

Combined Authority Functional Assessment

1. Table 1 sets out a summary of an assessment of principal Council functions and how these relate to the proposed West Yorkshire Combined Authority (CA) in terms of key risks (and mitigation) and issues for further discussion/negotiation.
2. As a result of the assessment, it is evident that there are significant strategic investment opportunity benefits for York being a full member of the CA from 1st April 2014, or as near to this date as possible. Therefore, it is recommended that the Council pursues four strategic planning and investment areas within the Combined Authority within the short term. These are:
 - Participation in the West Yorkshire Plus York Transport Fund (WYYTF) – enabling greater leverage of investment to meet York’s future transport infrastructure needs;
 - Continued involvement in the Economic Investment Fund (EIF) – a revolving fund aimed at investing in projects that support economic growth and kick-starting investment in York’s infrastructure priorities;
 - Rail franchising – having a greater say in the specification of the Northern and Transpennine rail franchises that underpin York’s connectivity to adjacent city regions;
 - Strategic network planning with the Highways Agency and Network Rail – an enhancement to existing Leeds City Region LEP arrangements that will promote joint investment planning across the strategic networks.
3. The remainder of this annex includes further consideration of these four items, but in the case of the WYYTF and the EIF, the immediate aim will be to finalise arrangements already in place for the use of investment from the Council.
4. Figure 1 shows how York’s involvement within the CA as at 1st April 2014 could work in relation to the structures being taken forward by the CA.
5. At the present time, there is a lot of detail to be worked through on functions that could be ceded to a CA, not only from York’s

perspective, but also from other constituent members of the CA, and so it is not suggested that any change to operational issues be pursued in the short term. As well as representation on the CA and the existing Leeds City Region (LCR) Leaders Board, Figure 1 shows how the Council's existing structures and functions would work alongside existing West Yorkshire structures at an operational level from April 2014.

6. Allied to the other potential changes in strategic planning and investment that could take place within the next two years, the medium term would seem the most sensible timeframe in which to consider what functions that are proposed to be part of the CA from the outset are ceded to the CA from York at an operational level. This would allow more detailed discussions with other CA members on such operational issues over the next two years.

Short Term Opportunities and Issues with the CA

7. The principal opportunity for York with membership of the CA lies in the participation in the WYYTF, the principal benefit of which would be to secure a longer term funding commitment for York as well as providing the greatest ability to leverage York's co-investment in the WYYTF.
8. The detail behind this is included in Annex B. Participation in the WYYTF from the outset would also make it more likely that the major transport priorities to support economic growth in the City (City centre/York Central interchange/ public transport/access improvements and Northern Outer Ring Road Improvements) could come forward within the first 10 years of the WYYTF.
9. Membership of the CA would also bring opportunities to work collaboratively with other CA districts in sharing resources, from design to implementation, as well as procurement programme management and business case preparation. This should help ensure that budgets and deadlines are met and that value for money for the investment required from the Council is maximised.
10. It should also be noted that York is already a member of the LCR revolving EIF through its Business Rates Pool, established in late 2012. The revolving fund is an approach by the LCR to create a fund of up to £500 million that could be invested in projects that support economic growth, with financial returns being invested on a revolving basis. The CA will be the Accountable Body for the

fund, and so it would seem logical for York to retain membership of the EIF through the transfer arrangements.

