

Chapter 13. Measuring Progress

Introduction

13.1 To monitor the effectiveness of our Plan, and take appropriate action where necessary, we have developed a series of indicators and targets. Seventeen of these are “Mandatory”, ie the indicator has been prescribed by the DfT and against which a target must be set (some are sub-divided to allow reporting on specific elements or geographic areas). A further set of indicators and targets are discretionary or “Local”. We have defined six Local Indicators as being helpful to us in keeping track of progress. For each indicator in these two groups we have defined which shared priority they principally relate to. In addition to these two groups of indicators and targets, we have identified a suite of complementary indicators. We have not set targets against these, but they will be useful in helping us monitor overall performance including in those areas and activities which impact on the delivery of our LTP but over which we may have limited if any direct influence.

Mandatory Indicators

13.2 Of the seventeen Mandatory Indicators, nine are Best Value Performance Indicators and must be monitored as part of our Corporate assessments for the ODPM. The other eight are specific to the LTP.

13.3 We have not yet been able to set targets for inclusion in this document in respect of three Mandatory Indicators. BVPI-224a (Non-principal Classified Road condition) is based on a new survey method; LTP-4 (mode share journeys to school) requires DfES data from the new 2006/07 school census; and LTP-7 (congestion) requires data on network delays before establishing a target by July 2006, in line with DfT advice.

13.4 In relation to the LTP-1 accessibility indicator, we have selected two components on which to report progress. These are considered most appropriate to monitor in the context of our overarching strategy, i.e. access to Work and access to Local Centres. We have produced provisional baseline figures and targets based on locally available data and use of the new “Accession” software.

13.5 Appendix H includes further information on our LTP indicators and targets, including the standard DfT Pro-Forma (which summarises indicator baselines / targets/ trajectories), and detailed templates for each indicator, which provide background information on determinants in setting targets and aspects of risk. **Table 13.1** provides brief summaries on the Mandatory Indicators.

Chapter 13. Measuring Progress

Shared Priority	Ref.	Indicator	Baseline (year)	Target (Year)	Initiatives / schemes we will deliver to achieve target
Road Safety (Congestion) (Accessibility)	BVPI-223	Principal Road condition	36.77% (2004/05)	30.35% (2010/11)	Partnership contracts; Innovative new treatments; Programming of works.
		<p>Risk Assessment: MEDIUM</p> <p>Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Funding has been reduced for this part of the network despite higher costs. We intend, however, to pursue innovative new treatments and year on year efficiency savings together with improved performance standards.</p>			
Road Safety (Congestion) (Accessibility)	BVPI-224a	Non-principal Classified Road condition	Requires TRACS	Requires TRACS	Partnership contracts; Innovative new treatments; Programming of works.
		<p>Risk Assessment: MEDIUM</p> <p>Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: The target is yet to be established. We intend, however, to pursue innovative new treatments and year on year efficiency savings together with improved performance standards.</p>			
Road Safety (Congestion) (Accessibility)	BVPI-224b	Unclassified Road condition	28.66% (2003/04)	21.89% (2010/11)	Partnership contracts; Innovative new treatments; Programming of works.
		<p>Risk Assessment: MEDIUM</p> <p>Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Higher costs. We intend, however, to pursue innovative new treatments and year on year efficiency savings together with improved performance standards.</p>			
Road Safety	BVPI-99a	Total killed and seriously injured casualties	727 (2001-04 Average)	582 (2010)	Road safety analysis and use of data to 'tailor' maintenance / transport programmes and for education, training and publicity campaigns; Strategy development / implementation (Road Safety and Disadvantage Strategy, Rural Road Safety Strategy; Speed Management Strategy); Local Safety Scheme programme; Partnership working.

