

Addressing Inequalities

Main Network Bus Review Equalities Impact Assessment

Surrey County Council Bus Review Equality Impact Assessment

Stage one – initial screening

What is being assessed?	Possible impacts as a result of the review of the subsidised bus network
Service	Transport
Name of assessor/s	Keith McKain (Project Officer) with input from Paul Millin (Passenger Transport Group Manager) Laurie James (Service Planning Team Manager) Peter Wylde (Project Manager) Liz Daughters (Equality & Diversity Manager) Jan Haunton (Senior Lead Manager PPPU)
Head of service	Iain Reeve
Date	May 2010
Is this a new or existing function or policy?	This is a major review of the existing network due to a requirement to reduce levels of subsidy

Write a brief description of your service, policy or function. If this screening is part of a project it is important to focus on the service or policy the project aims to review or improve.

The purpose of this assessment is to highlight the possible affects on vulnerable groups that may result from a reduction in public bus provision. It tries, as best possible, to outline all the possible impacts, whether positive or otherwise, and, where possible, gives ways of mitigating against them. This is an extremely important and necessary part of the Bus Review and goes toward informing the decision making process.

Surrey's buses are successfully meeting many people's travel needs, with 28.2 m journeys a year made on a network of 250 services. Patronage is rising and meeting targets, helped by a recent surge from free concessionary fares for people aged over 60 and disabled people with around 6.9 million journeys were made using concessionary bus passes. User satisfaction has also risen.

Ideally services should be provided commercially by the bus companies, and many are. However subsidy is necessary to operate many services. This is under our duty in the Transport Act 1985 to maintain services that the Council deems socially necessary but are not commercially viable. The Act does not

outline any criteria for what is considered socially necessary or what levels of subsidy councils should provide.

The County Council therefore supports bus operators how provide services where the cost of running the service is greater than the fare returns they receive from passengers. Of the 28.2m journeys a year, 15m are made on services supported by the County Council - an average of 41,000 trips per day.

The County Council subsidises buses by £13m per annum, offset by £2m of income from grants and various agreements, making net subsidy £11.02m. This means that Surrey sends more on its subsidized network than other peer councils including Hampshire and Hertfordshire. However this cost has risen sharply in recent years, from only £4m pa in 2001/2. On current trends the level of subsidy will rise to £13m pa by 2012/13, £1m over the available budget.

The Surrey bus network is a universal service for residents of the county and those who commute here for whatever reason. The bus service is provided in two ways

- By bus operators as commercial ventures, without subsidy, contract or control from Surrey County Council
- By bus operators with subsidy from Surrey County Council. These are felt necessary, but are not commercially viable services. The bus company runs these under contractual arrangement to routes, frequencies and times set by us

Over the past 10 years, costs in the bus industry have been rising much faster than general inflation. Many main bus services, including those in towns, have stopped being commercially viable, requiring Surrey County Council to spend much more in order to keep the network running.

There is significant financial pressure on local authorities, and Surrey County Council is no exception. It is clear that, if not controlled, the subsidised bus network would become unsustainable.

Indicate for each equality strand whether there may be a positive impact, negative impact, or no impact.

Equality Strand	Positive ¹	Negative	No impact	Reason
Age	X	X		Removal or shortening of routes and changes to frequency (increase/decrease) may affect people using the network This will have an effect on older people and their carers,

				children and younger people with knock-on effects for parents and schools
Race	X	X		Removal or shortening of routes and changes to frequency (increase/decrease) may affect people from ethnic minority groups using the network
Disability	X	X		Removal or shortening of routes and changes to frequency (increase/decrease) may affect people with disabilities and their carers using the network
Gender	X	X		A proportionally larger number of women use the bus network and therefore removal or shortening of routes and changes to frequency (increase/decrease) may affect their using the network 62% of respondents to the consultation, using the survey form, were women
Belief / Faith	X	X		Possible removal, shortening or changes to frequency (increase/decrease) of a service This may affect people's ability to get to their place of worship
Sexual Orientation			X	There is no likely effect for people based on their sexual orientation as this is not a barrier to using the public bus network
Other equality issues – please state	X	X		Removal or shortening of routes and changes to frequency (increase/decrease) may affect people using the network This may have an effect on

				people in geographically isolated places, people on low incomes or living in areas of social deprivation
HR issues			X	The County Council has no liability for bus operator staff under the tendering process

¹The positive would be an increase in frequency along a main route. This would only have a positive impact for people living in the vicinity of that service. Changes to route frequencies are not decided at this time so no specific detail is available. Final route decisions for Phase 1 will be made in June 2010

If you find a negative impact on any equality group you will need to complete stage one and move on to stage two and carry out a full EIA.