11. The other key opportunity for York with membership of the CA at this time is in the ability to influence strategic road and rail investment decisions as part of the CA, as opposed to a relatively small individual authority.
12. As part of the Rail in the North Executive (RINE), the West Yorkshire CA will be one of the three main members of the board seeking to devolve specification and funding for the next Northern and Transpennine rail franchises to local bodies. It is vital that York has a key role within such negotiations, along with a strong influence over future five year investment planning periods by Network Rail, and membership of the CA provides this.
13. Similarly, as reforms to the Highways Agency seek to provide five year funding periods and strengthen links with local partners to ensure that the strategic road network can support growth aspirations, it will be important for York to have a strong influencing voice as to where such strategic highways investment would benefit the City and the LCR. This influencing role would be maximised within the CA.
14. Whilst there are opportunities for York with the CA in the short term, there are also some issues that need to be borne in mind as membership of the CA is confirmed and any formal agreements drawn up.
15. As a CA member in its own right, York will have only one vote out of ten as proposed. Therefore, York's influence might be limited, particularly as simple majority voting is proposed for most decisions. On the other hand, as a non-constituent member (which is the current arrangement), such influence is likely to be even more limited, with non-constituent members only allowed to vote on issues agreed by the constituent members.
16. The majority voting issue may only become a problem where York's voice is not heard. At a detailed level, it should be questioned whether York's transport needs are as aligned to, say, Calderdale or Wakefield, as to other CA members, or its North/East Yorkshire neighbours? This risk can be offset by the formal adoption for all CA business of the Memorandum of Understanding for the Local Transport Body. This requires that

both York and the other members need to agree on the use of investment provided by York, and that such investment can only be used on schemes of benefit to York and its hinterland or those of mutual benefit to York and West Yorkshire.

17. There is currently no revenue budget provision for the York contribution to the additional district contributions for the WYYTF. These additional contributions would add to the existing budget gap and need to be considered in the context of the budget savings which the Council is already having to identify.
18. However, it is clear that the increased contribution to the WYYTF (and the EIF for that matter) provides significant additional leverage, and without membership of the CA, it is unlikely that all of the transport improvements most needed to support economic growth could be funded from the indicative allocations for York alone.

Medium Term Opportunities and Issues

19. Given the need to allow the CA to bed down, and especially with the proposed introduction of the Single Local Growth Fund (SLGF) in financial year 2015-16, there are strategic investment opportunities in the medium term to pursue York's involvement within a West Yorkshire and York SLGF.
20. The SLGF will be influenced by a LCR Strategic Economic Plan, which the shadow CA and the LEP will develop jointly by April 2014, and so it may be that beyond the establishment of the SLGF, strategic economic planning is part of the CA's remit under its well-being powers, supported by a Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan. These would complement the existing York documents but identify those proposals/measures whose impact would be beyond York's administrative boundary and/or require investment beyond that which could be raised by York alone.
21. The CA arrangements at the moment do not include for strategic planning functions. As York is a unitary authority it has responsibility for both planning and transport functions. If transport powers are ceded to the CA there is a risk of reduced integration. It is also unclear at this stage how any monies from Section 106 Agreements or any Community Infrastructure Levy income will be apportioned between local and strategic investment needs, even

though the Council will remain the accountable body for each of these.

22. As a comparator, the Greater Manchester CA has agreed with its constituent districts an Operating Agreement which, amongst other things, provides for the detailed arrangements for the discharge of various transport and economic development and regeneration functions. In support of this Operating Agreement, a series of protocols for each of the functions has been developed which describe the respective roles of the CA and the district councils. These protocols are intended to be flexible documents, which can be amended as the respective roles of the CA, and the constituent districts in relation to economic development and regeneration, and traffic issues, evolve. Such an arrangement would seem sensible for aspects of the West Yorkshire CA, so as to protect York's statutory planning role and ensure that an integrated approach to planning and transport continues.
23. As the WYYTF becomes established, there is likely to be benefit of including a review of how major local transport schemes are delivered, from the outset to opening and full membership of the CA will provide opportunities for shared resource and efficiency.
24. Beyond this, there may be additional merit, further driven by pressures on local authority budgets, to look at more shared procurement of services, with some transport functions being taken forward on a lead authority/centre of excellence basis. In this respect, one area where York would seem ideally placed to lead the rest of the LCR is in park and ride.
25. Although the CA as proposed has relatively limited powers, principally being those discharged at present by the ITA, there may be an expectation that York cedes the same powers to the CA as the other authorities from the outset. This could lead to a break between the LTA/public transport obligations and those for highways, in both locational and practical terms, which may not be desirable or efficient.
26. On the other hand, the lack of additional powers being ceded to the CA at present may be a benefit to allow the CA to be established and begin operating without additional distraction. There is the opportunity, as the CA evolves, to review its functions and agree where there may be future opportunities for additional collaboration.

