Consultation on Integrated Transport Block Funding

December 2012

The Department for Transport has actively considered the needs of blind and partially sighted people in accessing this document. The text will be made available in full on the Department's website in accordance with the W3C's Web Content Accessibility Guidelines. The text may be freely downloaded and translated by individuals or organisations for conversion into other accessible formats. If you have other needs in this regard please contact the Department.

Department for Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London SW1P 4DR
Telephone 0300 330 3000
Website www.dft.gov.uk

Contents

Executive summary

Issues for consultation

1 This consultation is about the calculation and distribution of a capital block grant that the Department for Transport allocates by formula to local transport authorities in England outside London. The grant is the Integrated Transport Block – capital funding for small transport improvement schemes.

2 Chapter 2 is about the rationale for considering changes to the current funding formula and the principle of updating the formula to reflect current priorities.

3 Chapter 3 seeks views on suggested changes to the formula designed to eliminate perverse incentives (Option 1).

4 Chapter 4 seeks views on additional elements that might be introduced into the formula in the future (Options 2 and 3).

5 Chapter 5 is about changes to the weightings given to the elements in the existing formula. It seeks views on the appropriate weightings for any future formula.

6 Chapter 6 seeks views on the use of new data sets for two elements of the existing formula: road safety and congestion.

7 Finally, Chapter 7 seeks views on transparency and value for money.

Audience for consultation

8 It is anticipated that local transport authorities in England outside London and their representative organisations will have the strongest interest in the proposals. Other stakeholders, groups and individuals may also wish to respond.

How to respond and next steps

9 This consultation runs from Wednesday 12 December 2012 to Wednesday 6 March 2013. For further details on how to respond, please see Chapter 9 of this consultation.

10 For ease of reference, the questions for consultation are listed in Chapter 8. It would be helpful when responding to these questions if consultees would use the standard template at **Annex C**. All responses will be treated equally regardless of whether or not they are received in this format.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

1.1 The focus of this consultation document is on the future distribution of Integrated Transport Block (IT Block) funding; it is not about amending the national total for IT Block – that is for Spending Reviews to determine. The IT Block formula was created in 2005 and, along with the Highways Maintenance Formula, was used to determine the Local Capital Transport Settlement from 2006 onwards.

1.2 IT Block funding is provided for small transport improvement projects such as road safety schemes, bus priority schemes, walking and cycling schemes and transport information schemes. The funding is not ring-fenced and local authorities can spend their allocations according to their priorities.

1.3 In 2011/12 the Department for Transport provided local authorities with £350m in IT Block funding for small transport improvement schemes.

1.4 This funding is currently allocated according to a needs formula based on six elements: deprivation, road safety, public transport, air quality, congestion and accessibility. This formula can be seen at **Annex D**.

Integrated Transport Authorities and Joint Plan Areas

1.5 In the six Metropolitan Areas, IT Block funding is paid to the Integrated Transport Authority (ITA) or in the case of Greater Manchester to the combined authority. Both in the Metropolitan Areas and in other areas with joint Local Transport Plans, authorities have the flexibility to alter the distribution of funding within the Joint Plan Area.

The 2010 Consultation on Local Transport Funding

1.6 The Department for Transport held a consultation exercise on Local Transport Funding in August 2010. The consultation took place against the backdrop of the Spending Review 2010 and much of it was concerned with the question of data timeliness; that is how new or old data was being used in the formula to establish individual allocations. It concluded that there was not time to examine the structure of the formula before the Local Government Finance Settlement 2011/12, but that there would be merit in examining it in more detail in advance of future settlements.

1.7 The summary of responses to that consultation committed to establishing a working group to review the formula used for the IT Block funding. The group was established in July 2011. It reported to ministers in December 2011 and

has now been disbanded.

1.8 The group did not make specific recommendations to ministers, but provided the Department for Transport with a list of points that it would like taken into account in any review of funding. The final report of the working group is available from the Department's website: http://www.dft.gov.uk/publications/local-transport-capital-block-funding/

Timing of changes

1.9 The Department does not intend to make any changes to either the data or the formula used for IT Block funding before 2015.

Chapter 2 – The Case for change

The current formula

2.1 The formula for the IT Block was developed over time and in working groups with representation from a range of local authorities. There is no suggestion that anything in the current formula is inherently unfair and the status quo is always considered as an option. However, as transport priorities change it may be necessary to amend the formula to reflect this.

2.2 The current formula is relatively complex – containing six elements and twenty-five variables. To simplify the funding process, it would be possible to allocate the funding according to population figures. However, the Department's view is that the formula is designed to reflect transport need and there is no compelling case for the allocation of this funding to be oversimplified.

2.3 The vast majority of respondents to the 2010 consultation supported the Department's intentions not to make any immediate changes to the IT Block Formula. However, the majority of respondents also considered that the formula needed to be updated at some stage to take account of current priorities, particularly around carbon and the economy.

2.4 In updating the formula the Department recognises the challenge of balancing the views of different types of local authority. It also recognises the need to maintain transparency.

2.5 Clearly any changes to the formula may mean that some local authorities will receive more funding than they would otherwise have done without the changes, and others will receive less funding. The Department does not believe, however, that change should necessarily be avoided simply because some local authorities will lose and some will gain.

Potential changes

2.6 Potential changes to the formula can be divided into four groups: changes to eliminate perverse incentives; the addition of new elements; changes to the data sets used in the formula; and changes to the weighting of elements.

2.7 This consultation focuses on three options:

Option 1 – Formula based on need and improvement
Splitting the formula so that, where possible, 75% of funding is allocated according to the current needs-based formula and the remaining 25% on the basis of continuous improvement using trend data. The proposal is to split the road safety, congestion and air quality elements this way. Elements where

improvement is nonsensical (Objective One Areas[1]) or unworkable (accessibility) or where the improvement is inherent in the existing funding (public transport) will continue to be 100% needs based. This option is discussed in Chapter 3 and can be seen at **Annex E**.

Option 2 – Needs-based only
The current formula with the addition of carbon emissions and economic growth. This option is discussed in Chapter 4 and can be seen at **Annex F**.

Option 3 – Formula based on need and improvement with additional data
Needs and improvement-based: allocated using the formula for Option 1 above with the addition of needs and trend-based carbon emissions and needs-based economic growth. This option is discussed in Chapter 4 and can be seen at **Annex G**.

2.8 The effects of each of these options, measured against the current allocations for 2014/15, can be seen in **Annex H**.

2.9 Question 1 – Do you have any objections to the principle of updating the formula to reflect current transport priorities?

[1] Objective One Areas are part of the European Union's cohesion policy and are currently known as Convergence Areas

Chapter 3 – Option 1: Changes to eliminate perverse incentives

Need and reward

3.1 The current funding is allocated according to a formula based on six elements: deprivation, road safety, public transport, air quality, congestion and accessibility (**Annex D**). It is a needs-based formula and each element is calculated according to perceived need eg local authorities with higher levels of road casualties receive higher levels of funding. Inherent in the formula is the danger of creating perverse incentives as, in some areas, the formula can reward local authorities for a failure to improve and penalise those that do.

