PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report provides the background to the current position and seeks to address the outstanding matters identified by some Members in July 2015.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Members are asked to:

(i) note the contents of the report;
(ii) decide whether non-assistance dogs should be permitted to travel on Metrolink and under what conditions; and
(iii) if Members agree to permit non-assistance dogs, TfGM officers will undertake further work to develop and implement a trial period with associated conditions.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS


CONTACT OFFICERS

Peter Cushing 0161 244 1040 peter.cushing@tfgm.com
James Lomax 0161 244 1542 james.lomax@tfgm.com
1. **Executive Summary**

1.1 Non-assistance dogs are currently not permitted to travel on Metrolink. This report provides the background to the current position and seeks to address the outstanding matters.

1.2 In July 2015, TfGM presented a report that provided the background to the work conducted by officers. This work led to the public consultation on whether to change the existing Byelaws and Conditions of Carriage. A further report was requested by Members to be presented at the November 2015 meeting.

1.3 In December 2013, Members agreed to a review. This consisted of a full consultation exercise to ascertain attitudes in relation to the conveyance of non-assistance dogs. Other work included a multi-modal comparison and risk assessment exercise.

1.4 The public consultation, seeking views about whether to permit non-assistance dogs closed in early 2015. The consultation revealed a diverse response. It emerged that respondents who travelled on Metrolink more frequently were more likely to oppose the change, as were peak-time travellers. In light of the diverse set of views officers used the findings from the consultation to inform the hazard identification and risk assessment.

1.5 Train Operating Companies and those bus operators surveyed within Greater Manchester do permit dogs with associated conditions. Six of eight light rail networks in England and Scotland permit non-assistance dogs but with associated conditions.

1.6 For reporting purposes, identified risks were categorised, and then tested with scenarios. Through the risk assessment, officers identified a number of risks that could be potentially managed through control measures. This included permitting non-assistance dogs carried within suitable containers.

1.7 If Members decide to permit non-assistance dogs to travel on Metrolink, it is recommended that any change is made incrementally.

1.8 It is therefore proposed that non-assistance dogs are permitted to travel on Metrolink on a trial basis, with the condition that they are kept within a suitable container. If Members agree to this option, officers will develop a fixed period trial with necessary terms and conditions of carriage.

1.9 This approach will ensure the continued safe and responsible operation of Metrolink. It is proposed that any trial and associated communications commences in early 2016. The trial will be monitored by officers with a further report presented to Members on completion of the trial.
2. Introduction

2.1 On 3 July 2015, Members of the Capital Projects and Policy Sub-Committee considered a report entitled ‘The Carriage of Non-Assistance Dogs’. The report provided the background to the work conducted by officers which led to the public consultation on whether to change the existing Byelaws and Conditions of Carriage.

2.2 The July report set out details of the risk management exercise undertaken by TfGM. Members noted the outcome of the options appraisal.

2.3 It was highlighted by some Members that there were still a number of issues unresolved in the report. A further report was requested to be presented at the November meeting of the Sub Committee.

2.4 This report provides the background to the current position; seeks to address the outstanding matters identified by some Members and provides a list of recommendations.

2.5 There are 4 Appendices, as follows:

- revised multi modal network comparison;
- survey questions;
- online surveys and passenger surveys analysis; and
- example of an animal container.

3. Background

Conditions of Carriage

3.1 With the exception of Guide Dogs, Metrolink System Byelaws do not permit any animal to be carried on the Metrolink network unless authorised by the Conditions of Carriage or any authorised officer. As authorised by the subsequent Conditions of Carriage, Assistance Dogs, which include Guide Dogs, are permitted, as is any dog being accompanied to the People’s Dispensary for Sick Animals (PDSA).

3.2 In December 2013, Members were advised of the ‘Campaign for Dogs on Metrolink Trams’. Members agreed to a review of the Conditions of Carriage. This review consisted of a:

- full consultation exercise to ascertain attitudes in relation to the conveyance of non-assistance dogs;
- multi-modal comparison, public consultation; and
- comprehensive risk assessment.
3.3 Given the amount of changes to the Metrolink network during 2014, it was proposed that any consultation would be launched toward the end of that year.