A full EIA will also need to be carried out if this is a high profile or major policy that will either effect many people or have a severe effect on some people.

Is a full EIA required?	Yes X	No
If no briefly summarise reasons why you have reached this conclusion, the evidence for this and the nature of any stakeholder verification of your conclusion.		
Briefly describe any positive impacts identified that have resulted in improved access or services		

For screenings only:

Review date	
Person responsible for review	
Head of Service signed off	
Date completed	

- Signed off electronic version to be kept in your team for review
- Electronic copy to be forwarded to Equality and Diversity Manager for publishing

Stage 2 – Full Equality Impact Assessment

Introduction and background

Using the information from your screening please describe your service or function. This should include:

- **The aims and scope**
- **The main beneficiaries or users**
- **The main equality, accessibility, social exclusion issues and barriers, and the equality strands they relate to (not all assessments will encounter issues relating to every strand)**

If this EIA is part of a project it is important to focus on the service or policy the project aims to review or improve.

The overall aim of the Bus Review is to reduce the annual level of subsidy by between £2 to £4 million. This will be achieved by removing, shortening or reducing routes subsidised by the County Council.

Whilst the resulting net effect would be a reduction in bus provision, Surrey County Council hopes to create a robust and future proof network. There has been a commitment to, where possible, protect routes serving areas of greatest social need (Priority Places) identified in the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment.

This is a considered approach and a departure from the criteria based removal of bus subsidy in the past. However, Surrey County Council finds itself in the difficult position where it must reduce subsidy levels whilst trying to balance this with maintaining a viable network and protecting the needs of vulnerable groups. This assessment, therefore, attempts to identify impacts on vulnerable groups so as to inform the decision making process for the design of the final network.

The review has focused more on making changes to the network as a whole and where possible by increasing frequency to some areas of higher demand. This would be of direct benefit to those people living in those areas or travelling to those destinations (these will not be known until after the new timetabling is finalised).

Now describe how this fits into 'the bigger picture' including other council or local plans and priorities.

The Bus Review is one part of the wider Environment and Infrastructure (E&I) Directorate performance, efficiency and savings review. Due to financial pressure already mentioned there is a requirement for the County Council to reduce its annual revenue and capital budgets. A balance will need to be found between the requirement to reduce cost and to maintain and improve services for residents so that other Council strategies are unaffected by any change to the network.

Any decisions made by the Cabinet on Bus Review will affect how the public bus network will fit into the next Local Transport Plan (LTP3) and the overall Bus Strategy.

With the results of the Bus Review not being known fully until 2012 other strategy planners will need to consider how this may affect more overarching strategies like the Surrey Rural Strategy, Total Place, Localism and the Surrey

Strategic Partnership to name some.

With transport being an important factor in overarching strategies and access to services a very high priority for public transport users it may be worthwhile including transport and access to services in the 2010 review of the Surrey County Council Equalities Guidance examining if this could be included somehow when undertaking EIAs.

Evidence gathering and fact-finding

What evidence is available to support your views above? Please include:

- **A summary of the available evidence**
- **Identification of where there are gaps in the evidence (this may identify a need for more evidence in the action plan)**
- **Information on contributing factors to inequality.**
- **What information is currently captured with respect to usage and take up of services.**
- **What the current situation is in relation to equality and diversity monitoring (where relevant)**

The [Accessibility Project](#) mapped the county to look at the speed of access to services by public transport. They looked at access to town centres (for retail), hospitals, GPs, libraries, adult education centres, colleges and school, supermarkets and leisure centres. The maps show that in some areas to the south and east of the county people would have long journeys (an hour+) to reach these services. This problem becomes more acute outside of peak times.

The results of the National Highways and Transport (NHT) Network Survey 2009 showed that, of the 975 respondents, 56% use local buses less than monthly or never. However, this may be because the survey takes a random sample across the county therefore reflecting that the majority of respondents are car users (60% of respondents stated they use a car or van daily).

This is a reflection of the 2001 Census data around access to a car. That Census revealed that 51% of respondents had access to 2 or more cars with only 10% having no access to a car. Also, it showed that the pattern of travel is heavily weighted toward car use with 59.9% travelling to work by car and 4.3% travelling as a passenger. This contrasted with the 8% who walked, 2.2% who cycled and 2.3% who travelled by bus.

