

---

**From:** Stephen Calvert <sjcalvert010266@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 24 March 2018 12:46 p.m.  
**To:** Mailroom Mailbox  
**Subject:** Re: LTP SUBMISSION

Corrected copy...

## Introduction

I would like it recorded that I reject all three options proposed to address the shortfall in funding running public transport in the city. They offer no real choices and they continue ECANs trend of degrading public transport in Christchurch, with no accountability to the public. Although I accept fare increases are a necessary evil, cutting six bus services with no alternatives is completely unacceptable. If meeting a budget is the only criteria that matters to ECAN, the only option is to reduce overall service frequency across the whole network, not reduce coverage. Whether you use public transport or not, we all pay for it, and therefore we should all have access to it. I ask if ECAN was responsible for healthcare, law enforcement or education would you adopt the same approach of leaving large areas of the city without those services.

My primary concern is how we got to where we are now. It is my view that ECAN has failed to deliver a viable bus network and has created this problem with its refusal to restore a radial bus network in favour of the present "hubs and spokes" network.

Having dealt with commissioners and traffic managers at ECAN, whilst trying to save bus services in Bishopdale, I feel the most effective contribution I can make to this consultation process is the letter I wrote earlier this month to the Minister of transport.

In that letter I asked the Minister the following:

- To intervene in the short term to maintain the current level of services.
- Provide adequate funding for a new "viable" bus network.
- Put pressure on ECAN to abandon the hubs and spokes network model.
- Urgently pass legislation to have ECAN removed as the agency running bus services in Christchurch and the wider region.

I can provide a copy of this letter if you wish.

## ECANs failure to manage Public transport

Public transport is NOT a social service for the poor and those who can't or don't own a car. It is an alternative to the car and its use should be encouraged for the betterment of the environment and to reduce congestion on our roads. ECAN fails at every level to address that, I truly believe the commissioners with their, "school tie" privileged backgrounds simply "dont get" the importance of public transport in a developed and modern city. When you read through the frequently asked questions section of the long term proposal it is clear that ECAN has a very narrow tolerance for, as you say, "innovative ideas" concerning the way forward. It would appear you intend keep everything tied to the failed Networks and hubs network model which has blighted commuters for the past six years. In my opinion, This network model is run purely intended to meet costs, regardless of whether the services are used or not. It does not encourage use of public transport as it fails at every level to deliver passengers to their destination in a direct and timely manner.

So i reiterate why the Network and hubs model does not work:

- This network greatly inconveniences passengers as they are forced to make frequent service changes to reach their final destination. This adds significant delays reaching their final destination and makes journeys even less attractive compared to using a car. **Outcome: would be passengers use a car.**

- Connections are heavily reliant on traffic conditions and services running on time. In the case of evenings, some services finish early and there is no means to make a return journey! The outcome of this is the overall journey is dictated by the weakest link, that is the least frequent service used (the feeder bus routes). **Outcome: would be passengers use a car.**
- Many of the feeder services take you on indirect tours of the suburbs, covering the remains of what was once were several radial routes. This greatly adds to journey times and causes inconvenience, adding to this a service change is then required to reach the final destination. **Outcome: would be passengers use a car.**
- Not much has been made of this in your consultation announcement, but every service that has been withdrawn or is proposed to be withdrawn in recent years are the very “feeder routes” which were setup to support the hubs and spokes network. (Services 118/119 - cut 2014, Services 107/108/135/145/535/150 - cut 2018?). I ask, what further evidence do you need that these services have failed due to their unpopularity. Once again, I say, it is because they do not offer direct and convenient public transport option compared to the car. The final irony in all of this is, is that as the feeder services fail, we end up with a much reduced radial network with much reduced capacity and coverage consisting of principally 4 colour branded lines. I ask is that ECANS aim all along?
- You blame the earthquake for the drop in passengers, but this network was introduced after the earthquake, it was the solution not the problem! is there no accountability in your organisation for its failure?

Please accept that this network model has failed and restore a viable radial network before public transport in the city degrades to a point beyond recovery. It is my view that this network is the single biggest contributing factor to the fall in passenger numbers in recent years and it is critical that it is dismantled and a radial bus network is reformed before public transport is degraded to a point of no return..

