

Question	Answer
Did you use the EIA Screening Tool? (Delete as applicable)	Yes (please attach upon submission) / No

1. Explaining the matter being assessed

Question	Answer
What policy, function or service change are you assessing?	Bus service provision, prioritisation for investment and the expansion of Digital Demand Responsive Transport (DDRT).

Why does this EIA need to be completed?

The bus industry facing extremely difficult operating conditions. Costs have increased significantly, passenger numbers are still not back to those before the pandemic and Government recovery funding is going to end in March 2023. This means that the money the county council has to pay for local bus services will not pay for the same services in future as it does currently.

In a letter, it was made clear that the Department for Transport expects to see Local Transport Authorities work with bus operators to “build a financially sustainable bus network.”

At the same time, we are also expected, as part of our BSIP, that we will grow patronage, reduce journey times, improve bus punctuality and improve customer satisfaction.

Following further guidance from the Department for Transport (DfT) on the network review, we undertook an extensive piece of work with the bus operators to understand their operating costs and cost pressures on a route by route basis. This resulted in a number of routes where the operators were asking for additional funding to keep routes running as they do currently. Changes to 24 routes were proposed for change by:

1. Reducing the frequency, hours or days of operation; and/or
2. The potential to withdraw the service.

This work led to the public consultation that was held from November 2022 to January 2023.

One of the most important things that supports bus services is investing in bus priority. Examples of this are bus lanes, bus gates or changing traffic signals to prioritise buses. This can make bus services be more reliable and have faster journey times. These make buses a better option for people to use. To do this can also mean that it makes journeys slower for cars.

Investment in bus priority also has investment in accessibility and information improvements both of which encourage bus use.

The final aspect of the consultation was expanding Digital Demand Responsive Transport (DDRT). Where services may be removed as a result of the cost pressure on the service and reduced passenger numbers, the route may be replaced by a DDRT offer.

Question	Answer
	<p>DDRT is not a timetabled bus service and people have to book in advance using a mobile phone app or by phoning the provider or a call centre. Because of this, some people may not see it as a viable alternative for a timetabled bus. It does offer greater flexibility and hours of operation than some of the infrequent services in Surrey.</p> <p>The consultation asked for views on all three aspects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Investment in bus infrastructure – bus priority, bus stops, real time information etc; 2. The proposed changes to bus services; and 3. A potential expansion of Digital Demand Responsive Transport <p>Not part of the consultation but being assessed is introducing a 20s and Under Half Fare Scheme. This would provide half price bus travel for Surrey residents aged between five and 20. This would be a smart card issued. The renewal process and when it will be necessary for people to renew their pass is still being determined.</p> <p>Should this be agreed, it will be available to all Surrey residents based on age.</p>
<p>Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?</p>	<p>Anyone who uses the bus routes listed in the consultation where proposals are to change or withdraw a route.</p> <p>Any bus use, or potential bus user, in areas where it is suggested to target investment.</p> <p>People aged five to 20, should a half price fare scheme be introduced.</p>
<p>How does your service proposal support the outcomes in the Community Vision for Surrey 2030?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Children and young people are safe and feel safe and confident. ▪ Everyone benefits from education, skills and employment opportunities that help them succeed in life. ▪ Everyone lives healthy, active and fulfilling lives, and makes good choices about their wellbeing. ▪ Residents live in clean, safe and green communities, where people and organisations embrace their environmental responsibilities. ▪ Journeys across the county are easier, more predictable and safer. ▪ Everyone has a place they can call home, with appropriate housing for all. ▪ Businesses in Surrey thrive. ▪ Well-connected communities, with effective infrastructure, that grow sustainably.

Question	Answer										
<p>Are there any specific geographies in Surrey where this will make an impact?</p> <p>(Delete the ones that don't apply)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County-wide <p>However, it is likely that priority areas and routes will need to be identified for targeting available funding that will boost bus use most quickly.</p> <p>These locations will most likely be key towns or routes between towns.</p> <p>There may be a negative impact on more rural services as well as services in some smaller towns and villages where services may be reduced or withdrawn</p> <p>More rural areas of Surrey are the focus of new Digital Demand Responsive Transport. These areas are likely to have low frequency bus services and would benefit from Demand Responsive Transport (DRT).</p>										
<p>Briefly list what evidence you have gathered on the impact of your proposals</p>	<p>Consultation feedback, from both residents and stakeholders.</p> <p>Passenger numbers show that the number of trips on the services where changes are proposed might impact less than one per cent of all bus trips in Surrey.</p> <p>Feedback from all the Disability Empowerment Networks, the Surrey Vision Action Group and ATLAS Surrey.</p> <p>Concessionary pass holder numbers. Because of how this data is collected we are not able to separate out older people from disabled pass holders. Overall, concessionary bus pass use is lower than pre-pandemic levels and not going back as quickly as other passengers.</p> <p>Current total concessionary pass holder numbers are, as of December 2022:</p> <table data-bbox="555 1487 1278 1675"> <tr> <td>Disabled +C</td> <td>2,323</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senior +C</td> <td>383</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senior</td> <td>148,946</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disabled</td> <td>4,776</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>156,428</td> </tr> </table> <p>A desk based report looking at the areas affected by the consultation and the Indices of Multiple Deprivation.</p>	Disabled +C	2,323	Senior +C	383	Senior	148,946	Disabled	4,776	Total	156,428
Disabled +C	2,323										
Senior +C	383										
Senior	148,946										
Disabled	4,776										
Total	156,428										