3.2 The Government is keen to drive out perverse incentives from the formula and to encourage continuous improvement. However, it does not want to set targets for local authorities and recognises the possible negative impacts of a wholesale move to a formula based only on trend data. The recent Local Government Resource Review was based on an ethos of empowering local authorities, rather than just allocating funds according to need. However, the Government recognises the importance, within the formula, of maintaining some link with transport need.

3.3 The Government is minded to move towards a funding formula that will remove the penalties that come with improvement.

Option 1: Proposed new formula to eliminate perverse incentives

3.4 The Government is proposing a new alternative funding formula. The suggested alternative formula (**Annex E**) allocates for a given element of the formula, where possible, 75% of funding according to the current needs-based formula and the remaining 25% on the basis of continuous improvement using trend data. The proposal is to split the road safety, congestion and air quality elements this way. So, for example, in 2014-15 of the total £450m IT Block funding, roughly 20% (£89m) was allocated using the Road Safety 'needs' data items. In Option 1, this pot (£89m) is split so that £67m is allocated using the existing 'needs' data items and £22m using the 'trend' data items.

3.5 Elements where improvement is nonsensical (Objective One Areas) or unworkable (accessibility) or where the improvement is inherent in the existing funding (public transport) will continue to be 100% needs based.

Trend data

3.6 It has only been possible to calculate trend for three elements of the formula. The road safety element is currently based on the average number of reported casualties on local authority managed roads, both KSIs and 'Slight Injuries'. The Department already collects this data and it is therefore relatively easy to calculate the trend between the latest (2009-11) three year average and the 2005-09 baseline period.

3.7 The congestion element of the current formula is based on population data by settlement size. Calculating the trend in population levels does not tell us much about improvements in congestion levels and so we have looked for suitable alternative data. We have measured the trend between 2009/10 and 2011/12 in congestion using average vehicle journey times, during weekday morning peak on local authority managed roads.

3.8 In creating this alternative formula we have calculated the trend data using the percentage change, weighted by population, reflecting a sense of improvement and progression. We have also used data sets that do not impose any additional data gathering burdens on local authorities.

3.9 The population estimates of local authorities with Air Quality Management Areas are currently used to calculate the air quality element of the formula. We have used data on the average emission level ratings of privately owned cars to calculate the trend between 2009 and 2011 in air quality.

3.10 To exemplify the impact of including trend data, we have, where possible, used the most up to date data available[2]. The intention would be to use the most up to date data in any future allocations too but this would not be before 2015. Therefore the figures used in the options modelled should not be read as what would necessarily happen in 2015 even if the proposed changes are implemented. Changes in data between now and 2015 will have an impact.

3.11 Some data sets for trend have simply not proved workable. Use of public transport, Objective One Areas and accessibility have all been excluded from the trend data. Public transport use already has an inbuilt incentive in that as patronage grows funding is adjusted to meet the increased 'need'. Reward for Objective One status appears to be a nonsensical concept. For accessibility, based on household car ownership alongside indices of deprivation and population data, it has not been possible to find an alternative data set that would indicate trend.

3.12 Any new formula could be based solely on the six existing elements or it could include additional new elements such as carbon. The addition of possible new elements to the formula is discussed more fully in Chapter 4.

3.13 The proposed new formula is based on the weightings used in the current formula. It might be possible to adjust these weightings to reflect current

[2] Due to timing issues in the preparation of exemplifications, 2011 Census data has not been used.

transport priorities. This is discussed more fully in Chapter 5.

3.14 The proposed new formula uses the existing data sets from the current formula to calculate the 'needs' portion of funding. However, possible new data sets could be used for two elements of this formula: road safety and congestion. This is discussed more fully in Chapter 6.

3.15 A table showing the impact of this new formula on the funding received by each local authority can be seen at **Annex H**.

3.16 Question 2 – Do you think IT Block funding should continue to be based solely on need?

3.17 Question 3 – Do you have any comments on the proposed new formula to eliminate perverse incentives?

3.18 Question 4 – Do you have any suggestions for trend data for any of the elements of the current formula?

3.19 Question 5 – Do you have any views on the proposed balance (75%:25%) between 'need' and 'improvement'?

3.20 Question 6 – Do you have any further comments on Option 1?

Chapter 4 – Options 2 and 3: New elements to be added to the formula

4.1 The formula suggested in Chapter 3 (Option 1) uses existing elements from the current formula to calculate both the needs portion of funding and the new continuous improvement based portion of funding. The Department is also considering whether new elements should be added to the formula in order to recognise current priorities. The two elements under consideration are carbon and economic growth.

4.2 New elements could be added to the existing needs-based formula (Option 2) or to a formula based on both need and continuous improvement (Option 3).

Option 2: New elements for the needs-based portion of funding

4.3 Carbon and economic growth could be added to the six existing elements contained in the needs-based portion of funding (**Annex F**). The effects of a formula based wholly on need, with the addition of carbon and economic growth, can be seen at **Annex H**.

Carbon

4.4 In its response to the 2010 consultation on Local Transport Funding the Department said it was strongly minded to include carbon measures in the formula. However, it acknowledged the complexities that existed around the cost of data collection, reliability and perverse incentives.

4.5 The existing air quality and public transport elements of the formula could act as proxies for carbon measures. However, the Department is also considering an additional element for carbon. This is based around the 2010 DECC estimates of carbon dioxide emissions that are within local authority control - the road transport emission figures for 2010, which exclude motorways. This data is based on local level traffic data from DfT, alongside national information on vehicles, emissions, etc.

Economic Growth

4.6 The Department is minded to include economic growth in a revised formula, but acknowledges that there are issues around the most appropriate measure for growth. The existing congestion element could act as a proxy for economic growth. However, the Department has also considered a number of different scenarios for calculating economic growth. These include level of employee earnings within each authority, the number of working age people in employment within each authority and levels of worklessness. As each

scenario has benefits and drawbacks, we have based our calculations on the 2010 level of employee earnings within each authority.

Weightings for Option 2

4.7 Although Option 2 contains all the elements in the existing formula, the addition of carbon and economic growth means that the weightings for each element have been revised:

- 35% economic growth (employee earnings and old congestion element)
- 35% carbon (new data on carbon, old air quality element, old public transport element)
- 30% safety and accessibility (old road safety and accessibility elements)

4.8 This revision of weightings is for illustrative purposes only. A breakdown of the revised weightings is shown at **Annex F** and the issue of weightings is discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

4.9 Question 7 – Should carbon be part of the IT Block formula?

4.10 Question 8 – Do you have any comments on the suggested data set for adding a carbon element to the formula? Are there further alternatives you would like to suggest?

4.11 Question 9 – Should economic growth be part of the IT Block formula?

4.12 Question 10 – Do you have any comments on the use of employee earnings for measuring economic growth? Are there further alternatives you would like to suggest?

4.13 Question 11 – Do you have any further comments on Option 2?

Option 3: New elements for the improvement based portion of funding

4.14 The third option (**Annex G**) for a revised formula is both needs and improvement based. It allocates funds using the formula for Option 1, with the addition of needs- and trend-based carbon data and needs-based economic data.

