

**Indicators and Targets: Public Consultation May - July 2012**  
**Results and Responses 3 October 2012**

Respondent No	Full text	Action	Rationale for Action
1	Air quality - pollutants are mostly transport generated	Noted	Air quality is monitored under Supporting Indicators.
2	If we are to leave the cars at home we need more buses to cope not less.	Noted	Bus usage is monitored under the Mode Share target and also under Supporting Indicators
3	I've searched the documents and found no reference to flood impact as an indicator or sub indicator. Flood risk and climate change impact already seriously affect the transport network and performance through impact and damage to network infrastructure, culverts and bridge structures adversely impacting on service performance. The existing transport system drainage network is predominantly ageing or Victorian infrastructure in need of significant investment and future proofing. Flood risk impact and climate change in relation to flood risk and drainage issues should be sub indicators feeding into the primary indicators. Audit of flood risk and the transport drainage network together with %age improvements to flood risk protection and drainage infrastructure as they are brought up to national standards and made fit for puprpose for the lifetime for the project should be measured. What funding has been allocated for the above audit and improvements programmes, and as part of match funding proposals with regional partners to address issues involving multiple sources? What %age of the transport network has been audited and condition assessed? What %age of the network is fit for purpose to nation standrads for the duration of the plan? What %age improvement is proposed to bring the drainage network up to national standards? What %age improvement is proposed to bring the transport network up to national flood protection standards? What %age improvement is proposed to future proof the drainage network for climate change?	Noted	Reduction of CO2 emissions is one of the key targets. The issue of adapting assets to be more resilient is covered by the TAMP.
3	Duplicate - see above	Noted	See above
3	Duplicate - see above	Noted	See above

Indicators and Targets- Reults and Responses

4	i would like to know why the 16 bus comes up in 4 buses at a time 2 had a few people on the other 2 were empty how do people keeps their appointments or get their connections if catching another bus is beyond belief also when i was on boar lane i waited 20 mins for a bus also in farsley town street no wonder people use their cars it would be nice to have a bus timetable same as the bus drivers then we could get there on time i dont drive for medical reason dont you think this is important	Noted	Yournextbus' is Metro's bus departure times service which uses GPS satellite technology to track the location of buses - this means you can find out the scheduled or real-time for any bus by text message. Bus Real Time information is also displayed at an increasing number of bus stops. Bus journey time variability is monitored as one of the 6 Key Indicators/Targets
5	Rather bus orientated - we need to increase train satisfaction and reliability more	<b>No change to Key Indicators and Targets.</b> Revise Supporting Indictors to add Satisfaction with Rail and Rail Reliability	Rail satisfaction is a component of the Satisfaction with Transport indicator. Individual satisfaction by mode are reported as Supporting Indicators. Rail reliability will be a Supporting Indicator.
6	PLEASED TO SEE ASPIRATION TARGETS - SHOW POLITICAL LEADERSHIP	Noted	Support welcomed
7	Service time table stability. The main reason I do not use use buses is that I never know when they are due as the timetable changes every 6 months. This produces a, probably unfair, lack of cofidence in the service.	Noted	Proposals for Quality Contracts should improve this. This could be developed as a supporting indicator, though would it be hard to differentiate between minor and significant changes when reporting