The main piece of evidence gathering was the public consultation and other stakeholder engagement. These are discussed more in the next section.

Sources of evidence may include:

- Service monitoring reports including equality monitoring data
- User feedback
- Population data – census, state of the county, Mosaic
- Complaints data
- Published research, local or national.

- Feedback from consultations and focus groups
- Feedback from individuals or organisations representing the interests of key target groups
- Evidence from partner organisations, other council departments, district or borough councils and other local authorities

How have stakeholders been involved in this assessment? Who are they, and what is their view?

This section outlines details of the stakeholders and engagement events organised and requested as part of the Bus Review (more comprehensive stakeholder feedback was published as annexes to the 2 March 2010 Cabinet Report). There was some support for the Bus Review stating that a review was needed and the bus network was historic and required updating. However, most of the feedback we received outlined the difficulties people would experience with a reduced level of service than that at present.

From the beginning of the review it was clear that stakeholder and public engagement would be a vital part of the process. The consultation process for the bus review was launched on 13 November 2009 by organising a meeting of the Passenger Transport Assembly. Around 100 people attended the event representing bus providers, disability groups, residents associations, town and parish councils and the Districts and Boroughs. The feedback from the event is available to the public and can be found on the [Bus Review](#) page of the Surrey County Council website. A more summarised version of the group work engagement activity can be found in Annexe B1 to the 2 March 2010 Cabinet Report.

Other, smaller scale, stakeholder events have also been held. There have been meetings and presentations given to the Local Committees, various Disability Empowerment Boards and the Transport for Surrey Board. Feedback from these events can be found as Annexe B2 to the 2 March 2010 Cabinet Report.

Drop in surgery sessions were held at a number of locations in the Phase 1 areas including Walton, Woking, Redhill and Horley Libraries, the Horley 'Help Shop,' Runnymede Civic Centre and on Staines High Street using a Bus Users UK event. There was also an event for the staff of St Peter's Hospital.

We sought feedback from members of the 50+ Network. We have received feedback from their members, some very detailed, about how the bus network could better suit the needs of older people.

Members of the External Equalities Advisory Group were also asked for feedback on the draft EIA that went to Cabinet on 2 March 2010. The Advisory Group is made up of a number of people representing all equalities groups. More information about the External Equalities Advisory Group can be found on the SCC [website](#). As well as the External Equalities Advisory Group the Directorate Equalities Group members were asked for their views on the EIA as part of the corporate equalities procedure.

In attempting to get as comprehensive an equalities view as possible we also asked for feedback on the EIA from representatives on the Carers Forum. This was done out of good practice and ahead of the October 2010 inclusion of Carers as an equalities group in legislation.

Arguably the most important piece of stakeholder engagement is the public consultation. We have received a large amount of feedback. This has been using the Bus Review survey form or by letter, email or in the form of petitions. When people filled in the survey form they were also asked to complete an equalities monitoring form. This showed that the majority of respondents to the survey are over 60 and this highlights the high up take of the Concessionary Fares scheme. 69% of respondents stated that they hold a free travel pass.

The number of survey respondents stating that they have a disability or longstanding condition that affects how they live their life is also higher than percentages for the general population of Surrey. Within the Surrey population the figure is 14% according to the 2001 Census, compared to 31% of survey respondents.

Other characteristics of survey respondents include

- 62% were women
- 90% were white British or white other
- Less than 2% of respondents were of any other ethnicity

The Surrey Coalition of Disabled People pointed out the possible inaccurate recording of the numbers of concessionary pass users and therefore an under representation of how many people might be disadvantaged by the proposals. As a result a meeting was held to discuss the issue and it was mutually agreed that more work would need to be done. Surveys were to be sent to all disability concessionary pass holders similar to the previous Bus Review survey form. Unfortunately, due to our need to comply with the Data Protection Act, all the pass holders had to receive notice that we were going to undertake the survey before the surveys could be sent. This delay means that the results of the survey may not be available for the Cabinet Report. However, with the large proportion of people responding to the Phase 1 consultation stating they had a disability or long standing condition, as well as the views from the Surrey Coalition and Disability Empowerment Boards, it could be assumed that the concerns raised are representative. The survey is a very worthwhile task and will provide good evidence that can be used in future network planning for Phases 2 and 3. If any major issues were raised there is also scope for these to be looked at for the Phase 1 area. Possible changes to be examined and made to the Phase 1 network, if necessary.

