

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

CABINET

DATE: 13 July 2010

REPORT OF: CLLR IAN LAKE, CABINET MEMBER FOR
TRANSPORT



LEAD OFFICER: IAIN REEVE, HEAD OF TRANSPORT FOR SURREY

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF LOCAL BUS PROVISION: SCHOOL SPECIAL SERVICES

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

1. Following the Bus Review report to Cabinet on 2 March 2010, Cabinet is asked to decide in principle which 'School Special' bus services should be supported from September 2011 onwards. This report summarises feedback from the recent consultation and engagement, and sets out options for Cabinet in terms of:
 - Applying criteria of cost and usage to the current list of services
 - Proposed increases in fares on School Special services that would continue to be provided
2. On this basis, annual revenue savings, taking into account all relevant factors, could range from about **£525,000** to **£827,000** per year.

DETAILS:

Background

3. Home to school transport comprises several different forms of bus provision. This report relates simply to School Special services. These services are 'open' public bus services subsidised by the County Council, which are designed around the needs and session times of particular schools. 'Closed' coaches where pupils are allocated a seat in advance are **not** currently being reviewed.
4. On any given day, the County Council subsidises 56 School Special routes which transport 2,829 students to around 40 of the county's schools or colleges. Very few primary schools are served by these services.
5. Of these students, **2,152** are not 'entitled' to any form of free transport. The remaining 677 students are 'entitled' to free school transport and will continue to be transported to school by the most economic means should any services be withdrawn.
6. In most schools/colleges served by School Special services the number of non-entitled pupils on School Specials represent between 3% and 8% of the total school population.

7. School Special Services can be very expensive to support as many of them use buses for which there is no economic use during the middle of the day. The current (2009/10) overall costs are:

Total annual cost of School Specials	£2,110,555
Schools & Learning support for entitled pupils	£441,384
Subsidy from Transport for Surrey for non-entitled pupils	£1,669,171

8. However if all the School Special services were withdrawn, the net saving would be less than £1.67m, as new provision would have to be made for entitled pupils. The final net saving could be:

Cost of re-provision for entitled pupils if all School Specials were withdrawn	£615,315
Net saving if all School Specials were withdrawn	£1,053,856

9. Consultation on proposals to review School Special services was included in the main consultation for the Bus Review Phase One areas of Elmbridge, Reigate and Banstead, Runnymede, Spelthorne and Woking which ran between November 2009 and January 2010.
10. These proposals generated widespread opposition, and over 1,300 responses were received. Views received during this period were summarised in the Cabinet report of 2 March, paragraphs 36 to 41 and Annexe D.
11. Cabinet agreed that a decision on the future of all School Special services should be deferred until after its decisions of 2 June on the main bus network. This additional time would allow for officers to consult with schools served by the services in the remaining Phases.
12. The Cabinet Member had already announced that there would be no withdrawal of any School Special services until September 2011 at the earliest. Cabinet also agreed that any changes to School Specials should be made for all areas of the County together from September 2011.

E&I Business Plan

13. As reported on 2 June, the Environment & Infrastructure Business Plan sets out targets to support the County Council budget approved on 9 February. This shows cumulative savings on bus subsidy in all its forms of:

£1.6m	for	2010/11
£3.1m	for	2011/12
£4.1m	for	2012/13

£5.0m for 2013/14

14. The build-up to these savings was shown in Annexe E of the 2 June report, which included a notional figure for savings on support to School Specials of approx **£800,000** pa by 2013/14. This is therefore the target for the options described in paragraph 44.

Consultation

15. For the new consultation on all School Specials, the project team decided that a new approach was needed, to avoid repetition for Phase One schools and to understand better how far parents and schools might accept alternatives. **Annexe A** shows the project plan adopted for consultation and engagement.
16. The project team worked with a contact group of secondary school Headteachers nominated by the Secondary Schools Phase Council. This group also included one FE College Principal. While reserving the right to object to the proposal, the group gave useful advice on the handling of engagement.
17. Consultation was launched at a meeting of 25 Headteachers held on 22 April, and featured:
 - Letters and surveys sent to parents via the secondary schools. Surveys aimed to establish parents' attitudes to home to school travel
 - Four externally-run focus groups of parents
 - Four open meetings in schools for parents and Councillors, held on an Area basis
 - Support to schools in preparing business cases for their own bus services, provided by the Safer Smarter Travel team

Consultation Responses

18. Nearly 800 consultation responses were received from schools and the public. These, along with the October to January consultation responses, demonstrate the level of interest in this issue. The responses are summarised in:
 - **Annexe B** – Surveys of parents' views
 - **Annexe C** – Views from focus groups
 - **Annexe D** – Views from open Area meetings
 - **Annexe E** – Views from schools and major stakeholders

Using various consultation techniques enabled the project to compare and validate the responses.

