

Runnymede Borough Council

COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Thursday 9 July 2020 at 6.30 p.m.

To be held remotely via MS Teams

**SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

11. **RUNNYMEDE TRAVEL INITIATIVE (COMMUNITY SERVICES - DARREN WILLIAMS)**

**Synopsis of report:**

The Runnymede Travel Initiative (Yellow Bus Service) is a discretionary service provided by Runnymede at a cost to the Council of approximately £300,000 a year. With the current contract with an external company to deliver the service ending at the end of July 2020, this report sets out options for re-providing the service in a different format to reduce the ongoing subsidy paid by the Council.

The report details other considerations that were asked for by Corporate Management Committee to be included in the report to Community Services Committee.

**Recommendations:**

The Committee considers the information provided in the report regarding the Runnymede Travel Initiative (Yellow Bus Service) currently operated along with the proposal of an in-house service option as a replacement for the current Service.

The Committee considers the financial implications of committing to an in-house service against the current financial position of the Council and the impact of Covid-19 on this financial position.

**EITHER**

The Committee confirms that it wishes to proceed with the in-house service model proposed and recommends to Corporate Management Committee that:

1. A capital estimate in the sum of £315,000 be approved for the purchase of the additional 7 buses and the committee establish the means for financing it; and
2. A capital estimate in the sum of £135,000 be approved for the replacement of existing Community Transport vehicles to be taken from the vehicle replacement budget held within the current capital programme; and

**3. The commencement date for the new service will be January 2021, subject to the fleet and employees required to deliver the service being available and subject to the ability to provide the service to comply with any relevant Government requirements in respect of the Covid-19 pandemic that may apply at that time.**

**OR**

**The Committee confirms that it wishes to discontinue the school transport service.**

**OR**

**The Committee defers a decision until later in the year when the long-term financial effects on both the Council and the general household income of those wishing to use the scheme can be fully appraised to ensure the schemes long term viability**

## **1. Context of report**

- 1.1 The conclusion of the current contract for the Runnymede Travel Initiative (which has come to be known as the Yellow Bus Service), school transport service at the end of the 2019/2020 academic year has resulted in a report being requested by Corporate Management Committee.
- 1.2 The service, provided in Runnymede for almost twenty years, is a legacy of the Runnymede Business Partnership who initiated the service and who contributed significant sponsorship to the service.
- 1.3 This, together with Section 106 funding received via approved planning applications in the borough, funded the service in the main for much of its existence.
- 1.4 However, more recently, with the sponsorship funding reduced to zero and changes in legislation meaning that Section 106 money will no longer be available to fund the service, the Council has been left with a subsidy of approximately £300,000 per year. The Council committed to the service on the assumption that new s106 monies would be forthcoming. This source of income has not materialised however, and the subsidy has, for the past few years been a growth item in the Medium-Term Financial Strategy.
- 1.5 Given the current financial climate and the financial position of the Council, the need to undertake a review of the service and if possible, find a more cost effective and therefore sustainable solution has been identified as required.
- 1.6 Now, with the necessary decision taken to inform schools of the cessation of the current service at the end of this academic year, there is a more pressing need to consider alternative solutions which it is hoped will enable future service provision.

- 1.7 This report provides full detail of the current service provided, of the role schools play in the delivery of the service and the current demand and finances related to the service. The report also attempts to address some of the misunderstandings outside the Council, given that the service provided is completely discretionary and now at a significant cost to the Council.
- 1.8 The report also sets out what is considered the most cost effective option available to Members for the delivery of a future service and in addition outlines how an in house transport solution would not only provide replacement transport, but also look to improve the quality, whilst reducing the overall subsidy. It should however be noted that there have been a lot of assumptions made as to pricing and demand based on the existing service, rather than predicting the financial impact of the current coronavirus pandemic on households and their ability to continue to access the service.
- 1.9 The level of detail in the report is intended to provide Members with the fullest information possible, so an informed decision can be made regarding any future service provision. Any such decision should be made with the understanding of the Council's current financial situation.

## **2. Report**

### Background

- 2.1 The Yellow Bus Service is a discretionary service started by the Council as an initiative led by the then Runnymede Business Partnership. The service was heralded as a new approach to the delivery of home to school transport, filling a void left by the County Council, modelling the service on American style school transport services.
- 2.2 The primary reason at the time for launching such a service in Runnymede was to contribute to a reduction in congestion during peak traffic periods, an issue that affected many businesses within the Runnymede area.
- 2.3 The Yellow Bus Service was initially set up without the requirement for the Council to subsidise the service, such were the levels of sponsorship income from those within the Runnymede Business Partnership, together with the availability of Section 106 monies from planning applications used to fund the service. The service was not set up with the intention of being heavily subsidised by the Council, the position the Council finds itself in today.
- 2.4 Since its inception, the service has been delivered on behalf of the Runnymede Business Partnership, and more latterly the Council, as the business partnership has retreated from this initiative, by First Beeline ("First"), who provide a range of transport services nationwide.

### About the Current Contract

- 2.5 The current service is contracted to First following a tender process and subsequent contract award, that took place in 2017. The current contract is for a fixed period of three years, commencing on 4 September 2017 and does not contain the opportunity to extend the current contract beyond the end of the 2019/2020 academic year.

- 2.6 When the service was tendered in 2017, the decision was taken to provide bidders with the opportunity to bid for one or more of the schools that were to receive the service, these being Fulbrook School, Jubilee High School, The Magna Carta School and Salesian School. Bidders wanting to bid for one or more of the available “lots”, were given the opportunity to offer a discount for multiple lots.
- 2.7 The contract was tendered in 2017 and awarded to First. Whilst quality scores as part of the tender process were largely consistent between bidders, the fact that First Beeline already had the fleet resources in place is likely to have contributed to the significant difference in prices submitted. This resulted in a cost of £468,000 (the next closest being in the region of £750k followed by a bid of £1.5 million).
- 2.8 The most cost-effective bid in revenue terms was to bring the service in house but was rejected because of the capital costs of procuring a new fleet of vehicles.
- 2.9 The decision was taken to specify within the tender the capacity requirements for each of the schools, based on an average number of passengers over the three years previous plus 10% to allow for growth. As a result, the current service capacities per school are as follows:

*Table 2: Service Capacities by School*

Fulbrook	250
Jubilee High	40
Magna Carta	125
Salesian	50

- 2.10 The contract is for the provision of transport to arrive at the beginning of the school day and leave at the end of the school day. In addition, some provision for after school club provision was included in the contract.