Indicators and Targets- Reults and Responses

8	<p>It is essential that the conflict of interests between improving journey time reliability, and access to employment has with reducing KSI accidents is taken into account and balanced properly. The best way to improve journey times and access to employment is to smooth out traffic flow, and reduce stop-start driving, and particularly to increase average journey speeds. The current thinking on reducing KSI accidents is to reduce traffic speeds, and provide safe at grade crossing points for pedestrians, such as signal controlled crossings, build-outs and pedestrian refuges. These are opposed to each other. Therefore a proper compromise must be established, with innovative solutions implemented at particular bottlenecks with high KSI rates. CO2 emmisions is another area with a potential for conflicts of interest. The best way to reduce CO2 is to encourage everyone to leave the car at home. However, this makes access to employment difficult, and will also require increased use of motorcycles, which will likely result in increased KSI rates.</p>	Noted	The conflicts are recognised.
8	<p>Journey time reliability is absolutely key to encouraging mode shift. If a commuter knows it will take 20minutes by car, and 25 minutes by bus, then they will be able to make an informed decision. At present the commuter knows a journey that takes 10-15 minutes by car plus a 10 minute walk, or will take 20 minutes by bicycle, or will take 40 minutes on foot, or 15 - 30minutes by bus plus two 5 minute walks. The decision is unlikely to go in favour of bus travel, as alternatives are so much quicker, and more convenient. Bus travel must become both quicker and more reliable, with much more frequent services, and proper integration with both other bus routes and rail. The alternaice is continued increases in car use, or where cars are kept out by excessive congestion or by high parking charges, then other private transport will become more frequent, including motorcycles (with an negative effect on KSI rates). Due to considerable recent advances in Highway Safety, including both passive and active safety systems, we are now faced with a law of diminishing returns. Continuing the improvements in safety, from what are currently extremely high levels, will cost exponetially more in both financial terms, and in terms of compromises with other targets, such as access to employment, journey time relaibility, and satisfaction with transport.</p>	Noted	<p>Improving bus journey time reliability is recognised as a key area. However, the indicator is relatively new and there is little trend data to aid understanding. The proposed target represents a 50% improvement on the current situation which is already seen as challenging.</p>

Indicators and Targets- Reults and Responses

9	I think health of the community should be a contributing factor. There are major long term health benefits to cycling rather than driving and in addition to the “sense of well being” there are long term savings to the NHS. As an experienced cyclist I am seriously concerned about my safety on the roads. I never recommend others to cycle and I am not going to let any of my children cycle until with out parent supervision until they have passed bikeability 3. The general road layout and design is a major contributing factor to the saftey issues and I generally find even new roads are not, in my opinion, designed to help commuting cyclists.	Noted	Walking and cycling are both recognised as contributing to health. The hierarchy for consideration of users in the LTP puts these users at the top of consideration when designing new schemes. Both these modes will need to grow to achieve the target for mode share. No need to modify targets
9	Satisfaction with transport should be segmented for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport etc. With greater emphasis for "sustainable modes of transport" More emphasis needs to be placed on providing safe places to park and leave cycles, both in town and especially and venues which attract large numbers of people, e.g. concerts / festivals.	Noted	The supporting indicators will report satisfaction by mode.

Indicators and Targets- Reults and Responses

<p>10</p>	<p>Economic growth: There is a frightening emphasis the economy via transport to Leeds. It is your duty to provide services to people everywhere in the region - particularly those most vulnerable/least wealthy who are less likely to work/live in Leeds (ie older people, younger people, single parents, unemployed people). There is more to West Yorkshire than Leeds and you are responsible for all of us. Journey time reliability: The title of this and the target for it should be expanded to be about reducing the journey time - you have alluded to this in the description but it is not reflected in the target or the title ?? Mode share: Car sharing is unrealistic as well as being a backward step - people are extremely unlikely to use it (it isnt practical) and it is limited in its potential effect - it was tried in Calderdale and doesnt work. Although I cant relaly tell if you are talking about car sharing or publis transport use , I suggest to you that you are really talking here about public transport. Increased use of public transport would reduce traffic by shared transport and is more realistic, practical and progressive. You need to create the option for poeple to commute on public transport - make it a realistic option (ie regular, near to home and work), affordable, and most importantly you need to be selling the idea of a shared responsibility in the environment and the roads - to make it the norm for people to choose this rather than the car. I really believe this is extremely important and your main priority. I agree with your targets here. Satisfaction wi transport: This is important to capture somehow, however, he target seems meaningless.</p>	<p><b>No change to Key Indicators and Targets.</b> Revise presentation of Satisfaction Indicator/Target</p>	<p>The targets are not Leeds specific - the only reference is within the LTP objectives which refer to WY and LCR. JT reliability is seen by many as important, but it is recognised that actual JT is important too. This is monitored by a supporting indicator. Mode share target is about increasing the use of sustainable modes, essentially getting more use of public transport, walking and cycling, Car sharing is however a key part of promoting more sustrainable travel habits. We will look to make the Satisfaction target easier to understand.</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Re Mode share: Define "trips made by sustainable means" ??</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>In context of the Mode Share target the source National Travel Survey data provides 'non-car trips' i.e. Public Transport, Cycle, Walk. Car sharing is however a key part of promoting more sustrainable travel habits.</p>

