

## Minutes

HaskoningDHV UK Ltd.  
Mobility & Infrastructure

Present: David Taylor (DT) – Independent Consultant (Chair)

Emma Odabas (EO), Lee Quincey (LQ) – Leicestershire County Council

Clare Waldron (CW), Matthew Tough (MT) - ITP

Adam Hemingway (AH) - Vectare

David Brookes (DB) - Centrebus

Nicola Tidy (NT) – Nottingham City Transport

Patrick Stringer (PS) – Stagecoach Midlands

Ross Hitchcock (RH) – Kinchbus

Toby France (TF) - Arriva

Bijel Mistry (BM) – Leicester City Council

Liz Hopwell (LH) – Charnwood Borough Council

Apologies: David Atkinson – Harborough District Council

From: Matthew Tough

Date: 14 March 2024

Location: MS Teams

Copy: 0001

Our reference: TP1147-RHD-XX-XX-MI-X-0001

Classification: Project related

Enclosures: N/A

**Subject: Leicestershire EP Board Meeting**

---

Number	Details	Action
1	<p><b>Minutes of previous Board and Forum meetings (DT)</b></p> <p>EP Board meeting</p> <p>MT shared the minutes of the previous meeting. LH pointed out that it is Charnwood Borough not District Council. After this, they were accepted as an accurate record. DT summarised that most actions were completed shortly after the previous meeting.</p>	

Number	Details	Action
--------	---------	--------

LQ informed the meeting that LCC anticipate a ZEBRA2 funding bid outcome announcement from the DfT ,shortly.

DT suggested that the way the EP Board, EP Forum and Public Transport User Group (PTUG) meeting minutes are circulated for comments and approved should be streamlined. He proposed that they are published on the to be developed Enhanced Partnership website once agreed as a true record. They may have to be partially redacted should they contain sensitive information.

There were no objections to the proposal of publishing minutes on the EP website two weeks after the meetings have taken place. LQ suggested publishing minutes from now onward rather than all previous meetings. NT suggested we could publish all previous meetings as there haven't been that many. LQ stated he was comfortable with that approach, providing there was a consensus.

Action: Share complete set of minutes of all previous Board, Forum and PTUG meetings with LCC  
 LCC to publish all minutes on the EP website.

ITP  
 LCC

**2. Wider funding update (LQ)**

LQ reminded the meeting of the BSIP Plus funding that has been awarded - the two tranches of £1.79 million plus £4.05 million from Network North. The spending approach will be based on the cabinet report and revised Passenger Transport Policy and Strategy (see links below):

- Cabinet Report [Improving Passenger Transport Cabinet 191223 FINAL.pdf \(leics.gov.uk\)](#)
- Passenger Transport Policy [E&T Passenger Transport Policy \(leics.gov.uk\)](#)
- Passenger Transport Strategy [Appendix B Passenger Transport Strategy.pdf \(leics.gov.uk\)](#)

LQ advised that a DfT visit had taken place which was positive for LCC, and a network review is going to be undertaken by ITP with support from EO's team. There are also various initiatives underway, including the Easter youth fares scheme and the branding work for the Enhanced Partnership.

Number	Details	Action
3.	<b>BSIP refresh / update on feasibility studies &amp; other elements for potential inclusion in EP Scheme document (LQ)</b>  LQ indicated that the BSIP refresh may require an extension beyond the June deadline, and that LCC is liaising with DfT to see if this is a possibility. The intention is to undertake a robust refresh of the document and, considering the political approvals required, an extension may be needed to deliver this.	
4.	<b>EP Scheme variation vote (DT)</b>  DT stated that this is the first board meeting that has taken place since Arriva's proposed variation to the scheme. TF summarised that a survey of all bus stops on the B4114 (Narborough Road South) corridor had taken place. Arriva is the main operator on the corridor although Centrebus also has services that traverse it. The proposal is for an extension to the number of bus stops included on the corridor to include identified stops on the Enderby loop, Narborough and South Wigston. It is proposed that paragraph 4.3.1 is revised from "in Year 1" to "by March 2024" and that 4.3.2 is revised to read "Following completion of the bus stop audit a detailed programme of works will be compiled to deliver the infrastructure upgrades as appropriate by March 2025."  The scheme amendment proposed would also specify that vehicles operating on the corridor should be zero emission. TF proposed that paragraph 5.2 is appended to read "Local Qualifying Bus Services operating as registered services along the B4114 and A5199/B582/B5366 corridors with a daytime frequency of every 20 minutes or greater will be operated by Zero Emission Vehicles where reasonably practicable."  Should LCC's ZEBRA2 bid be successful, it gives a basis to provide bus stop improvements along the corridor.  BM pointed out that the City Council and County Council had already agreed to Leicester buses branding being applied within the 'Flexi' area, and some of the stops in the proposed corridor are in their plans. TF responded that there is no plan to alter anything already in the works within the area close to the Leicester city border. The aim is to update all stops on the corridor in line with the ones which had already received	