27. At an operational level, the medium term would seem the most sensible timeframe in which to consider what functions that are proposed to be part of the CA from the outset are ceded to the CA from York as a public transport authority. This will need close working with CA partners and other Council services, so as to maximise the benefits of the CA taking a lead in, say, subsidised bus services and public transport investment, without losing local focus.

Longer Term

28. In the longer term, taken to be beyond April 2016, further discussion may be had around highways functions and strategic planning, along with any associated funding. The allocation and inclusion of EU Structural Funds may also be a subject for further negotiation.
29. At an operational level, the longer term could potentially see a widening of the CA's functions to include park and ride, maintenance and the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, although whether this funding stream exists beyond 2015 is not clear at present.
30. However, there are also a number of operational items that are unlikely to be suitable for ceding to a CA, or where it is in York's best interests not to do so. Examples of such include the Co-ordination of Response to Highway Disruption, where the particular nature of York and its tourism economy is very different to West Yorkshire; Sustainable Transport Initiatives, which are very local in their concept, design and delivery; Marketing and Promotion, linked to both of the above and thought to remain with a local focus; and Stakeholder Liaison, where sensitive issues will continue to be best dealt with at a local level.

Table 1 – Summary of Functional Assessment

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
Strategic Planning and Investment			
West Yorkshire + York Transport Fund	Short	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overspend on other schemes within the Fund may impact negatively on York scheme delivery – careful management of the fund and schemes from the outset will reduce this possibility. • No clarity at present on how “earn back” part of the Fund is going to work – more information is needed on this, as well as an agreement from Government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When will the planned programme management function be operational, and can York draw upon it as a full member of the CA? • Can the funding for York package remain mutually ring fenced or a minimum allocation be guaranteed as in current Memorandum of Understanding? • Is there the option to look at how to “share” optimism bias savings for efficient delivery? • Can “earn back” on York schemes be ring fenced?

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
Economic Investment Fund	Short	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation of funds may be competitive (based on achievement of economic objectives) and prioritisation may not favour York schemes – pursue a similar arrangement to the WYYTF MoU. • Private finance will be sought to co-invest at revolving Fund and/or project level – this needs some more clarity as to the expected contribution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the planned Partnership Agreement governing how funds are allocated between authorities been finalised yet? • Is there a formula/proposal as to how the recycling of project returns is to work?
Rail Franchising	Short	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future rail devolution issues could become focused on capacity issues around Leeds station, as well as the developing debate around the HS2 station in Leeds, and hence draw funding – CA needs an agreed position on key rail priorities within next franchise periods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued active involvement in developing the Long Term Rail Strategy for the North, but can York’s role be expanded with full membership of the CA? • What are the revenue risks, how have these been determined and how are these to be managed/funded?

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> York's membership of the CA could expose it to a revenue risk for future rail service specifications – Council needs to be aware of what value this risk may be within any negotiations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity is needed on York's rail investment priorities?
Strategic Road/Rail Network and Highways Agency/Network Rail Interface	Short	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> York needs to be represented in discussions with the Highways Agency given issues on the A19 (north and south) and the A64, and how these interact with the local highway network – these are outside CA area, and so continued liaison with neighbouring LEPs is needed. Similarly, York needs to be represented in discussion with Network Rail on plans for the East Coast Main Line, as well as further infrastructure improvement schemes such as Transpennine electrification and Northern Hub. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a defined CA strategic highway network? Can protocols be developed which set out agreed arrangements for joint working between the CA authorities and the Highways Agency and Network Rail How can York's leading role with the East Coast Mainline authorities group be rolled forward into the CA?