The responses have been from bodies such as Surrey Link and Kingston Age Concern, local media (Surrey Mirror's organised petition), head teachers, school governors and members of the public. Feedback from all these sources can be found as an annexe to the March 2010 Cabinet Report.

Officers tried to fulfil all requests made of them to speak to stakeholders and

members of the public making sure that, when the event or meeting was organised by SCC, the location was accessible. Also that, throughout the review, the Corporate Equalities Guidance was followed.

Analysis and assessment

Given the available information, what is the actual or likely impact on minority, disadvantaged, vulnerable and socially excluded groups? Is this impact positive or negative or a mixture of both?

(Refer to page 17 of the EIA guidance for full list of issues to consider when making your analysis)

What can be done to reduce the effects of any negative impacts? Where negative impact cannot be completely diminished, can this be justified, and is it lawful?

Possible impacts on older people and their carers

- Older people may be less likely to want to or be able to change buses one or more times to reach a previously direct destination
- Older people may be less likely to want or be able to walk increased distances to an alternative bus stop if the service in their vicinity is withdrawn
- Many people have commented that the proposed changes will have a negative effect on their or their friends and relatives ability to get to hospitals, GP surgeries etc
- This may reduce the ability of some older people to live independently possibly resulting in increased demand on other services like Adult Social Care
- This may have a knock on affect on other services such as libraries, adult education with less people being able to access these services
 - The above points have been mentioned by members of the public via consultation responses and also at stakeholder engagement events, specifically the Disability Empowerment Boards

Mitigation for older people and their carers

- A project is currently underway to increase the role of the Transport Coordination Centre
 - To take on a centralised role for the provision of non-emergency hospital services
 - To have more cost effective coordination of community transport and Dial-a-Ride services for people who are entitled
 - To provide help and information on other methods of transport for people who are not entitled
- Home Care Services and Self Directed Support helping people stay independent and in their own homes. People receiving Home Based Care in Surrey has grown from 8,000 in 2007 to 10,000 this year. Whilst this has no direct scope in terms of travel people receiving support could have some allocation of money for transport included in their

support plan

- This could also be viewed as an impact on the basis that if there was public transport available the transport cost would not have to be met from the individuals Self Directed Support payments
- We are in negotiation with Surrey PCT regarding hospital transport. One idea stemming from this is: is there scope to link this with community transport or have a Health Bus like the one provided by Croydon PCT. Also there are Community Transport and charity run alternatives, like the British Red Cross Transport Service, to get to GPs and hospitals. Community Transport is also an option for attending social events and adult learning courses.
- Surrey County Council is also investigating arrangements for the coordination and delivery of local services with partners across the county. This work on 'Localism' may result in forms of mitigation once the draft ideas are being discussed with both County Council and District and Borough members at present
- More co-location of services, especially for new builds, such as libraries, community centres, GP Surgeries etc. A good example of this is the Ebbisham Centre in Epsom
- Assessing areas that could have mobile services such as community outreach workers, meals on wheels and mobile libraries (at present mobile library services are set out as follows: One serving urban areas, four serving village and isolated communities and sheltered housing units, and one serving residential homes for the elderly). Any increase will likely require increased revenue that may not be available
- There are schemes to help people become more independent through increased mobility like the charity [Motability](#)

Possible impacts on people with disabilities and their carers

- People with disabilities will be affected by the accessibility of the buses themselves and the network infrastructure. When speaking about network structure this refers to the possibility of users having to change services and therefore waiting at interchanges. There is currently severe pressure on capital budgets and therefore it is unlikely that money will be available to be spent on improving interchanges. However, changes to infrastructure are outside the scope of the review
- May be less likely to want to or be able to change buses one or more times to reach a previously direct destination
- Many people have commented that the proposed changes will have a negative affect on their or their friends and relatives ability to get to hospitals, GP surgeries etc
- Those people with mobility problems may have difficulty walking increased distance to get another bus service
- This may reduce the ability of people to live independently with possible knock on affects for other services
- Any changes to fares may not have a great affect due to the availability of the concessionary bus pass
- Some feedback from disabled users stated that Dial-a-Ride or

