



Strathclyde Regional Bus Strategy – Recommendations for Future Delivery of the Regional Bus Network – for Public Consultation

Date of meeting 15 March 2024

Date of report 6 March 2024

Report by Head of Policy & Planning

1. Object of report

The object of this report is to update the Partnership on the development of the Strathclyde Regional Bus Strategy (SRBS) and to seek approval to consult on the recommendations arising from the SRBS Options Development and Appraisal stage.

2. Background to report

In Strathclyde, bus services are a lifeline that many people heavily rely on, with around 70% of all public transport journeys in the region being taken by bus. However, SPT's work in developing the new Regional Transport Strategy reaffirmed significant concerns in terms of the efficiency, performance, affordability and overall sustainability of the bus network in Strathclyde. The development of the SRBS seeks to address these issues and aims to deliver a clear vision and strategy for the future of bus services in our region.

Members will recall earlier reports relevant to and regarding the development of the SRBS, including:

- (i) The initial report to the Strategy & Programmes Committee in November 2022¹ commencing the SRBS process.
- (ii) The approval of a contract award to consultants SYSTRA by the Strategy & Programmes Committee in June 2023 to support the development of the SRBS².
- (iii) "A Call to Action: The Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) for the west of Scotland 2023-2038" approved by the Partnership in March 2023³, and subsequently approved as a statutory document by Scottish Ministers in July 2023⁴.
- (iv) The SRBS Case for Change reported to the Partnership in September 2023⁵.
- (v) The update to the Partnership in December 2023 outlining the SRBS Options Development and Appraisal stage; highlighting that the recommended options emerging from the appraisal process would be presented to the current meeting of the Partnership⁶.

¹ https://www.spt.co.uk/media/zqsayayn/sp251122_agenda8.pdf

² https://www.spt.co.uk/media/gr3hd3qj/sp090623_agenda7.pdf

³ https://www.spt.co.uk/media/wmxnkmvp/p170323_agenda9.pdf

⁴ https://www.spt.co.uk/media/ammadxc1/p290923_agenda7.pdf

⁵ https://www.spt.co.uk/media/4eapnkmz/p290923_agenda8.pdf

⁶ https://www.spt.co.uk/media/3wdb2fxa/p151223_agenda7.pdf

3. Outline of proposals

Based on earlier work, consultation, and engagement undertaken to date, and following further dialogue with councils and operators, the SRBS Options Development and Appraisal process is now complete. Further detail on this is provided below:

(i) Development of SRBS Policies

SRBS-specific policies have been developed to establish the principles of a better bus network for the region and facilitate the Options Appraisal. The policies cover Level of Service, Affordability, and Service Quality. The Level of Service policy establishes principles on when, where and how often buses should operate. The Service Quality policy establishes principles on a range of factors including reliability, punctuality, and accessibility. The Affordability policy establishes principles for fares and ticketing. The policies have been developed to a sufficient level of detail to meet the needs of the appraisal process.

(ii) Options to be appraised

Five Options for future delivery of the regional bus network were appraised: Business As Usual; Voluntary Partnerships; Bus Service Improvement Partnerships; Local Services Franchising; and Municipal Bus Company. Further detail on the Options is provided in Appendix 1 of this report.

(iii) The Appraisal Criteria

The five Options were appraised against a range of criteria including:

- The SRBS Policies of Level of Service, Affordability, and Service Quality;
- Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG) criteria: Environment; Climate Change; Health, Safety & Wellbeing; Economy; and Equality and Accessibility;
- Implementation criteria of Feasibility, Affordability and Public Acceptability; and
- Risk and Uncertainty.

(iv) Outcomes of Appraisal

The outcomes of the appraisal for each Option are summarised in the following sections. Further detail is provided in Appendix 2 via a summary table and detail on the scoring methodology.

(v) 'Business As Usual' Option - Summary of appraisal findings

This model does not perform well against the appraisal criteria. It will not deliver enhanced levels of provision or more affordable fares. It is also likely to require growing levels of financial support from SPT and councils via SPT's socially necessary bus services budget. There is no evidence from the appraisal that this model will break the cycle of bus patronage decline. It is therefore improbable that continuing with business as usual will contribute to delivering the objectives of the RTS or fulfil the aspirations of current and potential bus passengers and key stakeholders.

