

# Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00087 (Version 1)

## SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

<b>Service &amp; Division:</b>	Development Services Design, Roads & Transport	<b>Lead Officer Name:</b>	Chris Cox
		<b>Team:</b>	Transport Planning
		<b>Tel:</b>	01324 504723
		<b>Email:</b>	christopher.cox@falkirk.gov.uk
<b>Proposal:</b>	Reduction of bus subsidies (1)	<b>Reference No:</b>	DV11

<b>What is the Proposal?</b>	<b>Budget &amp; Other Financial Decision</b>	<b>Policy (New or Change)</b>	<b>HR Policy &amp; Practice</b>	<b>Change to Service Delivery / Service Design</b>
	Yes	No	No	Yes
<b>Who does the Proposal affect?</b>	<b>Service Users</b>	<b>Members of the Public</b>	<b>Employees</b>	<b>Job Applicants</b>
	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
<b>Other, please specify:</b>				

### Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):

18/01/2019	This option would reduce the expenditure on subsidised bus services in 2019/20 (please also refer to 12/DV2). The savings would be delivered by the transfer of Local School Bus Services to Children's Services (saving £146,000 in a full financial year) and a reduction of £206,000 (full financial year) on local bus service contracts, which would involve reducing service frequencies and/or days of operation. Depending on the overall saving required from 11/DV2 and 12/DV2 this may also include complete withdrawal of some/all contracted bus services.

**SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION**

For budget changes ONLY please include information below:			Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:	1293	
Reduction to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:	352	
Increase to this service budget (£'000s)	Per Annum:		
If this is a change to a charge or concession please complete.	Current Annual Income Total:		
	Expected Annual Income Total:		
If this is a budget decision, when will the saving be achieved?	Start Date:	31/03/2019	
	End Date (if any):	31/03/2020	

**SECTION THREE: EVIDENCE**

Please include any evidence or relevant information that has influenced the decisions contained in this EPIA. (This could include demographic profiles; audits; research; health needs assessments; national guidance or legislative requirements and how this relates to the protected characteristic groups.)

**A - Quantitative Evidence**

This is evidence which is numerical and should include the number people who use the service and the number of people from the protected characteristic groups who might be affected by changes to the service.

Public consultation was carried out in January 2017.

Questionnaires were distributed at the bus station, Newmarket Street and NHS Forth Valley. They were distributed to members of the public travelling on subsidised bus routes only.

From the bus ticket machine data, 815,000 journeys were made per annum on subsidised bus services, 61% of people using subsidised bus routes use concessionary passes and are therefore either elderly (over 60) or disabled.

In the 2011 Census, 17.6% of households in the Falkirk Council area did not have a car or van and 39.5% of households have access to one motor vehicle, suggesting that for those households, where more than one person is required to travel, there is the possibility that the other person/people residing at the same address have to travel by another mode.

**B - Qualitative Evidence**

This is data which describes the effect or impact of a change on a group of people, e.g. some information provided as part of performance reporting.

**Social - case studies; personal / group feedback / other****Best Judgement:**

Has best judgement been used in place of data/research/evidence?

No

Who provided the best judgement and what was this based on?

What gaps in data / information were identified?

Is further research necessary?

No

**If NO, please state why.**

Public consultation was carried out in January 2017 to members of the public travelling on subsidised bus routes.

**SECTION FOUR: ENGAGEMENT**

Engagement with individuals or organisations affected by the policy or proposal must take place

Has the proposal / policy / project been subject to engagement or consultation with service users taking into account their protected characteristics and socio-economic status?	Yes	
If YES, please state who was engagement with.	Bus users	
If NO engagement has been conducted, please state why.		
<b>How was the engagement carried out?</b>	<b>What were the results from the engagement? Please list...</b>	
Focus Group	No	
Survey	Yes	See section 3
Display / Exhibitions	No	
User Panels	No	
Public Event	No	
Other: please specify		
Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed / changed as a result of the engagement?	No	
Have the results of the engagement been fed back to the consultees?	No	
Is further engagement recommended?	No	

## SECTION FIVE: ASSESSING THE IMPACT

**Equality Protected Characteristics:** What will the impact of implementing this proposal be on people who share characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 or are likely to be affected by the proposal / policy / project? This section allows you to consider other impacts, e.g. poverty, health inequalities, community justice, public protection etc.