Chapter 13. Measuring Progress

Shared Priority	Ref.	Indicator	Baseline (year)	Target (year)	Initiatives / schemes we will deliver to achieve target
		Risk Assessment: LOW/MEDIUM Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Takes into account generally good performance over the last twenty years; our emphasis on partnerships and investment in data monitoring / analysis to target actions but acknowledges the impact of traffic growth in the County.			
Road Safety	BVPI-99b	Child KSI casualties	124 (2001-04 Average)	93 (2010)	Road safety analysis and use of data to identify / treat child casualty "hotspots"; Education, training and publicity campaigns (inc. cycling and walking); Speed reduction schemes; Partnership working.
		Risk Assessment: LOW/MEDIUM Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Takes into account fluctuations, but generally downward trends, in casualty rates; targeting in disadvantaged areas; our emphasis on partnerships and investment in data monitoring / analysis to target actions; but acknowledges the impact of traffic growth in the County.			
Road Safety	BVPI-99c	Total slight casualties	5875 (2001-04 Average)	5581 (2010)	Road safety analysis and use of data to 'tailor' maintenance / transport programmes and for education, training and publicity campaigns; Strategy development / implementation (Road Safety and Disadvantage Strategy, Rural Road Safety Strategy, Speed Management Strategy); Local Safety Scheme programme; Motorcycle safety initiatives.
		Risk Assessment: LOW/MEDIUM Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Takes into account generally good performance over the last twenty years; our emphasis on partnerships and investment in data monitoring / analysis to target actions but acknowledges the impact of traffic growth in the County.			

Chapter 13. Measuring Progress

Shared Priority	Ref.	Indicator	Baseline (year)	Target (year)	Initiatives / schemes we will deliver to achieve target
Congestion (Air Quality)	BVPI-102(+)	Public transport patronage – based on the BVPI related to total bus patronage, but South Yorkshire will be including other local public transport modes.	138.4m (2003/4)	142.8m (2010/11)	<p>Targeting punctuality, reliability and customer service on the busiest corridors affecting most users, particularly on "Key Routes";</p> <p>Traffic management measures (aimed at increasing bus attractiveness in relation to the car);</p> <p>Better media coverage / promotion;</p> <p>Real Time information;</p> <p>Ticketing initiatives ("Yorcard");</p> <p>Customer care courses (operators);</p> <p>Managing schemes (partners' actions and timings are complementary);</p> <p>Continued programme of improving "door to door" service accessibility of overall network.</p>
		<p>Risk Assessment: HIGH</p> <p>Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Improvement is expected entirely from Tram and Rail during the period of LTP2 with significant effort required to return bus patronage to its 2003/04 level, however, success at achieving this will set up bus patronage growth in the longer term. Within South Yorkshire progress is dependent on continual partner management and better image presentation.</p>			
Congestion (Air Quality)	BVPI-104	Satisfaction with local Bus services.	59.0% (2003/04)	65.0% (2009/10)	<p>Targeting punctuality, reliability and customer service on the busiest corridors affecting most users, particularly on "Key Routes";</p> <p>Traffic management measures (aimed at increasing bus attractiveness in relation to the car);</p> <p>Better media coverage / promotion;</p> <p>Real Time information;</p> <p>Ticketing initiatives ("Yorcard");</p> <p>Customer care courses (operators);</p> <p>Managing schemes (partners' actions and timings are complementary).</p>

Chapter 13. Measuring Progress

Shared Priority	Ref.	Indicator	Baseline (year)	Target (year)	Initiatives / schemes we will deliver to achieve target
		Risk Assessment: HIGH Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: The target and trajectory are sensitive to external effects. Within South Yorkshire progress is dependent on continual partner management and better image presentation.			
Accessibility (Road Safety)	BVPI-187	Footway condition	41.12% (2003/04)	41.05% (2010/11)	Partnership contracts; Innovative new treatments; Programming of works.
		Risk Assessment: MEDIUM Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Higher costs. We intend, however, to pursue innovative new treatments and year on year efficiency savings together with improved performance standards.			
Accessibility	LTP-1	Access to Work Access to Local Centres	100a/i (2005/06) 100a/i (2005/06)	100a/i (2010/11) 100a/i (2010/11)	Linkages with spatial / land use planning policy formulation / decisions and 'integration' of access considerations in regeneration / development initiatives; Focus on "Key Route" network (bus priorities, highway improvements / traffic management schemes, etc.); Development of non-core networks (supported services, brokerage schemes, cycle / walking initiatives); Product development - service delivery and asset management.
		Risk Assessment: MEDIUM Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Takes into account declines in bus patronage levels / reducing network, but also projections based on LTP2 interventions, particularly on "Key Routes". They also consider more pro-active "accessibility" interventions and maximisation of external funding sources. It is acknowledged that there will be "lag-time" in respect of the impact access considerations will have on new developments. We, therefore, anticipate declines in 'access scores' prior to recovery by the target year.			
Air Quality (Congestion)	LTP-2	Change in area wide road traffic mileage (Vehicle KM)	6638m (2004)	7534m (2010)	Linkages with spatial / land use planning guidance / policies seeking to reduce / control the need for travel; Demand management (parking controls, meter / restrict traffic flows);