(vi) 'Voluntary Partnerships' Option - Summary of appraisal findings

There is no direct evidence from existing voluntary partnerships in the region that these have generated significant or sustained growth in patronage, and there is no evidence that suggests voluntary partnerships alone are likely to break the cycle of bus decline. It is therefore unlikely that voluntary partnerships will contribute to delivering the objectives of the RTS or fulfil the aspirations of current and potential bus passengers and key stakeholders. Whilst their feasibility and affordability are generally sound (albeit on the assumption that there would be no further real terms reduction in funding) and an ambitious partnership could potentially achieve minor beneficial effects for the

network, they are unlikely to deliver the enhanced levels of provision, more affordable fares or higher quality required to achieve the aspirations of the RTS. This model is also still likely to require increasing public sector support for subsidised bus services to fill gaps in the commercial network. Voluntary partnerships are also not a suitable foundation to take forward comprehensive joint initiatives of sufficient scale between the public and private sectors to improve bus, who will both rightly expect and require greater levels of certainty and commitment from each other in doing so.

(vii) 'Bus Service Improvement Partnerships' Option - Summary of appraisal findings

Bus Service Improvement Partnerships (BSIPs) are defined by statute in the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019 and offer a robust, contract-based governance structure, whereby commitments made by partners are carefully matched, and in certain circumstances, can be imposed on those whose services or responsibilities may be affected. The anticipation is that by creating a robust BSIP governance process, it will give greater certainty and encourage all partners to make more ambitious commitments. Similar delivery models in England (Enhanced Partnerships) have successfully been used as the foundation for targeted public sector funding.

The appraisal finds that BSIPs may have a positive role to play in delivering the objectives of the RTS and fulfilling the aspirations of current and potential bus passengers and stakeholders. Through engagement during the Option Development and Appraisal stage, operators gave an indication of the potential commitments which might be feasible given suitable matching commitments from the public sector. However, while the feasibility of BSIPs appears good and risks on the surface appear low if all parties deliver agreed inputs, achieving the beneficial outcomes for the network and passengers will necessarily be heavily dependent on availability of additional funding. If this were to be achieved, BSIPs have the potential to deliver enhanced levels of provision, more affordable fares and a higher quality of service.

Notwithstanding the above, the success of BSIPs would be wholly dependent on early positive and ambitious engagement and agreement between partners, and any delay or reluctant behaviour by principal partners would fundamentally undermine the BSIPs' credibility and successful delivery. On balance, the positives outweigh these potential negatives, but it would be remiss not to acknowledge the question marks which would ultimately remain as to whether the scale and certainty of sustained change BSIPs could deliver is sufficient to achieve the bold ambition of the RTS.

(viii) 'Local Services Franchising' - Summary of appraisal findings

The appraisal finds that this Option would have the most beneficial effects for the delivery of enhanced service provision, more affordable fares and quality.

Whilst there are many different forms which franchising may take (e.g. in terms of risk sharing, asset ownership models, geographical scope and flexibility of operational delivery), if the franchising authority can afford to fund its initiatives, bearing in mind that all revenue and expenditure on the bus network would be channelled through it, then it would be in a position to control and direct the outcomes it desires. It must be acknowledged, however, that the appraisal process identified an indicative high-level estimate of £45 - £85m per annum additional subsidy to deliver a regional franchise, although these figures could change dependent on whether any franchise is focused on a specific network area or routes. Notwithstanding this, franchising does provide the greatest opportunity to deliver the objectives of the RTS and would closely align with initiatives of significant national significance, such as the Clyde Metro project.

However, the appraisal identifies crucial caveats in relation to franchising regarding funding, feasibility, timescales, process for establishment, competition, risk-sharing and uncertainty:

