



Equality Relevance Assessment

1. Details of proposal	
Policy title	Negotiation of a revised concessionary rail scheme
Lead officer	Jim Jack – Head of Operational Services
Date relevance considered	04/09/2013
2. Does the council have control over how this policy will be implemented?	
YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy will, or may potentially:	
General Duties	Impact on equality (Yes or No)
Reduce or increase discrimination, victimisation or harassment against people covered by the equality protected characteristics?	Yes
Reduce or increase equality of opportunity between people who share an equality protected characteristic and those who do not?	Yes
Provide opportunity to improve good relations between those who share an equality protected characteristic and those who do not?	No
4. Equality impact assessment required? (Two Yes above = full assessment necessary)	
YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
5. Decision rationale	
<p>The proposed public transport strategy and subsequent changes to services and concessions may potentially impact upon those people within the protected characteristics of age and disability and as such should be subject to a full Equality Impact Assessment</p>	

- **No assessment required – process ends**
- **Assessment required – continue to next section**

1. Details of proposal

Details of others involved

Jim Jack – Head of Operational Services
Kenny Selbie – Equalities Officer
Sophie McKinnie – HR Advisor
Hannah Gardner – Equalities Analyst

Date assessment conducted

12/01/15

2. Aims of the proposed change to council policy or resources

The West Lothian rail concessionary travel scheme allows flat-fare travel per single journey within West Lothian to stations in Edinburgh, Falkirk and North Lanarkshire, with half-fare to Glasgow and East Lothian.

There is a need to revise the scheme in order to make cost savings as part of the Modernising Services and Managing our Workforce budget measures and an increase in cost to the customer is proposed.

3. What equality data, research or other evidence has been used to inform this assessment?

Evidence was gathered from the Scottish Government's reviews and audits of equality data and from the UK Government's High Level Summary of Equality Statistics.

4. Details of consultation and involvement

The assessment has been subject to scrutiny by representatives of the equality community forums through a specific focus on Delivering Better Outcomes projects as agreed by the council's Corporate Working Group on Equality.

5. Issues identified and 'protected characteristics' impact

(Covering: age; disability; gender; gender identity; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief and sexual orientation equality)

The proposed strategy / changes could adversely impact a number of protected characteristics:

The Scottish Government Gender Audit reviews evidence of gender differences in access to and usage of transport in Scotland, with data from 2004 and 2005. Overall, men are more likely than women to hold a driving licence and to live in households where a car is available for private use. They are also likely to drive more frequently and to travel greater distances. The Gender Audit suggests that differences between men and women in access to and use of transport are likely to reflect differences in gender roles, for example, the fact that men often tend to be the main earner and to be working full-time, while women are more likely to be secondary earners and to take the major responsibility for childcare, including escort journeys to school, and for domestic responsibilities such as food shopping. In general, women's poorer access to transport affects their access to training and employment opportunities, and to services such as hospitals, and to shopping and leisure facilities (*Scottish Government Equality Outcomes: Gender Evidence Review*). That being said, the evidence suggests that there is very little difference between men and women in the usage of train services specifically.

There is also a potential for the elderly to be impacted by an increase in the concessionary fare. Eighty-eight per cent of those aged 60 and over hold a concessionary pass (*Scottish Transport Statistics, 2013*).

However, the Scottish Household Survey in 2005 suggests that pensioners are less likely to use train services than adults as a whole.

Those with disabilities could be impacted by any price increase of the concessionary fare. The Scottish Household Survey (2009/10) found that disabled people were less likely to be coping financially. Households that contain at least one person with a long-term illness or a disability are more likely to be 'not coping' (15%) than those that do not (10%). The High Level Summary of Equality Statistics (gov.uk) reports that, in Scotland in 2005, only eight percent of adults with a disability or long-term illness have used a train service in the previous month compared to 22% of adults with no disability or long-term illness but there is no difference in perception of train fare value for money between disabled and non-disabled service users (Scottish Government, Social Focus on Disability, 2004). Transport Scotland reports that, as of January 2012, 166,605 concessionary fare passes had been issued to disabled people (around 3% of the population) and 16,107 concessionary fare passes had been issued to visually impaired people (around 0.3%) (*Scottish Government Equality Outcomes: Disability Evidence Review*).

Feedback on this measure both through DBO consultation and discussions with the Disability Community Equality Forum and Mental Health Users Forum suggest that there is not significant concern over the implications of this measure as the cost of a concessionary fare would still be significantly cheaper than the full unsubsidised cost.

6. What measures are in place to monitor the actual impact following implementation?

The Delivering Better Outcomes projects are being monitored by the Modernisation Board during implementation and equality impact assessment is identified as a key enabler for projects.

7. Recommendation

- Implement proposal with no amendments
- Implement proposal taking account of mitigating actions (as outlined below)
- Reject proposal due to disproportionate impact on equality

8. Mitigating actions and additional outputs

In the event of a subsidised rail travel contract not being negotiated with a new supplier, an equality impact assessment would be required on the subsequent implications for people with disabilities.

- **Equality impact assessment completed**