Number	Details	Action
	<p>improvement. If a totem could be fitted at all stops in the future it would be a good outcome for customers.</p> <p>DB suggested there wasn't much point in limiting the scheme to electric vehicles. TF responded that this was something in truth all operators were already doing, effectively in exchange for LCC providing improvements to the infrastructure. DB suggested the scheme should refer to at least Euro VI standard.</p> <p>It was agreed that Point 5.2 be amended to "by at least Euro VI vehicles as standard".</p> <p>The variation passed unanimously with the amended text.</p> <p>Action: EP Scheme document to be updated at the same time as the BSIP refresh to reflect the amendments to the scheme</p>	<p>LCC</p>
5.	<p><b>Update on youth fares scheme (CW)</b></p> <p>CW shared the proposed content for the pilot to be posted on the Choose How You Move website. The scheme is for free travel for children/young people during the Easter Holidays, between the 23<sup>rd</sup> March and 7<sup>th</sup> April 2024. The definition of young people is each operator's prevailing child / young person's fare age. The scheme will mirror the ENCTS time periods (9:30 – 23:00 Monday to Friday and all-day weekends and bank holidays) and place the onus on users to bring ID' to prove eligibility if challenged. The scheme includes journeys that start in Leicestershire, with select returns being included and on bus tickets only. The operators participating in the scheme are Arriva, Kinchbus, Centrebus, First, Diamond Bus East Midlands, Nottingham City Transport and Stagecoach.</p> <p>EO stated that all details and marketing materials will be shared with operators imminently and LCC will contact schools and colleges, to provide at least a weeks' notice.</p> <p>NT and DB requested details of how operators claim for the free travel. EO responded there will be an email sent round in the next few days confirming reimbursement. She recalled in the task and finish group meeting it was agreed that the reimbursement will be based on actuals. Operators will have to send a claim for the actual lost revenue the following month. She requested operators contact her if they have any further questions.</p>	

Number	Details	Action
--------	---------	--------

EO indicated that the idea is to look wider at summer promotions and whether operators had any good experiences from schemes that have taken place in other areas. She suggested schemes targeting families may be a good idea. RH queried whilst the adult £2 fare scheme is in place, we should look at targeted promotions.

DT stated the summer period would be busier than the Easter and that anything new could be added based upon what is learnt from the Easter scheme. EO understood that the county boundary issue is likely to be a source of confusion for drivers/passengers, and there is a recognition of what errors will take place. Any problems or issues of bad behaviour that take place in the first few days of the scheme should be notified to LCC.

**6. Update on branding working group (DT)**

DT summarised that the group has established what we don't want from the branding, and that now we need to look at what we do want, and how the branding will look, including logo, name and colours. DT said he had brought some proposed designs just as ideas to demonstrate the partnership. He shared the slides from the previous branding meeting, detailing proposed ideas, including names, logos and colour schemes. At the second working group, LCC's communication and design teams were present, and felt a simpler design without the Leicestershire map was a better way of conveying the bus partnership.

DT moved on to say it has been agreed to use a new section of the Choose How You Move website for posting all information relating to the EP. All operators will be able to provide links to any EP information/documents.

DB suggested using the word 'bus' rather than 'transport' in the branding. DT agreed.

The words Leicestershire and Buses don't necessarily need to be included in the logo, but could be in a tagline for the brand.

CW reiterated DT's point about using the word 'bus' rather than transport. She acknowledged we don't have to include the partnership as part of the brand, as the real point is what message we want to convey about the network via the branding.