- **Affordability:** Delivering enhanced outcomes through franchising which meet the RTS objectives can only be achieved through additional funding e.g. for targeted affordable fares or enhanced levels of service. The absence of additional funding will simply leave the authority responsible for continuing with Business as Usual and managing a declining bus network. As noted above, this additional funding will be significant. In addition, the process of actually developing Franchising proposals will require funding and diversion of existing activity in SPT and local councils to support preparation of the necessary Business Case and related work.
- **Feasibility and timescales:** The process of establishing a franchise is set out in the 2019 Act. In England, only one authority (Transport for Greater Manchester) has successfully introduced a franchising delivery model beyond that existing in London. Its timescales, and those of other authorities considering a similar approach, suggest that it may be 5-7 years before franchising could be introduced at a regional scale in Strathclyde, although a phased implementation might be feasible on an accelerated timescale by initially targeting selected parts of the region.
- **Competition:** The development of a franchising system requires the introduction of a competitive tendering regime to franchised areas and/or routes. Accordingly, it should be noted that the design and development of a franchise requires significant consideration in respect of scope, scale, risk, finance and funding required in order to engender suitable levels of competition for any subsequent franchise contract(s), and to deliver best value for the taxpayer. Further consideration of the competitiveness, and quality, of the local bus market structure in respect of large operators, SME's and Community Transport operators, would be required for example.
- **Challenging processes:** The 2019 Act franchising process is untested and there is a risk that there will be delays along the way. The legislation has incorporated the concept of an independent review 'panel' which must agree to the authority's proposals before franchising can proceed. It should be noted that this requirement was omitted from equivalent English legislation, but did apply under the 2001 Transport Act, when it resulted in a similar style panel rejecting Nexus' Quality Contract (a form of franchising) proposals after some years of development.
- **Risk sharing and Uncertainty:** The more control the public authority seeking to franchise wishes to direct over bus service delivery, the greater risk will be borne by that public authority. For example, in order to simplify and make fares more affordable, the authority may need to take some, if not all, revenue risk and be in a position to react to uncertainties around key drivers such as level of passenger demand. If passenger demand is not as high as anticipated, then the authority will still have to meet its contract payment obligations.

(ix) 'Municipal Bus Company' - Summary of appraisal findings

Municipal bus companies operate within the restrictions of the delivery model of their operating area. Currently, in the Strathclyde region, that would mean a municipal operator competes 'on the road' with private bus operators for commercial market share and would have to compete with private operators for contracts to provide socially necessary bus services. It is conceivable that a municipal bus company entering the market might help to drive up standards or could fill gaps in provision by accepting lower profits (or accepting a social cost) than the private sector, but there are significant risks for public authorities and no certainty of success. Any new municipal bus company in Strathclyde would either need to start 'from scratch' or be based around the acquisition of an existing operator. Both situations would require potentially significant initial investment in the form of start-up or acquisition costs, and in the latter case there is no current indication of companies available to purchase.

The appraisal finds that, under a Business as Usual delivery model, a municipal bus company would offer few significant benefits over and above those already set out above (e.g. helping to drive up standards or accepting lower profits than private sector), and whilst a municipal bus company would presumably be an active participant in any partnership (voluntary or BSIP), again it is not clear whether this would be sufficient to timeously deliver significantly better outcomes than through partnership with private sector operators alone. Nevertheless, in some parts of the region there may be merit in establishing an alternative to existing operators where competition for contracts has become restricted or limited (e.g. rural areas), potentially based around any existing in-house transport operations by local councils, community transport or demand responsive transport services. A municipal bus company could also serve a role as an active challenger for contracts under the franchising delivery model as well as offering a ready-made 'operator of last resort', but this is not likely to be a critical factor in the success of any franchising model because of the degree of control that the franchising authority can exert over the bus network irrespective of whether bus operators are municipally- or privately-owned.

Assuming that any profits generated are re-invested into more comprehensive services, maintaining affordable fares and/or higher quality standards, there is an argument that, over the longer term, municipal bus companies could provide a greater social dividend (i.e. non-financial benefits to society and the local economy) which could contribute to achieving RTS aspirations, but this will always be within the restrictions of the prevailing delivery model and ultimately the performance of any municipal operator

(x) Recommendations

Based on the findings of the appraisal process as noted above, the recommendations for future delivery of the regional bus network to be consulted upon are as follows:

- **Recommendation 1: Franchising**

SPT should commence work on franchising, in line with the requirements of the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019.

Franchising is a proven model for delivery of local bus services across Europe and beyond and provides the greatest certainty of making significant improvement to the network to achieve passenger growth and better accessibility for all and deliver on wider public policy outcomes. Therefore, SPT should initiate the franchise process in line with the requirements of the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019. The cost of carrying the franchising process to the point of implementation is estimated to be c. £15m and to take 5 – 7 years. SPT is in a position to initiate the franchise assessment process of its own accord at this stage but will require financial support from government to see through the processes to later stages, and ultimately in the implementation.