19. As with the feedback for the 2 March report the views expressed opposition to reducing the number of School Special services. However, the question was asked from various sources, both schools and the public, as to why Surrey County Council provides services to schools out of the County.
20. As would be expected, the reasons respondents gave in surveys, focus groups, and open meetings for opposing the proposals were very similar to those expressed in the previous consultation. These are:

- Means of getting to school other than driving are not viable;
 - Environmental impact due to increased traffic leading to a rise in congestion and CO₂ emissions;
 - Contradicts both Government and SCC policies on carbon reduction, sustainable transport and parental choice;
 - The admissions system and school closures have made the situation worse by forcing children to travel as there is a lack of places at local schools;
 - There is a wider impact on families not just the children using the services;
 - Parents made their choice of school based on the School Special provision and this was done in good faith.
21. The written responses from a number of schools, the Secondary Heads' Phase Council, and Surrey MPs are summarised in **Annexe E**. Their comments, like those of parents and carers, echo those expressed in the previous consultation. The main objections are as follows:
- **Impact on students:** attendance, safety of alternative walking or cycling routes, removes the ability to travel independently, practicality of alternative transport (longer journeys with interchanges).
 - **Impact on the school:** longer term affect on the pattern of school admissions.
 - **Impact on parents/carers:** financial impact of increased cost of alternative transport or increase in fares, implications around pupil attendance, inability to accompany or drive children to school due to other commitments, impact on parental choice.
 - **Environmental Impact:** congestion around schools, Eco-schools, 10:10 commitments
 - **Issues for Surrey County Council:** primary schools not engaged directly in consultation, consultation insufficient in length and scope, shows short term savings without considering possible longer term expenditure, questioning the patronage figures and the procurement of the services.
22. As stated in the 2 March report and in the Equalities Impact Assessment (**Annexe H**), if any service is withdrawn, all 'entitled' children using the service will continue to receive free home to school transport. The re-provision cost for entitled children has been factored into all the business cases.
23. Both the surveys and focus groups (**Annexes B and C**) asked parents how much more they might be prepared to pay for transport, and if they would pay termly in advance. Both were likely to figure in any funding solution for School Specials. The main conclusions were:
- Most parents currently pay between £1 and £2 return per child per day, in cash on the bus. In fact the County average is **£1-63** return per child per day.
 - Hardly any have any form of season ticket

- Survey respondents showed some willingness to pay higher fares – see **Annexe B**
- Focus group participants were less ready to pay more – see **Annexe C**
- Advance payment was accepted to a limited extent

School run coach services

24. One option for the future of School Special services presented to schools is for services to be set up as a school-run coach service. At the 22 April Headteacher meeting, attendees heard a presentation by a school already running their own service.
25. Officer time and support was offered to explore this option with schools, including liaison with bus and coach operators. To transfer the route in this way the service would have to be a 'closed' coach service, administered by the school and carrying only registered students. Schools would be able to agree prices locally and review routes. Where relevant, the County Council has offered to purchase 'entitled' seats at the ticket rate in force at the time.
26. There have been a few discussions with schools on this option. However, as yet there are no firm expressions of interest. The offer of officer support and guidance to fully explore the options remains and it is likely that discussions will continue in the next few months.