Indicators and Targets- Reults and Responses

11	<p>Economic growth: There is a frightening emphasis the economy via transport to Leeds. It is your duty to provide services to people everywhere in the region - particularly those most vulnerable/least wealthy who are less likely to work/live in Leeds (ie older people, younger people, single parents, unemployed people). There is more to West Yorkshire than Leeds and you are responsible for all of us. Journey time reliability: The title of this and the target for it should be expanded to be about reducing the journey time - you have alluded to this in the description but it is not reflected in the target or the title ?? Mode share: Car sharing is unrealistic as well as being a backward step - people are extremely unlikely to use it (it isnt practical) and it is limited in its potential effect - it was tried in Calderdale and doesnt work. Although I cant relaly tell if you are talking about car sharing or publis transport use , I suggest to you that you are really talking here about public transport. Increased use of public transport would reduce traffic by shared transport and is more realistic, practical and progressive. You need to create the option for poeple to commute on public transport - make it a realistic option (ie regular, near to home and work), affordable, and most importantlty you need to be selling the idea of a shared responsibility in the environment and the roads - to make it the norm for people to choose this rather than the car. I really believe this is extremely important and your main priority. I agree with your targets here. Satisfaction wi transport: This is important to capture somehow, however, he target seems meaningless.</p>	Noted	Duplicate - see respondent no.9
11	See my comments on the previous page of this form. re Mode share: define "trips made form sustainable modes" ?	Noted	Duplicate see respondent no. 10
11	Your primary target should be about getting people from A to B, quickly cheaply and comfortably.	Noted	A generalised cost indicator could cover much of this, but the methodology / output isn't well understood. Cost of travel is one of the supporting indicators as is journey time in peak periods.

Indicators and Targets- Reults and Responses

12	<p>satisfaction with all transport; • bus journey times; It is all well and good improving bus journey times, but is the buses don't run after certain hours they might as well not run at all. • car journey time reliability; By removing lanes of traffic in the likes of leeds city center, the traffic that built up in rush hour in the past now just builds up all day with regular commuters learning 'alternative routes' • access to labour markets; If people want to work they will get to work, the provision of services to those out of work is a waste of money • principal road condition; By adding extra capacity all road users benefit, the provising of part of the road for some road users (Bus, 2+ Lane work as a stick, and doesn't solve the under lying problem of poor junction design at known bottle necks. • low carbon trips; Only so good as electric car and bus design is improved - give it time done force the issue, the best cure to low carbon transport would be fast efficient transport allong key commuter routes into the cities, this will of course require park and ride style projects in the short term.</p>	Noted	Comments related to interventions rather than targets
13	<p>Satisfaction is the most importanmt element across the board especially if the the train and bus companies are going to be able to attract new customers and opperate as sustainable businesses. Bus / train staff training is vital in this - customer care and disability awareness</p>	Noted	Support welcomed