Carbon and economic growth

4.15 We have already illustrated the problems inherent in calculating trend. Only three elements of the existing formula - congestion, road safety and air quality – have been proposed to have a trend based portion of funding. However, the addition of carbon emissions on a needs basis means it would also be possible to include data showing the trend, and hence improvement, in carbon emissions. We have based the calculations in this consultation document on the latest trend data, between 2008 and 2010.

4.16 There is no proposal to add economic growth on the basis of improvement. As with public transport, economic growth already has an inbuilt incentive in that as the local economy grows funding is adjusted to meet the increased 'need'.

4.17 As with Option 1, in creating Option 3 we have calculated the improvement data using the percentage change, weighted by population, reflecting a sense of improvement and progression. The effect of this alternative is shown at **Annex H**.

4.18 A full breakdown of the formula used in Option 3 is shown at **Annex G.**

4.19 Question 12 – Do you have any comments on Option 3?

Walking and cycling data

4.19 In the summary of responses to the 2010 consultation the Department said it was strongly minded to include walking and cycling measures in the future formula, but acknowledged there were issues around data collection.

4.20 In August 2012, DfT published new official statistics on the prevalence of walking and cycling amongst adults at local authority level during 2010/11. These are based on data from the Active People Survey, an annual household telephone survey administered by Sport England, with a sample size of approximately 500 persons per lower tier local authority.

4.21 This data could be used for an additional new element, similar to the carbon and economic data proposed in Options 2 and 3. In such a scenario local authorities with higher prevalence of residents walking and cycling would receive a larger allocation of funding.

4.22 Question 13 – Do you have any suggestions for how walking and cycling data might be included in the funding formula?

Chapter 5 – Changes to the weightings in the formula

5.1 Each element of the current formula is weighted. These weightings were originally based on historic spend patterns. The current weightings are:

- Public transport 30%
- Congestion 25%
- Road safety 20%
- Accessibility 20%
- Air quality 5%
- Objective One <1%

5.2 However, the funding is not ringfenced and local authorities are able to spend their allocation according to their own local priorities.

5.3 The Department no longer collects data on spending patterns, so to continue to base weightings in this way would leave them potentially out of touch with current priorities. Additionally, while the Department does not want to direct where and how local authorities spend, it is minded to signal its priorities via the weightings given to specific elements. Funding would still be un-ringfenced and local authorities would be at liberty to allocate funding according to their own local priorities.

5.4 Question 14 – Do you think the Department should base weightings on current transport priorities, rather than historic spend patterns?

5.5 Question 15 – Which elements in the formula should be given the heaviest weighting?

Chapter 6 – Changes to the data sets used in the formula

Data refreshes

6.1 Some of the elements in the existing formula are reliant on population and Census data. The first release of data from Census 2011 has now been published, with further releases due over the next two years, and we would expect to use that data in allocations beyond 2015. This is likely to have an impact on the distribution of funding regardless of whether any of the proposed changes to the formula are taken forward.

6.2 However for the purposes of this consultation we have continued to used the Census 2001 data throughout. We believe this is easier for comparing the options to the existing base case.

Data change scenarios

6.3 All of the three options outlined in Chapters 3 and 4 use the existing data sets from the current formula to calculate the 'needs' portion of funding. However, possible new measures could be used for two elements of this formula: road safety and congestion.

6.4 The Department has no immediate plans to consider new data sets for four elements of the current formula: Objective One Areas, public transport, accessibility and air quality.

6.5 Objective One Areas, currently known as Convergence Areas, are part of the European Union's cohesion policy. This programme is subject to change beyond 2013 and, depending on the nature of the changes, the Department may need to alter the funding formula to reflect the new position. The Department will work with any local authorities affected by the changes.

6.6 The public transport element of the formula accounts for 30 percent of the current funding. It is based on local bus and light rail passenger journeys, based on data supplied by local authorities and operators to produce local authority estimates of passenger journeys. There may be a possibility of using Smart Ticketing data sometime beyond 2015, once the robustness of the data had been established. In the meantime the Department has no plans to change this element.

6.7 Accessibility is calculated in the current formula using 2001 Census data on household car ownership, alongside the 2007 Index of Multiple Deprivation,

and the latest residential population data to calculate accessibility. The Department has considered an alternative scenario using the Department's Accessibility statistics on the average shortest journey time in each local authority to the nearest employment centre. However, it is not clear that this alternative has any advantage over the current method of calculation.

6.8 Air quality, based on the population of air quality management areas (AQMA), accounts for 5 percent of the current funding. There have been no changes to the data available on AQMAs since the formula was devised.

6.9 Question 16 – The Department is not considering changes to the data sets used for four elements of the existing formula: Objective One Areas, public transport, accessibility and air quality. Do you agree with this approach?

6.10 There are two elements for which new measures have become available since the current formula was devised: road safety and congestion. It would therefore be possible to update these elements of the formula.

Road safety

6.11 The current formula uses the average numbers of killed and seriously injured (KSI) and slight casualties on local authority managed roads between 2005 and 2009 to measure road safety. These are sourced from the dataset (STATS19) behind the Department's Reported Road Casualties publication.

6.12 The Department is considering two alternative measures for the road safety element of the formula. The first alternative uses the rate of KSI/Slight casualties per billion vehicle miles for 2005-2009 on local authority managed roads; this is a needs-based assessment. The second alternative uses the change in the number of road casualties on local authority managed roads; this allocates money according to the size of the decrease in road casualties, encouraging continuous improvement in road safety.

6.13 Question 17 - Do you have any comments on the two alternatives for the road safety element of the formula? Are there further alternatives you would like to suggest?

Congestion

6.14 The current formula uses population data by settlement size from the 2001 Census, along with current daytime and resident population projections data to provide a population-based measure of congestion.

6.15 The Department is considering an alternative measure using the DfT congestion statistics on 'average vehicle journey times (flow-weighted) during the weekday morning peak' on locally managed A roads.

6.16 In this scenario local authorities with lower speeds would receive a larger allocation of funding.

6.17 Question 18 – Do you see any problems with the current measure for congestion? Do you have any comments on the alternative scenario? Are there further alternatives you would like to suggest?

Chapter 7 – Transparency and value for money

Transparency and value for money

7.1 The Government is seeking views on transparency and value for money. IT Block funding is un-ringfenced and local authorities are free to spend their allocations as they see fit. This gives authorities maximum flexibility to respond to local needs.

7.2 Historically, with elements of performance funding, and transport indicators being included in Local Area Agreements, transparency has been a relatively minor issue. However, the Government's decentralisation agenda means that spending by local authorities will in future come under greater scrutiny from members of the public. Increased transparency is needed to empower local communities to scrutinise expenditure effectively.

7.3 The Government does not want to add to the data gathering and evaluation burdens placed on local authorities. However, there is currently a very low evidence base on which the public can make judgements on the costs and benefits of small transport schemes.

7.4 The Government is also keen to obtain more information on the value for money of integrated transport schemes. There have been some studies, but these have tended to look at 'best in class' projects. If it were possible to demonstrate robustly, and at little cost, the value for money of IT schemes more generally, rather than those just at the top end of the spectrum, this would be of long-term benefit to both local authorities and the Department.