Implications for Admissions and School Places

27. School admissions is a central issue for schools, parents, and the County Council. Pupil numbers are rising in Surrey at the moment, and the County Council is engaged in a significant expansion of primary places, which is likely to be followed by a similar demand in secondary schools from about 2014. There is a risk that changes to School Special bus services could alter patterns of parental preferences and admissions, and so increase pressure for capital investment in new classrooms and facilities.
28. A small project led by Environment & Infrastructure with the Schools & Learning Admissions and Transport team assessed which schools might suffer an admissions impact if their School Specials were withdrawn. A summary of conclusions is shown in **Annexe F**.
29. The report divided schools receiving School Special services into four categories, where withdrawal of the services:
 - (a) Would have no significant impact on school numbers
 - (b) Would be unlikely to have an impact
 - (c) Could have an impact
 - (d) Would be likely to have an impact
30. Schools in category (d) were those where:
 - The percentage of non-entitled pupils who currently arrive by School Special is 6% or over of the total number on roll, and
 - The number of first-choice applications is close to or lower than the Published Admissions Number (PAN)

31. Eight schools were identified in group (d), and their services have been given the highest priority in the criteria for assessing which services should be continued or withdrawn:
1. St Andrews Catholic Secondary School, Leatherhead
 2. Woolmer Hill School, Haslemere
 3. Collingwood College, Camberley
 4. Therfield School, Leatherhead
 5. Bishop Wand Cof E School, Sunbury
 6. Matthew Arnold School, Staines
 7. The Priory CofE School, Dorking
 8. Thamesmead School, Shepperton
32. This approach gives higher priority to children making long journeys to schools which are not well-subscribed. It makes good sense at a time when capital resources are limited and demand for secondary school places is likely to increase. From parents' point of view, however, it supports children who travel to less popular schools, but not to the most popular schools. This may well be contentious.
33. There are also significant risks from other groups. If some children stop applying to more distant schools they may concentrate applications on nearer schools, which will increase appeals and could displace some children who currently obtain places at these schools. This will lead to some growth in 'entitlement' for children unable to obtain their school of choice.
34. There is also a risk that parents who are at present happy to pay a modest bus fare will now pursue claims to entitlement. The County Council should make some allowance for this category of growth. Cabinet should also be aware that some schools in categories (b) and (c) may be affected by these changes, even if most are not. It is proposed that the impact, if any, on the 2011 admissions round should be reviewed in spring 2011.
35. At the time of writing, schools are being invited to apply for 'academy' status. It is not clear how many may apply, nor what framework of regulation will operate. In the current circumstances it is unlikely that the County Council will make new discretionary school transport arrangements for either academies or other schools.

Approach

36. In the light of the consultation responses, formulating options for the future of the School Special services has been guided by the following considerations. That:
- Services are highly valued by schools and parents
 - Alternative modes of travel, such as walking and cycling, are not seen as credible, especially for longer journeys
 - Significant numbers of parents would drive their children to school, but are reluctant to do so, on personal or environmental grounds
 - Parents accept that fares may have to rise to some extent, but there is no consensus about what is 'reasonable'
 - Most schools themselves are reluctant to take on running services

- There is a widely held view that services to out of County schools should not be funded
 - Services are very different, and the issues vary from case to case
37. Equally the savings described in paragraph 14. still have to be achieved. The project therefore decided to:
- Assess services on a case by case basis
 - Develop and apply criteria to offer realistic options
 - Plan for fare increases as part of an implementation package
38. Looking ahead to implementation in 2011, **new costings** for all the School Special services have been prepared on the basis of the new tender prices received during May 2010, as reported in the 2 June Cabinet report. Most are actual tender prices, but some are estimated.
39. All services were then assessed on the basis of criteria, taking into account two key factors:
- The cost of re-providing transport for entitled children where services are withdrawn. Costs would be deducted from the contract savings made by Transport for Surrey, and vired across to School & Learning.
 - Reductions in patronage caused by fare increases. Standard ratios of 'elasticity of demand' prepared by the Transport Research Laboratory have been applied in order to estimate future fares income.

Options

40. The table in paragraph 44 shows a range of options by applying various criteria, at two possible levels of new cash fare: £2-50 or £3-00 return per child per day. These figures assume that:
- From Sept 2011 the County Council would retain fares on all School Special services. All services would charge a single flat fare
 - The number of fare-paying children would be as predicted by the 'elasticity' formula
 - Where a School Special is withdrawn, all its entitled children would be transported by appropriate means
 - Services may be run as either public buses or advance-payment coaches. This does not affect the basic costings
41. Under 'elasticity' new fare levels would show a likely drop in bus patronage of:
- | | | | |
|--------------|-------|------------|---------------|
| £2-50 | loses | 21% | of passengers |
| £3-00 | loses | 34% | of passengers |
- For interest, a fare level of **£3-50** per day would lose **46%** of passengers
42. To apply criteria, School Special services been grouped into grouped into the following categories, as shown in **Annexe G**.
- A** Services which carry over 50% of entitled children – **10** routes. These would be in future be run as 'closed' coaches for entitled children, with spare seats

sold to other parents as at present. Any costs incurred in this transfer are within normal allowance for reprovision.