Indicators and Targets- Reults and Responses

14	<p>Access to employment: focussed entirely on public transport, need infrastructure for active mode access, through planning system. Mode share: cycling share looks good, but will still be behind many major European cities in share. Little idea on how this is to be achieved. Reduction in CO2: a minimum target, and objectives too dependent on technological progress rather than personal responsibility. Casualties: overall objective could mask negative trends in particular modes. We need to ensure that active modes in particular remain safe, or get safer. Would prefer individual mode targets for these modes. Satisfaction: overall levels again can mask important differences. A big increase in satisfaction levels is required for public transport, and a reduced level for car users is acceptable - or even desirable.</p>	Noted	<p>PT access to employment is key to reducing car usage. Arguably cycling access is already 100%as can make use of highway network. It wouldn't be practical to monitor this via dedicated cycle facilities. CO2 emssion target is consistent with mode share target. Casualty trends by user group are covered in supporting indicators. The Satisfaction target will be reviewed in 2017 as the current baseline represents a new indicator and there is no trend data, however, a score of 7.0 is considered by survey practitioners as being a high level of satisfaction and may be difficult to surpass. Individual mode satisfaction scores are covered in the supporting indicators.</p>
14	<p>The feasibility of many of the indicaators will depend crucially on the level of investment available, which is high;y uncertain in the face of a government opposed to public transport and the north of England. There's also a significant need for change in personal attitude, especially in the CO2 reduction area, and in the overly-car-based attitudes of both local and national government.</p>	Noted	<p>Comments relate to government policy rather than targets. The WY LTP partnership is committed to investing in improving conditions for all modes.</p>
15	<p>You ask for peoples input about public transport, yet at the last consultation, one of the main problems highlighted by the public was the high and ever increasing fares. However, bus fares have recently increased on all services at an exorbatant rate. They are prohibitively expensive for many. £2 for one short journey is ridiculous. The bus companies take people for fools.</p>	Noted	<p>Proposals for Bus Quality Contracts will address the issue of fare levels.</p>
16	<p>(Request for notification of any future consultations)</p>	Noted	



Indicators and Targets- Reults and Responses

17	Emissions from transport other than CO2, such as particulates. All road casualties and not just Killed or Seriously Injured.	Noted	Particulates are monitored and are a supporting indicator as are all casualties
18	As the Council continues to encourage cyclists the numbers rise but the infrastructure for them is not in place. They have to ride on pavements where roads narrow, there are not enough dedicated cycle lanes and they need to be separated from traffic wherever possible. Many of the road edges are in poor condition and graters are below the surface of the road adding to the dangers. We need to do a lot more to make cyclists safer if you want to encourage the more mature of our community to take to their cycles. I would like to reduce car use but do not have the confidence to cycle again. I suppose I should move to York where they have got it right. We need specific indicators for the quality of roads for cyclists! The bus service where I live is not too bad but I know that many of the poorer areas in the city have no service at all or buses are infrequent and unreliable. What happened to the quality bus initiatives that were going to solve this and force bus companies to meet demand and not profit. We should have indicators on specific bus routes regarding reliability/performance. We need to monitor costs against fare increases and profits taken by First Bus - WE ARE BEEN RIPPED OFF. The train service to York is far too expensive and the trains inadequate for the demand. Do we have indicators on numbers using this to pressure the rail service	Noted	Comments related to interventions rather than targets. The satisfaction indicator covers provision for cycling and highway maintenance. Proposals for Bus Quality Contracts will address the issue of fare levels.
19	Journey time reliability and the satisfaction with the transport it key. As a daily bus user I pay what i feel are high costs for a less than reliable service on sometimes sub standard buses and have staff who are not interested in customer service. My regular bus is the FTR number 4 and the amount of customer service personnel who read magazines and books rather than go round the bus collecting fares or giving updates on what the hold up is. The amount of buses that go pack out of service or just don't turn up at all is ridiculous.	Noted	Support welcomed.
20	Measurement of support of disability awareness, disability awareness training by driver and the company. Greater use of disability friendly rolling stock (buses), greater accountability by the company. less refusal of access to the bus by chair users. direct accountability by the driver for refusal to allow access of chairs that the driver deems to be "too heavy or big" instead of hiding behind "company rules".	Noted	Comments relate to issues over customer treatment by bus companies.