**Multi-Modal Comparison**

3.4 Appendix 1 provides a revised multi-modal network comparison, which now also includes Edinburgh Trams.

3.5 Six of eight light rail networks permit non-assistance dogs, all with associated conditions of carriage.

3.6 Nottingham Express Transit and Sheffield Supertram permit non-assistance dogs on the network as long as they are held within a suitable container / transporter. The Sheffield network also has on tram supervisors present on each vehicle. Tyne and Wear Metro and Croydon Tramlink allow non-assistance dogs to travel without a suitable container but only if on a suitable lead. Blackpool Tramway and Edinburgh Trams permit dogs and have tram supervisors present on each vehicle.

3.7 Subject to conditions, other modes permit non-assistance dogs. In summary:

- Train Operating Companies permit non-assistance dogs;
- Transport for London, London Bus Services Limited and London Underground Limited Conditions of Carriage permit non-assistance dogs; and
- all of the Greater Manchester bus operators surveyed for reporting permitted dogs.

**Public Consultation**

3.8 TfGM launched the consultation in December 2014. Appendix 2 details the survey questions. Approximately 2,400 surveys were completed and over 40 individual / stakeholder written responses were submitted to TfGM. The remainder of this section provides the headline results.

3.9 Appendix 3 provides the findings presented to TfGMC on 13 March 2015. In summary, the analysis identified a diverse set of views. For both surveys, respondents who travelled on Metrolink more frequently were more likely to oppose the change, as were peak time travellers.

3.10 It was suggested that Metrolink should match the practice of other public transport modes that permit dogs. However, it was also identified that the different ‘open-system’ operating environment of Metrolink may provide an unsuitable environment in terms of passenger safety, Assistance Dog and their owners welfare and dog welfare in general.
3.11 There were a range of reasons identified to support this, including:

- passenger volumes; and
- driver only operation, therefore making it difficult to enforce any conditions.

3.12 In light of the diverse set of views officers used the findings from the consultation to inform the hazard identification and risk assessment.

4. **Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment**

4.1 Risk Management is a key aspect of TfGM’s activities. Our highest priority is the health and safety of the public, staff, contractors and customers.

4.2 Metrolink is an open network. The degree of subjectivity involved, in establishing whether a non-assistance dog is trained and conveyed by a responsible owner in reality is extremely difficult.

4.3 It was concluded, therefore, that it could not be guaranteed that all non-assistance dogs would be conveyed by a responsible owner. Therefore it would not be acceptable to permit the carriage of non-assistance dogs solely on the assumption that only responsible owners and trained dogs would travel on the Metrolink network.

4.4 The unknowns regarding the levels of dog ownership makes it impossible to estimate the numbers of dogs that could potentially be travelling on the Metrolink network, the breed and frequency of journeys. The diverse range of dog breeds was also considered within the discussions on key topics including, size of the dog and physical characteristics; and temperament, intelligence, behaviour.

4.5 The unknowns associated with some breeds of dog make it difficult to have an overarching policy to permit non-assistance dogs.

4.6 In July 2015, TfGM recommend that no immediate changes were made to the current Byelaws and Conditions of Carriage. This option was recommended due to the:

- key considerations and risks identified during the risk management process;
- broader impact on TfGM achieving its objectives; and
- diverse range of views obtained through the public consultation.
4.7 For reporting purposes, identified risks were categorised, and then populated with scenarios. Examples of these scenarios are also highlighted.

- biological hazards;
- human injury / illness;
- non-assistance dog and assistance dog injury / illness;
- allergy / phobias / perceptions; and
- Metrolink operations.

4.8 Through the risk assessment, officers identified a number of risks that could be potentially managed through control measures.

5. Potential Control Measures

Leads

5.1 Any non-assistance dogs would as a minimum be required to be on a lead. But it is believed that this would still not be sufficient to meet some of the risks.