- B** Services to schools located outside the County – **3** routes
- C** Uneconomic services with a subsidy cost per child per day of £15 or more – **4** routes
- D** Services that would need a net subsidy (allowing for fares income) of £30,000 pa or more – **8** routes
- E** Services that would need subsidy of £20,000 to £30,000 pa – **6** routes
- F** Services that would need subsidy of £10,000 to £20,000 pa – **7** routes
- G** Services that would need less than £10,000 pa subsidy – **1** route
- H** Services to schools with identified ‘admissions’ impact – **17** routes

43. Criteria could be applied at a variety of fare levels, but for realistic options it is clear that:

- A fare level over £3-00 per day would be unacceptable to the public, and would cause severe loss of passengers
- The change in category **A** is good housekeeping
- Consultation responses showed an overwhelming wish to withdraw services in category **B**
- Savings in some categories are outweighed by potential loss of fare-paying passengers
- Category **H** should be retained to maintain current admissions patterns

44. Cabinet is therefore asked to consider the following options, all of which assume that category **A** routes would be run as closed coaches, as above.

At **£2-50** standard fare:

Option:	Proposal:	Routes run:		Non-entitled pupils carried:		Net saving pa:
	Current position	56		2,152		
		Proposed	Change from current	Proposal estimate	Change from current	
1.	Withdraw B and C	39	Less 17	1,463	Less 689	£537,800
2.	Withdraw B, C, and D	31	Less 25	1,189	Less 963	£734,600
3.	Withdraw B, C, D, and E	25	Less 31	1,059	Less 1,093	£827,800

At **£3-00** standard fare:

Option:	Proposal:	Routes run:		Non-entitled pupils carried:		Net saving pa:
	Current position	56		2,152		
		Proposed	Change from current	Proposal estimate	Change from current	
1.	Withdraw B and C	39	Less 17	1,234	Less 918	£525,700
2.	Withdraw B, C, and D	31	Less 25	1,004	Less 1,148	£721,400
3.	Withdraw B, C, D, and E	25	Less 31	890	Less 1,262	£812,400

Please note that:

- Savings figures are ongoing full year savings, assuming that changes take effect in September 2011. The financial 2011/12 would show a part-year proportional saving.
- Numbers of pupils to be carried in future reflect the reduction caused by fares 'elasticity'. However, more could choose to travel on the retained services at the new higher fare.
- The reduction in several hundred pupils who might travel should be compared with the Surrey secondary school population of 60,000 pupils.

Implementation and Next Steps

45. These figures are to some extent a worst case, and further work may enable the County Council, in partnership with schools, parents, and bus operators to run more services than the options imply. In the coming months:

- Some bus operators may make commercial offers on some routes
- Some schools may indicate firm interest in setting up a bus or coach service of their own

Passenger Transport Group will continue to explore every opportunity to transport as many non-entitled pupils as possible within the agreed financial constraints.

46. Parents and Councillors should be reassured that all existing services will continue to run during the 2010/11 school year, and that all entitled children will be transported, as now, in the most cost-effective way.

47. The County Council will need to decide whether to run services retained from 2011 as public buses or closed coaches. It will also need to plan to administer the collection of fares or charges, with any staffing implications. A further report will be presented to Cabinet in spring 2011 to update Members with latest estimates of patronage and costs, and recommend the best way to administer the new routes.

Financial and value for money implications

48. All the options shown in paragraph will deliver ongoing revenue savings, and all consequential and re-provision costs have been taken into account. The priority given to minimising the impact on admissions and school place planning should avoid any consequential capital spending.