7.5 There is already some information available around value for money. The Department, in conjunction with the Institute of Transport Studies at the University of Leeds, developed a database to help investigate the returns from small scale projects (http://www.its.leeds.ac.uk/aoss/index.html). However, it might be helpful if local authorities could, for example, add some basic information to their own websites on the costs and benefits of transport schemes.

7.6 Question 19 – The government is keen for local authorities to provide more transparency around transport spending. Do you have any views as to how this might be achieved?

7.7 Question 20 – Do you have any other issues you would like to raise about the calculation or distribution of IT Block funding?

Chapter 8 – Consultation Questions

The 20 consultation questions asked in the course of this document are collected together here for ease of reference. It would be helpful when responding to these questions if consultees could use the form at Annex C. All responses will be treated equally regardless of the format in which they are received.

1 Do you have any objections to the principle of updating the formula to reflect current transport priorities?

2 Do you think IT Block funding should continue to be based solely on need?

3 Do you have any comments on the proposed new formula to eliminate perverse incentives?

4 Do you have any suggestions for trend data for any of the elements of the current formula?

5 Do you have any views on the proposed balance (75%:25%) between 'need' and 'improvement'?

6 Do you have any further comments on Option 1?

7 Should carbon be part of the IT Block formula?

8 Do you have any comments on the suggested data set for adding a carbon element to the formula? Are there further alternatives you would like to suggest?

9 Should economic growth be part of the IT Block formula?

10 Do you have any comments on the use of employee earnings for measuring economic growth? Are there further alternatives you would like to suggest?

11 Do you have any further comments on Option 2?

12 Do you have any comments on Option 3?

13 Do you have any suggestions for how walking and cycling data might be included in the funding formula?

14 Do you think the Department should base weightings on current transport priorities, rather than historic spend patterns?

15 Which elements in the formula should be given the heaviest weighting?

16 The Department is not considering changes to the data sets used for four elements of the existing formula: Objective One Areas, public transport, accessibility and air quality. Do you agree with this approach?

17 Do you have any comments on the two alternatives for the road safety element of the formula? Are there further alternatives you would like to suggest?

18 Do you see any problems with the current measure for congestion? Do you have any comments on the suggested alternative? Are there further alternatives you would like to suggest?

19 The Government is keen for local authorities to provide more transparency around spending on small transport projects. Do you have any views on how this might be achieved?

20 Do you have any other issues that you would like to raise about the calculation or distribution of the IT Block Funding?

Chapter 9 – Next steps and how to respond

9.1 The consultation period began on Wednesday 12 December 2012 and finishes at 23.59 on Wednesday 6 March 2013. Please ensure that your consultation response reaches us by that date – we do not guarantee to consider responses arriving later.

9.2 If you would like further copies of this consultation document, it can be found at www.dft.gov.uk or you can contact Fran McMahon if you would like alternative formats (Braille, audio CD, etc).

9.3 Please send consultation responses to

Fran McMahon
Department for Transport – Zone 2/14
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London SW1P 4DR
020 7944 2141
020 7944 2207

Email: itblockconsult@dft.gsi.gov.uk

9.4 If you have any queries during the consultation period, please contact us at the above email address or on 0207 944 2141.

9.5 When responding, please state whether you are responding as an individual or representing the views of an organisation. If responding on behalf of a larger organisation, please make it clear who the organisation represents and, where applicable, how the views of members were assembled.

9.6 The Government will consider all suggestions on local transport funding presented in response to this consultation paper.

9.7 The Department will aim to publish a summary of responses, including the next steps, by the summer of 2013. Paper copies will be available on request.

9.8 Your opinions are valuable to us. Thank you for taking the time to read this document and respond.

Annex A – Freedom of Information

A.1 Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

A.2 If you want information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the FOIA, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence.

A.3 In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information, we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department. The Department will process your personal data in accordance with the Data Protection Act (DPA) and in the majority of circumstances this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Annex B – Consultation principles

The consultation is being conducted in line with the Government's key consultation principles which are listed below. Further information is available on the Better Regulation Executive website at https://update.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/resource-library/consultationprinciples-guidance

If you have any comments about the consultation process please contact:

Consultation Co-ordinator
Department for Transport
Zone 1/14 Great Minster House
London SW1P 4DR
Email consultation@dft.gsi.gov.uk

Consultation Principles

- departments will follow a range of timescales rather than defaulting to a 12-week period, particularly where extensive engagement has occurred before;
- departments will need to give more thought to how they engage with and consult with those who are affected;
- consultation should be 'digital by default', but other forms should be used where these are needed to reach the groups affected by a policy; and
- the principles of the Compact between government and the voluntary and community sector will continue to be respected

It is anticipated that local transport authorities in England, outside London, and their representative organisations will have the strongest interest in this consultation. This document has been published on the Department's website and the link sent to local authorities and key local sector groups. Other stakeholders, groups and individuals may also wish to respond.

This consultation will last for a period of 12 weeks. The Department has not consulted previously on any of the proposals and wants to give all interested parties the opportunity to make full and considered responses.

Annex C – Optional template for consultation responses

The consultation period closes on Wednesday 6 March 2013. We do not require every question to be answered.

Name of authority:
Contact details in case of queries:

Question 1 - Do you have any objections to the principle of updating the formula to reflect current transport priorities?

Question 2 - Do you think IT Block funding should continue to be based solely on need?

Question 3 - Do you have any comments on the proposed new formula to eliminate perverse incentives?

Question 4 - Do you have any suggestions for trend data for any of the elements of the current formula?

Question 5 - Do you have any views on the proposed balance (75%:25%) between 'need' and 'improvement'?

Question 6 - Do you have any further comments on Option 1?

Question 7 - Should carbon be part of the IT Block formula?

Question 8 - Do you have any comments on the suggested data set for adding a carbon element to the formula? Are there further alternatives you would like to suggest?

Question 9 - Should economic growth be part of the IT Block formula?

Question 10 - Do you have any comments on the use of employee earnings for measuring economic growth? Are there further alternatives you would like to suggest?

Question 11 - Do you have any further comments on Option 2?

Question 12 - Do you have any comments on Option 3?

Question 13 - Do you have any suggestions for how walking and cycling data might be included in the funding formula?

Question 14 - Do you think the Department should base weightings on current transport priorities, rather than historic spend patterns?

Question 15 - Which elements in the formula should be given the heaviest weighting?

Question 16 - The Department is not considering changes to the data sets used for four elements of the existing formula: Objective One Areas, public transport, accessibility and air quality. Do you agree with this approach?

Question 17 - Do you have any comments on the two alternatives for the road safety element of the formula? Are there further alternatives you would like to suggest?

Question 18 - Do you see any problems with the current measure for congestion? Do you have any comments on the suggested alternative? Are there further alternatives you would like to suggest?

Question 19 - The Government is keen for local authorities to provide more transparency around spending on small transport projects. Do you have any views on how this might be achieved?

Question 20 - Do you have any other issues that you would like to raise about the calculation or distribution of the IT Block Funding?