15

2. Service Users / Residents

There are ten protected characteristics to consider in your proposal. These are:

1. Age including younger and older people
2. Disability
3. Gender reassignment
4. Pregnancy and maternity
5. Race including ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality
6. Religion or belief including lack of belief
7. Sex
8. Sexual orientation
9. Marriage/civil partnerships
10. Carers protected by association

Though not included in the Equality Act 2010, Surrey County Council recognises that socio-economic disadvantage is a significant contributor to inequality across the County and therefore regards this as an additional factor.

Therefore, if relevant, you will need to include information on this. Please **refer to the EIA guidance** if you are unclear as to what this is.

All Equalities groups will be impacted by some or all of proposals that may be implemented

Question	Answer
<p>What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?</p>	<p>The feedback from the consultation response, including demographic information to help assess impacts on people with protected characteristics.</p> <p>Responses from stakeholders that highlight issues people with protected characteristic would face.</p> <p>We have patronage data from the bus operators on use of the services covered by the consultation. This does not separate people out by protected characteristic outside of where we know someone has used a concessionary pass or the bus is a school service. This would then tell us that older and or disabled concessionary pass holders and school children are using the services. This data showed that the journeys made on the services under review and described in the consultation, which are counted as single trips, are less than 1 per cent of all bus journeys made in Surrey.</p> <p>We hold information related to age and disability because of having information on concessionary bus pass holders. We also have information children who use school services and holders of the Student Fare Card that allows for discounted travel for people in full time education.</p> <p>We hold a significant amount of information from historic bus and transport consultations that cover other protected characteristics and other information related to bus use and barriers to use. The main barriers being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reliability. Will the bus arrive and get me where I want when I need it to? - Affordability. Is bus travel a viable transport option compared to driving, the train or other transport? And - Accessibility. Can I use a bus stop and a bus with my mobility needs? Can I get information in a format and way that is usable for me? <p>The Future Bus Network Review Consultation Feedback Analysis shows that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - about 45 per cent of respondents said they had a Concessionary Bus Pass. With around five per cent of them having a Disabled Person's Bus Pass - over 85 per cent of respondents are from a White ethnic background. 6 per cent preferred not to state their ethnicity. Around two per cent of respondents stated they are of Asian ethnicity. This was similar to those stating they are from a mixed ethnic background - the majority of respondents were female. With just over 50 per cent of respondents saying they are female and just under 40 per cent stating they are male. Nearly 90 per cent stated this was the same

Question	Answer
	<p>gender as they were at birth with half of one per cent stating they are a different sex to that at birth and seven per cent preferring not to say.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nearly 59 per cent of respondents said they did not have a disability or long-term illness. The summary breaks down the options for the nearly 40 per cent of respondents for did state they have a disability or long-term illness. - Nearly 47 per cent of respondents were over 65. Less than four per cent were under 18. Fewer than ten per cent were under 34. - Just under 25 per cent of respondents said they were a carer for someone due to illness or disability. Just under 65 per cent said they had no caring responsibility. <p>A desk-based report was produced that looked at parts of Surrey impacted by the proposals for bus service changes. This report identified seven areas near or where changes are proposed that are also identified as Key Neighbourhoods. This is based on these areas score on the Indices of Multiple Deprivation.</p> <p>These areas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hooley, Merstham and Netherne, • Stoke (Guildford), • Tattenham Court and Preston, • Court (Epsom and Ewell), • Redhill West and Wray Common, • Horley Central and South and • Ash Wharf <p>For this Impact Assessment, this report and the consultation summary were compared to try to link numbers of respondents to the consultation and if they may be from one of these areas. This proved difficult to link because of the size of some post code areas and the respective size of these wards. For example, the post codes for Hooley and Merstham are CR5 and RH1. There were 156 respondents to the consultation who gave these posts. However, these also cover some large areas such as Redhill so makes it difficult to relate responses to the consultation as people from these seven areas.</p> <p>In most instances, the proposals are to reduce evening and weekend services rather than withdraw all services. The report also highlights that in some of the identified areas may have access to alternative bus services because of how close they may be to other routes. However, this is not the true in all areas.</p>