#### Current Service Overview

- 2.11 The service operates using previously agreed service routes, which due to the size of the vehicles used, vary only slightly year on year due to the restriction of the kinds of roads the vehicles can navigate.
- 2.12 Whilst the contract states that the service is coordinated by the Council, the reality is that for a number of years the service has been coordinated locally between the provider and the schools directly. This is particularly the case regarding slight variations to routes, pupil behaviour discussions, discussions relating to unforeseen service delays etc.
- 2.13 The four schools have played an important role in the coordination of the service. This support has been in-kind support assisting the coordination of the service. The role of the schools involves promoting the service to existing, prospective and new school pupils, receiving bookings and payments for the service and consolidating payments against the service providing and transferring the fare income to the Council. The schools also liaise directly with First on operational matters.

- 2.14 The main point of contact within each school have always been accessible to requests for information, subject to data protection rules, to answer questions and discuss elements of the service and have been very supportive of the delivery of the service.
- 2.15 With the largely static routes that are in place, First will coordinate the pickup points/information for parents that is then relayed to them via the school. The intention of the service is to ensure that so far as is possible, no pupil must walk any further than 300 metres to their nearest bus stop.
- 2.16 The fleet is no longer made up exclusively of the American style school buses and is now a mixture of the original vehicles and other older school buses within the First fleet. Each vehicle has a seated capacity of 60.
- 2.17 The current charge per pupil per day is set at £3.50, with a discounted charge of £5.00 for two siblings travelling and a further discounted price of £6.50 for three siblings travelling. There is no additional charge for pupils who require transport from after school clubs, which whilst ensuring the service remains affordable for parents, has placed an additional subsidy and cost pressure with the Council.
- 2.18 Fares are paid either termly or half termly in advance by cash or cheque to the schools. There is currently no provision for regular invoicing or payments by direct debit to support parents making payments over the course of an academic, or school year.
- 2.19 Details on pupil usage are limited given the way in which the service is currently coordinated. However, in October 2019, as one of the first pieces of work undertaken in reviewing the current service, a request was made by the Council to First to record the number of passengers boarding at each stop, each morning of the week and also the number alighting at each stop in the afternoon. The results of this weeklong evaluation were as follows:

*Table 3: Passenger Usage: Full Week – October 2019*

School	Lowest Combination Total Users per Day	Highest Combination Total Users per Day	Total Passengers Travel Over Week	Total Seats Available per Week to Pupils as per Contract	Percentage Uptake Against Total Available Capacity
Fulbrook School	80	95	430	1250	35%
Jubilee High School	2	4	14	200	7%
Magna Carta School	82	108	493	625	79%
Salesian School	52	78	341	250	137% (See 2.24 below)
	216	285	1,278		

- 2.20 It is important to note that with limited processes in place for the collation of Key Performance Indicators relating to the service, it is accepted that given this information was collated by drivers during the course of their work, there is the potential for a degree of inaccuracy. However, what can confidently be taken from the above table is that the service delivered in the 2019/2020 academic year, in its totality is under-utilised against the contract specification.
- 2.21 It is recognised that the schools where there is a greater percentage uptake on a day by day basis are currently Magna Carta School and Salesian School, although it is important to note that this is an ever-changing statistic dependent on school admissions numbers year on year.
- 2.22 Salesian School was able to be provided with additional transport this year, due to the reduction in service uptake at Fulbrook and Jubilee schools. However, this would not necessarily be possible when Salesian change their school hours for the 2020/2021 academic year or if it were another school that required the additional resource instead.

#### Current Cost of Service

- 2.23 The table below outlines the costs of providing the Yellow Bus Service over the last few years:

*Table 4: Cost of Yellow Bus Service to Council*

	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
	£	£	£	£
<b>Expenditure</b>				
School Bus Contract	447,287	459,790	462,185	469,370
Printing	361	346	315	375
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>447,648</b>	<b>460,136</b>	<b>462,500</b>	<b>469,745</b>
<b>Income</b>				
Fares	171,414	174,328	176,700	196,137
S106 Payments	40,655	-	19,872	134,979
Sponsorship	12,500	5,000	12,500	-
Planning Tariff			-	300
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>224,569</b>	<b>179,328</b>	<b>209,072</b>	<b>331,416</b>
<b>Net Service Cost</b>	<b>223,079</b>	<b>280,808</b>	<b>253,428</b>	<b>138,329</b>
<b>Subsidy per child (based on 285 pupils from table 3)</b>	<b>£783</b>	<b>£985</b>	<b>£889</b>	<b>£485</b>

- 2.24 The table shows that the service operates at a significant subsidy to the Council. The net service cost includes income streams from some remaining

Section 106 agreements as well as ad-hoc sponsorship payments, the former of which will shortly not be available to offset the costs of future services.

- 2.25 The vehicles are used to provide “interpeak” transport, supporting the activities of the four schools supported as well as other schools in the area. Such work is not included as part of the contract and therefore any arrangements are directly between schools and First, with any associated income going directly to First.

#### Positives and Identified Weakness with The Current Service

- 2.26 It is important to highlight the positives within the service that is currently provided. These include:

- The service is reliable and punctual
- The service is provided by a team of reliable, committed staff working on behalf of First
- The schools are supportive of the service, communicate well and play an important role in the coordination of bookings and payments
- The service is highly valued by the schools it supports
- The service is highly valued by the parents who access the service for their children

- 2.27 However, in undertaking this review some weaknesses or areas where potential improvement could be made have been identified:

- There is a need for improved management of the service
- There is a requirement for greater monitoring information linked to the service
- The age of vehicles, non-compliance with equalities legislation and lack of identifiable brand
- The need to review pupil numbers ongoing and flexibly deploy resources to where there is demand
- A need for dynamic review of routes to accommodate pupils requiring the service
- A lack of technology in delivering the service, both regarding parent/pupil/school communication and user safety
- A lack of alternative payment options to make service more affordable to families
- The need for greater promotion
- The reduced take up of service at Jubilee and Fulbrook schools

### **3. Future service provision**

- 3.1 Members have asked that consideration is given to future service provision focussing on the potential for an inhouse transport solution. In considering a future service provision four key areas of focus have been identified:

- Reduced cost
- The Need to Serve All Secondary Schools
- Enhanced Coordination and Service Quality
- Environmentally Friendly

- 3.2 It has been the Officers' view that given the last tender was in 2017, the current subsidy paid by the Council would most likely increase in the event of the service being re-tendered. Reasons for this include likely changes in requirements relating to vehicles, the change in service delivery arrangements as a result of the change of school hours at Salesian School, the need to incorporate Chertsey High within any future service provision and the inflationary increase in costs since the previous tender exercise.
- 3.3 However, since the announcement that the current contract would come to an end at the end of this academic year, some Councillors have been approached by commercial bus and coach operators with regard to providing the service.
- 3.4 As a result, in order to ensure the breadth of consideration to the options has been given, following the meeting of Corporate Management Committee in June 2020, work has been undertaken to look at possible options working with commercial operators. However, it must be stressed that this does not negate the requirement for a full procurement process being required.
- 3.5 In addition, the internal model originally proposed in the report to Corporate Management Committee has been further reviewed and refined, to see whether if this was the preferred option, the overall cost to the council could be reduced further.