Equalities implications

49. School Special services are used by 2829 pupils per day. Of these 677 are entitled to free transport under our statutory obligations. Therefore if there is any change to or removal of School Specials those entitled children will continue to be transported.
50. School Specials though predominately used by school children remain public buses and can therefore be used by other members of the public. It has been mentioned that displacing these children onto the Main Network could create some competition between school children and other bus users, especially older people and the disabled.
51. Importantly the impact on vulnerable children was examined. For children with Special Education Needs (SEN), children with disabled parents, from low-income families, children from Gypsy and Traveller communities, and excluded and difficult to place children there would be no impact or a means of mitigation. This is due to School Special services not being appropriate for their transport requirements or other provision being available. Looked After Children are discussed in paragraph 66 below.
52. Because options are available for services to be taken over by other parties, and because provision of these services is discretionary, the view could be taken that any reduction of subsidy resulting in the removal of a service or services would not be discriminatory on equalities grounds.
53. Whilst this may be strictly true due to the nature of the transport a full EIA was undertaken and can be found as Annexe to this report.

Risk management implications

54. This proposal does carry some risks, both in the financing and management of the transport function, and for future planning by Schools and Learning. The main risks are:
 - For Environment and Infrastructure, which will have to support more services than originally envisaged, and recover the anticipated level of fares income
 - Fare collection and inspection could incur some small extra costs
 - For Schools and Learning, where changes to bus patterns could lead to unexpected changes in admissions patterns
 - The changes or withdrawals of service could also lead to an increase in claims for 'entitled' travel
 - There could be some impact on school attendance by more vulnerable children

Any possible legal risks are described below.

Implications for the Council's priorities or Community Strategy/Local Area Agreement targets

55. The review of School Specials could affect some elements of Local Area Agreements.

NI 117 - 16 to 18 year-olds not in education, employment, or training - NEET's

NI 79 - Achievement of Level 2 qualification by age of 19

56. There are other LAA indicators that could apply to the School Special review

NI 4 and **NI 5** - People's influence on decisions in their locality, and general satisfaction with it. May be an impact where bus services are removed and residents feel that their area is particularly poorly served.

57. One key LAA indicator is covered below is:

NI 186 - Reduction in CO₂ emissions

There was a large response to consultation arguing there could be an increase in CO₂ emissions as a result of a shift in school transport from buses to cars.

58. The final relevant LAA indicator is:

NI 47 & 48 - People & Children killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents.

Many respondents suggested a link between removal of School Specials and a decrease in child safety. There is some statistical evidence for this. Department for Transport figures show that, on average, there are 10 serious injury accidents (killed or seriously injured) for every billion passenger kilometres travelled by bus or coach. By contrast, there are 589 serious injuries or deaths for every billion passenger kilometres travelled by pedal cycle and 439 for the same distance travelled by pedestrians. There are 27 fatalities or serious injuries for car occupants over the same distance.

However, the Department for Transport's guidance is that the health benefits far outweigh the risks of personal injury accidents. The actual road safety risks are very small – there is one cycling death per 33 million km of cycling. Each year 100 people in the UK die whilst cycling compared to 50,000 people who die from coronary heart disease caused by insufficient physical activity. All in all, people who cycle to work or school have a 39% lower mortality rate than people who do not. However the survey results in **Annexe C** show that parents are extremely reluctant to allow their children to cycle to school on grounds of distance and safety: only 7% would do so where a bus service is withdrawn.

Climate change/carbon emissions implications

59. The County Council attaches great importance to being environmentally aware and wishes to show leadership in cutting carbon emissions and

tackling climate change. It was for this reason that an Environmental Impact Assessment was carried out and presented as an Annexe to the 2 March Cabinet Report. The Safer Smarter Travel team are fully engaged with this project, and in case where School Specials may be withdrawn, will work actively with the school, parents, and children on sustainable alternative means of travel.

60. Whilst the Impact Assessment estimate does not apply to the lower number of journeys made using School Specials each year it is likely that, if the 58% of survey respondents stating they would drive their child or children to school did so, there would be some increase in carbon emissions. This is due to car journeys producing, on average, higher CO₂ emission than trips made by bus, per mile. However changes to transport patterns are complex, and it is hard to predict outcomes with certainty.
61. However there are options, as stated in this report, for this to be minimised due to routes being taken over by schools or other bodies or the route continuing to be run based on a solid business case. Also, this issue should not be looked at in isolation as many other projects will produce larger carbon savings than would result from this modal shift.