community transport are not always as convenient as using the public bus network

Mitigation for people with disabilities and their carers

- All the forms of mitigation listed above for older people would apply for people with disabilities
- In particular, it is important to minimise the need to change buses to reach a person's destination. Interruptions to routes are minimised in the latest proposals.
- Independent travel training for people with learning disabilities
 - Based around the continuing work of the project team based at the Squirrels in Banstead.
- Expansion of Telecare. More information on this can be found on the [Surrey website](#) or is available on request
- Increased disability awareness training for bus and taxi drivers
- In the Phase 1 area nearly 100% of the buses on the strategic network are low-floor accessible buses
- Encourage sign up to the Surrey Adult Linked Disabilities Register (SALDR). This would help with targeted information from partners and services, to the 5769 people who are registered, on transport or transport alternatives
- There are schemes to help people become more independent through increased mobility like the charity [Motability](#)
- There may be help available through Access to Work. They can pay 100% of travel costs, above normal, for new starters who have a disability
 - The Pathways To Work scheme gives focused advice for individuals on applying, obtaining and travelling to work

Possible impacts on children and young people

- Main impact will be on those children who use the bus network to get to and from school
- Other impacts around access to leisure facilities/after school clubs especially in evenings and at weekends
- Any increase in fares will prove to be a barrier

Mitigation for children and young people

- A small percentage of children may be able to walk, cycle (taking advantage of improvements like Cycle Woking and Bikeability cycle training for school children) or use other public bus services to get to school
- See if there is any opportunity to expand/adapt upon the Mole Valley Free Access Scheme which gives free travel to activities for looked after children
- Specific mobile services for children and young people e.g. Children's Centre, Playbus, IBus, Big Bus and the Caterham Youth Bus, and

ensuring we maximise their use

- Providing better transport information on the Surrey website and installing free internet access “Kiosks” in 21 Children’s Centres across the county, helping to disseminate that information and promote use of public transport

Possible impacts on Black and Minority Ethnic communities

People from Black and Minority Ethnic communities, including Gypsy and Traveller communities, were not very well represented in the consultation feedback. Therefore it would be difficult to gauge the impact on them.

Mitigation for Black and Minority Ethnic communities

- Include Gypsy or Traveller in the equalities monitoring in line with new legislation
- Seek members of the Black and Minority Ethnic Forum to contribute to the further Phases of the review. As a member of the External Equalities Group their input was sort when completing this EIA.
- If there is the possibility of setting up a Bus Users Forum make sure that black and minority ethnic people are represented

Possible impacts on people on low incomes, the unemployed and in areas of social deprivation

Many vulnerable people e.g. people on benefits (older people, those with disabilities, some families, job seekers) may also come under this category.

Having access to a car as an alternative means of transport would mean those people did not have to rely on the public bus network. In the consultants report produced for Surrey County Council in early 2009, it is stated that the overall numbers of households in Surrey without access to a car, not ownership, is below the national average.

However, when they looked at the levels of access to a car at the smallest level of census data (Census Output Areas) they found that 13 areas in Surrey have over 60% of households with no access to a car. Conversely car ownership in areas identified as being of multiple need might be high. Sheerwater has levels of car ownership at over 90%. Therefore, access to employment in Surrey cannot be solely a transport issue.

Other impacts might be

- Any increase in fares may prove a barrier
- More difficult journey or no public bus to get to Job Centre Plus, job interviews or work

Mitigation for people on low incomes, the unemployed and in areas of social deprivation

- Localism and co-location of services such as community centres, Job Centre Plus, Citizens Advice Bureau, Town Council offices

- As part of the Accessibility Project MOSAIC mapping of communities has been done. This gives us the opportunity to identify groups with higher needs including people on low incomes or unemployed and specifically target services for them
- Improvement of bus information through publicity and changes to the Surrey website. This is linked with the promotion of both the Contact Centre and free internet in libraries
- There has been a commitment to, wherever possible, protect routes passing through identified areas of social deprivation. This was one of the aims of the review as it is likely that these routes would serve a number of vulnerable groups such as those mentioned previously. The four areas identified as being areas of multiple need, Stanwell, Maybury and Sheerwater, Westborough and Merstham, all have some provision
- There is the Government 'Travel to Interview Scheme' organised through Job Centre Plus. This scheme allows job seekers to claim back costs of travelling to interviews within certain criteria

Impacts on geographically isolated areas

Some areas in Surrey, such as parts of Waverley, Mole Valley and Tandridge, are geographically isolated. This is defined by having to walk 12 minutes or more to a bus stop. These areas may already have an infrequent bus service. If these are removed or reduced it may result in an area of population having no access to major towns by public transport.

