

The impact of the rise in the  
concessionary bus fare in  
Greater Manchester

“Food or education?”

Produced for the  
Transport Resource Unit



Report produced by Andy Wynne for the Transport Resource Unit in 2008.

The Transport Resource Unit (TRU) provides a link between the Voluntary Sector and the Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Authority

More information on TRU can be found at: <http://www.gmcvo.org.uk/transport>

## **Acknowledgments**

With thanks to Bill Harrop of the Community Network for Manchester's Transport Pool, who first suggested the need for a survey, and to John Hannen and Melanie Jeffs of the Transport Resource Unit who commissioned the research and this report. All three read and commented on the first draft, and Melanie provided advice and support for the research and the focus group.

The survey was publicised through numerous organisations in the Voluntary and Community Sector in Greater Manchester, school travel plan co-ordinators and officers, Connexions and the Netmums website.

Particular thanks go to those individuals who gave up their time to complete the survey and attend the focus group, without whom the research and this report would not have been possible.

# Contents

<b>Background and purpose</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Headline Results</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Analysis</b>	
<b>Comments on the extent of the price rise</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Fairness, cross-subsidy and taxation</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Free travel to school</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Free travel at all times</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Reduced travel and the impact on other activities</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Modal shift and barriers to use of public transport</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Social Exclusion</b>	
<b>Social exclusion and multiple deprivation</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Income Deprivation</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Education, skills and training deprivation</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix: The survey</b>	<b>24</b>

# Background and purpose

This report is concerned with the impact of the April 2007 rise in concessionary fare on families in Greater Manchester. From a voluntary sector perspective, concerns were initially raised through the Community Network for Manchester's Transport Pool.

The Greater Manchester Transport Resource Unit (GMTRU) was then requested to use its sub-regional remit to research the implications of the price rise throughout Greater Manchester. GMTRU is based at the Greater Manchester Centre for Voluntary Organisations (GMCVO) and provides a link between the voluntary sector and the Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Authority (GMPTA). It was decided to carry out a piece of small scale research, primarily as a means of exploring the issues and identifying those that would need further research and consideration.

GMPTA announced the price rise on 2 February, 2007, following a decision by the Department of Transport that forced them to provide the bus operators with an additional £3.4 million of subsidy for concessionary fares:

The Department for Transport has ruled that the bus companies are entitled to more money to cover the cost of the free travel scheme for disabled people and those aged 60 and over. At [the] GMPTA budget meeting, councillors reluctantly agreed to increase the concessionary bus fare from 50p to 70p in order to balance the budget.

GMPTA Chair Councillor Roger Jones said: *"I am extremely disappointed by this decision, which effectively forces us to give more public money to extremely profitable bus companies. In return, we have no control over the level or quality of services they provide, or the increasingly high fares they charge."*

*GMPTA Press Release 5 February 2007*

GMPTA (the PTA executive) received a fivefold increase in the number of complaints in the relevant quarter:

There is a significant increase in ticket/price related complaints this quarter, from 25 last quarter to 134..... These complaints were primarily about the increase in the concessionary fare from 50p to 70p.

*GMPTA Transport Network Committee. 6 July 2007 Complaints received by GMPTA*

# Research Methodology

It was not the intention of this initial research to produce a fully representative survey. The aim, as stated above, was primarily to explore the issues and identify those that would benefit from further research and consideration.

The research was carried out using an online questionnaire and a focus group meeting. The survey was originally publicised in August and had attracted 11 responses by 28 September 2007. However, the loss of the original member of staff meant that the survey was not disseminated again until 27 November. In the two month period to 28 January 2008 a further 102 responses were received. The survey was disseminated through a wide range of contacts in the voluntary sector and through school travel co-ordinators. A copy of the survey can be found in the appendix.

Eight people attended the focus group on 28 January 2008.

# Headline Results

## Sample

113 people had completed the survey by 28 January 2008. Of these, 107 had children between the ages of 5 and 15. The 107 families had a total of 208 children, an average of 1.95 children per family.

39 families had 1 child  
42 families had 2 children  
20 families had 3 children  
5 families had 4 children  
1 family had 5 children

Responses were received from all 10 districts of Greater Manchester, with the highest number coming from Stockport (37), Manchester (21), Bury (20) and Tameside (14).