#### Research into Potential Commercial Operator Model

- 3.6 Following the meeting of Corporate Management Committee, the Corporate Head of Community Services has attempted to contact three local Bus & Coach companies, the names of whom have been raised by Members in communication over the last six weeks.
- 3.7 Of the three companies, two have engaged with information on potential options, costs etc. and have been very helpful in supporting the process of looking at various options. Both of these companies currently provide Home to School transport services elsewhere in various ways.
- 3.8 The first company we contacted stated an interest in providing such a service but were unable to give any real indication of costs until they had detail of the routes, the number of vehicles required and importantly, the specification of vehicles required to deliver the service.
- 3.9 Company 1 provides Home to School transport but more so as public bus services as opposed to closed services, ringfenced to a certain group of people. The public bus model is different from that provided to date and being considered for the future.
- 3.10 Company 1 would consider possibly bidding for a future service whether public service or closed service, although they explained the cost implications dependent on the service type. For example, public service vehicles that are designed to accommodate standing passengers are exempt from the legislation relating to the use of seatbelts.
- 3.11 Company 2 provided Home to School transport, but as a closed service model as opposed to via public service vehicles.



- 3.12 Company 2 had received requests from others to look at two of the existing service routes and provide indicative prices. These prices were shared by the company, giving an indication based on the size of the vehicle required, the route requirements etc.
- 3.13 Prices provided were based on the use of 50 seater or 72 seater vehicles, although Company 2 did state that they also had other smaller vehicles available. However, in the event that smaller vehicles were required to be used, to supplement larger vehicles, potentially this could be more cost effectively provided via the Community Transport service.
- 3.14 However, Company 2 again stated they would not be able to provide any accurate pricing until the full specification and route information was provided.

#### 4. **Service Options**

- 4.1 The report intended to be debated at Corporate Management Committee in June 2020 gave a proposal for an in-house service model for the continued delivery of the Runnymede Transport Initiative.
- 4.2 Having considered the information received through the discussions with commercial operators and further considered the original proposal for an in house service, this report to Community Services Committee again recommends that an in house service model, although with some risk (outlined below), would be the preferred method for future service delivery.
- 4.3 The report does however provide an overview of how an alternative model of a mixed commercial/community transport service, which Members may wish to consider.

##### Preferred Option – In House Model

- 4.4 The current Community Transport service has seen significant growth and diversification. However, an increase in resources has been limited. As a result, a shortage of drivers is a regular occurrence, with work covered by a combination of over reliance on casual staff and the use of office staff/managers.
- 4.5 Therefore, the service proposal addresses not only the requirements for a school transport service, but also for the wider Community Transport service.

##### Service Capacity

- 4.6 The service proposed is based on the current usage figures of the service, as outlined in Table 3. This is to ensure that the service requirements and therefore the cost reflect the current demand.
- 4.7 In addition, the service proposal includes provision of transport to Chertsey High School. With no information on usage trends etc. for a service to Chertsey High it is proposed that a capacity of 28 seats is provided initially. In the event of additional transport requirements over time as the school continues to grow in its student numbers, a report will be returned to Community Services Committee on this matter.

- 4.8 The proposed service will therefore offer the following capacity initially to each school:

*Table 5: New Service Capacity by School*

<b>School</b>	<b>Number of Vehicles to be Deployed</b>	<b>Number of Routes</b>	<b>Total Capacity</b>
Chertsey High	1	2	28
Fullbrook	4	8	112
Jubilee High	1	1	14
Magna Carta	4	8	112
Salesian	2	4	56
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>322</b>

- 4.9 The majority of the vehicles will operate two routes in the morning and afternoon to either the same school or two different schools, dependent on timetabling, routes and pick up/drop off locations in relation to other schools. It is not proposed at present that pupils from different schools will travel on the same vehicles, something that may be considered given the spread of pupils attending schools right across the borough.
- 4.10 The way the current service operates means that some schools already receive two groups of pupils on different routes from the same vehicle, with some arriving earlier than others. Given the size of the vehicles and their capacity, it is thought that each route will be relatively short, meaning that pick up times will not need to be overly early.
- 4.11 For the return journeys, for most pupils this will be a change in arrangements. Whereas normally vehicles are available for pupils to board at the end of the school day, in order to make the service as cost effective as possible two routes will also be undertaken in the afternoon. The intention would be to provide transport initially to those who live closest, before returning to provide transport to those living furthest away from the school. Again, given the capacity of the vehicles and the intention to provide transport as locally as possible first, it is hoped that the second group of pupils' departure time will not be too long following the end of the school day. This may however prove a disincentive to take up and will be monitored closely.
- 4.12 Regarding pick up and drop off locations, the current service works as far as possible to the principle of no pupil having to walk further than 300 metres to and from the bus stop to their home. Given the smaller capacity on vehicles, it is felt that this arrangement can where possible continue, although this would need to be flexible in terms of distance. Picking up from safe locations is imperative, however this does not necessarily have to mean bus stops and instead could be landmarks within local communities.

#### Vehicles to be Used

- 4.13 The service will operate through a fleet of smaller vehicles, of no greater than 16 passenger seats. All vehicles will be fully accessible and able to provide transport to pupils with mobility problems or who are wheelchair users. The service has been modelled based on each vehicle having a maximum

capacity of 14 passengers at any one time, to reflect the current fleet that would be used in part to deliver this service.

- 4.14 The current Community Transport service has a fleet of fifteen vehicles. Given the commitments currently in place in providing a range of other transport services, whilst it is possible to use some of the existing vehicles, in order to deliver the service in the way proposed, seven additional vehicles would need to be purchased for which additional money will need to be found.
- 4.15 As an alternative, consideration has been given to leasing vehicles. However, experience has shown that leasing generally works out considerably more expensive than purchasing, from experience possibly more than double the cost of purchasing a vehicle.
- 4.16 Whilst maintenance would be included in the lease agreement, this would probably reduce on average the cost of operating a purchased vehicle by £3,000. Previous experience has also highlighted the difficulty in arranging maintenance and fleet repairs, with inevitable delays and vehicles being out of service for longer than necessary.
- 4.17 The ultimate preference would be for Ultra Low Emission Vehicles (ULEV) (most likely electric vehicles), working to the Council's priority of reducing its environmental impact. However, currently it is felt that considering the financial position of the Council, this approach would be cost prohibitive. To give some indication of this, an electric vehicle would be close to at least double the price of a diesel vehicle with the added cost of the installation of charging points at any given overnight storage point.
- 4.18 It is though, important to note, that against the size and age of the existing vehicles delivering the service, the use of smaller vehicles with the latest technology in diesel engines is likely to still have a positive environmental impact.

