

## **Bus Reform Task Force Mayoral Meeting: Decision, Message & Action Log**

DATE: 7 July 2	020	TIME: <b>10:30-11:30</b>	LOCATION: online	
ATTENDEES:	James Palmer (JP)		CPCA Mayor (Chair)	
	Ashton Cull (AC)		Senior Policy Advisor, CPCA	
	Mike Bartram (MB)		Policy Advisor, Transport Focus	
	Richard Wood (RW)		Secretary, Cambridge Area Bus Users Group	
	Darren Shirley (DS)		CEO, Campaign for Better Transport	
	Cllr Josh Schumann (JS)		East Cambridgeshire District Council	
	Cllr Lis Every (LE)		East Cambridgeshire District Council	
	Cllr Anna Bradnam (AB)		South Cambridgeshire District Council	
	Cllr Chris Seaton (CS)		Fenland District Council	
	Cllr Steve Allen (SA)		Peterborough City Council	
	Paul Raynes (PR)		Director of Strategy and Delivery, CPCA	
	Tim Bellamy (TB)		Transport Strategy and Policy Manager, CPCA	
	Rowland Potter (RP)		Head of Transport, CPCA	
	Oliver Howarth (OH)		Bus Strategy Manager, CPCA	
	Susannah McIntyre (SM)		Communications Advisor, CPCA	
APOLOGIES:	Wendy Otter (WO)		Fenland District Council	
	Cllr lan Bates (IB)		Cambridgeshire County Council	
	Dawn Badminton–Capps (DB-C)		Director for England, Bus Users	
	Professor David Begg (DB)		Transport Consultant	
	Edward L	eigh.	Smarter Cambridge	
	Peter Ha	rdy (PH)	Consultant, ITP	
	Emily Martin		Head of Communications, CPCA	

#	Item	Decision, Message, Action	Owner	Deadline
1.	AB considered that the split between who is and who isn't using public transport is a reflection of the white-collar job roles that can be carried out whilst working from home. The benefits obtained whilst working from home may influence passenger ridership so that numbers do not return to previous levels.	Message		
2.	RW suggested that a reform of the fares is required, similar to the rail industry. JP expressed concern that restructuring fares would have an unsustainable impact on operator running costs. However, he agreed that reform is needed; with a view to moving passengers around the region in a more innovative way and by embracing new technologies. We need to consider all challenges that lie ahead.	Message		
3.	LE asked to see comparable passenger statistics for the rural areas, and anticipated that patronage numbers may not have decreased to the same extent as city levels.	Action	ОН	1 August
4.	DS noted that the National Bus Strategy will now be published in 2021.  He further recommended that we review the impact of messaging in other countries, and noted that UK government communications have left the public afraid of using public services. Additional funding is required from Government. Meanwhile, we need to consider:  1. What does connectivity look like for the network, and 2. What funding do we need to enable us to support that connectivity	Message		
5.	The group discussed whether a local media campaign would be useful, to encourage passengers back. It was felt that whilst a localised response would be beneficial, we need to find the right balance between acknowledging increased flexible home working and enabling workers to congregate physically. Ultimately ensuring the bus companies do not go bust.	Message		
6.	It was agreed that the Mayor's office will organise a campaign, including a visual of Mayor Palmer on a bus. Any local support on social media channels is welcome. SM agreed to coordinate comms for the group.	Action	SM	9 Sept
7.	AB pointed out that the duration of the public consultation has reduced, and that it is being held over Christmas. She further reported that she has received complaints that online consultation documents are difficult to navigate and queried if paper versions of the bus consultation will be provided. Mayor Palmer noted that online public consultations are reaching far greater numbers than the physical consultations, and that this format would be replicated again and would benefit from responders being available over Christmas to	Message		



	browse the documents. He advised that door-to-door posting is too			
	expensive.			
	MB noted that he can bring some expertise from the Consultation			
	Institute. He queried whether we are assessing a base case scenario	Message		
8.	and OH confirmed that we are. DS felt that timescales for a franchising			
	option appear tight, and further recommended caution regarding the			
	approach to consultation.			
	RW asked whether we are assessing models pre-COVID19, or, whether			
9.	whatever model is selected it will be resilient and robust enough to Mess			
	deal with the issues at hand. OLIVER – what is the response here?			
	AB recommended that we analyse how other key European countries			
10.	have responded to these decisions, and whether we can learn anything	Action	ОН	2
10.	here or from other Authorities. OH agreed that countries such as the		011	•
	Netherlands can offer extensive learning in this respect.			
	RW raised an issue with developments in Cambridge. RW felt that early			
11.	intervention by the Mayor could help facilitate correctly timed road			
' ' '	calming measures to enable public transport to utilise a direct route			
	through the development.			

NEXT MEETING				
DATE: Wednesday 9	TIME: <b>1000-1100</b>	LOCATION: TBC		
September				