- **Recommendation 2: Bus Service Improvement Partnerships**

SPT should progress with Bus Service Improvement Partnership (BSIP) arrangements to provide a firm basis for private and public sector commitments to arrest further passenger decline and improve the bus network over the medium term.

The appraisal identified that 1) there is a need for improvement in the short/medium term and 2) franchising has a lengthy development process and delivery risks. Bus Service Improvement Partnerships generally perform well against most criteria and can be implemented relatively quickly, potentially within 12 months of commencing the process, although they are not without implementation risk and the need for dedicated resource from public sector to develop and manage. In this context, it is worth highlighting that the Scottish

Government has indicated that they have paused the Bus Partnership Fund (BPF) in 2024/25.

- **Recommendation 3: Municipal Bus Company**

As and when it may be required, SPT will consider developing business case(s) for small-scale municipal bus company(ies) aimed at providing socially necessary services in parts of the region where private operators are currently very limited.

A municipal bus operation will not in itself deliver the change needed to achieve the aspirations of the RTS. However, municipal bus provision may help in the near term in areas where competition for bus contracts is currently limited and there is a requirement for an 'operator of last resort'. Further investigation should be conducted in a targeted way and in partnership with the relevant council(s)

- **Recommendation 4: Bus Partnership Fund**

SPT should continue working with local authorities, Transport Scotland and bus operators to continue delivery through the Bus Partnership Fund.

Bus priority, funded by the BPF, will be critical to the successful delivery of both BSIPs in the medium term and franchising in the longer term. Capital investment in bus priority will be necessary to secure agreements with private operators in any BSIP and to arrest patronage decline in the medium term. In the longer term, a 'bus-friendly' roads network, with faster and more reliable journeys, will improve the attractiveness of bus compared to private car and help deliver a modal shift. However, as noted above, the Scottish Government has paused the BPF in 2024/25, and further, as members are aware, the Scottish Government has reduced SPT's capital programme to zero in 2024/25, thereby removing two potential sources of funding for investment in bus.

- **Recommendation 5: Business As Usual and Voluntary Partnerships**

Business As Usual and Voluntary Partnerships should be ruled out as means to deliver a better bus network as more radical intervention as required.

(xi) Consultation

The consultation on the recommendations will be for 6 weeks over the period April – May 2024. Further information on how to take part in the consultation will be made available on SPT's website and advertised and communicated with key stakeholders in advance. The full appraisal report will be made available at the time of the consultation, via SPT's website. The results of the public consultation and its impact on the SRBS will be reported to the Partnership later in 2024.

(xii) Next Steps

Subject to approval of the recommendations noted above, and following the public consultation during April-May, the next steps for the SRBS will be to conclude the remaining work packages, namely:

- Work Package 3 (WP3) Strategy Development & Consultation
- Work Package 4 (WP4) Finalise Strategy & Delivery Plan
- Work Package 5 (WP5) Strategic Business Case
- Work Package 6 (WP6) Strategic Advisor - Bus Reform and Organisational Change

The SRBS remains on track to complete by Summer 2025 and officers will continue to keep members updated on progress.

4. Partnership action

The Partnership is recommended to:

- Note the update on the SRBS provided in this report; and
- Approve the commencement of the public consultation on the recommendations noted in section 3 above arising from the SRBS Options Development and Appraisal stage.

5. Consequences

Policy consequences	<i>Supports delivery of a wide range of policies in the Regional Transport Strategy, including Policy 21 Bus Quality and Integration.</i>
Legal consequences	<i>None at present.</i>
Financial consequences	<i>None at present.</i>
Personnel consequences	<i>None at present.</i>
Equalities consequences	<i>An Equality Impact Assessment, Fairer Scotland Duty Impact Assessment, Island Community Impact Assessment, and Child Rights and Wellbeing Impact Assessment are being carried out as part of the SRBS development process.</i>
Risk consequences	<i>None at present.</i>
Climate Change, Adaptation & Carbon consequences	<i>Delivery of the SRBS will have a positive impact on climate change, adaptation and carbon reduction. A Strategic Environmental Assessment was undertaken as part of the development of the new RTS, from which the SRBS has developed.</i>