Muzzling

5.2 The condition of having a dog muzzled was investigated as a control measure following survey feedback. This option was not progressed, as it was identified that having a condition to make it compulsory to muzzle a dog would be wrong for those dogs that are well behaved and could present dog welfare concerns. Other issues with muzzling dogs were also considered which included:

- customer perception of being on a tram with a muzzled dog, even though it might not be for aggression purposes;
- dog owners may view the condition as inhumane; and
- cost associated with purchasing muzzles, some of which may have to be custom made.

Charging

5.3 In parallel to the risk assessment being completed, officers investigated any potential charging structure for the carriage of non-assistance dogs. Charging policy varies across modes. Setting of fares and collection would potentially be expensive for the level of return expected. If members agree that non-assistance dogs are permitted within a suitable container, it is proposed that customers will not be charged.

Containers
5.4 Pet allergies and phobias were identified within the risk assessment. The control measure of permitting a customer to travel with a non-assistance dog within a suitable container would help mitigate the risk. However, it is acknowledged that dog allergens can still remain long after the dog has left the tram / infrastructure.

6. Proposed Trial

6.1 If Members agree to permit non-assistance dogs, it is recommended any change is made incrementally. This is due to the identified risks and associated unknowns associated with their carriage.

6.2 Subject to Members agreement, it is proposed that TfGM permit non-assistance dogs to travel on Metrolink, with the condition that they are kept within a suitable pet container for the duration of the journey (including time on Metrolink stops and other infrastructure). This is consistent with the Sheffield and Nottingham networks.

6.3 If Members agree to this option, officers will develop a ‘fixed period’ trial with necessary terms and conditions of carriage.

6.4 This condition will ensure the continued safe and responsible operation of Metrolink. It is proposed that a report defining the terms of the trial and communication methods, is presented to Members in early 2016. The trial will be monitored by officers with a further report presented to Members on completion of the trial.

6.5 A suitable container will include the following characteristics, the container must:
   - be carried by one person;
   - enable a dog to be able to stand up; and
   - constructed from rigid material and have a closable door which can be locked.

6.6 Other conditions include:
   - there will be no charge to the dog owner;
   - customers could travel with their non-assistance dog during the full service, however advice would be given around times when tram services are likely to be busier;
   - person(s) responsible for any non-assistance dog shall be liable for the reasonable cleaning costs if the dog soils / dirties property;
   - customers with disabilities, or those with prams or buggies, will take priority over dog containers. Any authorised staff member will have the discretion to decline non-assistance dogs if services are experiencing heavy demand;
• dog containers will not be permitted to take up a seat; and
• only one container per customer.

6.7 An example of dog container can be found in Appendix 4.

6.8 To help the transition into the trial, it is proposed that the trial commences early 2016. This will help avoid the busier shopping periods traditionally associated with December / January.

6.9 Any trial would include a review which would help determine the success and inform future policy.

6.10 It is proposed that there will be no change to the existing arrangement for customers taking their non-assistance dog to the PDSA.

7. Recommendations

7.1 A full set of recommendations appears at the front of this report.

Peter Cushing
Metrolink Director
Appendix 1: Multi Modal Network Comparison

1. Rail: National Policy

1.1 Passengers are permitted to travel with their dogs, free of charge and subject to conditions, as follows:

- maximum two per passenger;
- they do not endanger or inconvenience passengers or staff;
- dogs must be kept on a lead at all times unless contained in a basket;
- dogs without leads, must be carried in an enclosed basket, cage or pet carrier. It must be rigid and not open (to prevent escape) and the animal able to stand and lie down in comfort;
- must not occupy seats, otherwise a charge will be made; and
- the train company to refuse carriage if the dog causes a nuisance or inconvenience to other passengers. Passengers may be asked to remove it from the train or railway premises by the Train Company or Rail Service Company staff.

