

CONSERVATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT

SUPPORTED BUS SERVICE NETWORK

To amend recommendation 2.2 with the addition of the wording “with the exception of routes 27, 22, 52 and 81” and an additional two recommendations 2.3 and 2.4 as shown in bold italics:

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Policy & Resources Committee award contracts for the supported bus routes as set out in Appendix 1 in Agenda Item 14 which is a Part Two Report.
- 2.2 That contracts for the additional services, shown in paragraph 3.14, are not awarded on the grounds of insufficient budget, ***with the exception of routes 27, 22, 52 and 81.***
- 2.3 ***That a report be brought back to the Policy & Resources Committee on 12th July identifying funding for the routes 27, 22, 52 and 81.***
- 2.4 ***That officers urgently re-examine the evidence given for terminating the 96 school bus route and that no changes are implemented until September 2013 at the earliest.***

Proposed by Cllr Geoffrey Theobald

Seconded by Cllr Garry Peltzer Dunn

Supported Bus Routes – Conservative Amendment

Comments of the Chief Finance Officer

The funding required to maintain the supported bus routes 22, 27, 52 and 81 is £127,000 per annum. The amendment sets out that the proposed source of funding would be brought back to this committee on 12th July. Over a four year contract period this would be a commitment of £508,000. This would then need to be referred for final decision to Full Council on 19th July. This is because, taking into account both the scale and length of the financial commitment and the explicit decision made by Budget Council on 23rd February 2012 in relation to the available budget for supported bus routes, this is outside the agreed budget framework and therefore is a matter for Council to determine, not Policy & Resources Committee.

The continuation for one year of the supported bus 96 of the Part 1 report would cost a minimum of £38,000. The procurement process undertaken to award this contract

was for a period of 4 years. A one year contract on this route would be a material departure from that advertised. Therefore a further EU compliant procurement process would be required which would take an estimated 3-4 months. A short term contract would therefore need to be let in the interim with the existing operator for this route because the current contract cannot be further extended. It is likely that the short term contract with the existing operator and the new contract for potentially 6-9 months (after taking into account the procurement timetable and any necessary notification period to the transport commissioner) would have higher costs than that quoted for a 4 year period.