

THE YORK ENHANCED PARTNERSHIP FOR BUSES



Meeting Title	The York Enhanced Partnership for Buses Forum	
Date / Time	Monday 28 th November 2022, 2.00 pm (Finish 4:00 pm)	
Location	City of York Council, West Offices, York	
Attendees	Andrew McGuinness (AMG)	Confederation Passenger Transport (Forum Chair)
	Cllr Andy D'Agorne (AD)	CYC (Exec Member for Transport / Green Party Group)
	Cllr Stephen Fenton (SF)	CYC (Lib Dem Group)
	Cllr Pete Kilbane (PK)	CYC (Labour Group)
	Louise Collins (LC)	Transport Focus
	Graham Collett (GC)	York Bus Forum
	Martin Higginson (MH)	York Civic Trust
	Mike Longhurst (ML)	Dodsworth Area Residents Association
	Andrew Mortimer (AM)	Badger Hill Residents Community Group
	George Wood (GW)	York Older Peoples Assembly
	Dave Merrett (DM)	York & District Trades Union Council
	Helen Jones (HJ)	York Disability Forum
	Sam Fryers (SFR)	City of York Council (CYC)
	Lucas Hindle (LH)	City of York Council (CYC)
Apologies	Cllr Rachel Melly	
Circulation	Attendees	
Minutes By	Lucas Hindle	
Item	Discussion	Action
1.0	<u>Introductions and Apologies</u>	
2.0	<u>Housekeeping</u>	
2.1	Emergency evacuation routes stated	
3.0	<u>Membership of the Forum and EP Governance</u>	
3.1	AMG sets out the forum membership rules and suggests BID, Visit York, and a stakeholder group from the health sector are missing. SF suggests a stakeholder group from Education, and Parish Council groups are missing. ADG suggests the Youth council are missing. DM states he is in discussions with the Environment Forum, who will inform him if they are interested in participating in the forum.	
4.0	<u>Terms of Reference and Objectives</u>	
4.1	AMG introduces how EP was formed, speaking of Bus Service improvement Plan. States the challenges involved with levelling up within the North itself. SFR introduces Enhanced Bus Partnership and states £4m of funding is to be spent by March. SFR reads to members the 10 high level objectives of the EP Partnership and shows organisation chart. States minutes of the meeting are public.	

THE YORK ENHANCED PARTNERSHIP FOR BUSES



4.2	DM asks how EP forum is to operate. AMG states it is a strategic group. SFR states passenger liaison group exists for more specific, local bus issues.	
4.3	AM suggests having a member on the forum who isn't a typical bus passenger. AMG to discuss this away from the meeting. LC states not to select a committed non-bus user, as it would be more helpful to have someone who may use the bus services. ADG suggests half of subgroup could feed into the EP forum, as the operational delivery group will be more concerned with high level issues. AMG states it is important to avoid unnecessary bureaucracy but make sure all groups work together.	ACTION: AMG to consider/discuss inviting relevant stakeholder representative to future forum
4.4	ADG questions how it works with the managing director of each operational group in determining where the £4m funding is spent. How does the governance work here, and how is transparency achieved? SFR responds that the DfT have stated the governance of the EP is very detailed and appropriate.	
5.0	<u>Opportunity for any registered members of the public to address the forum</u>	
	MH states York Civic Trust are an independent group. They have an informal/formal relationship with CYC in setting out EP Forum.	
6.0	<u>Bus Industry Update</u>	
6.1	<p>AMG gives industry update. States bus patronage approx. 70-95% of pre-COVID levels. Exceptions to this are areas of high tourism, although this does not necessarily include York. Concessionary patronage approx. 60-70%. Older people are making less discretionary journeys. Significant cost pressures exist in the industry, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Driver shortages • Increase in cost of materials (e.g., Aluminium up 44%) • Industrial relation challenges <p>Some of these exist because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brexit • Sector competition • Individuals reviewing their choice of lifestyle (e.g., drivers) <p>AMG states that driver shortages have historically been an issue, however it is currently more pronounced.</p>	
6.2	SFR gives York specific update. York doing relatively well given tourist nature. Park and Ride at 85% pre-COVID levels. Concessionary levels are at 65% pre-Covid. Some commercial deregistration's (e.g., 412 and 13 Saturday service – CYC is working on tenders for these). Driver availability issues, however, data hints that rate of drivers leaving is lower now than this time last year.	
6.3	GW states York Older Peoples Assembly (YOPA) and York Bus Forum (YBF) emailed members a brief questionnaire regarding bus use. Happy to circulate the results from the survey.	ACTION: GW to circulate results of YOPA/YBF survey