Please send consultation responses to:

Fran McMahon
Department for Transport – Zone 2/14
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London SW1P 4DR
020 7944 2141
020 7944 2207

Email: itblockconsult@dft.gsi.gov.uk

Annex D – The current IT Block funding formula

The current formula has six elements. Each of these elements is made up of one or more data items (or **factors**), which are weighted to determine what share of the funding should go to each authority.

An explanatory note providing more detail about the current formula and data sources is available at http://assets.dft.gov.uk/publications/local-transport-capital-block-funding/it-block-formula-explanatory-note.pdf. A copy of the raw data used to calculate the 2010-11 to 2014-15 IT Block allocations is available at http://assets.dft.gov.uk/publications/local-transport-capital-block-funding/itblockformularawdata.xls

Element	% Funding	Factor	IT Block Factors: Description
Objective One Area	0.6150%	1	Objective One Area Adjustment
Road Safety	19.8770%	2	Average: People Killed or Seriously Injured in reported road accidents, on LA Managed Roads only
		3	Average: People with Slight Injuries in reported road accidents, on LA Managed Roads only
Public transport	29.8155%	4	Local bus and light rail passenger journeys originating in the authority area
Congestion	24.8463%	5	Percentage of the LA Population in Urban Settlements of more than 250,000 people
		6	Percentage of the LA Population in Urban Settlements of 100,000 to 250,000 people
		7	Percentage of the LA Population in Urban Settlements 50,000 to 100,000 people
		8	Percentage of the LA Population in Urban Settlements 10,000 to 50,000 people
		9	Percentage of the LA Population in Settlements of less than 10,000 people
Air Quality	4.9693%	10	Air Quality Management Area Population
Accessibility	19.8770%	11	Population of areas within the LA with Low Proportion of Households w/o car and Low Deprivation
		12	Population of areas within the LA with Low Proportion of Households w/o car and Medium Deprivation
		13	Population of areas within the LA with Low Proportion of Households w/o car and High Deprivation
		14	Population of areas within the LA with Medium Proportion of Households w/o car and Low Deprivation
		15	Population of areas within the LA with Medium Proportion of Households w/o car and Medium Deprivation
		16	Population of areas within the LA with Medium Proportion of Households w/o car and High Deprivation
		17	Population of areas within the LA with High Proportion of Households w/o car and Low Deprivation
		18	Population of areas within the LA with High Proportion of Households w/o car and Medium Deprivation
		19	Population of areas within the LA with High Proportion of Households w/o car and High Deprivation
		20	Percentage of the LA Population in Urban Settlements of less than 25,000 people
Ref. data		21	Daytime Population
		22	Resident Population
		23	Projected Population

Annex E – Suggested new formula (Option 1)

Option 1 adds trend data to the existing IT Block formula.
The current IT Block methodology is used in all respects, except for an additional stage for the three elements with the new trend data. For these, the total pot for that element is split so that 75% of it uses the existing 'needs' data, and 25% uses the new 'trend' data to determine local authority allocations for that element. For example, in 2014-15 of the total £450m IT Block funding, roughly 20% (£89m) was allocated using the Road Safety 'needs' data items. In Option 1, this pot (£89m) is split so that £67m is allocated using the existing 'needs' data items and £22m using the 'trend' data items.

'NEEDS' ELEMENTS 100%			
Existing formula elements	**Public Transport** 30%	One factor – bus and light rail passenger journeys	
	Accessibility 20%	Ten factors – based on household car ownership alongside indices of deprivation and residential population data	
	Objective One Areas <1%	One factor – Objective One Area adjustment	
'NEEDS' ELEMENTS 75%			***TREND DATA 25%***
Existing formula elements	**Congestion** 25%	Five factors – based on population data by settlement size	Trend in average vehicle journey times during weekday morning peak on LA managed roads for previous three years (2009/10 – 2011/12)
	Road Safety 20%	Two factors – based on average number of KSI and slight casualties on LA managed roads 2005-09	Trend in average number of KSI and slight casualties on LA managed roads for previous three years (2009-11) compared against the 2005-2009 baseline.
	Air Quality 5%	One factor – Air quality management area population	Trend in overall average of emission level ratings of privately owned cars for previous three years (2009-11).

Further information, including the raw data, on the data sources for the new elements are provided in **Annex I.**

Annex F – Suggested new formula (Option 2)

'NEEDS' ELEMENTS 100%		
Existing formula elements	**Public Transport** 20%	One factor – bus and light rail passenger journeys
	Congestion 25%	Five factors – based on population data by settlement size
	Road Safety 15%	Two factors – based on average number of KSI and slight casualties on LA managed roads 2005-09
	Accessibility 15%	Ten factors – based on household car ownership alongside indices of deprivation and residential population data
	Air Quality 5%	One factor – Air quality management area population
	Objective One Areas <1%	One factor – Objective One Area adjustment
New elements	**Carbon** 10%	One factor – DECC carbon dioxide emissions estimates for local authorities for 2010
	Economic data 10%	One factor – Employee earnings for 2010

Further information, including the raw data, on the data sources for the new elements are provided in **Annex I.**

Annex G – Suggested new formula (Option 3)

'NEEDS' ELEMENTS 100%			
Existing formula elements	**Public Transport** 20%	One factor – bus and light rail passenger journeys	
	Accessibility 15%	Ten factors – based on household car ownership alongside indices of deprivation and residential population data	
	Objective One Areas <1%	One factor – Objective One Area adjustment	
New element	**Economic data** 10%	One factor – Employee earnings	
'NEEDS' ELEMENTS 75%			***TREND DATA 25%***
Existing formula elements	**Congestion** 25%	Five factors – based on population data by settlement size	Trend in average vehicle journey times during weekday morning peak on LA managed roads for previous three years (2009-11)
	Road Safety 15%	Two factors – based on average number of KSI and slight casualties on LA managed roads 2005-09	Trend in average number of KSI and slight casualties on LA managed roads for previous three years (2009-11) compared against the 2005-2009 baseline
	Air Quality 5%	One factor – Air quality management area population	Trend in overall average of emission level ratings of privately owned cars for previous three years (2009-11).
New element	**Carbon** 10%	One factor – DECC carbon dioxide emissions estimates for local authorities	Trend in DECC carbon emissions for previous three years (2008-10).