Question	Answer
<p>Impacts (Delete as applicable)</p>	<p>Positive – Investment in bus priority will help support bus services operate effectively and support those people who currently use them. It is also hoped to encourage new bus users. This investment will benefit people with any protected characteristic. However, this investment will need to be targeted in areas and on routes where it is felt that passenger growth is most likely. Positive improvements will not be seen countywide.</p> <p>Positive - Some residents may see a DDRT scheme is a better option than a scheduled bus because of the door to door service and more flexible operating hours. For example, the Mole Valley Connect Service operates from 7 am. to 7 pm. Monday to Saturday. If a similar service were introduced in areas where there is a timetabled service, for example, two days a week, people may see this as a better offer.</p> <p>Positive – A half price fare scheme for Surrey Residents aged five to 20 would help with the cost of transport being a barrier to regular bus use. This would also help people in that age range who are eligible for a Disabled Person's Concessionary Bus Pass as it would give them half price travel before 9.30 am. after which they can travel for free with their Disabled Person's Bus Pass.</p> <p>Negative – Some proposals for routes suggest evening and Sunday services be withdrawn. This will impact people who want to make leisure or shopping trips or those work in hospitality. If a current of new Demand Responsive Transport offer does not work in the evening or on Sundays, this will leave people without a public transport option at those times.</p> <p>Some proposals suggest withdrawing a route completely. If that happens, people will be left without a public transport option or they will need to use Demand Responsive Transport, which they may have never used before.</p> <p>Replacing a bus service with a DDRT scheme may be seen as being more difficult to use opposed to a scheduled bus service. Particularly if concessionary bus passes are not accepted on these services. Also, where people with learning difficulties who have had Travel Training to use the bus will be unfamiliar with having to book a minibus to make the same journey. This would restrict their ability to travel.</p> <p>As well as this, should a group of people want to make a similar journey at a similar time as they do currently on the timetabled service, they may find that there is not the same availability on a DRT service.</p>

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
What impacts have you identified?	What are you basing this on?	Actions to mitigate or enhance impacts	Due date	<i>Who is responsible for this?</i>
Bus priority improvement	Improved journey times and reliability. Providing better information to travellers. Investment in new buses.	Advertising availability of a scheme	This is an ongoing programme of work with spending in each financial year.	The Strategic Transport Group at Surrey County Council and the Enhanced Partnership Board
Service reductions or removals	Bus patronage and cost	Expansion of and advertising of DDRT. Further engagement with operators who as making assessments on the affordability of services using information updated on travel and the wider financial position for the bus industry. This may mean that some of the proposals in the consultation may not need to happen.	Subject to Cabinet decision	Strategic Transport Group at Surrey County Council
Expansion of DDRT (Positive and Negative)	Positive feedback to the MV Connect service. Replacement of scheduled bus service may be a barrier to people using this type of service	Advertising availability of each DRT scheme	Subject to Cabinet decision	Strategic Transport Group at Surrey County Council

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
A half fare scheme for people aged five to 20	Reducing fares is an aim of the National Bus Strategy and the Surrey Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) as cost is often quoted as a barrier to travel	Advertising availability of a scheme	Subject to agreement by the Enhanced Partnership Board & Cabinet	The Strategic Transport Group at Surrey County Council and the Enhanced Partnership Board

Question	Answer
<p>What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents?</p> <p>Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of</p>	<p>The Government have recently announced the National Disability Strategy. A large part of that strategy is focused on transport. The previous version of the BSIP and the revised version have elements in them to support disabled bus users and potential bus users. These are mainly focused on physical accessibility but also included training, ease of information availability before and during journeys, amongst others.</p> <p>Being 'greener' and looking to get greener buses on our roads will help with air quality and the county council's aspiration to be carbon neutral by 2030 and as a county by 2050.</p> <p>The National Bus Strategy (Bus Back Better), puts a responsibility on Local Transport Authorities to grow bus patronage. This needs to be reported on twice a year to the Department for Transport and includes improvements to journey times, reliability and customer satisfaction, as well as overall passenger numbers. This means that we need to look at investment that will support improving those targets. As a result, this means the spend on buses may be reallocated. This will positively impact some and negatively other bus uses, depending on where investment is made.</p>

Question	Answer
<p>Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why</p>	<p>Feedback from the consultation, from both the public and stakeholders, is that negative impacts will mainly be based on Age and Disability. Where services are school services, these will affect younger people, their parents and / or carers who will need to find alternative transport. There may also be an issue for people with learning difficulties and / or autism who have received, or are receiving, Travel Training or rely on routines to support their independent living. Changes to bus services and / or requiring people to use alternative transport may create problems for those people in their travel requirements.</p> <p>Where services are daytime, weekend or evening services, are proposed to be reduced, these will affect anyone with a protected characteristic who uses the routes covered in the consultation.</p>

You will need to copy and paste these boxes for each of the protected characteristics likely to be impacted.