Name Bruce Kiloh

Title Head of Policy & Planning

Name Valerie Davidson

Title Chief Executive

For further information, please contact *Bruce Kiloh, Head of Policy and Planning on 0141 333 3740 or Gordon Dickson, Head of Bus Strategy and Delivery on 0141 333 3407.*

Appendix 1: Options to be appraised

Delivery Model Option	Description	Rationale for considering option
Business as Usual	Business as usual is the way the bus network is delivered now.	This option allows other options to be compared against the current situation to understand the difference in costs and benefits that may be delivered through organising the bus market differently.
Voluntary Partnership	Bus operators and public sector partners may come together to improve the bus network through agreeing, on a voluntary basis, to provide or deliver improvements to services and infrastructure or other local policies to support bus services. There is no legal basis or enforcement mechanism for voluntary partnerships and parties can leave the partnership at any time.	This option is available to Local Transport Authorities and bus operators, either working together or on an operator-only basis, and has not been discounted through any previous work by SPT.
Bus Service Improvement Partnership (BSIP)	A BSIP is a formal partnership between a Local Transport Authority (or Authorities) and one or more bus operators. In the model, the Local Transport Authority is responsible for making a Partnership Plan and Scheme (or Schemes), which are developed and agreed with bus operators and other relevant partners. The Plan sets out policies and objectives to be achieved through the BSIP and the Scheme (or Schemes) imposes service standards on operators and specifies the facilities to be provided or measures to taken by the LTA to support the bus network. This model differs from a voluntary partnership in that there is a legal basis for the Plan and Scheme and, therefore, elements of the Scheme can be enforced.	This option is available to Local Transport Authorities under the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019, and has not been discounted through any previous work by SPT.

Delivery Model Option	Description	Rationale for considering option
Local Services Franchising	Local services franchising is a system that allows a Local Transport Authority to award exclusive rights to an operator to run certain bus services for a set period of time. In Scotland, the Local Transport Authority must first put in place a franchise framework setting out what local services are to be provided, the standards to which the services are to be provided, and any additional facilities or services that are to be provided. Under this franchise framework, the Local Transport Authority then enters into franchise agreements with bus operators, awarded through competitive processes, to deliver the specified services and standards.	This option is available to Local Transport Authorities under the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019, and has not been discounted through any previous work by SPT.
Municipal bus company	A municipal bus company is an operator of bus services owned by a Local Transport Authority. A municipal bus company can be formed from the purchase of an existing bus or coach company or the creation of a new company. Municipal bus companies compete for the market in the same way as privately owned bus companies. Currently, there are no municipal bus companies in the SPT area.	This option is available to Local Transport Authorities under the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019, and has not been discounted through any previous work by SPT.

Appendix 2: Summary of appraisal

The table below sets out a summary of the options appraisal by option and appraisal criteria. The scoring methodology and explanatory notes are included at the end of the table; however, full analysis of this table should be carried out alongside the full appraisal report.

APPRAISAL CRITERIA		OPTIONS				
		BUSINESS AS USUAL	VOLUNTARY PARTNERSHIP	BSIP	FRANCHISING	MUNICIPAL BUS OPERATIONS
TP Os	Improve service quality	x	x	✓✓	✓✓✓	— to ✓✓✓
	Increase affordability of the bus network	x	x	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓ to ✓✓✓
	Reliability and punctuality	x	✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	x to ✓✓
	Network identity	✓	✓✓	✓✓ to ✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓ to ✓✓
	Ticketing	xx	✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	xx to ✓✓✓
	Interchanges and bus stops	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓ to ✓✓
	Information	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓ to ✓✓✓
	Customer support and feedback	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓ to ✓✓
	Changes to services	—	✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓ to ✓✓✓
	Vehicles and depots	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓ to ✓✓✓
	Drivers	x	✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓ to ✓✓✓
	Safety and security	—	—	✓	✓✓	— to ✓✓