In the proposed bus routes for Phase 1 some places may no longer have any service. With no alternative bus service to replace the loss, this would isolate people living in those areas.

The groups mentioned above will feel the effects of no or reduced provision if living in a geographically isolated area more significantly, as will those who have no access to a car. This may exacerbate the impacts already mentioned.

Mitigation for geographically isolated areas

- Identification of isolated areas has been done and the areas mapped under the Accessibility Project. This helps services in their planning of provision
- Localism and co-location of services will help
- Increase the role of the Transport Coordination Centre
- Targeting of or increase in mobile services
 - Any increase will likely require increased revenue that may not be available
- SEEDA projects of which SCC are obvious and active participants
 - The Rural Access to Service Programme (RASP). This promotes the co-location of services, the regeneration of current services that may need modernisation and the communication of services available in the local area. Surrey Community Action are looking to start projects within the Surrey Hills AONB

- The Small Rural Towns Programme. This was launched in 2004 with a budget of £7 million. Part of this was to set up the South East Rural Towns Partnership. Surrey has 13 members of this region wide group. Of those 13 Cranleigh, Leatherhead and Dorking have received direct funding for projects (details of the specific projects the money was spent on was not available)

Other means of reducing/mitigating impacts:

Communication and engagement

- Enhancing the travel website with more and easier access to information on community transport, more on-line promotion of the bus network and availability of concessionary fares
 - In the 2009 National Highways and Transport (NHT) Network survey Surrey County Council came 3rd out of 24 on 'The availability of information to help plan journeys in advance' and 7th on 'The ease of finding public transport information'
- Proposed creation of a Bus Users Forum. This was mentioned in consultation and could comprise of disability groups, representatives from the Black and Minority Ethnic Forum and 50+ network, bus providers, officers, Surrey Police etc to address concerns and see if there may be any other strategies or ideas to be put forward.
 - However, it is unclear where new resource could be found to organise and run this forum
- When looking at fares and how fares may be a barrier to some people using the network it should be pointed out that fares are set by the operator and not by Surrey County Council. Also some cash fares in Surrey are cheaper than the flat rate cash fare for using a Transport for London bus and that any Surrey style Oyster Card scheme would not be likely to result in a reduction of fares. This is because of the much greater level of investment London receives in comparison to Surrey for public transport.

Where there are positive impacts, what changes have been or will be made, who are the beneficiaries and how have they benefited?

Moving away from the crude criteria based method of reducing subsidy to a more holistic process of network redesign will hopefully bring rewards. This is a more forward thinking way of reviewing the network in an attempt to make it 'future proof.' Officers have been working closely with bus operators to try to make the countywide bus network more commercial and therefore viable. The result of this could mean that the impacts mentioned in this EIA would be lessened or not experienced in some areas.

The potential of the new bus network

- Increased frequency along some main corridors
- The shortening of some routes may improve punctuality. This is because longer routes are more prone to delays. However, it would mean that people may need to change to reach a previously direct destination
- Some timetable adjustments may mean that, despite a reduction in frequency, the number of services to and from specific destinations will be unchanged. Two bus routes, that follow part of the same route, can offer a more frequent service by evenly spacing departure times over the course of an hour or two hours

Recommendations

Please summarise the main recommendations arising from the assessment. If it is impossible to diminish negative impacts to an acceptable or even lawful level the recommendation should be that the proposal or the relevant part of it should not proceed.

Due to the complex nature of the impacts of reduced service and the scale of the impacts will not being measurable until well after the review has been concluded and new services running. It is also very difficult to measure the non-monetary value of the network. Members of the public might walk, drive or cycle instead of using the local buses but they may value the presence of a bus service. However, this may be measurable from the results of the next NHT survey and the results of the quarterly Joint Neighbourhood Survey.

Whilst it is not desirable to inconvenience people in their transport habits, such as by them requiring them to change buses to reach a previously direct destination, this action is not discriminatory when alternative provision is available to protect the most vulnerable people in the community. Due to how dispersed people, and therefore vulnerable people, are around the county it would be disproportionate for Surrey County Council to protect all possible vulnerable bus users from any detrimental impact as a result of reduced bus provision. However, whether statutory or discretionary, carried out by Surrey County Council, Districts or Boroughs or a partner organisation the commitment to protect provision that supports the most vulnerable will always continue.