Indicators and Targets- Reults and Responses

21	Support the inclusion of "Mode Share" as an indicator. Not sure that measuring the NUMBER of car journeys by 2026 is future-proof. The number of car journeys could be impacted by a variety of factors beyond the influence of Metro, including fuel prices, the spread of fast broadband and changes in the level of economic activity. Could not the measure be the PROPORTION of total journeys achieved by a range of lower impact modes ranging from bus/train to walking? I like the aim to increase cycle/walking by +300% but with existing levels of about 2% a threefold rise will hardly be very impressive. I understand that, in Holland, some 37% of journeys are by cycle/walking. Also, there now seems to be evidence of modal shift here in UK - a trend that Metro could influence through improving infrastructure, integration and education.	Noted	Support welcomed. The indicator will measure the proportion of non-car trips as well as total car trips. A mode specific target hasn't been set, but cycling levels are monitored under this target and several supporting indicators.
21	More ambitious targets for mode share (see answer to 4 above)	Noted	The proposed target is already seen as challenging.
22	See comments on next question	Noted	

Indicators and Targets- Reults and Responses

<p>23</p>	<p>a) Journey time reliability: Actual journey times on all key routes should be monitored annually, especially in areas of congestion. This should be for cars and buses. We prefer this measure to journey time reliability measure which we feel can have some unintended negative effects, e.g. If mid-peak journey times were increased on a bus route then this could actually give the misleading impression that congestion has been reduced. For buses timetable information could be taken into account but not relied upon. Greater usage of public transport at off peak times should be a target make better use of vehicles. Off peak journey times need reducing to encourage more passenger use. A target for reducing these journey times should be set. There is a need to reduce car usage at weekends in some districts of Leeds - they can be as congested as at rush hours - affecting bus punctuality. b) Actual numbers of journeys (also percentages) not operated on bus services: These are a vital indicator of the reliability of services. On a 30 minute or 60 min service non-appearance of a bus is the most important problem for users and potential users. Target for improvement should be high. Data should be on Metro website for passengers to view. c) New Indicator of how close new housing estates (eg over 30 homes) are to frequent bus services (at least every 30 minutes). Important to ensure that new housing is served by good public transport to encourage greater use of public transport.</p>	<p><b>No change to Key Indicators and Targets.</b> Revise Supporting Indicators to add Bus Journey Time</p>	<p>Peak traffic speed is monitored as a supporting indicator. We recognise the issue with the bus JT reliability and will look to ensure that we aren't getting unintended consequences. Data on bus journey times is collected and could be added as a supporting indicator. Bus cancellations are a supporting indicator. The access to employment indicator will be influenced by the development of new housing estates. Accessibility of new development is covered by Local Development Framework Core Strategies.</p>
<p>23</p>	<p>Journey time reliability: Not commented on this because we believe that there is a simpler more effective way of measuring actual journey times. Satisfaction with transport: Would need to examine survey. In particular does it identify concerns? Need for local surveys to obtain more detail to identify concerns as a basis for improvements. Improvements to information and marketing should be a new target.</p>	<p><b>No change to Key Indicators and Targets.</b> Revise Supporting Indicators to add Bus Journey Time and Satisfaction with Information</p>	<p>Data on bus journey times is collected and could be added as a supporting indicator. The satisfaction data incorporates a wide number of topic areas including information. We will add satisfaction with information to supporting indicators.</p>