### **Innovative ideas - yeah right**

So what do with the threatened routes? I could propose lots of changes to the network, but experience tells me that a graduate with a degree in transportation and/or demographics just out of university will have more sway with you than me. I urge you to listen to the grass routes, that is the people who uses the services for a change!

However here are some general suggestions about the network as a whole, followed by ideas about the threatened services:

- Minibuses - Many of the affected routes use minibuses. I believe they have not been fully utilized, these vehicles can get to areas normal buses cannot. They could be used deliver people right to the door of the shops in the mall. The only obstacle is bureaucracy/regulation which ECAN loves to hide behind and the prejudice of the mall owners not wanting buses on their land due the social perception about them.
- Simplify network - The network is a confused mix of branded route (coloured) named brands (Orbiter) and numbers ranging from 17 to 820. All for just 25 routes! Why? I suggest simplifying the network to save costs and reduce confusion - drop branding (coloured lines/orbiter), re-introduce numbered lines with single digit numbers for major routes, double digit numbers for secondary routes. By abandoning branding you will reduce marketing costs and operational cost for operators, which will make tendering for lines more competitive and put money where it is needed - running the services!.
- Vehicles - If you have to reduce frequency on lines, if roads are suitable, adopt double deck vehicles with greater capacity which can compensate for reduced frequency.
- Rail - Christchurch's big lost opportunity! But it will be so much more expensive to adopt now compared to if it had not been addressed just after the earthquake. Rangiora and Rolleston would be far better served by rail. ECAN has consistently closed this idea down, the opportunity to bring rail into the city post-earthquake has largely been lost... for example, a car dealership has gone up on the site of the old station, oh the irony! Putting a disproportionate amount of resources in running services from Rangiora and Rolleston has been to the detriment of local bus services and created a two tier bus network of those who have access to it and those that do not.

### **Improvements/ changes to the threatened services**

These are my thoughts on Making the six services to be withdrawn more attractive and viable. I can hear the shutters rolling down in the ECAN “innovations” department as I write, however, I shall continue... my comments are very general, I can provide more details of my suggestions if you wish...

#### **Service 125**

- Not an affected line but could be used to salvage something from this mess. Making this bus circular adds Value to services 135 and 145 and gives more destination possibilities for passengers with minimal route extension.
- Option A - Make the line circular, connect to service 135 via preston rd and service 145 via pages road then continue to original service at Halswell via sparks road.
- Option B - As above but bypass airport, divert bus at Avonhead via Greers road, Condell ave, Blighs road and onto existing route on Papanui road
- Suggested frequency 30 min daytime, hourly evening and weekends.

### **Service 28**

- Extend to airport via Harewood road to replace Service 125 if Option B above is adopted. (restores link to city for Bishopdale)

### **Services 107/108**

- Alternate Belfast journeys of a B service (Confusing isn't it!! - Renumbered to distinguish from existing services) diverted at Papanui to serve 107 and then the next serve 108 routing before continuing journey to Belfast.
- This restores link to city and would result in a 1 hour daytime frequency on the former 107 and 108
- Note: in a perfect world there would be additional direct B service buses to belfast, but I am assuming no budget for this. Also Note: The inconvenience to B service passengers by the diversion is far less than the inconvenience to passengers with no bus after removing the 107/108 services.

### **Service 95**

- Made a slow service between Belfast and Papanui compensating for loss of direct buses from Belfast to Papanui.

### **Service B**

- See changes suggested for the services 107/108 above
- At the southern end of the route extend one journey from Princess Margaret hospital to Westmoreland part replacing service 145
- Westmoreland - restored link to city/ 1 hour frequency

### **Service 145**

- Replaced by circular service 125 and extension of service B (see above)

### **Service 135**

- Replaced by circular service 125 (see above)

### **Service 535**

- Improve the 535 by extending it to Governors bay from Rapaki and then over dyers pass to Barrington mall.
- Note: This was a route that was trialed prior to the earthquake but was never given a chance to prove itself. Also divert the route to serve ferrymeed heritage park, using minibuses go into the park!!!. (1 hour frequency)

### **Service 150**

- Option A - extend to the city to bus exchange.
- Option B - Make it a peak time extension of service on some service 100 journeys.
- Both options give more destination possibilities for passengers and make it more attractive as a service.