## Mode of travel for children

Of the 208 children, the numbers travelling to a range of typical activities were:

Attending school	208
Visiting friends	203
Visiting family	203
Sport and Leisure activities	202
After School Activities	195
Shopping	194
Attending youth clubs and groups	169

Each of the activities can be broken down by mode of travel as follows:

### School

Bus	119
Car	37
Walk	49
Cycle	1
Other	2
<i>Total</i>	<i>208</i>

### Visiting friends

Bus	63
Car	69
Walk	63
Cycle	4
Other	0
N/A	4
<i>Total</i>	<i>203</i>

**Visiting family**

Bus	30
Car	150
Walk	12
Cycle	4
Other	5
N/A	2
<i>Total</i>	<i>203</i>

**Sport and leisure activities**

Bus	69
Car	101
Walk	24
Cycle	7
Other	0
N/A	1
<i>Total</i>	<i>202</i>

**After school activities**

Bus	74
Car	75
Walk	33
Cycle	0
Other	1
N/A	12
<i>Total</i>	<i>195</i>

**Shopping**

Bus	78
Car	93
Walk	6
Cycle	1
Other	4
N/A	12
<i>Total</i>	<i>194</i>

**Travel to youth clubs/groups**

Bus	30
Car	82
Walk	19
Cycle	5
Other	0
N/A	33
<i>Total</i>	<i>169</i>

## Bus usage

From a total of 208 children, the numbers who usually use the bus for each of the activities surveyed was:

School	119
Shopping	78
After School	74
Sport and Leisure	69
Friends	63
Family	30
Youth Club/Groups	30

## Choice of travel mode

Parents and guardians were asked to rate four factors by order of importance when considering the choice of travel mode for their children. The percentage who rated each of the factors of high importance when making travel decisions was:

Safety/Security	88.8 %
Convenience	63.8 %
Cost	60.0 %
Developing Life skills/ independence	54.0 %

## Confidence in using different modes of travel

The survey identified that children have a high level of confidence as pedestrians and bus users. The level of confidence reduces substantially for cycling, with only 40% being confident when using a bike. Low levels of confidence for train and tram are likely to reflect a lack of familiarity with these modes.

Confident pedestrians?	91.3%
Confident bus users?	88.0 %
Confident cyclists?	40.4 %
Confident train users?	29.4%
Confident tram users?	24.5 %

## Key barriers for the use of public transport by children

Cost is seen as the major barrier by three quarters of the respondents. The other factors surveyed were all seen as barriers by over half of the parents.

Cost	75.5%
Safety/Security	70.9 %
Attitudes of other passengers	65.5 %
Reliability	60.9 %
Driver attitudes	52.7 %

## **Impact of the rise in fare on the way children travel to school**

Almost half of 103 respondents to this question stated that the rise in fare had impacted on the way their children travel to school.

## **Impact of the rise in fare on the way children travel to activities other than school**

The impact has been even higher on other activities with 60% of the 95 people who responded claiming that it has made a difference.

## **Financial impact on families of the rise in bus fare**

65% of those surveyed stated that the rise in fare had had an impact on disposable income. This is consistent with the figure of 57% of families whose children use the bus for school, given that children are also using the bus for other purposes.

16% of the responses indicated that the rise in fare had had an impact on their ability to pay for necessities such as rent, mortgage and utility bills.

# Analysis

## Comments on the extent of the price rise

Almost two thirds of those surveyed reported a reduction in disposable income because of the increase in fare. This has resulted in a reduction in travel generally and the suggestion that some children may not be attending school. These issues will be discussed further below. Of most concern, however, is the fact that 16% of the survey population have reported an impact on the ability to pay for essential costs such as housing and heating, etc.

