if they have a nowcard or a operator pass. It could be a nominal fee say 50p. If the service is needed like they say it is everyone wont mind paying.

By definition you're not counting frustrated journeys by passengers who would like to travel and can't. Some cross-research, say, checking taxi journeys, car sharing, lifts or community transport might reveal hidden and frustrated demand.

Depends on the answer to my question above. (Does that mean that the higher the passenger number the more you will support it or the lower the passenger numbers the more you will support it?).

Only fare payers should count

Population should be considered - demographics in areas change and the need for buses can fluctuate - just because a bus service isn't well used now doesn't mean it won't be in the future - and people considering moving to an areas without links would be dissuaded.

Look at the main routes, the routes which can be easily accessible without having to walk great distances to get to the nearest route/bus

Consideration should be given to using smaller vehicles in areas where there are fewer passengers.

You need to ask whether people would use a service if it were to run more frequently.

Need to take account of rural areas and options

Measure by hour/journey.

I think this factor needs to be weighted in some way - as again rural areas will be disadvantaged

Actual numbers are currently not given enough weighting

To consider weightings for the impact of topography on creating higher costs for running services. Also consider a formula based on % of population/cost per km /cost per passenger.

In areas where existing services are inadequate it will take time to build up passenger numbers

Maybe service usage as a percentage of local population

To service villagers and visitors

8. Overall

Respondents were asked if they had any further comments on the proposed criteria. All comments are provided below.

This above system leads to discrimination. More positive attitude to smaller and rural communities needed.

I am glad to see that, at last, people's needs are going to be taken into consideration as well as financial criteria. It will be hard to wean car owners from using their cars so as things are at the moment people who do not have the use of a car should be considered first in allocating resources. This is particularly true in rural areas. So children, disabled, elderly should be considered first. Another factor for consideration for people who do not qualify for ENCTS is the high cost of travel

Any assessment is strongly biased against rural areas who already get the thin end of the wedge with WBC/LCC provision. Transport links are vital for employment, education and health provision.

I think the majority of 'free pass' holders would be happy to pay 50p per bus trip as we need to do.

It is good to see LCC trying to rationalise the criteria for supported bus services. However it seems to me that a "top down" approach defining the types of service and general links that LCC would like to see would be a better starting point than a "bottom up" approach which considers services generally in isolation.

Issue of tickets - machines not always working. Need to scan NOW card. Are all journeys recorded.

It would be nice wouldn't it. But it's not a viable option, most regular long distance services have quiet periods, off peak times. It took me five years to get stagecoach to use drop nose vehicles on the 41 and 41 services. It's taking a damn site longer to get them on the 42 service and yet when you go to Lancaster all new buses are on the uni route. Stagecoach is not interested in passengers! Only their shareholders, other than that not a bad co. the staff are well trained and polite. Stagecoach manager at Lancaster, never been on a bus in his life - so the drivers tell me.

Include community transport with concessions in with the above.

It is welcome to see a Local Authority thinking about different themes and areas that are now being taken into consideration. However, the themes as they stand are generally very subjective, and unless the person carrying out the assessment is extremely experienced and clued in to local circumstances are like to generate a lot of debate. Alternatively, measuring the number of people actually using the buses gives a direct indication of how useful they are.

The 40% - 60% ratio of weighting between Priority Themes and Accessibility should be the other way around. Rural services need to be emphasized. The scoring for the top 3 - 'Priority Themes' - there is only one '5' the other criteria under 'Accessibility' include an '8' and three '5s'. Smaller buses should be introduced for rural bus routes, for example, in the Yorkshire Dales, 20 seater buses are used saving £7,500. More information is required on service usage; number of journeys; income generated etc. Finally, we feel the criteria is a blunt instrument avoiding consideration of each individual bus route. Each route should be considered on its own merit.