2. UK Light Rail Network Comparison

2.1 The table below details each English light rail operator’s current position regarding allowing non-assistance dogs to travel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tram Network</th>
<th>Allow Non-Assistance Dogs</th>
<th>On-tram Supervisor / Ticket Assistant</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackpool (Tramway)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dogs must be carried, held on a lead for the whole of the journey, they are not allowed on seats. Dog owners charged a fare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon (Tramlink)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dogs must be kept under control on a lead or in a suitable container, and must not take up a seat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Trams</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All dogs must be on a lead and are carried at staff discretion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tram Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Allow Non-Assistance Dogs</th>
<th>On-tram Supervisor / Ticket Assistant</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham (NET)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Must be carried in a suitable container</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne and Wear (Metro)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dogs must be on a lead and kept under control at all times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands (Midland Metro)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield (Supertram)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Only carried if held safely in a cage or transporter of a design which is considered by an authorised officer to be suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester (Metrolink)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **London Public Transport**

3.1 Transport for London, London Bus Services Limited and London Underground Limited Conditions of Carriage permit non-assistance dogs, "unless there is a good reason to refuse it" and abide by the condition that they must not use a moving escalator. *They must be carried down a moving escalator; however, if it is too large to carry, a member of staff will stop the escalator to allow it to travel on it when it is safe to do so.*

4. **Bus Operators**

4.1 A desktop survey of Arriva, First Group and Stagecoach Bus operators Conditions of Carriage has identified that each operator allows the conveyance of non-assistance dogs. However, conditions do apply and is at the discretion of the bus driver.

4.2 It was highlighted that conditions for carrying dogs (or other small animals unless they are specifically excluded) aren't standard across all modes, which was cited as disappointing, particularly in relation to permitted hours, which may be difficult to enforce. However, it was accepted that Metrolink may consider itself a special case.
Appendix 2: Survey questions

Transport for Greater Manchester is consulting passengers about whether Metrolink should allow dogs that are not currently allowed on board, to travel on trams. TfGM will manage the information you provide according to the Data Protection Act 1998, it won’t be shared with any third parties. Please can you spare a few minutes to give your views?

SHOWCARD & READ OUT

At the moment only certain dogs are allowed to travel on trams – guide dogs, hearing dogs, or cats or dogs going to the Old Trafford PDSA (People’s Dispensary for Sick Animals). There is no charge for this. No changes would be made to these rules.

The proposal is that other dogs would be allowed on trams if they:

1. were on a lead
2. had a muzzle, or were in a carrier,
3. are charged a child fare,
4. only travel at off peak times (i.e. 0930-1600 and after 1830 on weekdays, anytime at weekends), and
5. did not take up a seat

Q1 Do you think that other dogs should also be allowed to travel on trams?

   No - don’t think other dogs should be allowed [GO TO Q2]
   
   Yes – happy with proposal [GO TO Q2]
   
   Yes – but disagree with conditions proposed [GO TO 1A]
   
   Yes – but want more conditions to apply [GO TO 1B]

Q1a Which conditions do you disagree with? (tick all that apply)

   1. on a lead
   2. had a muzzle or were in a suitable carrier
   3. are charged a child fare
   4. only travel at off peak times (0930-1600 and after 1830 weekdays, at weekends)
   5. did not take up a seat

GO TO Q2
Q1b What other conditions would you want to apply before other non-assistance dogs should be allowed on trams? (tick all that apply)

- Only small dogs that can be carried in suitable carrier
- Dogs only allowed in standing areas
- Pay an adult fare for each dog
- Not allowed on busy trams at weekend e.g. around football matches
- A Limit to number of dogs travelling per person
- Other *(but can't write in what – encourage them to write on sheet or do online)*

Q2 If other non-assistance dogs were to be allowed, should it be at peak times or off peak only?

Not at peak times, off peak only (Interviewer to explain Peak times = Mon-Fri 07:00-09:30, 16:00-18:30)

Any time including peak times

Q3 Would you change how often you travel on Metrolink if other non-assistance dogs were allowed on trams?

- No - would not change how often use Metrolink
- Yes – would use Metrolink more
- Yes – would use Metrolink less

Q4 How often do you currently travel on Metrolink?

- 5 or more days a week
- 3 or 4 days a week
- Once or twice a week
- Once a fortnight
- Once a month
- Less frequently
- This is the first time I have used Metrolink

Q5 Finally, can I just ask – are you a dog owner?

- Yes
- No
Appendix 3: Online Survey and Passenger Survey Analysis

1.1 The two surveys were identical however they were administered differently to two separate audiences:

- face-to-face interviews with Metrolink users on board trams; and
- online survey which was released to the public via a media campaign.