The response to the price increase was in many cases an emotive one. Several respondents pointed out that it was a 40% increase:

*A 40% increase!*

*We find that with 3 children a rise of 40% in the fares adds an extra £6+ per week to our outgoings.*

*This increase was at a rate of 40%, which is a very high percentage*

Reference to the extent of the increase, and the cost of public transport, in both the survey and the focus group, made use of words and phrases such as:

*Very expensive, Extremely Costly, Shocking, Extortionate and Appalling.*

## Fairness, cross-subsidy and taxation

A number of respondents to the survey were of the opinion that the rise in fare was inequitable because of the fact that children have no choice other than to go to school:

*The rise in the cost is particularly unfair for school travel because children HAVE to go to school*

*Very annoyed – [we are] told to use cars less but children who have to go to school [are] easy targets for a price rise and the percentage increase is staggering*

This viewpoint was also expressed within the focus group:

*There's no choice about going to school*

*They've picked on the weakest element, children have to go to school*

The focus group discussion regularly turned to issues of taxation, subsidy and how decisions about subsidised fares should be made, particularly in relation to what were seen as the two major competing groups of schoolchildren and pensioners.

Both within the focus group, and in some of the responses to the survey, it was recognised that subsidised fares had to be paid for by others. For example:

*Nothing is free. What we are really saying is should someone else pay for children to travel without paying.*

*I object to kids having to pay on public transport. I'm quite happy for my tax to be spent on concessionary fares. It's good economic and social sense.*

However, concern was expressed that the process was not transparent and that decisions about the degree of subsidy and where that subsidy should be best applied were not open to influence, or the result of informed debate:

*It's about choice and where we choose to put the money*

*There's no explicit choice given about whether we want to pay more council tax so children can travel free*

The focus group wanted to know how much is raised from charging concessionary fares for children. They also raised the issue of whether the money being raised from fines raised from cars in bus lanes could be used to subsidise the fare for children.

A number of responses drew comparisons between children and pensioners:

*The decision to give over 60's free travel had implications*

*The over 60's had free train travel added as well*

*If over 60's receive free transport, I feel that children should also receive it as they are unable to earn money to pay for the fares*

*Pensioners receive free travel and I strongly believe that families should be helped in the same way.*

Some attendees at the focus group saw the issue as a straight choice between subsidising children and subsidising pensioners, and were of the opinion that the fact that pensioners were able to vote had had an influence on the decision. It was also pointed out that some over 60's are still at work and well paid, and therefore in no need of a subsidy.

The attendees at the focus group clearly recognised that the issues concerning the budget were complex. Many of them were unclear about the decision making process, how it operated and how they could get involved.

## **Free travel to school**

A number of the attendees at the focus group, and some respondents to the survey, believed that travel to school should be free of charge for all children.

*Getting kids to school should be free*

*School is not a luxury*

*I feel any child who has to get the bus to and from school should be given a bus pass regardless of distance*

*I do have a problem with children who do not earn or have the ability to earn having to pay to go to school!!*

However, one member of the focus group felt that things were more complex than this and questioned whether other members of the public would agree with the above comments:

*What remit has Councillor Jones got to campaign for free transport for young people? Is this what we really want?*

## **Free travel at all times**

Some of those who wanted free travel to school were happy to pay a concessionary or capped fare for leisure activities, which were viewed as non-compulsory. Other respondents believed that children should be able to travel for free at all times:

*I believe all young people should access free fares*

*I feel that public transport should be free for all young people in education including university*

*In the light of the Government's Every Child Matters agenda I feel strongly that children should have free access to public transport*

In the focus group, comparison was also drawn with London where children under 16 get free travel in a scheme estimated to cost £70 million a year, but to increase the number of journeys by 50 million.

(source: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/transport/Story/0,2763,1506820,00.html> - accessed 7 February 2008)

However, one attendee pointed out that in London some people were now describing buses as “youth clubs on wheels” and that there had been a resultant increase in anti-social behaviour. This was impacting negatively on adults and, indeed, many other children.

Transport for London reserve the right to withdraw children's passes for anti-social behaviour and a total of 2,358 passes were withdrawn in the financial year 2006/7.

This represents 0.83% of the 276,000 passes that were held by under 16's in February 2007.