## Service 100

- See service 150

### Conclusion

When i moved to Christchurch thirteen years ago i used the buses every day to get to work and occasionally the weekend when i didn't want to fight for a car park. When an already substandard service 119 was removed from where i live i finally gave up on travelling by buses and bought a second car. I think if you are wondering where all your passengers are gone, perhaps there lies your answer. My life is too busy to catch a service to Papanui, risk life and limb crossing a busy main road and then catch a second bus to wherever i need to go. I want to use the buses, but your not giving me a reason to.... that is your problem and it not going to go away by simply cutting service to meet costs, it is just going to create more people like me. Of course this might not matter to you, as long as the buses run on budget who cares if they are any use to anybody! in that case i guess we can look forward to some more cuts in a few more years time.

On 24 March 2018 at 11:48, Stephen Calvert <[sicalvert010266@gmail.com](mailto:sicalvert010266@gmail.com)> wrote:

Stephen Calvert  
7 Stackhouse Avenue  
Bishopdale  
Christchurch

T: 021 045 3787

Will attend hearing if convenient time and/or if any of my suggestions are considered for adoption.

This is my submission for the long term plan with regard to proposed bus service changes in Christchurch

### Introduction

I would like it recorded that I reject all three options proposed to address the shortfall in funding running public transport in the city. They offer no real choices and they continue ECANs trend of degrading public transport in Christchurch, with no accountability to the public. Although I accept fare increases are a necessary evil, cutting six bus services with no alternatives is completely unacceptable. If meeting a budget is the only criteria that matters to ECAN, the only option is to reduce overall service frequency across the whole network, not reduce coverage. Whether you use public transport or not, we all pay for it, and therefore we should all have access to it. I ask if ECAN was responsible for healthcare, law enforcement or education would you adopt the same approach of leaving large areas of the city without those services.

My primary concern is how we got to where we are now. It is my view that ECAN has failed to deliver a viable bus network and has created this problem with its refusal to restore a radial bus network in favour of the present "hubs and spokes" network.

Having dealt with commissioners and traffic managers at ECAN, whilst trying to save bus services in Bishopdale, I feel the most effective contribution I can make to this consultation process is the letter I wrote earlier this month to the Minister of transport.

In that letter I asked the Minister the following:

- To intervene in the short term to maintain the current level of services.
- Provide adequate funding for a new "viable" bus network.

- Put pressure on ECAN to abandon the hubs and spokes network model.
- Urgently pass legislation to have ECAN removed as the agency running bus services in Christchurch and the wider region.

I can provide a copy of this letter if you wish.

### **ECANs failure to manage Public transport**

Public transport is NOT a social service for the poor and those who can't or don't own a car. It is an alternative to the car and its use should be encouraged for the betterment of the environment and to reduce capacity on our roads. ECAN fails at every lever to address that, I truly believe the commissioners with their, "school tie" privileged backgrounds simply "dont get" the importance of public in a developed and modern city. When you read through the frequently asked questions section of the long term proposal it is clear that ECAN has a very narrow tolerance, for as you say, "innovative ideas" concerning the way forward. It would appear you intend keep everything tied to the failed Networks and hubs network model which has blighted commuters for the past six years. In my opinion, This network model is run purely intended to meet costs, regardless of whether the services are used or not. It does not encourage use of public transport as it fails at every level to deliver passengers to their destination in a direct and timely manner.

So i reiterate why the Network and hubs model does not work:

- This network greatly inconveniences passengers as they are forced to make frequent service changes to reach their final destination. This adds significant delays reaching their final destination and makes journeys even less attractive compared to using a car. **Outcome: would be passengers use a car.**
- Connections are heavily reliant on traffic conditions and services running on time. In the case of evenings, some services finish early and there is no means to make a return journey! The outcome of this is the overall journey is dictated by the weakest link, that is the least frequent service used (the feeder bus routes). **Outcome: would be passengers use a car.**
- Many of the feeder services take you on indirect tours of the suburbs, covering the remains of what was once were several radial routes. This greatly adds to journey times and causes inconvenience, adding to this a service change is then required to reach the final destination. **Outcome: would be passengers use a car.**
- Not much has been made of this in your consultation announcement, but every service that has been withdrawn or is proposed to be withdrawn in recent years are the very "feeder routes" which were setup to support the hubs and spokes network. (Services 118/119 - cut 2014, Services 107/108/135/145/535/150 - cut 2018?). I ask, what further evidence do you need that these services have failed due to there unpopularity. Once i again, i say, it is because they do not offer direct and convenient public transport option compared to the car. The final irony in all of this is, is that as the feeder services fail, we end up with a much reduced radial network with much reduced capacity and coverage consisting of principally 4 colour branded lines. I ask is that ECANS aim all along?
- You blame the earthquake for the drop in passengers, but this network was introduced after the earthquake, it was the solution not the problem! is there no accountability in your organisation for its failure?

Please accept that this network model has failed and restore a viable radial network before public transport in the city degrades to a point beyond recovery. It is my view that this network is the single biggest contributing factor to the fall in passenger numbers in recent years and it is critical that it is dismantled and a radial bus network is retorted before public transport is degraded to a point of no return..

## **Innovative ideas - yeah right**

So what do with the threatened routes? I could propose lots of changes to the network, but experience tells me that some graduate with a degree in transportation and/or demographics just out of university will have more sway with you than me. I urge you to listen to the grass routes, that is the people who uses the services for a change!

However here are some general suggestions about the network as a whole, followed by ideas about the threatened services:

- Minibuses - Many of the affected routes use minibuses. I believe they have not been fully utilized, these vehicles can get to areas normal buses cannot. They could be used deliver people right to the door of the shops in the mall. The only obstacle is bureaucracy/regulation which ECAN loves to hide behind and the prejudice of the mall owners not wanting buses on their land due the social perception about them.
- Simplify network - The network is a confused mix of branded route (coloured) named brands (Orbiter) and numbers ranging from 17 to 820. All for just 25 routes! Why? I suggest simplifying the network to save costs and reduce confusion - drop branding (coloured lines/orbiter), re-introduce numbered lines with single digit numbers for major routes, double digit numbers for secondary routes. By abandoning branding you will reduce marketing costs and operational cost for operators, which will make tendering for lines more competitive and put money where it is needed - running the services!.
- Vehicles - If you have to reduce frequency on lines, if roads are suitable, adopt double deck vehicles with greater capacity which can compensate for reduced frequency.
- Rail - Christchurch's big lost opportunity! But it will be so much more expensive to adopt if had not been addressed just after the earthquake. Rangiora and Rolleston would be far better served by rail. ECAN has consistently closed this idea down, the opportunity to bring rail into the city post-earthquake has largely been lost... for example, a car dealership has gone up on the site of the old station, oh the irony! Putting a disproportionate amount of resources in running services from Rangiora and Rolleston has been to the detriment of local bus services and created a two tier bus network of those who have access to it and those that do not.

## **Improvements/ changes to the threatened services**

These are my thoughts on Making the 6 services to be withdrawn more attractive and viable. I can hear the shutters rolling down in the ECAN "innovations" department as I write, however, I shall continue... my comments are very general, I can provide more details of my suggestions if you wish...

### **Service 125**

- Not an affected line but could be used to salvage something from this mess. Making this bus circular adds Value to services 135 and 145 and gives more destination possibilities for passengers with minimal route extension.
- Option A - Make the line circular, connect to service 135 via preston rd and service 145 via pages road then continue to original service at Halswell via sparks road.
- Option B - As above but bypass airport, divert bus at Avonhead via Greers road, Condell ave, Blighs road and onto existing route on Papanui road
- Suggested frequency 30 min daytime, hourly evening and weekends.

### **Service 28**

- Extend to airport via Harewood road to replace Service 125 if Option B above is adopted. (restores link to city for Bishopdale)

### **Services 107/108**

- Alternate Belfast journeys of a B service (Confusing isn't it!! - Renumbered to distinguish from existing services) diverted at Papanui to serve 107 and then the next serve 108 routing before continuing journey to Belfast.
- This restores link to city and would result in a 1 hour daytime frequency on the former 107 and 108
- Note: in a perfect world there would be additional direct B service buses to belfast, but I am assuming no budget for this. Also Note: The inconvenience to B service passengers by the diversion is far less than the inconvenience to passengers with no bus after removing the 107/108 services.