Legal implications/legislative requirements

62. In considering these proposals, Members will need to decide whether discontinuing the services is a justified and proportionate response to the current requirement to make financial savings. Parents have a duty to ensure that their children attend school. The Council's powers to make travel arrangements for children who are not entitled to free transport (see paragraph 65, below) are discretionary. There is no requirement to provide transport by way of school special buses.
63. In exercising discretionary powers, or making changes to discretionary services, the Council must:
 - take into account all relevant factors and discard all irrelevant factors,
 - comply with its duties,
 - adopt a fair decision making process and
 - reach a decision that is reasonably open to it.

The following factors are likely to be relevant:

- The disadvantages of discontinuing the school specials, such as the impact on pupils and parents, especially where schools have been chosen on the basis of existing travel services, or any adverse impact on the environment or traffic congestion
 - The advantages, such as the likely cost savings to the Council and the avoidance of the need to cut other services
 - The consequences for schools, particularly in terms of the impact on their school travel plans and on admission numbers
 - The responses to the consultations, as contained in **Annexes B, C, D and E.**
64. The Council has the following additional duties, which should be taken into account in making the decision:

- The duty to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport to meet the school travel needs of its area.
- The duty to promote fair access to educational opportunity, the fulfilment by every child of his educational potential, and to increase opportunities for parental choice. It must exercise its functions with a view to these duties.
- The duty to eliminate unlawful discrimination and promote equality of opportunity and to comply with the Council's equalities & diversity policies.
- The duty to promote equality of opportunity for people with a disability even where that involves treating the disabled more favourably than others.

65. The Council has a duty to provide free transport to school for 'eligible' children. This category includes children unable to walk to school, children who have disabled parents who cannot accompany them on a walking route where necessary, children living outside 'statutory walking distance' and children from low-income families. The proposals in this report provide for eligible children to continue to receive free transport by other means if the school specials are discontinued, so the Council will continue to comply with this duty.

The Council may not 'fetter its discretion' by introducing blanket policies. It may therefore be appropriate for alternative arrangements to be made in some exceptional cases, in view of the impact of the proposals on those families concerned.

Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications –

66. Any change in policy for School Specials should have little or no impact on Looked After Children. Some Looked After Children may have been placed at schools within the statutory distances from their home. These students may make use of School Specials and could be negatively impacted if there is no re-provision for the route concerned. However, Looked After Children often need to be transported with relatively short notice and to a range of provision. Again, therefore, provision is often considered on a case-by-case basis and the authority has used its' discretion to offer transport to those students not statutorily entitled.

Section 151 Officer commentary

The section 151 officer confirms that all material, financial and business issues and risks have been considered in this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Cabinet is therefore asked to:

- (1) Agree what level of savings on School Special services from the options presented in the table in paragraph 44 it wishes to see implemented from September 2011

- (2) Decide whether the County Council should charge a new standard fare of £2-50 or £3-00 return per pupil per day on the remaining School Special services from September 2011
- (3) Request a further report on implementation and contract issues for the new services, including a choice between running the new services as public buses or as pre-booked, closed services
- (4) Request that the Schools and Learning service begin active discussions with schools about the possibility of devolving school transport responsibility to them
- (5) Request a review of the pattern of admission applications for September 2011 in spring 2011 to ascertain whether agreed changes to School Special services have made any impact

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

To ensure that any future support to School Special bus services give optimum value for money and provides appropriate transport to schools where it is most required.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

If Cabinet approves these recommendations officers will:

- Inform current and prospective parents which School Special services are likely to run or not run from September 2011
- Reassure parents that all current services will run during 2010/11
- Continue discussions with bus operators to seek the best commercial offers
- Continue discussions with schools who have expressed interest in running services
- Pro-actively offer Travel Plan support to schools where services are likely to be withdrawn
- Plan for implementation and collection of the new fares, and bring a further report to Cabinet
- Review the pattern of admissions to assess any impact

Contact Officer:

Iain Reeve, Head of Transport for Surrey (tel. 020 8541 9375)
Paul Millin, Group Manager, Passenger Transport (tel. 020 8541 9365)
Peter Wyld, Project Manager, E&I PPU (tel. 020 8541 9925)

Consulted:

Cabinet Member for Transport
Transportation Select Committee
Passenger Transport Task Group
Headteacher Working Group of Secondary School Phase Council

All Surrey secondary schools and Further Education Colleges
Surrey parents as described in the report

Informed:

All County Councillors, public, and stakeholders

Sources/background papers:

Review of Local Bus Services in Surrey, Cabinet, 2 March 2010