Chapter 13. Measuring Progress

Shared Priority	Ref.	Indicator	Baseline (year)	Target (year)	Initiatives / schemes we will deliver to achieve target
					Travel Planning initiatives.
			<p>Risk Assessment: MEDIUM / HIGH</p> <p>Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Takes into account recent and projected growth rates (DfT based), and the impact of ongoing economic / social investment. Also acknowledges the implications of motorways / trunk roads operating to capacity and potential for use of alternative "local" routes.</p>		
Accessibility (Congestion)	LTP-3	Cycling trips	100a/i (2003/04)	110a/i (2010/11)	<p>Strategy development / implementation (Accessibility Strategy, Local Cycling Strategies and Road Safety and Casualty Reduction Strategy);</p> <p>Improving access to local facilities;</p> <p>Travel Plan initiatives.</p>
			<p>Risk Assessment: MEDIUM / HIGH</p> <p>Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Takes into account previous performance but recognises shortcomings of current data collection methods to enable robust monitoring / analysis. Linked to Accessibility related initiatives and Travel Planning activities.</p>		
Accessibility (Congestion)	LTP-4	Mode share of journeys to schools.	Requires DfES 2006/07 School Census data	Requires DfES 2006/07 School Census data	<p>Strategy development / implementation (Accessibility Strategy, Local Strategies and Road Safety and Casualty Reduction Strategy);</p> <p>School Travel Plan initiatives;</p> <p>Improved cycle / walking networks.</p>
			<p>Risk Assessment: MEDIUM / HIGH</p> <p>Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Our final target is yet to be established. In setting the target we will have reference to recent data results but will also need to consider wider impacts, i.e. increased car ownership / use and national education policies. We intend, however, to further develop and enhance our Travel Plan activities and seek to halt the recent increase in car mode share journeys to schools.</p>		
Congestion	LTP-5	Bus punctuality (Headline average of "start of route" and "timing point en route")	75.4% (2005/06)	80.0% (2010/11)	<p>Ticketing initiatives ("Yorcard");</p> <p>Reducing boarding delays (e.g. trialling use of conductors);</p> <p>PIP schemes / SVD (bus detection at signals on core bus routes);</p>

Chapter 13. Measuring Progress

Shared Priority	Ref.	Indicator	Baseline (year)	Target (year)	Initiatives / schemes we will deliver to achieve target
					<p>Real Time Information (live management of bus operations);</p> <p>Targeting bus priorities on the busiest routes, particularly on "Key Routes";</p> <p>Bus Delays research identifying further, specific actions; Enforcement activities;</p> <p>Parking policies (reducing long stay parking in centres and introducing parking controls around centres);</p> <p>Target specific actions on specific operators and / or areas.</p>
					<p>Risk Assessment: HIGH</p> <p>Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Based on new method of data collection (9 months worth of data only). Continuing growth in car ownership / use and falls in bus patronage, congestion 'spread'. Enforcement of parking / bus priority infringements.</p>
Congestion	LTP-6	Changes in peak period traffic flows to Sheffield city centre. (% of all journeys that are car driver journeys).	51.8% (2004/05)	54.8% (2010/11)	<p>Provision / promotion of high quality public transport services;</p> <p>Travel Planning initiatives;</p> <p>Demand management (revised parking controls / standards / policies, Controlled Parking Zones, meter / restrict traffic flows).</p>
		Changes in peak period traffic flows to Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham town centres. (% of all journeys that are car driver journeys).	58.6% (2004/05)	64.0% (2010/11)	
					<p>Risk Assessment: HIGH</p> <p>Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Continuing growth in car ownership / use and falls in bus patronage. Objectives for provision / promotion of public transport (inc. measures on "Key Routes"), travel planning and demand management.</p>
Congestion	LTP-7	Congestion - Journey Time	Need to establish by July 2006	Need to establish by July 2006	<p>Provision / promotion of high quality public transport services;</p> <p>Travel Planning initiatives;</p> <p>Demand management (revised parking controls / standards / policies, Controlled Parking Zones, meter / restrict traffic flows).</p>