#### Employee Recruitment

- 4.19 With the proposed school transport service being incorporated into the wider Community Transport service, when considering the human resources required to deliver the service, it has been necessary to consider the requirements of the service in its totality.
- 4.20 The growth of the Community Transport service in recent years has been achieved with little change to the employee establishment. However, in order to meet new service demands there is a requirement for regular overtime to be undertaken by permanent employees and an over reliance on casual employees.
- 4.21 Therefore, the proposed budget enables adequate resourcing of all aspects of the Community Transport service, including cover for annual leave and sickness. This allows for an increase in weekly driver hours across Community Transport from 399.5 hours as per the current Council establishment to 781 hours.

#### Service Coordination

- 4.22 It is proposed that all aspects of the coordination of the service are undertaken by the Community Transport office team, based at Chertsey Depot. Their responsibilities will include the following functions:
- Day to day management of the operations of the service
  - Management of vehicles and employees
  - Receipt of bookings for the service
  - Parent enquiries
  - Receipt of compliments and complaints relating to the service
  - Receipt of lost property etc.
  - First point of contact for schools
  - Dynamic review of routes based on geography of booked pupils at the start of an academic year and ongoing throughout academic year
  - Processing of payments from parents etc.
  - School liaison
- 4.23 In incorporating a school transport service, it is felt there is a need for additional supervisory and coordination support within the service. This support would also be of assistance to colleagues within the DSO, regarding the coordination of fleet maintenance and reactive repairs.
- 4.24 It is therefore proposed that should these proposals be accepted; the current Community Transport Scheduler's salary is reviewed and takes on responsibility as the lead coordinator for the school service on a day to day basis. In doing so, it is intended to offer training and in-role support to develop skills in staff supervision etc. to provide more support for the increased driving team.
- 4.25 Secondly, it is proposed that as a priority against the Council's apprenticeship budget, an apprentice is appointed. Whilst the appropriate apprenticeship has not been identified at present, it is felt that one in logistics coordination, passenger transport or fleet management would be appropriate. At the end of the apprenticeship a decision would need to be taken as to whether a permanent post is created, which would require a further growth bid.

## 5. **Service Enhancements**

- 5.1 Whilst the core principles of how the service is delivered would remain the same, there are enhancements that are intended for the new service model which it is hoped will improve the service for parents and pupils as well as make the coordination and management of the service smoother. Such enhancements include:
- Use of software to assist in the coordination of the service and enhance interaction with parents and pupils
  - Installation of CCTV to provide reassurance to both parents, pupils and employees regarding the safety and wellbeing of all travelling on vehicles
  - Introduction of options for payment by direct debit
  - A change in approach to accepting bookings, planning routes around bookings and not the other way around

### Branding and marketing

- 5.2 The current service has, over several years, lost its identity from the original American school bus design which is still the focus of marketing literature produced. This is primarily as a result of the gradual replacement of the American style vehicles with other, normal style coaches of various ages.
- 5.3 A new branding and a marketing strategy will be required for the school transport service. Marketing will still primarily focus on parents and pupils of the schools served but will have both a paper based and digital approach. The wider branding and marketing of the service via social media and the borough magazine should provide a platform to more widely promote a discretionary service that the Council has remained committed to providing.
- 5.4 For the fleet, branding is important to remove any stigma related to “traditional” community transport services. Currently, due to the mixed age of the fleet most vehicles are yellow in colour with a standard text and Council logo. Newer vehicles are white and have been branded to reflect the branding used across Community Services in Runnymede and Surrey Heath. Therefore a review of vehicle branding is seen as an important step to making the scheme as success.

#### Sponsorship Opportunities

- 5.5 Sponsorship will be sought once more from both large companies and small/medium enterprises for any new service provision. To attract sponsors, packages will need to be produced, offering reciprocal benefits to companies.

#### Vehicle storage options (In-kind Sponsorship)

- 5.6 Currently, through in-kind sponsorship, the existing fleet of vehicles used to deliver the service is stored outside of operational hours at Thorpe Park. Given the current arrangements at the Council’s depot in Chertsey and the limited space currently available for additional vehicles, it is hoped that a relationship between the Council and Thorpe Park can be continued to enable storage of vehicles in the future.

### **6. Requirements of schools**

- 6.1 The success of any new service is in partly dependent on having a positive partnership relationship between the schools and the Council. The way in which the service is proposed to be delivered means that the requirements of schools will be different from at present.
- 6.2 Given the changes to the way in which the service will be coordinated, most notably bookings and payments, there will not be the requirement for schools to oversee the administration of these aspects of the service. Discussion with Headteachers on this have been met favourably, with the potential release of resources within schools.
- 6.3 However, there are other ways in which schools are required to support the service including:

#### Support Around Pupil Arrival and Departure

- 6.4 The proposed service operates on the basis that each vehicle deployed will operate two routes both in the morning and in the afternoon. As a result, at

each of the schools there will be some pupils who arrive earlier than others in the morning and who leave later than the end of school time in the afternoon.

- 6.5 As a result, one of the requirements of the schools will be to provide a safe and secure place for pupils to access upon arrival and prior to leaving. It is felt that this is a key measure that needs to be agreed, given that the Council would only be able to commit to delivering a service that promoted the safety and wellbeing of pupils using it in all areas relating to the arrangements.

#### Support with Complaints etc.

- 6.6 Whilst it is hoped that the number of complaints made and concerns raised in relation to the service will be few and far between, the Council will require the support of the schools in investigating complaints or concerns raised regarding pupil conduct etc.
- 6.7 It is intended that terms and conditions of service will formally be set out, and a service charter will be produced which will clearly set out the expectations of parents and pupils and what they can expect of the Council in relation to the service.

#### Potential Support with Vehicle Storage

- 6.8 Should it not be possible to continue basing vehicles at Thorpe Park, consideration of other storage locations would be required, including a potential request of the schools to provide overnight and school holiday parking.

### **7. Timescale for implementation**

- 7.1 Whilst the conclusion of the current contract results in a requirement for a service from September 2020 (the new academic year), achieving such a start date will not be possible.
- 7.2 One of the main reasons why a commencement date of September 2020 is not viable is because of the need to procure 7 new vehicles plus replace an addition 3 vehicles from within the existing Community Transport fleet.
- 7.3 The lead time on the build of a Community Transport vehicle is generally 12 weeks from the point at which the supplier receives the base vehicle from the manufacturer. It is currently not known to what extent there is a supply chain issue between manufacturer and supplier as a result of Covid-19.
- 7.4 A vehicle specification has been prepared to enable procurement, most likely via a framework to take place, to enable an order to be placed as soon as is practically possible, once approval is given by Members.
- 7.5 The other main action required prior to the launch of a new service is the recruitment of staff to deliver the service and the commencement of their employment.
- 7.6 As a result, a commencement date of January 2021, or as soon as is possible thereafter once vehicles and employees are in place, is seen as a more realistic commencement date for the proposed service.