APPRAISAL CRITERIA		OPTIONS				
		BUSINESS AS USUAL	VOLUNTARY PARTNERSHIP	BSIP	FRANCHISING	MUNICIPAL BUS OPERATIONS
	Customer charter	—	✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	— to ✓✓✓
	Data and monitoring	—	✓ to ✓✓	✓ to ✓✓	✓✓✓	— to ✓✓✓
STAG criteria ⁱ	Environment	—	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓ to ✓✓
	Climate change	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓ to ✓✓
	Health, safety and wellbeing	—	✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓ to ✓✓✓
	Economy	✗	✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓ to ✓✓✓
	Equality and accessibility	✗	✗	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓ to ✓✓✓
Feasibility	Minor consideration	Minor consideration	Moderate consideration	Major consideration	Moderate consideration	
Affordability	Minor consideration	Moderate consideration	Major consideration	Major consideration	Moderate consideration	
Public acceptability	Moderate negative consideration	Moderate negative consideration	Moderate positive consideration	Major positive consideration	Minor positive consideration	
Indicative peak vehicle requirementsⁱⁱ	-	-	+200 vehicles	+300 vehicles	-	
Indicative additional annual vehicle kmsⁱⁱⁱ	-	-	+8-10m	+20-25m	-	
Total fare revenue benefits per annum^{iv}	-	£0-2m	-£6 – (-4m)	£5-7m	-£6 – (-4m)	
Estimated MEC benefits per annum (2024 prices)^v	-	£0-2m	£5-7m	£8-10m	£5-7m	

APPRAISAL CRITERIA	OPTIONS				
	BUSINESS AS USUAL	VOLUNTARY PARTNERSHIP	BSIP	FRANCHISING	MUNICIPAL BUS OPERATIONS
Indicative additional annual operating costs ^{vi}			+£20-40m	+£50-80m	
Indicative required subsidy ^{vii}	-	-	+£40-60m	+£45-85m	-
Estimated additional bus journeys per annum ^{viii}	-	0-5m	20-25m	35-40m	N/A
Deliverability and acceptability risks	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Medium
Complexity of operation	Low	Low	Medium	High	High
Timescales and program risks	Short-term No program risk	Short to medium-term Some program risk, mitigated by low ambition	Short to medium-term Some program risk, mitigated by modest ambition	Medium to long-term High program risk due to uncertainty of process	Medium to long-term High program risk due to uncertainty of process

Scoring methodology:

The performance of an option follows the seven-point scale of assessment as recommended in STAG:

- **Major benefit (✓✓✓):** these are benefits or positive impacts which, depending on the scale of benefit or severity of impact, the practitioner feels should be a principal consideration when assessing an option's eligibility for funding;
- **Moderate benefit (✓✓):** the option is anticipated to have only a moderate benefit or positive impact. Moderate benefits and impacts are those which taken in isolation may not determine an option's eligibility for funding, but taken together do so;
- **Minor benefit (✓):** the option is anticipated to have only a small benefit or positive impact. Small benefits or impacts are those which are worth noting, but the practitioner believes are not likely to contribute materially to determining whether an option is funded or otherwise;
- **No benefit or impact (-):** the option is anticipated to have no or negligible benefit or negative impact;
- **Small minor cost or negative impact (✗):** the option is anticipated to have only a minor cost or negative impact. Minor costs/negative impacts are those which are worth noting, but the practitioner believes are not likely to contribute materially to determining whether an option is funded or otherwise;

- **Moderate cost or negative impact (xx):** the option is anticipated to have only a moderate cost or negative impact. Moderate costs/negative impacts are those which taken in isolation may not determine an option's eligibility for funding, but taken together could do so; and
- **Major cost or negative impact (xxx):** these are costs or negative impact which, depending on the scale of cost or severity of impact, the practitioner should take into consideration when assessing an option's eligibility for funding.

ⁱ <https://www.transport.gov.scot/publication/scottish-transport-appraisal-guidance-managers-guide/#:~:text=STAG%20stands%20for%20Scottish%20Transport,the%20UK%20Government's%20Green%20Book>.

ⁱⁱ The indicative additional peak vehicle requirement to operate the indicative level of service improvements from the baseline.

ⁱⁱⁱ The indicative additional annual vehicle kms required to operate the indicative level of service improvements from the baseline.

^{iv} High level estimate of additional annual fare revenues based upon the demand impacts of the indicative level of service improvements, fare adjustments and service quality improvements from the baseline.

^v High level estimate of Marginal External Cost (MEC) benefits of additional bus journeys delivered by the option.

^{vi} High level estimate of additional annual operating costs based upon the indicative level of service improvements from the baseline.

^{vii} High level estimate of indicative additional subsidy required per annum to achieve indicative level of service improvements from the baseline.

^{viii} Currently, these figures assume options are delivered in isolation.