Chapter 13. Measuring Progress

Shared Priority	Ref.	Indicator	Baseline (year)	Target (year)	Initiatives / schemes we will deliver to achieve target
Air Quality	LTP-8	<p>Risk Assessment: HIGH</p> <p>Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: The target is yet to be established.</p>	45mg/m ³ (NO ₂) (2005)	40mg/m ³ (NO ₂) (2010)	Targeted measures towards areas / corridors where congestion and air quality are of concern.
		<p>Air quality – Pollutant concentrations in AQMAs</p>			<p>Travel Planning.</p> <p>Strategy development / implementation (Parking Strategy and Bus Strategy);</p> <p>South Yorkshire Intelligent Transport System;</p> <p>Development Planning Guidelines.</p>
		<p>Risk Assessment: HIGH</p> <p>Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Assessment of recent trends, with consideration of ongoing impacts of economic recovery alteration of traditional commuting patterns and factors outside of our control, i.e. Meteorological impacts and vehicle emission improvements.</p>			

Table 13.1: Mandatory Indicators - Targets, Risks and Extent of Challenge

Chapter 13. Measuring Progress

Local Indicators

13.6 We have identified six local indicators, which are included to measure aspects of our strategy that are not covered by the Mandatory Indicators. **Table 13.2** provides brief summaries on our local indicators.

Complementary Indicators

13.7 A suite of complementary indicators have been identified on the basis of their capacity to provide a fuller picture about all our activities and some activities of others which impact on performance but over which we might have no control. They also include a number which reflect the knock-on impacts of our strategy of which we should be aware. We have also separated out 'bus patronage' as a complementary indicator, given its importance to our overall strategy and as the mandatory indicator BVPI 102 covers all public transport patronage. This is a critical gauge of how effective our policies are in promoting modal switch away from the private car and providing access opportunities for those who do not have the use of a car but is affected by so many other influences outside our control, such as fare levels, car ownership or the numbers of driving licences held by the traditional 'captive' bus user (e.g. older women).

Realistic And Ambitious

13.8 Targets are a valuable tool in setting direction and providing a performance benchmark to aim for. However, they are also a means to allow actual performance to be assessed and judgements made by others as to whether we are making sufficient progress. In the case of DfT their assessment is critical in setting future years' capital allocations through the LTP process. Aspirational targets that cannot be met because they are set at unrealistic levels, therefore, will result in poor settlements further into the LTP2 period. We have been very careful therefore to set our targets in LTP2 levels which are more measured and take account of some of the key downward pressures on delivery over which we have little control. Nevertheless they are still challenging as to be realised they will need intensive effort in LTP2 to bring about the right combination of targeted effort, commitment and smarter delivery.

13.9 For each indicator we have identified the risks associated with the delivery of the target and our assessment of why we consider the target to be realistic and ambitious, as detailed in Appendix H. Given the nature of some of the key trends that we are working against and the level of resource the LTP process can make available setting an ambitious target may mean just staying still or slowing the rate of decline that would continue without intervention. Where this is the case we have provided an explanation against the appropriate indicator.