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Such discussions currently happen through an Officer Group which advises the Transport Panel of the LEP – a similar arrangement needs to be put in place within the emerging CA structures. 	
Major Local Transport Scheme Delivery	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is currently unknown how the delivery of individual major schemes will be directly managed i.e. through the CA or individual authorities. Metro is currently developing programme management arrangements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When will the planned programme management function be operational, and can York draw upon it as a full member of the CA? Clarify how delivery will be directly managed e.g. through CA or individual authorities? How can resources be shared effectively? Can protocols be developed which set out agreed arrangements for joint working between the CA authorities on Major Scheme Delivery?

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
Single Local Growth Fund	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding allocation will be based on Leeds City Region Strategic Economic Plan. Focus could be on larger schemes benefiting the wider CA rather than York focussed projects, and has a competitive element. In the initial stages, York may want to pursue a similar arrangement to the WYYTF MoU. Risk that Strategic Economic Plan does not complement existing York plans – Council needs to closely monitor development of the Plan and influence prior to submission in April 2014. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity is required on how the relationship between the CA and LEP is to be developed with regards to SLGF.
Economic Strategy	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A CA could lead to a lack of focus on York specific economic objectives due to the differing priorities of other constituent authorities - pursue a similar 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing commitment required by CA with regards to ensuring successful delivery of York Economic Strategy – does this require an amended/another

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
		arrangement to the WYYTF MoU with regards to the development of the Leeds City Region Strategic Economic Plan.	Operating Agreement?
Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no proposal for a CA-level IDP at present – this should be considered as infrastructure to support growth aspirations should be addressed at a strategic level. • Risk that IDP does not complement existing York plans - York needs to closely monitor development of the Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing commitment required by CA with regards to ensuring successful delivery of York Delivery Plan – does this require an amended/another Operating Agreement?
Procurement of Services	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CYC already has network of suppliers and frameworks in place. Move to CA could impinge upon ability of York to utilise existing suppliers and move towards a “one size fits all” approach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will services be procured? • Will there be any flexibility in approach to allow York to continue to use local/trusted suppliers? • Can a joint procurement strategy be

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
			<p>developed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will a joint procurement body/board be required?
Strategic and Local Planning	Long	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is the risk that the planned delivery of the Local Plan could be adversely impacted by the CA's discharge of its powers if resources are focused away from York – need an early Operating Agreement similar to Greater Manchester Combined Authority. • There may be complications in preparing updates to the Plan if the strategic transport and economic planning resource is housed within a CA in the future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can protocols be developed which set out agreed arrangements for joint working on planning issues and a shared approach in the preparation of Local Plans and their supporting transport/economic evidence base between CA members? • Can protocols be developed with regards to Housing Strategy?
EU Structural Funds	Long	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some degree of uncertainty as to whether York could be eligible for EU Structural Funds within a CA – 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will EU funding bids be developed with the LEP?

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
		<p>clarity is needed on this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU Structural Funding Programmes are likely to require some degree of match funding from local sources. This may place even more pressure on existing funding streams used for projects of local importance in York if it is part of the CA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would York be able to access funds if it was not part of the CA?
Operational			
Local Transport Plan	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A joint or collaboratively produced LTP undertaken by the CA members could lead to a shift in focus away from local York issues and make it difficult to reflect cross boundary issues with respect to neighbouring authorities of North Yorkshire (NYCC) and East Riding (ERYC) – this could be mitigated to some extent by a common strategic ‘front 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent of the impacts on the LTP development process needs to be clarified. • Can protocols be developed which set out agreed arrangements for preparing a shared LTP/common ‘front end’ between CA members?