Further information, including the raw data, on the data sources for the new elements are provided in **Annex I.**

Annex H – Estimated allocations using the suggested new formulae

	2014-15 Allocation	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
North East	**30,756**	**32,371**	**28,859**	**30,379**
Darlington	1,025	987	1,000	952
Durham	4,475	4,460	4,287	4,271
Hartlepool	790	796	777	775
Middlesbrough	1,443	1,861	1,490	1,870
Northumberland	2,719	2,529	2,746	2,545
Redcar and Cleveland	1,126	1,104	1,130	1,109
Stockton-on-Tees	1,752	1,761	1,818	1,782
Tyne and Wear ITA	17,426	18,873	15,611	17,075
North West	**78,891**	**77,839**	**75,389**	**74,537**
Blackburn with Darwen	1,381	1,349	1,361	1,345
Blackpool	1,928	1,762	1,729	1,592
Cheshire East	3,208	2,952	3,388	3,158
Cheshire West and Chester	3,254	3,027	3,284	3,084
Cumbria	4,277	4,827	4,428	4,910
Halton	1,020	1,326	1,048	1,351
Lancashire	12,305	12,555	11,932	12,202
Warrington	2,091	1,879	2,182	2,006
Greater Manchester ITA	32,193	30,843	30,316	28,970
Merseyside ITA	17,234	17,319	15,721	15,919
Yorkshire and the Humber	**61,403**	**61,788**	**58,502**	**59,226**
East Riding of Yorkshire	2,692	2,524	2,790	2,639
Kingston upon Hull, City of	3,416	3,358	3,168	3,124
North East Lincolnshire	1,688	1,701	1,665	1,672
North Lincolnshire	1,489	1,366	1,543	1,425
North Yorkshire	5,753	5,824	6,066	6,133
York	2,323	2,705	2,280	2,627
South Yorkshire ITA	16,877	17,323	15,504	15,983
West Yorkshire ITA	27,165	26,987	25,486	25,623
East Midlands	**43,787**	**42,960**	**44,516**	**43,555**
Derby	2,860	2,827	2,911	2,906
Derbyshire	6,784	6,974	6,888	7,032
Leicester	4,271	4,075	3,967	3,832
Leicestershire	4,931	4,587	5,373	4,980
Lincolnshire	5,816	5,620	6,109	5,902
Northamptonshire	5,668	5,685	6,323	6,247
Nottingham	5,756	5,407	5,117	4,784
Nottinghamshire	7,406	7,460	7,461	7,492
Rutland	295	325	367	380

	2014-15 Allocation	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
West Midlands	**60,290**	**60,684**	**58,649**	**58,942**
Herefordshire, County of	1,425	1,525	1,557	1,608
Shropshire	2,385	2,477	2,569	2,609
Staffordshire	6,178	6,700	6,656	7,091
Stoke-on-Trent	2,519	2,376	2,518	2,365
Telford and Wrekin	1,320	1,430	1,434	1,559
Warwickshire	4,740	5,046	5,224	5,486
Worcestershire	4,328	4,466	4,574	4,617
West Midlands ITA	37,395	36,664	34,117	33,607
East of England	**49,633**	**49,844**	**52,800**	**52,548**
Bedford	1,415	2,124	1,501	2,197
Cambridgeshire	5,707	5,320	6,297	5,844
Central Bedfordshire	1,882	2,108	2,045	2,269
Essex	11,764	11,795	12,367	12,200
Hertfordshire	8,748	8,369	9,571	9,218
Luton	1,890	1,689	1,861	1,695
Norfolk	7,487	7,943	7,870	8,207
Peterborough	2,109	2,189	2,192	2,240
Southend-on-Sea	1,600	1,476	1,525	1,410
Suffolk	5,796	5,534	6,234	5,916
Thurrock	1,235	1,297	1,337	1,352
South East	**75,795**	**74,272**	**80,134**	**79,033**
Bracknell Forest	789	756	976	942
Brighton and Hove	4,316	3,966	3,788	3,483
Buckinghamshire	4,025	3,771	4,403	4,165
East Sussex	4,871	5,206	4,818	5,178
Hampshire	9,821	9,242	11,046	10,538
Isle of Wight	1,432	1,359	1,270	1,226
Kent	12,299	13,447	12,598	13,635
Medway	2,216	2,725	2,215	2,740
Milton Keynes	2,224	2,025	2,509	2,322
Oxfordshire	6,264	5,683	6,586	6,034
Portsmouth	2,226	2,125	2,290	2,210
Reading	2,095	1,895	2,009	1,837
Slough	1,200	1,062	1,325	1,215
Southampton	2,851	2,956	2,721	2,889
Surrey	9,411	8,176	10,559	9,456
West Berkshire	1,103	993	1,424	1,272
West Sussex	6,438	6,418	6,978	6,982
Windsor and Maidenhead	980	929	1,217	1,179
Wokingham	1,234	1,538	1,402	1,730
South West	**49,438**	**50,242**	**51,152**	**51,780**
Bath and North East Somerset	1,723	1,849	1,709	1,832
Bournemouth	2,159	1,969	1,993	1,858
Bristol, City of	4,960	4,683	4,974	4,761
Cornwall	7,096	7,126	7,284	7,226
Devon	6,159	6,481	6,525	6,715

	2014-15 Allocation	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Dorset	3,391	3,961	3,544	4,106
Gloucestershire	5,121	5,160	5,382	5,409
North Somerset	1,431	1,694	1,503	1,756
Plymouth	2,868	2,578	2,768	2,518
Poole	1,353	1,217	1,387	1,271
Somerset	4,029	4,019	4,341	4,275
South Gloucestershire	2,061	2,114	2,359	2,393
Swindon	1,970	2,135	2,055	2,222
Torbay	1,365	1,271	1,302	1,216
Wiltshire	3,752	3,985	4,026	4,222

Annex I – Local authority data

REF:	A	B	C	C	C	D	D	D	E	F	G	H	H	H
	Road Safety Trend data		Congestion trend data			Air Quality trend data			Reference data	Carbon data	Economic data	Carbon trend data		
Local Authorities	Average KSIs: 2009-2011	Average Slights: 2009-2011	Average Vehicle Journey times: 2009/10	Average Vehicle Journey times: 2010/11	Average Vehicle Journey times: 2011/12	Average Car Emission Level Ratings: 2009	Average Car Emission Level Ratings: 2010	Average Car Emission Level Ratings: 2011	Resident Population (mid-2009)	Carbon Dioxide Emissions: 2010	Employed Earnings: 2010	Carbon Dioxide: 2008	Carbon Dioxide: 2009	Carbon Dioxide: 2010
North East														
Hartlepool	24	161	1.73	1.76	1.74	163	160	159	90,900	159	11,463,920	167	161	159
Middlesbrough	29	330	2.27	2.18	2.10	162	160	158	140,500	309	25,602,450	323	313	309
Redcar and Cleveland	40	274	1.62	1.68	1.67	163	160	159	137,500	220	16,081,920	234	222	220
Stockton-on-Tees	56	325	2.32	2.34	2.29	164	161	158	191,100	371	32,758,380	378	372	371
Darlington	35	297	2.20	2.21	2.21	163	160	158	100,400	160	21,362,200	164	161	160
County Durham	182	1,492	1.80	1.82	1.78	163	161	161	506,400	776	67,829,940	804	776	776
Northumberland	143	916	1.68	1.68	1.68	166	167	164	311,100	609	37,164,900	634	606	609
Tyne and Wear ITA	327	3,125	2.57	2.58	2.43	162	159	158	1,106,300	1,829	213,326,080	1,915	1,844	1,829
North West														
Halton	39	378	1.74	1.62	1.62	164	161	159	118,700	190	23,926,320	199	196	190
Warrington	90	674	2.75	2.74	2.74	166	163	161	197,800	262	58,575,680	275	265	262
Blackburn with Darwen	65	499	3.12	3.05	3.05	164	161	159	139,900	121	25,225,250	125	120	121
Blackpool	69	598	3.20	3.36	3.18	165	162	161	140,000	129	21,827,250	134	130	129
Cheshire East	228	1,191	2.10	2.14	2.09	171	168	165	362,700	621	71,878,800	648	626	621
Cheshire West and Chester	188	1,030	2.01	2.01	2.04	168	164	162	326,600	586	59,987,200	619	598	586
Cumbria	194	1,331	1.93	1.92	1.87	165	162	160	495,000	937	88,994,360	972	938	937
Lancashire	616	3,936	2.36	2.34	2.31	166	163	161	1,165,800	1,648	206,540,700	1,714	1,655	1,648
Greater Manchester ITA	713	6,632	3.29	3.28	3.28	165	162	160	2,600,900	2,932	520,572,000	3,054	2,964	2,932
Merseyside ITA	512	3,942	2.77	2.75	2.71	164	161	159	1,350,600	1,581	228,558,200	1,652	1,597	1,581
Yorkshire and The Humber														
Kingston upon Hull, City of	111	780	3.65	3.59	3.55	163	160	159	262,400	310	43,884,500	318	314	310
East Riding of Yorkshire	180	937	1.69	1.72	1.69	167	164	161	337,000	638	47,041,900	672	646	638
North East Lincolnshire	79	635	2.40	2.39	2.35	163	161	159	157,100	229	25,998,560	237	230	229
North Lincolnshire	97	599	1.60	1.63	1.61	166	163	161	161,000	288	29,993,700	300	288	288
York	54	463	2.96	2.87	2.81	166	163	161	198,800	283	44,822,400	295	285	283
North Yorkshire	434	1,722	1.77	1.75	1.74	168	165	163	597,700	1,620	99,459,550	1,724	1,632	1,620
South Yorkshire ITA	451	4,181	2.53	2.51	2.47	165	162	160	1,317,300	1,660	221,015,340	1,738	1,672	1,660
West Yorkshire ITA	874	6,982	2.75	2.71	2.70	165	162	160	2,226,700	2,601	425,821,500	2,748	2,632	2,601