Number	Details	Action
--------	---------	--------

DT queried what we really want from the branding as this was something that hadn't really been established. NT agreed the importance of including buses, and a map may be a good graphic. She felt the brand should complement the Leicester buses brand as the public do not care about the boundary and if they find the Leicester logo recognisable then it would make sense to adopt it for Leicestershire as well.

EO agreed with CW's point as to whether we are creating a brand for the county replicating Leicester City or are we trying to showcase what has been achieved by the Partnership; which if we are, then we must include the partnership in the brand. This could either be through the name, image, or strapline.

TF felt the idea of Leicestershire buses should be carried forward, and the word Partnership could be appended on it when ready and use the names interchangeably rather than branding every activity as the Partnership. He felt 'Leicestershire buses' would be better than Leicestershire Bus 'something'.

RH asked where we expect the brand to go, and how it complements existing operator branding. DT stated that the brand would be used on things like infrastructure, network maps, multi-operator tickets and promotions. It would not be used on buses themselves.

7. **Operator issues and feedback (All operators)**

DT introduced this as a new agenda item for future Board meetings. The meetings so far have been dominated by the Council providing updates and asking questions, this item gives a chance for operators to raise points with LCC.

8. **AOB (DT)**

a. **Bus driver apprenticeship scheme**

EO asked whether any operators are finding the scheme of use. She felt driver recruitment was not as much of a problem as this time last year, but wanted to know if operators had any issues they wanted to raise. She mentioned the need to get younger people into the workforce as otherwise there could be many people retiring at the same time. DB felt apprenticeships schemes had proven quite difficult as it was time consuming and dropout rates were high, so it was rare that a significant number of people actually came through via these schemes.

Number	Details	Action
--------	---------	--------

DT stated the issue of age and competition for work had led to there being few people to take on by the time they are actually able to gain a license and get a job. RH acknowledged that people can get a license to drive a bus at 18, but are just limited about what they can do.

DB recalled that Derbyshire CC used to do a scheme which covered the training cost for drivers. He acknowledged this was only a sporadic scheme, but suggested this is helpful for operators, as recruitment is a headache for operators, as it can be a 2–3-month process just to get people into the training bus. A lot of the customer service elements reflect who you want to attract. He suggested in South Yorkshire there are some people being trained for free outside of other work, rather than training full time on a trainer’s salary.

**b. Midlands Connect smart ticketing project**

Looking at offering local authorities support in implementing this feature so that customers can make a journey across city boundaries all on one ticket. EO felt it was aimed at the East Midlands area, breaking down barriers between different operators and authorities.

TF asked about the data requested by the Midlands Connect team, as all operators have received a proforma to fill in which includes how many buses each company operates. He felt that having one organisation requesting data rather than doing it by authority would be more helpful because it may lead to double counting,

BM suggested that overcounting is not taking place as the proforma is only asking for the number of vehicles operating within authority boundaries.

TF responded that the 200 buses that operate with tap on tap off in Leicestershire are the same as the ones in Warwickshire - if he mentions it twice this could be counted as 200 different vehicles in each authority area.

**c. Summary of DfT Visit**

Number	Details	Action
	<p>EO said the DfT had a very positive visit at the end of February, where LCC summarised its plans for the network review, and travelled on the FoxConnect service highlighting what they are aiming to do, and plans for initiatives such as hubs and DDRT. Feedback received suggested DfT are very supportive as they are looking to push LCC towards promoting and marketing of existing services. DfT are very keen to visit again in the autumn to observe progress in implementing phase 1 of the network review.</p>	
<p>d.</p>	<p><b>EP Governance</b></p> <p>DT stated that the AGM is due to take place in May 2024, so the process of electing/re-electing board members as well as the chair needs to take place soon. It will follow the same process as last year. which is likely to commence in mid-April.</p> <p>Last year the appointments were decided online prior to the AGM. CW suggested it was easier to do this again this year, with the forms being sent to operators and district / borough councils to nominate themselves or anyone they think should serve on the EP Board.</p> <p>Action: ITP to update and circulate the EP Chair and Board member nomination forms to all Forum members in mid-April.</p>	<p>ITP</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p><b>DoNMs (DT)</b></p> <p>AGM/ Forum 10<sup>th</sup> May 13:30 – 15:00</p> <p>EP Board 20<sup>th</sup> June 10:00 – 11:30</p>	