(source: [http://www.tfl.gov.uk/assets/downloads/foi/070227\\_Under-16\\_travel\\_passes\\_\(redacted\).pdf](http://www.tfl.gov.uk/assets/downloads/foi/070227_Under-16_travel_passes_(redacted).pdf))

## **Reduced travel and the impact on other activities**

The responses to the survey demonstrate that some parents make a clear distinction between travel for compulsory attendance at school and travel for activities carried out on a voluntary basis. However, education does not take place solely within the boundaries of the school. This has been recognised by the government's Extended Schools Agenda. Members of the Focus Group also expressed the opinion that extra – curricular activities can in some cases be more important than what is learnt in school, particularly for developing social skills.

We therefore need to consider what impact the rise in concessionary fare has had on other activities, particularly those that will impact on educational achievement and lifeskills. A number of respondents to the survey reported that other activities had been curtailed by the rise in fare:

*Activities are limited due to rise in fare*

*It's reduced the activities she can participate in over weekends and evenings after school*

*It is too expensive to fund as much as previously*

*Pocket money no longer stretches as far limiting some activities*

*I have had to refuse some activities because I just can't afford the cost and also pay for travel to school*

*It restricts leisure outings and visiting family and friends*

## **Modal shift and barriers to use of public transport**

As well as reducing the number of journeys taken, the survey suggested that another impact of the rise in fare has been to prompt modal shift away from public transport towards walking and use of the car.

### **Modal shift to walking**

Some of the respondents reported that their children are now replacing bus journeys by walking to save money:

*Sometimes she chooses to walk and save the difference*

*My son catches bus to school, but walks home to save money!*

*Bus fare is very expensive for such a short journey. Will try therefore to get a lift or walk in some instances.*

*They can only afford to pay for travel one way now. They have to walk one way*

This type of modal shift is relatively benign in terms of the external costs to society and it might also be argued that it promotes better health. However, for the families and children concerned there are issues related to lost time and security. The focus group discussed the fact that it was once the case that mothers would be able to walk to school with their children, but that the increased tendency for women to work, combined with busier roads to walk along, meant that this was now less likely to happen. It was also mentioned that the walking option could mean a lengthy time commitment for those who missed out on the three mile limit for free travel. One parent considered that their child was being put at an increased risk by having to walk:

*No option to take another form of transport. He is now more likely to be at risk as he will walk rather than take the bus.*

### **Modal shift to car**

For many of those who own a car, it is now seen as more cost effective to use it than to pay the increased bus fare. This is particularly the case if there is more than one child involved:

*Sometimes she has to travel by car because of cost*

*If the weather is bad or there any problems we're much more likely to use the car as it is cheaper*

*We use the car instead now*

*When the 2nd child starts High school I will drive them as its cheaper*

*Bus fares are too high for children to travel by bus. I find that I am using the car more frequently*

*With two children it can work out cheaper to drop them off rather than pay out £2.80 a day in fares*

*It can be more cost effective when travelling with 3 children to use other transport – car or taxi*

*It is cheaper to get a taxi if there are a few children going in the same direction*

Increased car use is counter to the need to promote mode shift towards public transport in order to reduce congestion, improve air quality, reduce global warming, conserve scarce resources, minimise road traffic accidents and to promote

sustainability in general. Many of those who took part in the survey and focus group recognised this:

*Many parents who have 2 and 3 children at school are now considering reverting back to using their cars as it will not be cost effective to use the bus. As I am sure you are aware this will just further increase the congestion on our already busy roads, not to mention the problems for local residents and parking. Then there is pollution and safety!*

*Encourages more parents to use the car, increases congestion, increases likelihood of child being injured cycling on the dark winter evenings.*

*This is way above inflation and does not give any incentive to get cars off the road and children onto buses.*

*We now only use the buses when no other option is available. This is therefore putting more cars back on the road. A backward step!*

One attendee at the focus group was concerned that increased mode shift from bus to car would result in the school bus service no longer being viable as a result of the reduction in demand.

