Finance and Constitution Committee Questionnaire

This questionnaire is being sent to those organisations that have an interest in, or which may be affected by the Transport (Scotland) Bill FM.

In addition to the questions below, please add any other comments you may have which would assist the Committee’s scrutiny of the FM.

Consultation

1. Did you take part in any consultation exercise preceding the Bill and, if so, did you comment on the financial assumptions made?
   
   No

2. If applicable, do you believe your comments on the financial assumptions have been accurately reflected in the FM?

3. Did you have sufficient time to contribute to the consultation exercise?

Costs

4. If the Bill has any financial implications for your organisation, do you believe that they have been accurately reflected in the FM? If not, please provide details.

   No detailed costings have been completed for this organisation at this stage, but the FM appears to provide a reasonable basis for a very broad estimate of some of the costs.

   **LEZ:**
   The FM does not accurately reflect the likely cost of developing, implementing and enforcing/operating a LEZ, which will include substantial traffic management costs over and above back office, staffing and cameras. The expectation is that operating and enforcement costs will be met from income received via Penalty Charge Notices. It is highly unlikely that the revenue from PCNs will be sufficient to cover annual or future replacement costs. The Bill also states that PCN revenue may also be required to be used to repay any grant funding provided by the Scottish Government. LAs do not have funding to support implementation or operation and this would have to be fully funded by the Scottish Government.
Bus Services:
It is not anticipated that there would be any additional costs to ACC associated with the Bill’s provisions in respect of Bus Service Improvement Partnerships nor the provision of better information. The expectation would be that any proposal for ACC to operate bus services would be cost neutral. There is no additional funding to be provided by the Scottish Government in respect of the Bill’s provisions relating to Bus Services.

Smart Ticketing:
It is not anticipated that there would be any significant additional costs to ACC associated with the Bill’s provisions in respect of ticketing arrangements.

Pavement Parking and Double Parking:
The Bill anticipates implementation, administration and enforcement costs can be met from PCN income. The FM suggests that the average cost of implementing this would be in the order of £25,000 and £33,000 for back office/ administration. This is not sufficient to enable this Council to manage these requirements and therefore it would be an expectation that the additional costs of implementing the requirements of the Bill would be met in full by the Scottish Government through the annual Local Government funding settlement. The Bill also makes provision for LA’s being required to prepare separate accounts for parking.

Road works:
No financial implications – staff involved are paid at an existing grade and additional training is unlikely.

Regional Transport Partnerships Finance:
No financial implications – the Transport Bill clarifies RTP financial reserve issues.

5. Do you consider that the estimated costs and savings set out in the FM are reasonable and accurate?

With the exception of the costs associated with LEZs and parking elements of the Bill, the wide range of potential costs identified the basis for those other estimates and ranges appears to be sound.

6. If applicable, are you content that your organisation can meet any financial costs that it might incur as a result of the Bill? If not, how do you think these costs should be met?

No. Local Government cannot meet the additional costs outlined within their current budgets so will expect that the Scottish Government honours the principle that additional costs associated with additional duties are provided for in full in the Local Government funding settlement. The Bill recognises that some Local Authorities have already set up Bus Service Improvement Partnerships, some already have parking enforcement schemes in place and some already have suitably qualified Road Works supervisors. However, should additional funding be provided for local authorities to implement such new duties then those authorities that have already invested their own resources in these areas should also receive funding to compensate them for that investment to maintain equitable funding levels.
7. Does the FM accurately reflect the margins of uncertainty associated with the Bill’s estimated costs and with the timescales over which they would be expected to arise?

Yes, for all except the LEZ and parking elements of the Bill.

Wider Issues

8. Do you believe that the FM reasonably captures any costs associated with the Bill? If not, which other costs might be incurred and by whom?

See responses to Questions 4 and 5 above

9. Do you believe that there may be future costs associated with the Bill, for example through subordinate legislation? If so, is it possible to quantify these costs?

None identified at this stage.