We have some concerns that the weighting schema will result in employment being the overriding factor with Business growth, sustainable development and operational service times all prioritising employment areas and conventional work patterns. This will mean that other social factors will only come into play if the service supports some evident employment area, which is worrying, however vital the local need for

employment support. Buses are such an integral part of life and any community, however large or small, that purely financial assessments will never sum up the benefit or loss of adding or taking away a bus service. All additional criteria is proposed are useful although we feel more work could be done to look at the whole picture and involve existing and would-be bus passengers directly in the process, across the county in rural and urban settings. While that may sound daunting, Bus Users UK would be happy to discuss how that might be achieved and can point to examples where this has been carried out and how much more accepting the public is of the outcome if they feel they have been heard.

The consultation was considered on 30th June and expressed concerns on the proposals which will affect weekend services.

The criteria and proposals have been considered we and believe them to be incomplete, as if accepted they would prevent Bretherton ever being provided with an adequate bus service.

The proposals were discussed at the recent Parish Council meeting. I have been asked to write and inform you that Freckleton Parish Council does not agree with the new method for assessing subsidised local bus services. It is the Council's view that the bus services through the Village should continue to be subsidised, as previously agreed.

At a meeting on Thursday 10th July 2014 the mentioned consultation was considered, It was resolved that the Council broadly supports the consultation and its contents but makes the following comments: Concern about the impact of the review criteria on health services – Rossendale has few health services in itself and relies on transport for residents to visit outlying hospitals and centres. A concern was raised about the ability of residents to visit friends and family in hospitals and to be able to get back home on the bus if evening services are to be reduced. Will Rover tickets be included in the consideration? Could the issue include a review of why students and young people can use their Rochdale card to get all the way into Lancashire but Lancashire can only use their card to get to the border with Rochdale? Will the criteria include new as well as existing services? The criteria assessment should be carried out in partnership or association with district and borough councils to ensure that local knowledge is crucially included into the discussions and deliberations.

The criteria in general will always favour services in more densely populated areas (where services are likely to be more commercially viable anyway) given the critical mass of usage that is required to score highly in some criteria. This will automatically mean many parts of West Lancashire will score poorly due to their rural nature, but it is these areas that often most need a subsidised service to prevent residents without private transport from becoming isolated. While providing access to employment and education is important and subsidised bus routes should be used where appropriate to ensure such access, subsidised bus routes are used by a wide range of people and for a wide range of purposes and so the criteria need to ensure that the wider

population's needs are taken into account by the criteria, not just those in employment, education or those that are elderly.

I am writing with regards to the Preston bus service 80 (Preston-Myerscough (Via Great Eccleston)) and the possibility that because the LCC has to make cuts this service could be reduced or even stopped, I understand that cuts have to be made but I urge you to please not cut or stop this rural service. I know I am in a minority but I do not drive so this service is vital to me. I am sure that some of the services that have buses it seems every 15 minutes or so could have some cuts without it affecting people so much. I urge you to please think carefully.

On routes where the evening element of an otherwise commercial service is tendered (so where there's a commercial daytime service and LCC pays for the evening journeys) many passengers hold the operator's day or weekly tickets bought on outbound commercial trips. When these are then used to make return journeys on the tendered trips, many drivers don't record the use of these passes and no revenue is declared against that journey. A good example of on the 12A between Preston and Ormskirk - most drivers don't record repeat day and weekly ticket uses. The true number of passengers using such supported service and the actual revenue is therefore potentially much underestimated, and certainly so is the value of running these journeys. These trips made using existing tickets not bought on that journey need to be considered when assessing the worth of a tender.

Some good ideas in here

It seems a fairer scheme than a blanket withdrawal of all evening & Sunday services it should be based on usage & demand its pointless having buses running around empty & unloved use it or lose it.

Rural services should be subsidised or alternative providers found

I think it is a good idea to try a new approach to setting criteria. The present system harks back to a bygone age, and is not fit for purpose in the current climate. A full review is necessary to cut out the instances of duplication of services both in the commercial and subsidised sectors. It would be very helpful to have the operators on board in the new planning.