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
		end' to separate LTPs, with delivery discharged through separate implementation plans.	
Quality Bus Partnership	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combined Authority members are currently considering whether to take forward an enhanced Voluntary Partnership Agreement with bus operators or pursue a Quality Contracts scheme – the latter could lead to a breakdown in York's existing and well regarded Quality Partnership with local operators. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to monitor the intended course of action by the CA with respect to VPA/QC scheme. • How could York's bus services be affected by the introduction of a QC scheme?
Bus Priority Infrastructure	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York has good record on delivering bus priority measures in cooperation with operators there is a reputational and delivery risk for York with bus priority being delivered through the CA. • The WYYTF includes a £200m 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As with QBP, continue to monitor the intended course of action by the CA with respect to VPA/QC scheme as this could impact on delivery. • Can the £200m package of highway management and bus priority works be developed to include York schemes, so

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
		<p>package of transformational highway management schemes that are intended to form a rolling 10 year programme of bus journey time and punctuality improvements, although Whilst there are no York-specific schemes within this package at present.</p>	<p>that the three bus priority schemes already included in the York package for the WYYTF or further schemes could be funded from an expanded pot?</p>
Better Bus Area	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> York has been designated as a Better Bus Area and therefore will receive BSOG currently paid to operators of commercial bus services plus an additional 20% of this amount (£1.3m). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to understand how BBA funding will work if York is a member of the CA, and how this could be affected by any VPA/QC scheme.
Smart Ticketing (including Metrocard)	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any smart ticketing system would be primarily based upon existing WYITA area products such as zonal MetroCard – this may affect current fare levels of tickets such as “All York” and impact upon existing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The level of integration with wider CA smart ticketing schemes needs to be considered. Could the West Yorkshire smart ticketing arrangements be embedded within the

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
		<p>reimbursement agreements with local operators and presents an opportunity for LCR wide zonal products.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were some issues and delays with the introduction of a Zone 6 Metrocard for Harrogate. 	<p>York transport system with minimal disruption/delay and over what timescales?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could those be expanded for wider LCR coverage? • How would this affect reimbursement processes? • Would there be any additional costs?
ENCTS	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A collective settlement agreement will have winners and losers and it is currently unknown how York may be affected. • Previous negotiations, led by NYCC, have been undertaken rapidly, assisting the budgetary planning process and maintaining relationships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding issues pertaining to a collective ENCTS agreement need to be resolved to ensure better appraisal of risk. • What has Metro agreed so far? • What is the bus operators' view on changing the current system? • How would York be affected in terms of budget planning and overall costs?

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
Subsidised Bus Services	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funding for subsidised bus services was handed over to the CA, there is the possibility that current subsidised services on the periphery of York may not be considered of sufficient value/priority to be funded by the CA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could reviews of subsidised services in York be considered separately from the other authorities? • Could an agreement be developed that would provide commitment to stabilise and secure subsidised bus funding for York for a set period?
Bus Information Service	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elements of the emerging West Yorkshire VPA are generally based upon existing Metro implementation and the plan for bus information to be delivered by mobile rather than static means. • The current service is contracted to EYMS and there may be issues/costs involved in terminating the contract. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does York want from a bus information system? • If York was to buy in to West Yorkshire system, would there be an additional cost and how does this compare to current costs?

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
Real Time Passenger Information	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current BLISS real time passenger information system implemented as part of Traffic Congestion Management System (TCMS) within York. • Integration with West Yorkshire system would require termination of existing contract and potential changeover period. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current state of progress of RTPi across West Yorkshire and delivery timescales need resolving, as does potential integration/changeover issues between proposed CA and existing York systems.
UTMC / Traffic Management	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centralised UTMC/Traffic Management system could result in a loss of local knowledge of York's network, together with a possible reduction in response time for incidents. • Potential for contractual and technical issues with incorporation into a new CA-wide system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are technical and contractual issues resolvable at an early stage (eg link with BLISS)? • What would be the costs and benefits of changing the existing system? • Could a protocol be developed with regards to Traffic Management/Traffic Signals?