3. Staff

All staff who use buses will have the same impacts as those covered in the equalities section above

Question	Answer
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	As per section 2
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	Positive & Negative.

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
What impacts have you identified?	What are you basing this on?	Actions to mitigate or enhance impacts	Due date	Who is responsible for this?

Question	Answer
What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of	If so, please detail your awareness of whether this will exacerbate impacts for those with protected characteristics and the mitigating actions that will be taken to limit the cumulative impacts of these changes.

Question	Answer
Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why	Same as Section 2.

You will need to copy and paste these boxes for each of the protected characteristics likely to be impacted

4. Amendments to the proposals

CHANGE	REASON FOR CHANGE
What changes have you made as a result of this EIA?	Why have these changes been made?
Exploration of changing Travel Training arrangements with Children Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture (CFLLC) to support Demand Responsive Transport us as well as bus services	Some people may be able to change their travel with proper support. This will need to be developed over the spring and summer so any person who may benefit from this type of training ready for any changes starting in September 2023.

5. Recommendation

Based your assessment, please indicate which course of action you are recommending to decision makers. You should explain your recommendation below.

Outcome Number	Description	Tick
Outcome One	No major change to the policy/service/function required. This EIA has not identified any potential for discrimination or negative impact, and all opportunities to promote equality have been undertaken	
Outcome Two	Adjust the policy/service/function to remove barriers identified by the EIA or better advance equality. Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers you identified?	
Outcome Three	Continue the policy/service/function despite potential for negative impact or missed opportunities to advance equality identified. You will need to make sure the EIA clearly sets out the justifications for continuing with it. You need to consider whether there are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient plans to stop or minimise the negative impact • Mitigating actions for any remaining negative impacts plans to monitor the actual impact. 	✓
Outcome Four	Stop and rethink the policy when the EIA shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination (For guidance on what is unlawful discrimination, refer to the Equality and Human Rights Commission's guidance and Codes of Practice on the Equality Act concerning employment, goods and services and equal pay).	

Question	Answer
<p>Confirmation and explanation of recommended outcome</p>	<p>Recommended Outcome Three.</p> <p>Following the consultation, there is support for investment in buses to help grow passenger numbers and provide a better service for current bus users. However, it is not possible to fund improvements on a countywide basis.</p> <p>With many people being neutral toward expanding DDRT, there may be more work that needs to be done with people at a more local level to communicate what the service is, how it works and how it is different from a public timetabled bus route. However, as there were many suggestions for other areas to have DDRT scheme included, there seems to be a desire to have this form of transport in Surrey.</p> <p>Consideration is given to amending routes or ensuring there is some alternative provision, such as other buses in the area or Community Transport, rather than full withdrawal of bus services.</p> <p>There will be negatives impacts for some residents, some of which cannot be fully mitigated, or the mitigation may not be suitable for every current bus user. However, the pressure on costs of bus services, that there will be some form of alternative transport offer, that most services are being reduced rather than completely withdrawn and that the number of bus users affected is less than one per cent of all Surrey bus trips, it is suggested that it is reasonable to progress with recommendations.</p>

15

6a. Version control

Version Number	Purpose/Change	Author	Date
0.2	Update following consultation close	Keith McKain	02/02/2023
0.3	Update following document review	Keith McKain	09/02/2023
0.4	Updated following Head of Service review	Keith McKain	20/02/2023

The above provides historical data about each update made to the Equality Impact Assessment. Please do include the name of the author, date and notes about changes made – so that you are able to refer back to what changes have been made throughout this iterative process. For further information, please see the EIA Guidance document on version control.

15

6b. Approval

Approved by*	Date approved
Head of Service	Lucy Monie
Executive Director	Katie Stewart
Cabinet Member	Matt Furniss
Directorate Equality Group	N/A

EIA Author	Keith McKain
-------------------	--------------

*Secure approval from the appropriate level of management based on nature of issue and scale of change being assessed.

6c. EIA Team

Name	Job Title	Organisation	Team Role
Keith McKain	Programme Manager, National Bus Strategy	SCC	Author

If you would like this information in large print, Braille, on CD or in another language please contact us on:

Tel: 03456 009 009
Textphone (via Text Relay): 18001 03456 009 009
SMS: 07860 053 465
Email: contactcentre@surreycc.gov.uk