Indicators and Targets- Reults and Responses

23	a) Journey times should also feature in Quality of Life key indicator. b) Access to employment indicator - does 30 min indicator include walking and waiting time? c) Satisfaction with transport - importance of robust detailed surveys.	<b>No change to Key Indicators and Targets.</b> Revise Supporting Indicators to add Bus Journey Time. Modify Access to Employment definition.	Data on bus journey times is collected and could be added as a supporting indicator. Access to employment includes walking and wait time. Satisfaction measured annually via Metro Tracker survey which has a robust WY sample of 2000.
24	Link the target for car journeys to population. There is an aspiration to keep car journey numbers static in the face of a rising population which is a challenging in the face of population increase, but if this does not materialise the plan needs to reflect this and actually reduce car journeys.	Noted	It is recognised that varying levels of population growth could affect achievement of this target. This will be picked up by the parallel target to increase proportion of trips made by sustainable modes from 36% to 42%
25	Why is there no carbon criteria for scheme selection? This is not impressive.	Noted	Comment relates to scheme selection rather than targets.
26	Be more specific on cycling targets. Use traffic free cycles routes as an indicator.	Noted	Targets for individual sustainable modes are not being proposed as the overall objective is to cap car growth.
26	What is the base level measurement used for cycling targets? What counts are used? How are these counts measured?	Noted	The data source is a WY subset of the National Travel Survey as specified in the report. Data from the Sport England Active People Survey is also a supporting indicator
26	Consider cycling forums with development of cycling plan.	Noted	Comment relates to scheme development rather than targets. A WY LTP3 Cycle Plan is being developed in 2012 and will be subject to consultation.

Indicators and Targets- Reults and Responses

27	<p>I am the secretary of CTC Calderdale (Cyclists Touring Club) with a interest in increasing the number (gross) of journeys made by bike. The 300% (tripling) the number of bike trips target is welcomed as this will support mode share/ CO2 objectives. With that as background it is suggested that further work needs to be done by Metro in conjunction with representative cycling user groups e.g. B-Spoke (Bradford)/ Calderdale Cycle forum etc to develop a small number of smart indicators that would accurately measure the extent of cycle useage for utility journeys across the county. Such indicators might include:- 1. Gross length of dedicated traffic free routes; 2. (In conjunction with Northern) bike usage by train-borne commuters; 3. (In conjunction with further education institutes) level of bike usage by students. But these are only examples.</p>	Noted	<p>Cycling is being monitored through a variety of ways. This includes the National Travel Survey, the Sport England Active People Survey and annual AM peak period cordon surveys around the five main centres (the latter two are supporting indicators). Other indicators would only provide a partial picture. Reporting the length of cycle routes wouldn't provide data on usage</p>
27	<p>Re journey time - problem with target us it could be acheived if off peak journey times get worse and peak remains the same!! Also target period (14 years) is far too long. Re mode share:- problem is trying target to level of car usage as so dependent on the economic conditions within the county. Also (as recognised) population changes - plan assumes growth, target as published has no time frame - it should have. As previously inidicated some more specific targets for cycle usage (gross please) should be developed. RE road casalties it is suggested target for reducing kSI figures is too low because the time frame is too long. Also, the target is undifferentiated, needs to be designed to identify KSI events involving pedestrians and cyclists.</p>	Noted	<p>All targets (except currently satisfaction) have a timeframe up to 2026 as that covers the period of the LTP. the issue with bus JT reliability is recognised. Change from base position is being monitored as a supporting indicator. Targets for individual sustainable modes are not being proposed as the overall objective is to cap car growth, rather than grow individual modes. Safety indicators include figures for individual user groups and are included in the supporting indicators.</p>

Indicators and Targets- Reults and Responses

27	The adoption of appropriate mode share and CO2 reduction targets is welcomed as increased cycle usage will impact on the supporting inidcators. At the consultation meeting reference was made to the imminent development of a cycle plan for West Yorkshire. This process would give an opportunity for the cycling community (of which CTC Calderdale is a part) to contribute to the adoption of appropriate bike related policies/measures/targets.	Noted	Support welcomed. A WY LTP3 Cycle Plan will be developed in 2012 and will be subject to consultation.
28	Recording and monitoring of accidents by age, including falls, and active interventions to tackle falls on public transport	Noted	Falls on PT are monitored and dialogue is maintained with operators.