REF:	A	B	C	C	C	D	D	D	E	F	G	H	H	H
	Road Safety Trend data		Congestion trend data			Air Quality trend data			Reference data	Carbon data	Economic data	Carbon trend data		
Local Authorities	Average KSIs: 2009-2011	Average Slights: 2009-2011	Average Vehicle Journey times: 2009/10	Average Vehicle Journey times: 2010/11	Average Vehicle Journey times: 2011/12	Average Car Emission Level Ratings: 2009	Average Car Emission Level Ratings: 2010	Average Car Emission Level Ratings: 2011	Resident Population (mid-2009)	Carbon Dioxide Emissions: 2010	Employed Earnings: 2010	Carbon Dioxide: 2008	Carbon Dioxide: 2009	Carbon Dioxide: 2010
East Midlands														
Derby	95	919	2.99	2.89	2.91	165	162	161	244,100	372	66,943,800	390	377	372
Leicester	89	1,189	3.60	3.62	3.53	167	164	163	304,700	325	68,430,150	340	329	325
Rutland	21	96	1.47	1.43	1.43	171	167	165	38,400	157	6,559,780	162	155	157
Nottingham	136	1,024	3.64	3.70	3.63	166	164	162	300,800	354	85,172,920	366	357	354
Derbyshire	329	2,152	1.98	1.98	1.95	167	164	162	760,200	1,363	118,559,700	1,421	1,365	1,363
Leicestershire	203	1,545	1.91	1.91	1.92	168	165	163	644,700	1,127	115,980,800	1,165	1,126	1,127
Lincolnshire	455	2,749	1.69	1.70	1.66	166	163	162	697,900	1,438	104,962,080	1,478	1,421	1,438
Northamptonshire	266	1,218	1.96	1.97	1.95	168	165	163	683,800	1,614	137,323,400	1,703	1,613	1,614
Nottinghamshire	393	2,152	2.07	2.06	2.03	167	165	163	776,600	1,435	120,550,400	1,491	1,428	1,435
West Midlands														
Herefordshire, County of	65	498	1.79	1.79	1.76	169	166	164	179,100	414	25,233,600	427	412	414
Telford and Wrekin	47	398	1.54	1.52	1.49	165	162	160	162,300	278	32,460,930	296	282	278
Stoke-on-Trent	51	839	3.08	3.12	3.06	162	159	157	238,900	328	45,291,330	338	333	328
Shropshire	107	764	1.67	1.66	1.65	175	171	168	291,800	637	44,293,320	663	638	637
Staffordshire	187	2,583	2.10	2.09	2.07	167	164	161	828,700	1,490	133,005,010	1,569	1,502	1,490
Worcestershire	152	1,535	1.91	1.91	1.90	168	165	163	556,500	952	90,060,660	989	955	952
Warwickshire	254	1,378	2.02	1.98	1.96	168	165	163	535,100	1,134	119,467,140	1,182	1,129	1,134
West Midlands ITA	957	7,489	3.01	3.01	2.96	165	163	161	2,638,700	3,272	516,951,470	3,426	3,313	3,272
East of England														
Peterborough	75	768	1.67	1.72	1.61	166	163	162	171,200	416	42,728,430	430	416	416
Luton	51	601	2.75	2.84	2.82	167	165	163	194,300	158	36,781,920	166	160	158
Southend-on-Sea	77	471	3.18	3.22	3.15	174	170	169	164,200	154	24,790,360	156	153	154
Thurrock	49	401	1.55	1.57	1.53	172	168	167	157,200	327	22,743,000	335	319	327
Bedford	54	443	2.44	2.21	2.13	170	167	165	158,000	268	30,057,920	278	265	268
Central Bedfordshire	96	591	1.87	1.83	1.80	170	167	165	252,900	424	40,996,560	441	424	424
Cambridgeshire	302	1,747	1.88	1.90	1.92	169	166	164	607,000	1,557	140,908,500	1,629	1,541	1,557
Essex	578	3,140	2.00	2.05	1.98	173	170	168	1,399,000	2,622	231,166,520	2,706	2,645	2,622
Hertfordshire	338	2,801	2.07	2.13	2.12	174	171	169	1,095,500	1,644	256,135,260	1,735	1,655	1,644
Norfolk	326	1,973	1.92	1.91	1.88	167	164	162	853,400	1,845	131,139,600	1,925	1,852	1,845
Suffolk	291	1,943	1.95	1.94	1.94	168	163	161	714,000	1,495	119,365,200	1,548	1,477	1,495
South East														
Medway	63	684	2.54	2.40	2.37	167	164	163	254,800	262	35,926,560	274	262	262
Bracknell Forest	26	281	2.05	2.10	2.15	174	170	168	115,100	147	38,841,500	154	149	147