- 7.7 A January 2021 commencement will obviously leave a gap in service provision from September to the start of the new academic year.
- 7.8 Potentially, subject to capacity within the fleet and the availability of drivers, the Council could provide assistance to schools with some of their high priority students who require transport, for example those who access the service via Pupil Premium funding, coordinated by the schools.
- 8. Risks Associated with Moving to an In-House Service Model**
- 8.1 Whilst delivering a service in-house places the Council in full control of the future service, there are a number of risks that would have to be accepted by the Council in doing so. These include:
- Delays to Procurement
- 8.2 A service would not be able to be launched in full until the vehicle procurement exercise has been completed and the Council is in receipt of the additional/replacement fleet. In addition to the “normal” lead time in 7.3, as a result of Covid-19, there is the potential for the lead time to be extended due to a backlog in orders as a result of the recent lockdown, changes in working practice or unavoidably delayed due to a second wave of Covid-19 and the potential for further lockdown scenarios, either locally or nationwide. Delivery of the base vehicle from other European countries is also subject to the same potential for delay.
- 8.3 Officers are trying to minimise any potential delay in this area impacting the commencement of the new service by writing a service specification and identifying procurement frameworks that lend themselves to a quicker procurement process.
- Delays to Recruitment
- 8.4 The successful recruitment of additional Drivers will be key to being able to launch the new service. Therefore, the potential failure to recruit to all vacancies on the first or even second attempt would place the commencement date of the service at risk.
- 8.5 Previously, the Council has struggled to recruit to its Driver vacancies. It is understood that the two main reasons for this are the requirement for Drivers to work “split shifts” and also the salary paid by the Council.
- 8.6 Split shifts are where a driver will turn up to complete part of their hours in the morning before returning later in the afternoon to complete the rest. In the case of the proposed service, split shifts would be a requirement to reflect the start and end times at schools.
- 8.7 In order to try and reduce the risk, other work within Community Transport (e.g. Day Centre Transport) has been planned into work patterns to reduce the gap between shifts and also to increase the number of hours per employee, in the hope that this will make the roles more attractive to potential applicants.
- 8.8 In addition, given the need to consider harmonisation of pay with Surrey Heath Borough Council employees in the future, the potential TUPE transfer

of staff from the current provider and also the restructuring of the lower part of the RBC salary scales, Officers are giving consideration to a possible change to Community Transport Driver salaries.

- 8.9 The finances presented in this report to include a budget for staff regrading, however work is currently ongoing to identify the appropriate salary band. It is intended that information related to this will be presented to Corporate Management Committee should the recommendations of this report be approved, requiring a further report to that Committee.

#### Unknown Likely Uptake of the Service

- 8.10 The feedback Officers and Councillors have received indicates the importance of the service and the need for its continuation from parents and schools. This suggests that it would reasonable to expect a full uptake in the proposed service. However, equally it cannot be guaranteed year on year.
- 8.11 Changes to the fare structure and also the cost per day may be one of a number of possible reasons as to why the service may not be utilised in the future. Personal circumstance amongst families and individuals may equally determine that the service is not required. As a result, there is the potential that the service could be left with a greater subsidy to the Council than that outlined in this report.
- 8.12 Therefore, whereas the original proposal was based on a 100% uptake in service, Officers, in reviewing the finances of this proposal, have adjusted the percentage uptake to 80%. As a result, in the event that there is a greater uptake than this forecast, it will generate additional income to the Council and reduce the overall subsidy, as opposed to always being at risk of increasing the subsidy.
- 8.13 However, it is possible that 80% uptake will not be reached in future years. If this was the case, Officers would review the utilisation of vehicles to maximise its resources but also potentially redeploy its vehicles to other future opportunities that are income generative as opposed to the current situation of operating vehicles way below capacity.

#### Logistical Risk

- 8.14 With the proposed service intending to operate two routes per vehicle in both the morning and afternoon, there is a logistical risk associated with this based on the fact that the location of pupils booked to know the service are unknown at present.
- 8.15 Whilst the current routes indicate there are clusters of pupils attending schools which would make the service easier to coordinate, in that there may be only one or two pick up points per route, until bookings are received this is not guaranteed. For example, if all schools received admissions from all parts of the borough it would increase the length of routes, the number of pick up/drop off points in routes etc. which in turn would impact the service logistics.
- 8.16 Therefore, to limit this risk as far as is possible, the 80% figure outlined above equally provides some flexibility in regard to limiting numbers on particular routes if necessary in order to ensure that model is viable.



- 8.17 Alternatively, routes could be set in advance for the service. However, this is identified as a weakness of the current service in that the service does not cover all parts of the borough. Other options do exist which could be considered in the future should such a problem be identified, including the potential to put in place a priority booking process to ensure that those travelling to their nearest school are able to book before those living further away or potentially the sharing of vehicles between schools for certain areas of the borough (i.e. the more rural areas).

### Service Failure

- 8.18 There is a risk of service failure each day as a result of one of a number of variables around employee attendance and the realisation of driver vacancies. Community Transport is successful in mitigating this risk currently, utilising casual staff, offering staff overtime and office staff back filling routes where necessary to ensure transport is delivered as required. This is clearly not ideal and results in pressure to deliver other Community Service functions.
- 8.19 However, with an increased fleet size there is an increased risk of service failure to the Council. Whilst service failure cannot be 100% planned for, the proposed service and budget includes drivers who are “spare” (not allocated to a specific service or route) to provide immediate cover where employees on 52 week contracts take annual leave, or for sickness and other cover requirements right across the service. In addition, a budget is included for casual staff and overtime and it would be the intention of recruiting a small casual pool of Drivers to provide additional cover.

## **9. Consultation held with Headteachers**

- 9.1 Ongoing dialogue with Headteachers has taken place since the letter confirming the end of the current arrangements was sent to each of the four schools. In addition, with the Executive Head at Salesian School also supporting Chertsey High School, a conversation regarding extending the service to Chertsey High has also been held.
- 9.2 Ahead of the meeting of Corporate Management Committee in June, representatives of the five schools were sent a copy of the report and a meeting with the Headteachers and Corporate Head of Community Services was held. This was to give an opportunity for the content of the report to be discussed, to receive any questions and also gather feedback on the proposals. This is set out below:

### **Chertsey High School**

“...I have read through the agenda – thank you for that – and I don’t have any questions other than to agree that CHS would definitely want to be included in the new proposal”

### **Fulbrook School**

“...Having read the proposed recommendations and reflecting on our discussion, I fully support the proposal for Runnymede Borough Council to set up and run an in house bus service to support families in Runnymede to get

their children to school safely and affordably as outlined in the documentation.”