Long-term projects such as Localism and the Sustainable Communities Strategy may have a mitigating affect but this may not be felt for some time. Also, some forms of mitigation such as increased mobile services, home

based care, free or subsidised travel for looked after children etc may be under similar financial pressure as the bus network or require an increase in, or joint, funding to make sure they have any mitigating affect. This funding may not be available at present or for some time.

However, there are some recommendations that can be put forward.

- Include Gypsy and Traveller as a ethnic group on the equalities monitoring form for Phase 2 of the Bus Review
- Investigate the prospect of setting up a Bus Users Forum. Is there available resource (including funding and officer capacity) to make such a forum workable? What would such a forum do better or differently to the current Passenger Transport Forums and other contact that officers have with stakeholders regarding the network and the External Equalities Group regarding equalities issues
- The expanded role of the Transport Coordination Centre will help those entitled to free travel with more a efficient service and also people who are not entitled by advising on alternative transport to suit their needs
- Checking performance and customer satisfaction with the bus network by examining the results of next years NHT Network survey. This will provide a benchmark for satisfaction going into Phase 2 and any changes in satisfaction after the phases on a District and Borough level. This can also be used to benchmark against the other Local Authorities signed up to the NHT Network
- Continued improvements to public transport information on the Surrey website, building on the good work found in the results of the NHT survey 2009 whilst continuing the availability of hardcopy information
- More accurate recording of and the separation of concessionary pass use. Anecdotal evidence suggests that both these groups are underrepresented in bus usage data
 - With regard to this issue Surrey County Council has been working hard with bus operators on this. Some are already changing their ticket machines to include a SmartCard reader. Therefore there will be accurate statistics of usage data on those routes. Ongoing installation and expansion of SmartCard readers will be expensive for operators or Surrey County Council. Therefore it may take some time before it is County-wide but work on this will continue
 - Carry out the survey of disability concessionary pass holders and use the results to inform the process of network redesign. Also use the data to get a better understanding of how pass holders are making use of the English Nation Concessionary Travel Scheme
- Surrey County Council needs to make its current policy on the availability of information in other formats and languages better known. It needs to be made clear that information in other formats (e.g. Braille or audio) or other languages is available on request. This comes after feedback from the Disability Empowerment Boards.

Action Plan – actions needed to implement the EIA recommendations

Issue	Action	Expected outcome	Who	Deadline for action
Recording of BME groups in equalities monitoring for the Bus Review	Include Gypsy and Traveller as a distinct group	Better understanding of usage by people from this often under represented group	PTG	Phase 2 Autumn 2010
The visually impaired being able to access the review information	Phase 2 proposals must be available in Braille and audio formats on request	Better access to the information for people with disabilities	PTG/ Communications Team	Between now and the Phase 2 consultation (Autumn 2010) make the policy clearer to the public and specifically to disability groups
Non/inaccurate recording of concessionary fares	Working with operators to separate out recording of users with a disability and those using the over 60s free pass.	Greater accuracy in the recording of bus patronage data	PTG and bus operators	Negotiating currently. Timescale is likely to be a number of years before all ticket machines are Smart Card enabled
Non/inaccurate recording of concessionary fares	Write to all disability concessionary pass holders with a self survey of their bus usage	Will provide valuable information about network usage and can go toward the consultation for Phases 2 & 3 and may affect the Phase 1 area post Cabinet	PTG with Travel Concessionary Authorities	June or July 2010

		depending on the results		
Importance of transport provision to people from equalities groups	Liase with E&D colleagues into the prospect and relevance of including a transport aspect in the E&D procedure review	View from different services when writing EIA of any affect on the transport of equalities groups	E&D Managers and DEG members	
Investigate merit and any possible source of funding for a Bus Users Forum.	Small scale preliminary correspondence with officers and stakeholders (External Equalities Advisory Group etc) to see if this is workable	Find whether a group on this issue is better than current Passenger Transport Forums or stakeholder processes	PTG	End of Phase 3 Sept 2012

- Actions should have SMART Targets
- Actions should be reported to the Directorate Equality Group (DEG) and incorporated into the Equality and Diversity Action Plan, Service Plans and/or personal objectives of key staff.

Review date	
Person responsible for review	
Head of Service signed off	
Date completed	
Date forwarded to EIA coordinator for publishing	

- **Signed off electronic version to be kept in your team for review**
- **Electronic copy to be forwarded to your service EIA coordinator**