1.2 The survey results differ by research approach, potentially because of the respondent profiles of each sample, presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dog Owner?</th>
<th>On-tram (n=1,454)</th>
<th>Online (n=953)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent Profile

1.3 The on-tram survey results are more reflective of the typical Metrolink user’s views. This sample is younger, travels on Metrolink more frequently, and is less likely to be a dog owner or travel with young children.

1.4 Respondents to the online survey were more likely to be dog owners and travel on Metrolink less frequently than the respondents to the on-tram survey. Online survey respondents were more likely to be aged 30-59 and travel with children under 10, than their on tram counterparts.

Respondent Views

1.5 Similar proportions of the on-tram and online sample thought that dogs should not be allowed to travel on trams (28%, 30% respectively). However 43% of the on-tram sample were happy with the proposal, but only 25% of the online sample were happy. There are also differences in the two samples about the extent to which they agree with the proposal.

1.6 The online sample were much more likely to disagree with the conditions proposed, compared to the on-tram respondents (44% of the online sample disagreed, while only 21% of the on-tram sample disagreed).

1.7 Respondents to the online survey objected to dogs being on a lead the most (97% of those disagreeing with conditions), closely followed by
“doesn’t take up a seat” (94%). Whereas 88% of respondents to the on-tram survey objected to dogs travelling only at off-peak times and 84% of them also disagreed that dogs should not take up a seat.

1.8 Most on-tram respondents favoured off-peak times only (69%), whereas less of the online survey respondents favoured off-peak times only (58%). Online respondents were more likely to approve of dogs travelling on trams at any time including in the peak travel periods.

1.9 While 7% of the on-tram sample agreed with the proposal but wanted more conditions to apply, only 1% of the online sample felt the same way.

1.10 Online respondents were also more likely to approve of dogs travelling on trams at any time including in the peak travel periods (44% compared to 29% of on-tram respondents). Although it should be noted that this was still less than half of the online sample favouring dogs travelling at peak times.

1.11 Two fifths of both samples who currently use Metrolink 5+ days a week would travel less if the proposal was introduced. 24% of the on board sample travelling 5+ days a week would use it more, but only 9% of the 5+ days a week users surveyed online said that they would use Metrolink more.

1.12 Peak-time travellers from both surveys were more likely than off-peak travellers to oppose the proposal.

Written Individual Submissions

1.13 TfGM received 42 written responses, these included respondents submitting views from individuals with affiliation to the ‘Disability Design Reference Group’, ‘Allergy Support Network’ and the ‘Dogs Trust’. Table 2.0 describes the characteristics of those submitting the response along with their views on revising the conditions of carriage.

Table 1.0 Characteristics of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dog Keeper / Owner</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Support Revision</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide Dog Owner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 42, 33% were dog keepers, with all but one respondent supporting a revision to the conditions of carriage to allow non-assistance dogs. Of the remaining, 67% that did not specify that they were a dog keeper, 43% supported the revision. The headline views put forward by respondents are as follows:

- fifty percent of respondents supported the revision;
- of the 9 respondents referencing a muzzle, 55% agreed to this proposed condition;
- of the 6 respondents referencing ‘charging’ for their dog to travel, 4 agreed;
- trains and bus operators within the city region permit dogs; and
- dog ownership is a life choice.

Other respondents identified that permitting a dog to travel could have a positive impact on the wellbeing of the dog’s keeper and family, whilst travelling on the network would contribute to the reduction in road traffic. Using Metrolink to travel to the vets was also cited, especially for those individuals who did not have access to a car.

Responses identified the variety of dog breeds and associated characteristics and temperament, some of which could result in the potential to make other passengers feel uncomfortable and deter them from travelling.

Dogs encountering other dogs, including Assistance Dogs could also present an issue, especially within a confined space.

In particular, a response highlighted the training Guide Dogs receive to be able to work in a social environment, such as public transport. Guide dogs are submissive and do not defend themselves if attacked by non-assistance dogs and therefore prolonging any attack. Attacks such as these can lead to Guide Dogs being withdrawn from service and prevent the Guide Dog owner from travelling independently. Guide Dogs can also be distracted by other non-assistance dogs, putting their owners at risk when using the Metrolink network.