### **Jubilee High School**

“...Jubilee High School support your proposals. As discussed, we will obviously have to look at the interim time between September and January.”

### **Magna Carta School**

“...Many thanks for your time today meeting with myself and other local headteachers regarding your work around replacing the yellow bus service with an in house option. I am fully supportive of your proposal and thank you for putting in so much thought and detail. My only concern would be the delay in provision until January 2021 at the earliest and what the alternatives might be for the Autumn term, especially for our more vulnerable students.”

### **Salesian School**

“...Having read through the proposal I can confirm that as the representative for Salesian School we are very happy with the current proposal and feel it meets the needs of many of our families that use the current yellow bus service. My only concern exists around the January start and the likelihood of this being pushed back further if buses cannot be secured in time and the impact this will have on our families”

## **10. Correspondence with Parents**

- 10.1 Since letters were sent to schools in May 2020, emails and telephone calls have been received from parents detailing their displeasure at the decision to end the service.
- 10.1 In addition, recently a petition has been set up titled “Petition to: Reverse the decision to abandon the Yellow School Buses serving Fulbrook, Magna Carta, Salesian and Jubilee High”, via the Council website. The closing date for people to sign this petition is 12 September 2020.

The petition prayer reads:

“Without consultation with schools, parents or the wider community RBC has withdrawn funding for the Yellow School Buses. As such parents, schoolchildren and the wider community will be impacted by an increase in peak time car journeys for pupils that will now need alternative means of attending school. This petition calls upon RBC to reverse their decision with immediate effect and to engage in consultation looking at continued provision or alternative travel arrangements that retains the safety of our schoolchildren and encourages the most environmentally friendly approach to school attendance.”

- 10.2 As at 7 July 2020 the petition had been signed by 471 people (with a further 77 unconfirmed signatures)
- 10.3 It should be noted that whilst started with good intentions it is doubtful that those signing the petition were aware of the costs to the Council of providing this service and given that there are more signatures than users of the

service, the result had the full facts been known may have been different. Had such information been made public, it may have resulted in some not deciding to sign the petition, however this is unknown.

## 11. **Alternative Options with Commercial Operator**

- 11.1 Based on the information received and the indicative costings provided, consideration has been given to a mixed delivery model through the use of larger coaches for specific routes/schools and the Council's Community Transport service.
- 11.2 Using the capacity by school in the in-house proposal, the following vehicles would be required to deliver the service:
- 2 x 70-seater vehicles – one allocated to each of Magna Carta and Fulbrook School
  - 3 x 50-seater vehicles – one allocated to each of Magna Carta, Fulbrook and Salesians schools
  - 2 x 14-seater Community Transport vehicles, one allocated to each of Chertsey High and Jubilee High
- 11.3 Whilst the use of larger vehicles will improve the logistics in a sense of being able to pick up more passengers in one route, there is equally a risk that the use of five larger vehicles would mean there is the need for them to cover all parts of the borough in the morning and afternoon; most likely requiring longer route times, as well as the potential for some areas to be left unserved as a result of the need to pre-plan routes.
- 11.4 In the case of Salesian school, one vehicle to cover all parts of the borough, dependent on the location of those who book, is unlikely to meet the demand in a logistical sense. Therefore, additional vehicles; possibly smaller Community Transport vehicles, may be required to supplement the service at additional cost. Alternatively, the Salesian's service could be provided by three Community Transport vehicles.
- 11.5 With some uncertainty as to the actual number of vehicles required, using indicative costings provided by Company 2 and Community Transport costings, the service as set out above would cost similar to the in-house service proposal. This is based on the same level of fare income as forecast for the in-house model.
- 11.6 The Council would lose most, if not all, of its capital funding requirements, but would equally not address the resource gaps within the current Community Transport service, that are addressed through the inhouse proposal. The cost of regrading drivers is not factored into this model and therefore through the pay harmonisation work required, would be a likely cost to the council at some point in the future. These aspects would likely cost approximately £100,000 in addition, if completed.
- 11.7 Given that coordination of the service would be completed in the same way through the Community Transport office, the costs of a salary regrade, and the introduction of an apprentice would still apply.

11.8 Corporate Procurement have advised that for a contract of this size, the likely lead time on procuring such a service would be between four and five months, although again there is the potential for delay due to Covid-19 etc. In advance of this a new service specification, routes etc. would need to be written.

11.9 In procuring a service, there is the chance that the best bid will be more cost effective and reduce the subsidy to the Council, but equally could be significantly more expensive and either increase the Council's subsidy or make the service financially unviable. At this point Members may wish to revert to the in-house solution but obviously this will further delay any implementation date.

## 12. **Human Resources Implications**

12.1 There are several HR implications as a result of this report and proposal are set out below and in Exempt Appendix '1':

### Current Employees

12.2 Current employees would need to be consulted regarding possible alterations to hours and work patterns because of the proposed changes.

12.3 For those who undertake regular overtime or who work on a casual basis, there is the opportunity to become permanent for some or all those hours.

12.4 Once the situation of all permanent employees and then casual employees has been resolved, it is intended that all vacant posts will be advertised both internally and externally. The number of available posts will also be dependent on any TUPE requirements with existing First employees.

### Additional Office Employee Requirements

12.6 It is proposed that an apprentice post is made available within the Community Transport office team, funded through the corporate apprenticeship budget.

12.7 This apprenticeship could focus on one of a few areas including logistics, passenger transport, fleet management etc., although currently a suitable apprenticeship has not been identified.

12.8 If approved, the apprenticeship role will provide what will be much needed capacity within the Community Transport office team. At the end of the apprenticeship a review of the future requirement for the role will need to be undertaken and if still required, will be made permanent subject to an approved growth bid as part of the budget setting a business planning processes.

### Recruitment of 2<sup>nd</sup> CT Manager

12.9 As part of the Community Services growth bid for 2020/2021, approved by Members in February 2020 and which as a result of the ongoing work with Surrey Heath is still to be taken forward, there is provision for a 2<sup>nd</sup> Community Transport Manager who will become the senior manager for the service.

- 12.10 This additional resource will be required to support the successful implementation and delivery of the service.

### TUPE

- 12.11 Legal Services have sought Counsel's advice as to whether TUPE would apply for employees of First delivering this service given that there is currently no confirmation of a replacement service or a commencement if approved.
- 12.12 The term TUPE is a shorthand way of describing the provisions of the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulation 2006. In summary these provisions protect employees if the business in which they are employed changes hands. Its effect is to move employees and any liabilities associated with them from the old employer to the new employer by operation of law. To operate it has to established that a group of employees are dedicated to the delivery of certain task and that task is transferred from one business to another.
- 12.13 Counsel advice is that if the proposed service is to commence in January 2021, then TUPE will apply and therefore taking on existing employees will have to be factored into the costs of the delivery of the service. One of the major points to note about the operation of TUPE is that employees will transfer on their existing terms and conditions of employment e.g. salary, annual leave, and pensions. There is extremely limited scope for changes to such terms and conditions.