THE YORK ENHANCED PARTNERSHIP FOR BUSES



6.4	LC states that Transport Focus also did a survey, and happy to circulate. LC to circulate.	ACTION: LC to circulate results of Transport Focus survey
6.5	AMG asks members if operators are not as aware of effects of COVID on passengers' attitude to travelling as they perhaps should be. DM echoes COVID issues are a big factor for not travelling. Also states current bus unreliability (late/not turning up) will deter potential bus users.	
6.6	GW states that at a YOPA meeting, an issue regarding no information leaflets (about the Park and Ride) was raised. Having information leaflets will encourage bus use. AM suggested introduction of a magazine may be a way of providing information. ADG says he has assurance from First buses they have £25'000 to spend on the promotion of Park and Ride, to be spent by Christmas.	
6.7	ML says No. 12 hourly service is not frequent enough and deters people from using the service.	
6.8	SF states he would like to know why services are being cut despite bus operators turning profits. It would be helpful to understand why services are being cut and get this information directly from the operators – for example have someone from one of the operators at the EP forum. AMG asks SFR if this is possible. SFR says governance will allow this. Members agree this is a good idea. AMG states that to his knowledge, none of the bus operators are turning large profits, and if any money is being made it is small margins.	ACTION: AMG to encourage operator representative to attend future forum
6.0a	<u>Use of Available Data</u>	
6.1a	PK states that the feedback he has got from members of the public is that the electronic information boards (at bus stops) are completely inaccurate. SFR states that the information is completely decentralised with operators feeding information to the Yorkshire-wide-system. CYC are not involved with day-to-day data provision or processing. Aware of some of the shortfalls and believes the boards are improving (following a recent update of the technology). GC says that when the buses are late, the time on the board disappears, which is confusing. GW/TM agree inaccuracies are across all operators and are not specific to one (for example). SFR says he will feedback to put it in colour.	ACTION: SFR to feedback request to colourise display boards at bus stops
6.2a	PK raises issue of buses not appearing on the app, despite being there in real time (or vice versa).	

THE YORK ENHANCED PARTNERSHIP FOR BUSES



6.3a	<p>SF suggests data he would like to have access to: Punctuality, and which routes show buses consistently late. Short notice cancellations. AMG suggests driver shortage data. GC asks about passenger numbers (on each route). ADG would like to know how driver shortages are resolved, and which services are cut when drivers are short. AM agrees – would be useful to understand how companies cut services when short of drivers. Data that members agree on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passenger data by route • Passenger data trends • Concessionary Travel <p>Data to be circulated from bus open data system.</p>	<p>ACTION: SFr/AMG to discuss with ODG members at next meeting.</p>
6.4a	<p>Members agree that a mission statement is to be finalised at the next forum. Some terminology that is suggested includes ‘Overview, Scrutiny, Representation, Advocates’.</p>	<p>ACTION: All members to agree upon mission statement at next forum</p>
6.5a	<p>LC asks what the groups opportunity between meetings is to affect the EP funding and where it is spent. SFR suggests where £4m is to be spent. GW questions how members will get the most out of the forum meetings, and how knowledge is gathered from operational delivery group in real time. SF would like to be able to see if recommendations (from the forum) are accepted or not. AMG suggests a ‘Teams’ meeting with the forum after the board meeting to discuss their minutes (see 8.1 below).</p>	
7.0	<u>Operational Delivery Group Update</u>	
7.1	<p>SFR states that major projects within York (including York Station Gateway Scheme, York Central, York Outer Ring Road Dualling) will inevitably cause disruption to bus travel. SFR says colleagues are working hard to mitigate this disruption. DM states he has objected to the YORR scheme, as traffic will increase on the arterial roads which will ultimately have a negative impact on bus travel in and out of York. Asks if the bus operators have considered the impact of the YORR scheme on bus industry? AMG confirms he will check. PK states his concern that Lendal Bridge works will contribute to the disruption. DM asks for major works to be a point of discussion at the next EP forum.</p>	<p>ACTION: AMG to check if operators have considered impact of YORR Dualling scheme on the bus industry</p> <p>ACTION: All members to discuss major infrastructure works at next forum</p>
7.2	<p>AMG discusses how BRG is distributed. AMG to check how DfT prioritise BRG.</p>	<p>ACTION: AMG to check how DfT prioritise BRG</p>
8.0	<u>Future Meeting Dates, Times and Locations</u>	

THE YORK ENHANCED PARTNERSHIP FOR BUSES



8.1	<p>AMG asks about the preference of future meetings. Forum members collectively decide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main meeting to take place before the Operational Delivery Group Board. In-person, with a hybrid meeting room to allow members to join online. 2-4pm on Mondays is a relatively good time for future meetings. • follow-up meeting after the operational delivery group board is to take place as a Microsoft Teams meeting. Expected to last less than 1 hour. Late afternoon suggested. <p>LH agrees to organise meetings (above) in next 2 weeks to maximise availability of forum members.</p>	<p>ACTION: LH to organise next forum meeting and follow-up meeting</p>
9.0	<p>AOB</p>	
9.1	<p>AMG stated he was the interim chair, and the forum members had the right to vote for another chair in line with EP forum governance. Members agreed that the chair position is to be reviewed at the end of the year.</p>	<p>ACTION: All members to review/vote upon chair position at the next forum</p>
9.2	<p>GW stated it would be helpful to get an update on the bus route between the Park and Ride and the Hospital. GC has a meeting with York Hospital representative in near future.</p>	<p>ACTION: SFR to update on bus route between P+R and York Hospital</p>
9.3	<p>GC raises point that First buses provide no printed timetables. AMG to contact First and provide update.</p>	<p>ACTION: AMG to contact First buses and provide update on printed timetables</p>
9.4	<p>DM requested update on £2 fare cap</p>	<p>ACTION: SFR to provide update on £2 fare cap</p>
9.5	<p>AMG thanked the attendees and closed the meeting at 4:05pm.</p>	