Three of the respondents mentioned that they would return to the bus if the fares were more affordable:

*I would certainly go back to using the bus if the fares were to drop but £2.80 each day is just ridiculous*

*Keep it affordable and we will use it - a 40% increase is too much. It is cheaper to get a taxi if there are a few children going in the same direction*

*I'm sure from talking to other mothers that used to use the school bus they would continue if fares were to reduce or free passes were introduced*

### **Barriers to the use of public transport**

As we have seen, cost is clearly seen as a barrier to the use of public transport with the increase in the concessionary fare promoting modal shift towards the use of the private car and the taxi. 60% of those who completed the survey considered that cost was of high importance when considering travel mode and it was ranked as the most important barrier to the use of public transport by 75% of the respondents.

However, each of the five potential barriers surveyed were considered as barriers by over 50% of the sample:

Cost	75.5%
Safety/Security	70.9 %
Attitudes of other passengers	65.5 %
Reliability	60.9 %
Driver attitudes	52.7 %

It is clear that there is a package of problems that must be addressed if the use of public transport is to be substantially increased and it may be the case that the overall barrier is greater than the sum of the parts.

Relevant comments from the survey are:

*The public transport service does not offer a service that is value for money, buses are unreliable and it is not cost effective*

*Buses are over crowded and not reliable*

*I'd rather use the car than prop up the bus service. The service not very reliable and the coverage is poor*

*The buses are unreliable and often not safe. The driver's attitudes are horrendous - they are rude, surly, sometimes aggressive and very unhelpful and inconsiderate at the best of times. We have regularly experienced drivers refusing to let children on buses and leaving them at lonely places on their own - seemingly on a whim and without any real or justifiable reason. The cost is way too high for the quality and reliability of the service. The whole system needs an overhaul, with timetables being stuck to.*

*We can manage the fares but both my children have had incidents when they have not been given the correct change in a morning from their £1 and then been short for their fare in the afternoon and when the eldest tried to challenge the driver he said "tough".*

*My son was recently pushed off the school bus - the bus was still moving and the driver didn't ask if he was OK. I think they have a certain responsibility to the children and why were the doors open before the bus stopped?*

# Social Exclusion

## Social Exclusion and Multiple Deprivation

The government's social exclusion agenda is intended to overcome multiple deprivation:

Social exclusion happens when people or places suffer from a series of problems such as unemployment, discrimination, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime, ill health and family breakdown. When such problems combine they can create a vicious cycle.

<http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/seu/pageac0b.html?id=96&pld=27&url=page.asp?id=213>  
Accessed 7 Feb 08

A further vicious cycle can be created when a child's family circumstances are such that its ability to fulfill its potential is compromised:

... Being born into poverty or to parents with low skills still has a major influence on future life chances.

<http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/seu/pageac0b.html?id=96&pld=27&url=page.asp?id=213>  
Accessed 7 Feb 08

in the 10 per cent most deprived wards in 1998, over 60 per cent of children lived in households that relied on means tested benefits

*A New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal: National Strategy Action Plan. 2002*

The index of multiple deprivation ranks the two domains most relevant to the rise in concessionary fares ( Income Deprivation, and Education, Skills and Training deprivation) joint first and joint third respectively. Both, of course, have strong linkages to employment deprivation.

Table 1: Domain Weights for the IMD 2004

	Domain Weight
Income deprivation	22.5%
Employment deprivation	22.5%
Health deprivation and disability	13.5%
Education, skills and training deprivation	13.5%
Barriers to housing and services	9.3%
Crime	9.3%
Living Environment deprivation	9.3%

*A New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal: National Strategy Action Plan. 2002*

The Government's *Every Child Matters* agenda is designed to ensure that children are given the best possible start in life regardless of their family circumstances and is therefore of critical importance to the Social Inclusion agenda:

The Government's aim is for every child, whatever their background or their circumstances, to have the support they need to:

- Be healthy
- Stay safe
- Enjoy and achieve
- Make a positive contribution
- Achieve economic well-being

[www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/aims/](http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/aims/) Accessed 4 Feb 2008

## **Income Deprivation**

As discussed above, 65% of those surveyed stated that the rise in fare had an impact on disposable income. 16% of the responses indicated that the rise in fare had an impact on their ability to pay for necessities such as rent, mortgage and utility bills. Two of the responses to the survey indicated that the rise in fares was affecting the ability to buy enough food:

*It costs too much bloody money daily when I need it for other things like food*

*The cost of public transport for children is too high and this affects how much money she has for her lunch*