## **13. Financial Implications**

- 13.1 Runnymede, like all local authorities, has been adversely affected by Covid19. Given the Council's current reduced level of resources (as reported to the Corporate Management Committee on 25 June) and the uncertainty surrounding future government funding for districts and boroughs, the re-introduction of a revised service at this time, no matter how much is saved, needs to be thought through very carefully.
- 13.2 As Members will know, the now lapsed yellow bus contract was estimated to cost the Council just under £300,000 in 2020/21. Given the number of children accessing the service, this equates to a subsidy of up to £1,000 per pupil.
- 13.3 Under normal circumstances, such a service would fall to an education or transport authority rather than a district council. Requests have been made to Surrey County Council over the years for contributions toward the cost to reduce the subsidy, but alas none have been forthcoming to date. No contributions have been received from any of the schools serviced by the scheme either.
- 13.4 The proposals set out in this report of bringing the service in house and combining it with the current Community Transport service is the best-case option and would deliver savings of £65,000 compared to the current service set up (see Appendix 'C'). However, this still represents a subsidy in the region of £231,892 an amount the Council can ill afford at the present time. On top of this, there is a need to purchase additional vehicles to enable the service to be implemented.

- 13.5 It is proposed that 7 additional vehicles will need to be purchased at an additional cost of up to £315,000. There is currently nothing in the Capital Programme for this and the Corporate management Committee will need to approve the purchase along with the means of financing them. Given the age and condition of parts of the existing fleet, there will also be the need to replace 3 vehicles at a cost of up to £135,000 this element can be taken from the current provision for vehicle replacements already in the current capital programme.
- 13.6 Due to the Council's current financial situation, officers have already deferred certain elements of the Capital Programme due to a lack of available capital receipts. Adding a new commitment to the Programme will mean Members will need to prioritise the remaining schemes to free up the finances to pay for the buses. Alternatively, it may be possible to lease the vehicles, however this will clearly add to the ongoing revenue costs of providing the service.
- 13.7 These figures come with significant risk. Estimating the demand for the service at the current time is fraught with danger and the demand for a service now, may be very different when any revised service is introduced as household finances are squeezed. In drafting these proposals, a lot of assumptions have been made. It is assumed for instance, that the demand for this service will still be there post Covid19, that those currently receiving a sibling discount will be happy to pay the full fare and that everyone will pay £4 a day when the local bus service equivalent charge could be as low as £2.50 for advance payment.

#### **14. Policy Framework Implications**

- 14.1 The Community Services Business Unit Plan for 2020/2021 includes the requirement for a review of the Yellow Bus Service.

#### **15. Legal Implications**

- 15.1 Organisations that provide transport on a 'not-for-profit' basis can apply for permits under Section 19 or Section 22 of the Transport Act 1985. These permits allow the holder to operate transport services for hire or reward without the need for a full public service vehicle operator's (PSV 'O') licence.
- 15.2 The service will be able to be delivered under a Section 19 permit given that all the requirements of operating under a Section 19 permit will be satisfied in the design of the service.

#### **16. Equality implications**

- 16.1 None.

#### **17. Environmental/Sustainability/Biodiversity implications**

- 17.1 Any future service would continue to have a positive impact on the environment, because of reducing the number of vehicles completing "school runs" in the morning and the afternoon. However, it should be acknowledged that a reduction in journeys to and from schools does not necessarily mean a reduction in vehicles on the roads.

- 17.2 The purchase of a further ten Community Transport vehicles with Diesel engines has an environmental impact, an impact that would be removed if a decision were taken to purchase ULEV vehicles. However, this is felt cost prohibitive at this time.
- 17.3 To minimise the environmental impact, the intention is to specify in the vehicle specification a Euro 6.2 Diesel engine. With a stated fuel economy of between 30 and 35 miles per gallon, the new vehicles implemented would be a far more efficient option than the larger vehicles currently used and emit significantly less emissions.
- 17.4 Members are asked to consider the benefit of purchasing a bio-diesel fuel tank for the depot, replacing the current diesel tank.
- 17.5 Biofuels are fuels produced from renewable organic materials, in the case of Biodiesel, waste products such as vegetable oils and animal fats. Biofuels are a good medium-term alternative to traditional fuels, because they are produced from more sustainable energy sources. In addition, biofuels produce significantly fewer pollutant emissions and toxins than fossil fuels.
- 17.6 Bioenergy Australia estimates that biodiesel could cut emissions by over 85% compared to diesel (RAC, 2019). However, it is important to note that the scale of the environmental benefit is dependent on how biofuels are produced and used and therefore slightly more conservative calculations should be applied.
- 17.7 The use of Biodiesel would not only reduce emissions significantly in relation to a future school and the wider Community Transport service but would also be able to be utilised by the Council's DSO and used to fuel the new refuse and recycling fleet that has been procured. Such an investment would therefore have much more significant environmental benefits.
- 17.8 The installation of a Biodiesel tank at the Council's Depot site has been included within the plans for the delivery of direct services, at an approximate cost of £79,500. However, given the benefit biodiesel would have on the environmental impact of providing an in-house school transport service, Members may wish to work with colleagues in Environmental Services in prioritising this, should the finances of the Council allow.

## 18. **Conclusion**

- 18.1 This report and the service proposal contained within, has been an ongoing piece of work, the expediency of which has escalated in recent weeks due to the need to advise schools and parents of the ending of the current contract arrangements and also the request from Members to have an option for an alternative service presented at this Committee.
- 18.2 The challenges faced in considering an alternative service are detailed, but the financial position both prior to the pandemic, but even more so since, has meant the need to reduce the overall subsidy of the service is key to future service viability
- 18.3 At the request of Members, other options have been considered but based on the previous procurement process undertaken in 2017 and the information provided more recently, an in-house model remains the preferred option. The

report therefore sets out the in-house service proposal, detailing the operational considerations, anticipated service improvements and the risks that such a model incurs.

- 18.4 The proposed service ensures that the school service continues and that the wider Community Transport service is strengthened significantly, a requirement given its growth and success in recent years.
- 18.5 By bringing all aspects of the service inhouse, a greater understanding of the demand for such a service will be able possible, allowing Members and officers the opportunity to review the service in the future and if appropriate redeploy resources to other transport opportunities or services, or reduce the overall size of the service.
- 18.6 Members are asked to consider the report and potential service option presented and together with consideration of the many priorities and financial pressures the council now has, determine whether a future school service is something that they would like to deliver. The options open to Members are set out in the recommendations at the beginning of this report.

**(To Resolve)**

**Background papers**

None stated.