I think it is very dangerous having a one size fits all policy as different area's of the county have different needs

Just remember that LCC is a LABOUR run council and it is beginning to behave with right wing ideas from the Thatcher era. There is insufficient information in the proposed criteria presented. It is simplistic and therefore difficult to make a judgement except that reading between the lines it would seem that basically the council want to cut certain services. Not good enough! Do they not realise that where investment has been pumped into making bus services more attractive and

affordable, such as in London, that passenger numbers have increased to post war levels. I also think that far too much money is poured into school contract bus services - for example on this area there are school buses taking children from Preston to Lancaster and vice versa - what a waste! This is where money could be saved.

My only other suggestion is that you could maybe charge 50p or £1 for each journey taken by a person with a free pass. I think it is preferable to have a more efficient service that could be helped by these charges. I do have a pensioner's pass and I would not mind paying

You need to understand barriers to bus travel and should look at research by RNIB, ensure its bus charter is used on all services and you consider the journey from door to door. There are many journeys I cannot do by bus even though the bus is there due to accessibility at one end or the other, for instance, I can't get from the bus stops at RPH to reception due to the hospital layout and my blindness, so there would be no point subsidising journeys there without integrating them with other measures

The present suggestions are at least an improvement on the previous ones where the sole criteria was monetary. But some adjustment are needed. In particular you should consult the users of a bus service or the potential users where no proper service exists. Even the present "consultation" is not widely publicised and does not seem to be available to anyone without internet access.

Much better. I should like to see co-ordination with neighbouring transport authorities although not using some of their extreme budgeting. Alas poor Pennine Motors RIP! reduce subsidies to the over 60s as they do not pay anything for their transport costs or allocate a flat fare of £1.00 per journey

No, thank you

I didn't understand the last question at all, it was confusing. I was surprised to learn that the fares only amount to 40%, the price of them just keeps going up and up, you'd think they'd count for more than just 40%.

New criteria should be in addition to existing.

The previous question was a bit restrictive. I strongly agree that the current system is a blunt instrument and reform is needed. I pretty strongly disagree with the direction of most of the proposed suggestions (as currently worded and presented in this consultation).

The current financial criteria are not perfect but I am not sure that the proposed replacement is better, at least without amendment. I feel that "cost per passenger carried" is a useful criteria whilst not being too far removed from the current method. The County Council should, I feel, develop a strategic bus network, much of which will

be provided commercially of course, at least Monday to Saturday daytime, and should give a high score to services that complement this. The council should not be afraid of abandoning little-used services or of leaving areas of the county unserved if such areas are unlikely to produce any passengers.

subsidising buses is a necessary evil of privatisation. the less services run the less people use. Subsidised travel should be limited to a monetary amount per month. ie £20/month at the end of the month the pass is topped back up rather than unlimited travel. it should be used to go to town shopping or a doctors appointment not a day trip to southport.

Please remember pensioners need the bus services to get out and meet people especially in rural areas.

Appreciate being consulted I could scrap three routes in Wyre and have minimal impact 16 87 and 86 would go plus all routes beyond Poulton into Blackpool. Simple

We need more bus services in Preston directly from East Preston to West Preston avoiding the need to change buses at Preston Bus Station. Similarly for other axes. ie North/South.

some service overlap ie service 5 service 2 covers part of this route so could be taking passenger due to its frequency thus affecting route 5 scoring

There was no comment box for the previous question! Services should have to have some financial commitment applied to them. Using both the new criteria and maintaining the 40% would be an idea. Using the points system a service could score highly in all bar the passenger loadings, and spend the whole day running round with no passengers.

I think priority and accessibility should be weighted the same. If the services aren't available where and when they are most needed then they are failing the community they serve.