13.10 Chapter 6 contains an explanation of the strategic transport model and the Bus Model which helped inform the setting of our LTP mandatory and local targets.

13.11 By way of introduction to the summary table (**Figure 13.1**), which uses information from the more detailed templates in Appendix H, a number of factors and issues relating to the principal indicators and targets for the shared priorities are highlighted below.

Congestion

13.12 We are working towards a July 2006 deadline to finalise mandatory journey time targets (LTP-7).

Chapter 13. Measuring Progress

13.13 Our public transport targets reflect the pressures that are resulting in a continuing decline in bus patronage. This second LTP is about slowing the rate of decline and fixing the problems that have been contributing to the decline so that patronage growth can be a focus for the third LTP and beyond.

Accessibility

13.14 We have agreed with our partners that, as the common thread across all housing market and neighbourhood renewal programmes will be access to work, one of the mandatory indicators that must measure progress toward achieving this objective.

13.15 It is important to acknowledge the wider factors which impact on a person's access to work, from support issues such as childcare to job availability, shift patterns and skill-match. However, whilst this LTP will contribute by identifying and managing access issues on a holistic basis through LSP and LAA structures, the focus of the indicator is one of strategic contribution to the primary objective – improving land use and transport integration alongside improved transport networks.

13.16 Whilst the 'access to work' indicator has academic strength, measuring it is problematic due to data availability. The key aspect of the indicator is its ability to measure changes in the spatial distribution of housing, employment and transport networks. Dynamic data sources are required for this to be possible. Whilst this has been accomplished for housing and transport networks employment is a more fluid and amorphous concept. As a result, we have used an 'interim' approach to enable a less robust but still important indicator to develop a baseline and to derive a target.

13.17 To complement the 'access to work' we have also defined a second indicator which focuses on 'access to local centres'.

Road Safety

13.18 Our road safety targets have been developed in close cooperation with the DfT. In recognition of recent good performance in reducing the number of KSI casualties, and realising this reduces the probability of meeting 2010 targets based on a previous trajectory, a new baseline figure has been adopted based on the average for 2001 to 2004.

13.19 Our targets for reducing KSIs, child KSIs and the number of slight casualties for the years 2006 to 2010 still accord with government targets but are centred on the new baseline figures.

13.20 In addition to KSI and slight casualty indicators we have identified BVPI road condition indicators as being important to achieving road safety.

Air Quality

13.21 The LTP-8 mandatory indicator must be assessed against a baseline of 2004 with targets set for 2010. The use of calendar years, rather than financial years, is essential so that results are consistent with reporting under the Local Air Quality Management regime.

13.22 It is recognised that air quality is influenced by a number of external factors which are beyond the scope of transport. Prevailing weather conditions will influence the annual recordings and hence it is not practical to set an intermediate annual target based on NO_x. Therefore we have selected the contribution of schemes to total road transport emissions as an intermediate outcome.

Chapter 13. Measuring Progress

13.23 The Air Quality Strategy also proposes Climate Change and Road Noise Indicators. The climate change indicator is based on a spreadsheet tool, which calculates a transport scheme's impact on CO₂ emissions, whilst the road traffic indicator proposes to use the existing Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (Section 1, 1988) methodology. These are discussed in more detail in pages 28 – 30 of the strategy in Appendix C.

Quality of Life and Environment

13.24 The SEA Environment Report contains a set of background environmental baseline information to help us keep track of the impacts of our LTP interventions across a suite of indicators. No targets have been set for these, but the information that will be gathered from a variety of sources allow us to continually keep under review the environmental impacts of LTP2.