## COMMUNITY TRANSPORT 2020/21 BUDGET

Business Centre Manager - Assistant Head of Community Services - Mr D Williams

	Cost Centre	Account Code	Community Services	Travel Initiative	TOTAL BUDGET	PROPOSED BUDGET	Notes
			£	£	£	£	
<b>Employees</b>							
Direct Employee Expenses	GETC	0010	Salary Allocation	70,400	1,800	72,200	
		0011	Salary Reallocations	12,151		12,151	No Change, links to SHBC employed post
		0050	Wages - General	304,038		304,038	All Posts Included - both current CT and Schools Requirement.
						-	
Training & Recruitment	GETC	0401	Short Courses	-		-	Will come from GELD budget
		0428	CRB Checks	1,020		1,020	Increased employee numbers. Not all will require new each year but there are on going costs now
		0444	Staff Medicals	-		-	
						-	
<b>Premises Expenses</b>							
Depot Recharge	GETC	1046	Maintenance - Fire Extinguishers	159		159	
		1156	Depot Recharge	10,400		10,400	Recharge - no additional cost to the Council
						-	
Premises related Expenditure	GETC	1224	Cleaning Materials	-		-	Need a budget for vehicle cleaning
						-	
<b>Transport Related Expenditure</b>							
Direct Transport Costs	GETC	1500	Hire of plant and vehicles	-		-	
		1504	Hire of Buses - School Run		481,135	481,135	
		1525	Operators Licences	104		104	Additional S19 Permits required plus spares
Car Allowances		1540	Vehicle Recharge	156,390		156,390	Based on current budget plus estimated new fleet costs
		1544	Transport Overheads	28,000		28,000	Recharge - no additional cost to the Council
		1566	Car Allowance	400		400	
		1570	Travelling Expenses	-		-	Changed as possible increase in travel due to vehicles stored on other sites, school liaison etc.
						2,000	
<b>Supplies and Services</b>							
Equipment, Furniture & Materials	GETC	1602	Furniture & Equipment - Purchase	1,640		1,640	Increased to reflect more equipment required on more vehicles
						-	
Clothing & Uniforms	GETC	1872	Uniforms	1,762		1,762	Increased as greater number of employees
						-	
General Office Expenses	GETC	1918	Printing		500	500	
		1962	Membership & Affiliations	406		406	
						-	
Communications & Computing	GETC	2028	Mobile Phones	709		709	To allow for switch to use of smart phones as PDA's
		2212	Computer Licences	9,701		9,701	Increased to allow for bolt on module to existing software
						-	
<b>Support Services</b>							
Support Service Recharges	GETC	3000	Accountancy	3,400	2,300	5,700	Recharge - no additional cost to the Council
		3002	Internal Audit	300	100	400	Recharge - Potential additional audit requirement
		3006	Insurance Admin	200	600	800	Recharge - no additional cost to the Council
		3008	Payroll and Payments	3,200	100	3,300	Increased payments (suppliers) and payroll (staff) costs
		3010	Income Services	500	100	600	Increased cost of invoicing & income collection
		3050	Computer Service	6,100		6,100	Recharge - no additional cost to the Council
		3053	Post Room Services Recharge	200		200	Recharge - no additional cost to the Council
		3054	Runnymede On-Line	600		600	Recharge - no additional cost to the Council
		3060	Human Resources Recharge	9,300	200	9,500	Recharge - no additional cost to the Council
		3070	Office Accommodation recharge	2,200	1,100	3,300	Recharge - no additional cost to the Council
		3078	Customer Services Recharge	400	4,300	4,700	Recharge - no additional cost to the Council
		3084	Legal Services Recharge	1,800		1,800	Recharge - no additional cost to the Council
		3085	Data Protection	1,100		1,100	Recharge - no additional cost to the Council
		3088	Information Governance Recharge	1,900	100	2,000	Recharge - no additional cost to the Council
		3089	Projects and Procurement Recharge	1,800	300	2,100	Recharge - no additional cost to the Council
		3120	GIS Recharge		300	300	Recharge - no additional cost to the Council

# COMMUNITY TRANSPORT 2020/21 BUDGET

Business Centre Manager - Assistant Head of Community Services - Mr D Williams

	Cost Centre	Account Code	Community Services £	Travel Initiative £	TOTAL BUDGET £	PROPOSED BUDGET £	Notes	
<b>Employees</b>								
		3126	Purchasing Services Recharge	800	200	1,000	1,000	Recharge - no additional cost to the Council
<b>Capital Charges</b>								
		3502	Capital charges - Depreciation	76,518		76,518	111,518	Assumes the Council can afford to purchase. If not then equivalent leasing charges of new purchases will be much higher.
			<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>707,598</b>	<b>493,135</b>	<b>1,200,733</b>	<b>1,142,918</b>	
<b>Income</b>								
Grants and Contributions	GETC	5054	Vehicle Fuel Rebate ("O")	10,000		10,000	12,500	Limited increase in BSOG fuel rebate grant
		5059	Partnership Income work ("O")	285,000		285,000	285,000	
		5060	Costs Recovered ("S")	-		-	-	
		5070	S.C.C. Transport Unit ("O")	28,737		28,737	28,737	
		5074	S.C.C. Social Services ("O")	13,026		13,026	13,026	
		5080	Rural Development Commission ("O")	-		-	-	
		5082	Partnership Funding ("O")	-		-	-	
School Service Income	XXXX	5580	Yellow Buses School Run - Fullbrook		110,223	110,223	-	
		5582	Yellow Buses School Run - Magna Carta		53,169	53,169	-	
		5584	Yellow Buses School Run - Jubilee High		9,546	9,546	-	
		5586	Yellow Buses School Run - Salesian		23,199	23,199	-	
		TBA	New replacement income			-	200,928	Assumes 23 trips of 14 seats (max 322) at £4 a day. 80% use capacity anticipated
Transport Income	GETC	5594	Client Membership ("O")	-		-	-	
		5595	Bus Service Fares ("O") (Longcross fares)	-		-	-	
		5596	Fares Income / Excursions ("O")	20,800		20,800	20,800	
		5597	Bus Service Fares ("O") (Franklands drive)	-		-	-	
		5598	Day Centre Transport Fares ("O")	33,000		33,000	33,000	
Other income		5934	Miscellaneous Income ("O")	16,340		16,340	16,340	
		6150	Recharged to GF Services	3,000		3,000	3,000	
			<b>Total Income</b>	<b>409,903</b>	<b>196,137</b>	<b>606,040</b>	<b>613,331</b>	
			<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>297,695</b>	<b>296,998</b>	<b>594,693</b>	<b>529,587</b>	
						<b>Costs reduction</b>	<b>£ 65,106</b>	
						Anticipated subsidy of new school service	£231,892	
						Cost per seat (at max)	£720	
						Cost per seat (at 80%)	£900	