A bus service is a lifeline to a community - and NOT having a bus service has a significant negative and isolating impact. If you had 1000 bus journeys a week to subsidise I'd rather see 100 communities get 10 journeys a week than 20 communities get 50 journeys a week - having buses on a few days a week is infinitely preferable than none at all.

I think you need to carefully consider the impact on your local communities before changing the buses. For many it is a lifeline to getting out and not being socially isolated. It also would encourage less people to use cars in the town centres but then you would lose income on car parking which is horrendously high compared to other areas! Council should put people not money first and then they would get more support in the long term for making changes!

I would welcome a change from evaluating subsidies on purely financial terms. Providing that the service-value metrics are widely accepted in the community and are regularly and publicly reviewed, they should be a much more responsive way of allocating resources.

I don't think everything can be dealt with in exactly black & white. The new rules are OK but within should be built say a 'weighting' of the services necessity. I realise this may be arbitrary but a service function as the word implies is to service and if the pendulum has swung too far on the count some draw back position should be inserted. Perhaps looking for a contribution from other areas.

It would be helpful if passengers views were sought directly, I appreciate this would be a mammoth task but a true picture would reveal what is required in terms of transport for Preston in particular and I am sure across Lancashire.

Rural buses must be maintained for those without transport or cannot drive

Have some concerns that those living in isolated areas may lose out, some provision must still be made for them.

I hope this succeeds as public transport is not just about financial viability but about providing a public service.

There needs to be a careful management to avoid the isolation of some communities. I would not want to see urban services (in some cases too frequent) being subsidised at the expense of hourly rural services etc. There should be a wider consideration to reduce the subsidy for services that are every 10 mins during the day in some parts of Preston city... these services are often empty but peak times lack the frequency needed

Not sure I like the current system or the proposed system. The whole thing needs looking at in a business like way. Finding ways to encourage new users. The fares system needs to make more sense with simple low cost monthly options which allow passengers to access the whole network. As I mentioned earlier pricing doesn't make sense Waddington to Clitheroe approx £1.40 per mile - Waddington to Barrowford £0.27p.. Who worked that out ???

I use the bus (do not have a bus pass) but the methodology of working out prices needs reviewing and does not encourage bus usage, especially for shorter journeys. When it is only slightly cheaper to get the bus for two people versus a taxi which is a door to door service does nothing to promote bus usage.

These comments have been made on behalf of Read Parish Council - comments submitted by Mrs Shirley Bridge, Clerk to Read Parish Council

If you reduce the cost of fares for children and adults, then more people will use the bus service

The new criteria appear to be more focused on the customer's requirements than just on commercial value. However, there still needs to be more emphasis on covering the needs of customers who travel between remote locations in the evenings. Some operators could consider making more use of smaller buses during off-peak times, to improve efficiency. LCC could also consider whether alternative operators may find ways to operate subsidised services more efficiently than the current ones, e.g. if Blackpool Transport could operate the 78 (Kirkham - Lytham St Annes) service more effectively than the current operator.

How are people without computer access being consulted? What is being done to publicise the existence of the consultation? Is there a closing date?

Before privatisation we had a service based on need, not profit. Many rural routes carry few passengers, but for the people they serve, are fundamentally essential to their lives. Withdraw those services, and people will suffer financially, socially and medically because isolation and depression are closely related.

We are largely in agreement with this new criteria for assessing subsidised bus services. We would emphasise that Lancs CC must publish score details when proposing withdrawals and present these to passenger representatives such as ourselves when making such proposals.

They are generally very subjective, and unless the person carrying out the assessment is extremely experienced and clued in to local circumstances are like to generate a lot of debate. Alternatively, measuring the number of people actually using the buses gives a direct indication of how useful they are.