Three other issues were identified in the survey as having an impact on disposable income:

1. The need for families to travel together, particularly when there are younger children:

*I think it's bad that children who are accompanying adults have to pay at all, in particular the younger children who have no choice whether they ride the bus or not.*

2. The impact of the price rise is higher the greater the number of children:

*I feel this is a barrier for low income or benefit families as of they have more than 2 children this is a big amount per week*

*We find that with 3 children a rise of 40% in the fares adds an extra £6+ per week in our outgoings*

*This increase was at a rate of 40% which is a very high percentage. If you have more than one child travelling to school by bus as I do then the increase is felt doubly*

*With two children it can work out cheaper to drop them off rather than pay out £2.80 a day in fares*

*It can be more cost effective when travelling with 3 children to use other transport - car, taxi. Increased costs reduces their opportunities*

### 3. The cost of making journeys that involve multiple routes:

*If we need to get 2 buses to our destination and 2 back it can be expensive*

*Unless he has a weekly pass it is too expensive to make multiply journeys to evening activities & visiting school friends*

*He avoids destinations involving a change of bus (therefore 2 x 70p each way), may ask for a lift one way or walk for one leg of journey*

## **Education, skills and training deprivation**

A recent report for the Sutton Trust entitled *Recent Changes in Intergenerational Mobility in Britain* claims that:

Parental background continues to exert a very significant influence on the academic progress of children” and that “The UK remains low in the international rankings of social mobility when compared with other advanced nations.

The government’s *Extended Schools* programme acknowledges that educational achievement is dependent on many issues outside the classroom, including extra-curricular activity:

All children should have the chance to learn new skills and have fun out of school hours — and extended schools will give them those opportunities.

Children, Schools and Families minister, Ed Balls, quoted in the Guardian Supplement on Extended Schools, 25 September 2007

The survey strongly indicates that the rise in the concessionary fare has curtailed extra-curricular activities for some children in Greater Manchester. Whilst it is not possible to quantify the effect of this for future educational attainment and the related issues of employment and income, it will clearly run counter to the intentions of the *Social Exclusion* agenda and the related agendas of *Every Child Matters* and *Extended Schools*.

Of even greater relevance to the need to promote equality of opportunity, however, was one example of the rise in the concessionary fare actually influencing the choice of school:

*It affected the choice of school. The one that needed bus travel we omitted from our choice of school list.*

# Conclusion

It is beyond the scope of this research to consider the impact of the rise in concessionary fares on other aspects of government policy in any detail, although many have been mentioned in passing in the analysis section. It is clear, however, that access to transport, particularly when linked to access to educational opportunity in the widest sense, will have implications for a wide range of policy initiatives. The *Egan Wheel* defines the ingredients of a Sustainable Community. It is a useful tool against which to assess the impacts of the rise in concessionary fare on the interlinked policy initiatives related to the development of sustainable communities and the regeneration of deprived communities.



*The Egan Wheel*

That the rise in concessionary fare would have negative implications was clearly recognised by GMPTA at the outset. However, budget and other constraints were responsible for the initial increase. It now appears that similar constraints will bring

about a 5p overall rise in fare for 2008/9, although this may be introduced as a 10p increase in the latter half of the year. The longer term outlook for fares is not positive as the Authority are also predicting a shortfall between increases in fares by operators and the level of subsidy received from the Department of Transport for concessionary fares.

GMPTA have a core objective for the concessionary fare scheme which is:

to subsidise the cost for public travel for key groups, so as to encourage greater usage and, in turn, contribute to modal shift and social inclusion for those without the option of travel by car.