REF:	A	B	C	C	C	D	D	D	E	F	G	H	H	H
	Road Safety Trend data		Congestion trend data			Air Quality trend data			Reference data	Carbon data	Economic data	Carbon trend data		
Local Authorities	Average KSIs: 2009-2011	Average Slights: 2009-2011	Average Vehicle Journey times: 2009/10	Average Vehicle Journey times: 2010/11	Average Vehicle Journey times: 2011/12	Average Car Emission Level Ratings: 2009	Average Car Emission Level Ratings: 2010	Average Car Emission Level Ratings: 2011	Resident Population (mid-2009)	Carbon Dioxide Emissions: 2010	Employed Earnings: 2010	Carbon Dioxide: 2008	Carbon Dioxide: 2009	Carbon Dioxide: 2010
West Berkshire	53	336	2.05	2.04	2.05	175	171	169	153,000	364	50,692,740	368	356	364
Reading	47	432	4.08	4.01	4.10	171	168	167	151,800	114	51,122,740	119	114	114
Slough	37	435	3.71	3.85	3.93	169	166	165	128,400	93	46,947,780	98	95	93
Windsor and Maidenhead	50	352	2.37	2.39	2.35	181	177	175	143,800	215	47,478,500	226	219	215
Wokingham	41	325	2.28	2.14	2.14	176	173	171	161,900	183	41,718,840	196	185	183
Milton Keynes	76	832	1.74	1.72	1.76	169	166	164	236,700	391	73,600,200	414	401	391
Brighton and Hove	146	893	3.39	3.37	3.43	171	167	166	256,300	317	50,128,100	331	320	317
Portsmouth	103	589	3.48	3.51	3.40	166	163	162	203,500	216	58,246,700	222	214	216
Southampton	125	645	3.58	3.53	3.42	166	163	162	236,700	234	50,169,600	247	236	234
Isle of Wight	84	447	2.52	2.48	2.50	166	162	161	140,200	130	17,955,000	135	129	130
Buckinghamshire	197	1,349	2.12	2.11	2.12	177	173	171	494,700	808	108,810,640	851	815	808
East Sussex	285	1,272	2.07	2.05	2.00	170	167	165	512,100	907	64,706,400	952	914	907
Hampshire	597	2,838	1.88	1.86	1.86	171	167	166	1,289,400	2,467	269,334,370	2,581	2,475	2,467
Kent	475	4,272	2.12	2.09	2.05	171	167	166	1,411,100	2,235	243,277,980	2,304	2,224	2,235
Oxfordshire	332	1,631	1.90	1.88	1.90	171	168	166	640,300	1,315	154,577,640	1,376	1,315	1,315
Surrey	486	4,111	2.50	2.49	2.55	178	175	173	1,113,100	1,926	286,175,670	2,021	1,944	1,926
West Sussex	378	1,788	1.96	1.93	1.93	172	168	166	792,900	1,488	156,086,400	1,563	1,504	1,488
South West														
Bath and North East Somerset	33	451	2.68	2.68	2.64	168	165	163	177,700	236	37,752,000	251	237	236
Bristol, City of	131	1,174	3.85	3.86	3.82	165	162	160	433,100	427	116,383,540	451	436	427
North Somerset	42	534	2.04	2.01	1.99	168	164	162	209,100	270	34,547,040	285	276	270
South Gloucestershire	48	544	2.41	2.44	2.39	166	163	161	262,200	388	70,900,000	409	392	388
Plymouth	57	806	2.85	3.08	2.95	165	161	160	256,700	319	45,197,500	335	324	319
Torbay	30	378	2.57	2.73	2.58	167	163	162	134,000	144	16,908,840	150	145	144
Bournemouth	73	583	2.43	2.46	2.55	170	166	164	164,900	171	31,110,200	184	175	171
Poole	53	438	2.50	2.54	2.52	171	167	166	141,200	179	33,606,600	187	180	179
Swindon	67	424	2.27	2.26	2.17	166	163	161	198,800	306	52,284,960	317	306	306
Cornwall	175	1,649	1.84	1.83	1.82	165	161	159	531,100	1,021	70,064,560	1,048	1,016	1,021
Wiltshire	195	883	1.88	1.87	1.84	176	171	169	456,100	943	78,119,600	986	943	943
Devon	212	2,155	1.87	1.86	1.84	167	163	162	747,400	1,533	120,208,050	1,587	1,534	1,533
Dorset	197	1,060	1.74	1.74	1.66	169	166	164	404,000	819	61,478,160	861	829	819
Gloucestershire	208	1,244	2.05	2.04	2.02	169	166	164	589,100	959	119,423,940	1,000	959	959
Somerset	223	1,389	1.92	1.91	1.91	168	164	163	523,500	1,025	86,444,740	1,067	1,028	1,025

Data Sources

ID		Title	Description	Data Sources
A	Road Safety trend data	Trend in KSIs on LA managed roads	Percentage change between 2005-09 Baseline and 2009-11 Average for People Killed or Seriously Injured in reported road accidents, on LA Managed Roads only	2005-09 Baseline: existing IT Block raw data (see link in Annex D) 2009-11 Average: Sourced from the dataset (STATS19) behind the DfT's Reported Road Casualties publication, at: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport/series/road-accidents-and-safety-statistics. Average figures for 2009-2011 are presented above.
B	Road Safety trend data	Trend in Slights on LA managed roads	Percentage change between 2005-09 Baseline and 2009-11 Average for People with Slight Injuries in reported road accidents, on LA Managed Roads only	2005-09 Baseline: existing IT Block raw data (see link in Annex D) 2009-11 Average: Sourced from the dataset (STATS19) behind the DfT's Reported Road Casualties publication, at: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport/series/road-accidents-and-safety-statistics. Average figures for 2009-2011 are presented above.
C	Congestion trend data	Trend in Vehicle Journey times on LA managed roads	Average percentage change between 2009/10 and 2011/12 Average Vehicle Journey times during the weekday morning peak on LA Managed A roads only	DfT Congestion Statistics, table CGN0201b: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport/series/road-congestion-and-reliability-statistics. Figures for 2009/10, 2010/11, and 2011/12 are presented above.
D	Air Quality trend data	Trend in Average Car Emission Level Ratings	Average percentage change between 2009 and 2011 Average Emission Level Ratings of privately owned cars by LA residents	Sourced from the dataset behind DfT Vehicle Licensing Statistics, further information at: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport/series/vehicle-licensing-statistics. Figures for 2009, 2010, and 2011 are presented above.
E	Reference data	Resident Population	Resident population as at mid-year 2009	Existing IT Block raw data (see link in Annex D)
F	Carbon data	Carbon Dioxide Emissions from Road Transport	Carbon Dioxide Emissions from 2010 from Road Transport (excluding motorways), that are within the scope of influence of Local Authorities	DECC Carbon dioxide emissions: www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/statistics/local_auth/co2_las/co2_las.aspx
G	Economic data	Employed Earnings	Total number of employees *multiplied by* mean gross weekly earnings, by the Local Authority that the workplace is located in	Employees: ONS Business Register and Employment Survey 2010, table 8: http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-230519 Earnings: ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings 2010, table 7.1a: http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-200444
H	Carbon trend data	Trend in Carbon Dioxide Emissions from Road Transport	Average percentage change between 2008 and 2010 Carbon Dioxide Emissions from Road Transport (excluding motorways), that are within the scope of influence of Local Authorities	DECC Carbon dioxide emissions: www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/statistics/local_auth/co2_las/co2_las.aspx Figures for 2008, 2009, and 2010 are presented above.