Just to confirm that the bus service in my region (Lune Valley) at night and weekends is vital to my work and social life and if removed would cause myself severe problems in attending work and social activities, so please do not remove our services

The current criteria does need amending. But the new proposals are also very subjective, and unless the person carrying out the assessment within a locality is extremely experienced and clued in to local circumstances the newer assessments may not improve or allocate resources any better. Measuring the number of people actually using the buses gives a direct indication of how useful they are. Other points to consider - newer buses which are massively more fuel-efficient (the older larger buses that Stagecoach continue to run up and down the Lune Valley are massively inefficient) - There is a huge need to look at Air Quality, and carbon impact of the fleet used by providers of services - Matching vehicle size to demand is becoming ever more viable than using one large catch-all bus all the time, even if it means having a larger vehicle fleet and parking up the larger buses outside peak times (NB an operator in the Yorkshire Dales is saving £7500 a year in fuel by running a new 20

seater bus (23 with three standing), which would be more than enough capacity for most Lune Valley runs) 1. It is important that trends on bus usage are looked at as some routes are increasing usage. Would it be possible to test a more refined and subtle look at recommissioning services within one or 2 pilot areas such as the Lancaster District if a broader approach cannot be taken on board across the County.

The two objectives 'Priority Themes' and 'Accessibility' should be weighted equally. Also, within each route there should be a financial measure and an incentive for operators to market services to increase passengers. In addition to the suggestions already made, one way of allocating subsidies would be to prioritise, and have a list of priority contracts. There is a need to ensure that access to subsidies is fair and other issues such as topography, access to alternative transport e.g. trains, and access to hospitals is considered, particularly for those areas where there is a lack of facilities and conditions within the area (e.g. hilly areas) mean that certain bus routes are essential for protected equality groups. The working group also strongly emphasise that Rossendale is the only Lancashire district without access to trains, and all major hospitals are outside Rossendale e.g. Blackburn, Rochdale, Bury, and Burnley. The consultation was unclear whether the criteria would be applied as an automatic process, or whether there would be consultation on each service afterwards. Also it was unclear whether it would be a whole scale re-evaluation or whether it would be done as contracts came up. The consultation document is only available online and wide ranging accessibility is required as many people do not have access to a computer. This is particularly so for many people who use these bus services, the consultation should be accessible to the people who use the services. The working group would like to request information in relation to consultees e.g. additional consultees, such as user groups/ citizens panels etc.

see previous comments relating to the Bretherton area

Lancashire, a place where no one matters

Your new proposed assessment methods are still based on financial measurement due to the nature of the scoring proposed. This will probably see the subsidy based more than 40% on financial grounds. This could become another example of taking council tax from rural taxpayers and directing those funds towards higher population areas. When are LCC going to recognise the needs of the rural communities that also help keep this great County ticking?

Adlington Town Council considers that a system should be put in place so that those service operators running the most profitable routes should also take on a similar but low profit route. This would enable bus services to be provided for all residents of Lancashire while reducing the need for LCC subsidy, and would secure the future of public transport to isolated areas

More qualitative criteria required for a balanced outcome

Last day of the consultation so I have to put my oar in but it's taken the deadline to force myself to see if there is really any value in this process. But I can't. This is an expensively elaborate but still fundamentally flawed approach. It's balkanising bus services when these services are an integral part of the county's transport system and so the question of resource allocation has to involve, at the very least, the resources spent on the whole of the highway/transport network. But further, I'd argue that the county council needs to 1) go back to the fundamentals of zero-base budgeting; and 2) devolve services and funding to district level in order to effect efficiencies in what is an over-centralised and too-remote system of governance.

I'm not arguing for 'no change' ever to the pattern and level of subsidy. But what you have presented the public with is just an attempt to cut the total level of subsidy in a different and ostensibly more 'objective' and therefore, as the county council persuades itself, a more acceptable way.

I know that the county council cannot on its own reintroduce regulation of bus services so that private companies can't cherry-pick the best routes/times. But that's really what's required too and the county council should be saying so loud and clear. For the people handling this process, sorry for being so downbeat about it. I know that you're trying to do your best within the parameters prescribed.