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
Maintenance of Infrastructure (Bus Stops)	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater buying power but potentially reduction in service levels for York 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the level of service be of a similar standard (cost, response times, frequency of visits etc)? What would be the costs associated with exiting the existing contract before its finish date?
Local Sustainable Transport Fund	Long	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unclear how access to new LSTF funding will be affected by the CA proposals (particularly as LSTF capital funding is to be included in the SLGF in 2015/16). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the CA proposals enhance York's ability to access any new LSTF capital funding (post 2015/16) if this is now to be included in the competitive element of the SLGF? Under what conditions will LSTF resource funding to be allocated? Will York be able to compete for this as an individual authority or not?
Maintenance Funding	Long	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unclear if maintenance funding will be affected by the CA proposals – there is the possibility they could 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will maintenance funding allocations be top-sliced or is it just the Integrated Transport Block element of existing local

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
		<p>be top sliced or incorporated into wider West Yorkshire funding pot if this element of local transport funding is included within the CA.</p>	<p>transport funding?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could maintenance funds could be ring-fenced for period of time?
Park and Ride	Long	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park and ride remains a key element of York's transport strategy, generates significant income, and contributes to a number of Council priorities. • There may be less appetite elsewhere across the CA area to promote and deliver park and ride (particularly bus park and ride). • Income generated by park and ride contracts could be allocated to the CA as this may be seen as a means of increasing 'local' contributions and recycling funds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the income from York park and ride contracts be treated if part of a CA? • Can York become a lead authority/centre of excellence on Park and Ride for the CA?

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
Public Transport Ticketing (All York Bus Ticket, YOzone 11-16)	Long	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tickets already established for the York market have been developed with that market in mind. • York tickets could become part of a CA-related ticket 'offer'. • Changes to the ticket offer could impact upon uptake and bus patronage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the York tickets would still be discernable amongst a wider offering? • Could the York tickets be removed altogether? • How would this affect reimbursement processes?
CCTV Bus Lane Enforcement	Long	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforcement is a priority for the Council, given the demands on road space and the recent policies towards promoting increased bus use and park and ride. • Enforcement is not currently considered to be of as high a priority across West Yorkshire at present although this may change as part of the CA's agreement to a £200m package of highway management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is to be included in the £200m package of highway management and bus priority works set out in the WYYTF? • Could an area wide proposal continue to provide improved or existing levels of service? • A protocol could be developed with regards to Network Management but to be effective this is likely to require delegation of this function to the CA and

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
		and bus priority works.	this is not currently proposed.
Other Functions	Long	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over time York may take on different/new functions and/or new funding streams will become available – when this happens it should consider whether these functions and funding remain with York or are taken on by the CA on a case-by-case basis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider the opportunities and threats relating to different/new functions. Agree protocols to manage the role/responsibilities of CA and York.
Co-ordination of Response to Highway Disruption	Unlikely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transfer of this function could result in a loss of local knowledge of York’s network and its particular characteristics, together with a possible reduction in response time for incidents. A CA-wide response unit along the lines of the Highways Agency’s Traffic Control Officers could offer some economies of scale. However, 	

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
		in the case of York it is very possible such a unit could offer a significantly lower level of service.	
Sustainable Transport Initiatives	Unlikely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions to the WYYTF from future LTP allocations will impact on the ability to deliver/maintain local schemes or provide match funding for schemes for sustainable modes. • Delivery of sustainable transport initiatives appear to be more successful when there is a local delivery focus. 	
Marketing and Promotion	Unlikely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A shift in priority and funding away from local sustainable transport projects could impact on marketing and promotional activities that have contributed to the promising trends in bus patronage and have helped reduce the rate of car trip growth. 	

Council Function / Interface	Timescale (Short / Medium / Long / Unlikely)	Key Risks and Proposed Mitigation	Issues for Further Discussion / Negotiation
Stakeholder Liaison	Unlikely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder relationships could be put at risk if responsibility for liaison is transferred to a more remote CA that may not be as sensitive to local issues as Council Officers. • Stakeholder networks are already well established within York and given they been used to good effect to shape policy and deliver schemes these should not be jeopardised. 	
Road Safety Partnership	Unlikely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing arrangements are much more in tune with the needs of York and its environs than a CA may be. • York's emergency services have fixed existing boundaries that do not align with those of the CA. 	

Strategic Economic Plan