Protected Characteristic	Neutral Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.
Age			✓	From analysis of ticket machine data, 61% of bus users use a concessionary pass so are either over 60 or have a disability.
Disability			✓	By reducing or removing bus services, this may have an impact in terms of people with disabilities maintaining their independence and may increase their dependence on other services such as Social Work or NHS.  From analysis of ticket machine data, 61% of bus users use a concessionary pass so are either over 60 or have a disability.
Sex				
Ethnicity				
Religion / Belief / non-Belief				
Sexual Orientation				
Transgender				
Pregnancy / Maternity				
Marriage / Civil Partnership				
Poverty			✓	Passengers may have to use other, higher cost, modes of public transport, for example taxis
Other, health, community justice, public protection etc.				
<b>Risk (Identify other risks associated with this change)</b>	High – approximately 815,000 journeys are made on subsidised bus services every year, with 61% of passengers holding either an over 60s or disabled concessionary pass.			

**Public Sector Equality Duty: Scottish Public Authorities must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance quality of opportunity and foster good relations. Scottish specific duties include:**

	<b>Evidence of Due Regard</b>
<b>Eliminate Unlawful Discrimination (harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct):</b>	We are meeting our statutory requirements.
<b>Advance Equality of Opportunity:</b>	
<b>Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):</b>	

**SECTION SIX: PARTNERS / OTHER STAKEHOLDERS**

Which sectors are likely to have an interest in or be affected by the proposal / policy / project?		Describe the interest / affect.
<b>Business</b>	Yes	This may affect employees that use subsidised bus services to access work. It may also have an effect on the bus service provider in terms of reduced numbers of people purchasing from it.
<b>Councils</b>	Yes	This may affect employees that use subsidised bus services to access work.
<b>Education Sector</b>	Yes	A reduced service may impact on transport options for school children who do not have a distance entitlement card.
<b>Fire</b>	No	
<b>NHS</b>	Yes	This may affect employees that use subsidised bus services to access work. It may also have an effect on patients attending appointments.
<b>Integration Joint Board</b>	No	
<b>Police</b>	No	
<b>Third Sector</b>	Yes	If there is a reduced number of supported bus networks, there may be a greater demand for services from the third sector.
<b>Other(s): please list and describe the nature of the relationship / impact.</b>		



## SECTION SEVEN: ACTION PLANNING

**Mitigating Actions:** If you have identified impacts on protected characteristic groups in Section 5 please summarise these in the table below detailing the actions you are taking to mitigate or support this impact. If you are not taking any action to support or mitigate the impact you should complete the No Mitigating Actions section below instead.

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes
Withdrawal of subsidised bus services	Passengers	Raise awareness of alternatives, i.e. commercial bus services, rail services, walking and cycling	Chris Cox	31/03/2020	Local Transport Strategy

### No Mitigating Actions

Please explain why you do not need to take any action to mitigate or support the impact of your proposals.

<b>Are actions being reported to Members?</b>	Yes
<b>If yes when and how ?</b>	At budget meeting in February 2019

**SECTION EIGHT: ASSESSMENT OUTCOME**

Only one of following statements best matches your assessment of this proposal / policy / project. Please select one and provide your reasons.

No major change required	No	
The proposal has to be adjusted to reduce impact on protected characteristic groups	No	
Continue with the proposal but it is not possible to remove all the risk to protected characteristic groups	Yes	Work will be undertaken to identify proposals and adjustments will be made to minimise impact.
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No	

**SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF**

Lead Officer:

Signature:	<i>Chris Cox</i>	Date:	18/01/2019
------------	------------------	-------	------------

**SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY**

<b>OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF EPIA:</b>	Has the EPIA demonstrated the use of data, appropriate engagement, identified mitigating actions as well as ownership and appropriate review of actions to confidently demonstrate compliance with the general and public sector equality duties?	Yes
------------------------------------	---	-----

<b>ASSESSMENT FINDINGS</b>	Good evidence provided on usage and impact.	
<b>If YES, use this box to highlight evidence in support of the assessment of the EPIA</b>		
<b>If NO, use this box to highlight actions needed to improve the EPIA</b>		

<b>Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing <u>without making changes been made</u>?</b>	Yes	If YES, please describe: There is an adverse impact on age and disability. Those clients do have alternative transport arrangements such as taxi cards etc.
---	-----	--

**LEVEL OF IMPACT: The EPIA Task Group has agreed the following level of impact on the protected characteristic groups highlighted within the EPIA**

LEVEL		COMMENTS
HIGH	Yes / No	
MEDIUM	Yes / No	
LOW	Yes	

**SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF**

<b>Director / Head of Service:</b>			
<b>Signature:</b>	<i>Rhona Geisler</i>	<b>Date:</b>	01/02/2019