Chapter 13. Measuring Progress

Shared Priority	Ref.	Indicator	Baseline (year)	Target (year)	Initiatives / schemes we will deliver to achieve target
Congestion	SYLI-1	Mode share of journeys to Sheffield city centre. (% non-car).	39.9% (2004/05)	38.5% (2010/11)	Provision / promotion of high quality public transport services; Travel Planning initiatives; Demand management (revised parking controls / standards / policies, Controlled Parking Zones, meter / restrict traffic flows).
		Mode share of journeys to Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham town centres. (% non-car).	25.4% (2004/05)	23.1% (2010/11)	
<p>Risk Assessment: HIGH</p> <p>Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Continuing growth in car ownership / use and falls in bus patronage. Objectives for provision / promotion of public transport (inc. measures on "Key Routes"), travel planning and demand management.</p>					
Congestion	SYLI-2	Light Rail Patronage	12.1m (2003/04)	15.0m (2010/11)	<p>Related Park & Ride expansion;</p> <p>Vehicle refurbishment (increase in capacity);</p> <p>Target poor performing areas of the network;</p> <p>Focused projects on pedestrian access to further increase catchment;</p> <p>Easier multi-modal ticketing – "Yorcard";</p> <p>Improved stop facilities (inc. information coverage).</p> <p>Deliver a program of Supertram extensions (subject to major scheme funding).</p> <p>Increase number of Trams (subject to major scheme funding).</p>
			<p>Risk Assessment: LOW / MEDIUM</p> <p>Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Continued increases in patronage and attractiveness over buses, but acknowledges constraints in achieving further improvements. Extension of concessionary travel and vehicle refurbishment programme would be the main components of increased patronage. Potential impacts of additional vehicles and network extensions (major scheme funding).</p>		
Congestion	SYLI-3	Light Rail Punctuality	96.7% (2003/04)	95.0% (2010/11)	<p>Target specific pinch points within the current network.</p>
		<p>Risk Assessment: LOW</p>			

Chapter 13. Measuring Progress

Shared Priority	Ref.	Indicator	Baseline (year)	Target (year)	Initiatives / schemes we will deliver to achieve target
Congestion	SYLI-4	Satisfaction with Light Rail services	70.9% (2004/05)	75.0% (2010/11)	<p>Related Park & Ride developments; Vehicle refurbishment;</p> <p>Target specific pinch points on the network (reduce the effect of traffic on the tram routes);</p> <p>Easier multi-modal ticketing – “Yorcard”;</p> <p>Improved stop facilities (inc. information coverage).</p> <p>Deliver a program of Supertram extensions (subject to major scheme funding).</p> <p>Increase number of Trams (subject to major scheme funding).</p>
			<p>Risk Assessment: LOW / MEDIUM</p> <p>Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Target and delivery levels are already very high and a “keep high” approach is most suited as delivery already sufficiently good to limit improvements to maintaining standards.</p>		
Congestion	SYLI-5	Rail Patronage	4.9m (2003/04)	6.4m (2010/11)	<p>Programme of Park & Ride sites;</p> <p>Develop attractive ticketing options (e.g. YORCARD);</p> <p>Provide better waiting environments;</p> <p>Restrict central area long stay parking;</p> <p>An increase in the number of trains (subject to funding).</p>
			<p>Risk Assessment: LOW / MEDIUM</p> <p>Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Rising national rail patronage and increasing car ownership / use, rising fare levels and capacity issues. Local initiatives to improve interchange environment, ticketing options and Park & Ride related proposals.</p>		

Chapter 13. Measuring Progress

Shared Priority	Ref.	Indicator	Baseline (year)	Target (year)	Initiatives / schemes we will deliver to achieve target
Accessibility	SYLL-6	Rural Accessibility	93.6% (2003/04)	95.0% (2010/11)	<p>Linkages with spatial / land use planning policy formulation / decisions and 'integration' of access considerations in regeneration / development initiatives;</p> <p>Focus on "Key Route" network (bus priorities, highway improvements / traffic management schemes, etc.);</p> <p>Development of non-core networks (supported services, brokerage schemes, cycle / walking initiatives);</p> <p>Product development - service delivery and asset management.</p>
		<p>Risk Assessment: MEDIUM</p> <p>Reason why target is realistic but ambitious: Declines in bus patronage levels / reducing network, but also projections based on LTP2 interventions, particularly on "Key Routes". It also considers more pro-active "accessibility" interventions and maximisation of external funding sources.</p>			

Table 13.2: Local Indicators - Targets, Risks and Extent of Challenge