**Stakeholders: Interested Parties**

The Metrolink ‘Disability Design Reference Group’ (DDRG) broadly agreed that there should be no changes to the condition of carriage. Reasons for this decision included:

- irresponsible dog owners / keepers;
- intimidation of passengers;
- allergic reactions;
• dogs will take up room for passengers;
• increased risk of Assistance Dogs being attacked; and
• Assistance Dog Owner welfare.

1.20 Concerns were also raised about how any changes would be ‘policed’ along with highlighting many forms of aggression that a dog can show, which a visually impaired person would not be aware of.

1.21 The RSPCA believe that permitting dogs may have an increased benefit to dog welfare as this may result in more dogs accompanying their owners which would otherwise be left at home alone and which can be a source of distress and anxiety for a large number of dogs. The RSPCA also:

• agree with the muzzling of dogs where a dog’s behaviour poses risk to people or other dogs and if a well-fitting muzzle has been introduced gradually and positively. However, strongly disagree with the requirement for every dog to be muzzled on a tram; and
• in relation to muzzling, believe that the benefit to public safety would not outweigh the risk to dog welfare and may negatively influence how people perceive the wider dog population in general.

1.22 Other key points include:

• to improve public safety around dogs on trams, the RCPCA believe a better and more positive approach would be to provide information to passengers on how to interact safely with dogs; and
• restricting travel to off-peak may have some benefit to dog welfare, reducing the likelihood of being stood on accidentally during busy times but this may make the proposal less favourable to owners.

1.23 Members of the Manchester Disabled Persons Access Group have no objections to the proposal providing the ‘rules’ mentioned are enforced. Members also commented that they would like to be reassured that dog owners will take responsibility for their dogs and that they wouldn’t use the wheelchair space for their dogs. They would also like to see clear appropriate channels where complaints could be made.

1.24 The Dogs Trust response welcomed the general intention to permit dogs to travel on Metrolink but suggest that the conditions proposed are unnecessary.

1.25 They also suggested that rather than just refer to ‘Guide dogs’ and ‘Hearing dogs’, that this be extended to include all Assistance Dogs as defined by the Equality Act 2010 and rather than just referring to dogs going to ‘the Old Trafford Peoples Dispensary for Sick Animals’, that this be extended to ‘any veterinary surgery or hospital’
1.26 As to the new proposed conditions, the Dogs Trust suggest that a model similar to the carriage of dogs on trains is followed e.g.:

- no charge to be made for a dog to be transported;
- keepers should have appropriate control of their dog at all times and therefore it is entirely acceptable to require a dog to be on a lead or be in a carrier. However, to suggest that a non-contained dog must be muzzled is onerous and unnecessary and could have welfare implications for the dog;
- restricted travel only to off-peak times is unreasonable as keepers may well need to travel during peak times with their dog.

1.27 The following paragraphs provide the key headlines from public transport operators.

Metrolink Operator

1.28 The Metrolink operator welcomed the opportunity to be consulted, reaffirming the commitment to improving accessibility throughout the city region and noting that any revisions will impact upon the operating environment. Therefore, the proposed ‘conditions of travel’, referenced within the consultation letter should be carefully considered before any decision is made. The different breeds of dog will have implications for the welfare of the dog and the travel experience of the keeper and other passengers.

1.29 The nature of the Metrolink system, in particular ‘driver only’ vehicles on the Metrolink network make it almost impossible to ensure any associated conditions of travel for non-assistance dogs are adhered to and enforced.

1.30 Ridership patterns vary significantly across the system throughout the day / week and heavy demand is not limited to traditional peak journey times. Therefore, permitting the carriage of non-assistance dogs may cause unnecessary stress to the dog because of the volume of passengers riding in the tram carriage. This may also have a negative impact on the journey experience of the keeper and other tram passengers.

1.31 The Metrolink operator will continue to work with TfGM and wider stakeholder groups, including the ‘DDRG’, to ensure the continued safe and responsible operation of the network.
Appendix 4: Example of Animal Container