This research has demonstrated how sensitive the aims of this objective are to the level of the fare. It appears that the situation can only deteriorate with GMPTA reporting that a 10p rise in fare will result in a reduction of approximately a million journeys. As this trend runs counter to the policy objective to build sustainable communities it will impact on the whole community, not just those who are directly affected. A debate that has so far perhaps been seen as unimportant by the majority may therefore demand greater attention. Amongst the many issues that the survey has identified, there are a number that merit further attention:

- 1. Should the fare for travel to school be addressed as a separate issue to that of subsidised fares in general? If so, should it also cover activity that contributes to educational attainment that takes place outside core teaching time? The *Extended Schools Agenda* is relevant here.**
- 2. What research has been carried out into the influence of out of school activities on educational achievement and the development of life skills? If it is accepted that these activities make a positive contribution, how could the subsidised fare be used to support them and ensure that it is not a barrier to some children being able to take part?**
- 3. How can those families that have serious financial constraints be supported with travel to school, or the use of public transport in general? This is clearly an issue that is of relevance to a number of policy areas, particularly given the importance of the social exclusion agenda. Should other interested parties be involved in the resolution of this problem?**
- 4. There is clearly a direct relationship between increased fares and modal shift away from bus usage. How can the bus companies be involved in alleviating the problems caused by the increase in the fare, particularly given their interests in promoting bus travel?**
- 5. How can the other barriers to increasing the use of public transport by children be addressed?**

- 6. Can the multiplied effect of the fare increase, resulting from having more than one child or from children having to make multiple journeys to their destination, be mitigated in any way?**
- 7. How can we increase the understanding of the GMPTA budget setting process and its implications?**

# Appendix

## The survey



### Local Travel by Children and Young People

*Note: The results of GMCVO Transport Resource Unit surveys are used to ensure that the work we do is representative of the sector.*

**In April 2007 the Greater Manchester Passenger Authority (GMPTA) announced a rise in the concessionary fare for children aged 5 to 15 from 50p to 70p on buses.**

**We are trying to understand the impact of this price rise on families and identify key issues for families and children in accessing transport. Your assistance in completing this short survey is appreciated.**

1. Are you responsible for any children between the ages of 5-15?

Yes

No

2. If yes, what age is the child / are the children in your care?

First Child \_\_\_\_\_

Second Child \_\_\_\_\_

Third Child \_\_\_\_\_

Fourth Child \_\_\_\_\_

Fifth Child \_\_\_\_\_

Sixth Child \_\_\_\_\_

Please indicate if you have more children:

3. How does your child / children in your care *usually* travel to and from the following?  
 (please indicate either *Bus/Car/Walk/Cycle/Other* or leave blank if not applicable)

	School	After School Activities	Visiting Friends	Visiting Family	Sport / Leisure	Youth Clubs / Groups	Shopping
1 <sup>st</sup> Child							
2 <sup>nd</sup> Child							
3 <sup>rd</sup> Child							
4 <sup>th</sup> Child							
5 <sup>th</sup> Child							
6 <sup>th</sup> Child							

4. Please rate from highest to lowest the factors that affect your choice of how your child / children in your care travel to school (*please tick*):

	High	Medium	Low
Safety / Security			
Cost			
Convenience			
Child developing life skills / independence			
Other ( <i>please specify</i> )			

5. Would you describe your child / children in your care as:

Confident bus users? Yes / No

Confident train users? Yes / No

Confident tram users? Yes / No

Confident cyclists? Yes / No

Confident pedestrians? Yes / No

6. What do you consider are the key barriers for children in using public transport. (*Please tick all those that apply*):

- Safety / Security
- Cost
- Reliability
- Driver Attitudes
- Attitudes of other passengers (eg anti social behaviour)
- Other (please specify)

7. Has the rise in bus fare from 50p to 70p per journey impacted on the way your child / children in your care travels to the following -

To school? Yes / No

To other activities? Yes / No

If yes, in what way?

8. Has the rise in concessionary fare from 50p to 70p impacted on your family / children in your care in other ways?

On disposable income Yes / No

On ability to pay for fixed necessities, (eg rent, utilities) Yes / No

Other (please specify)

9. Please provide any other comments you may have about the impact of the concessionary fare rise or the way children access public transport.

10. In which district of Greater Manchester do you live?

Bolton

Bury

Manchester

Oldham

Rochdale

Salford

Stockport

Tameside

Trafford

Wigan

11. If you would like to be informed about the results of this consultation or if you may be interested in participating in a focus group to discuss the results further please provide contact details...

Name:

Telephone:

Email:

***Thank you for your survey response. No personal information given will be used by or passed onto any third parties.***