#### **Service 95**

- Made a slow service between Belfast and Papanui compensating for loss of direct buses from Belfast to Papanui.

#### **Service B**

- See changes suggested for the services 107/108 above
- At the southern end of the route extend one journey from Princess Margaret hospital to Westmoreland part replacing service 145
- Westmoreland - restored link to city/ 1 hour frequency

#### **Service 145**

- Replaced by circular service 125 and extension of service B (see above)

#### **Service 135**

- Replaced by circular service 125 (see above)

#### **Service 535**

- Improve the 535 by extending it to Governors bay from Rapaki and then over dyers pass to Barrington mall.
- Note: This was a route that was trialed prior to the earthquake but was never given a chance to prove itself. Also divert the route to serve ferrymeed heritage park, using minibuses go into the park!!!. (1 hour frequency)

#### **Service 150**

- Option A - extend to the city to bus exchange.
- Option B - Make it a peak time extension of service on some service 100 journeys.
- Both options give more destination possibilities for passengers and make it more attractive as a service.

#### **Service 100**

- See service 150

#### **Conclusion**

When i moved to Christchurch thirteen years ago i used the buses every day to get to work and occasionally the weekend when i didn't want to fight for a car park. When an already substandard service 119 was removed from

where i live i finally gave up on travelling by buses and bought a second car. I think if you are wondering where all your passengers are gone, perhaps there lies your answer. My life is too busy to catch a service to Papanui, risk life and limb crossing a busy main road and then catch a second bus to wherever i need to go. I want to use the buses, but your not giving me a reason to.... that is your problem and it not going to go away by simply cutting service to meet costs, it is just going to create more people like me. Of course this might not matter to you, as long as the buses run on budget who cares if they are any use to anybody! in that case i guess we can look forward to some more cuts in a few more years time.

Regards

Stephen Calvert



---

**From:** Stephen Calvert <sjcalvert010266@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 24 March 2018 11:49 a.m.  
**To:** Mailroom Mailbox  
**Subject:** LTP SUBMISSION

Stephen Calvert  
7 Stackhouse Avenue  
Bishopdale  
Christchurch

T: 021 045 3787

Will attend hearing if convenient time and/or if any of my suggestions are considered for adoption.

This is my submission for the long term plan with regard to proposed bus service changes in Christchurch

### **Introduction**

I would like it recorded that I reject all three options proposed to address the shortfall in funding running public transport in the city. They offer no real choices and they continue ECANs trend of degrading public transport in Christchurch, with no accountability to the public. Although I accept fare increases are a necessary evil, cutting six bus services with no alternatives is completely unacceptable. If meeting a budget is the only criteria that matters to ECAN, the only option is to reduce overall service frequency across the whole network, not reduce coverage. Whether you use public transport or not, we all pay for it, and therefore we should all have access to it. I ask if ECAN was responsible for healthcare, law enforcement or education would you adopt the same approach of leaving large areas of the city without those services.

My primary concern is how we got to where we are now. It is my view that ECAN has failed to deliver a viable bus network and has created this problem with its refusal to restore a radial bus network in favour of the present "hubs and spokes" network.

Having dealt with commissioners and traffic managers at ECAN, whilst trying to save bus services in Bishopdale, I feel the most effective contribution I can make to this consultation process is the letter I wrote earlier this month to the Minister of transport.

In that letter I asked the Minister the following:

- To intervene in the short term to maintain the current level of services.
- Provide adequate funding for a new "viable" bus network.
- Put pressure on ECAN to abandon the hubs and spokes network model.
- Urgently pass legislation to have ECAN removed as the agency running bus services in Christchurch and the wider region.

I can provide a copy of this letter if you wish.

## ECANs failure to manage Public transport

Public transport is NOT a social service for the poor and those who can't or don't own a car. It is an alternative to the car and its use should be encouraged for the betterment of the environment and to reduce capacity on our roads. ECAN fails at every lever to address that, I truly believe the commissioners with their, "school tie" privileged backgrounds simply "dont get" the importance of public in a developed and modern city. When you read through the frequently asked questions section of the long term proposal it is clear that ECAN has a very narrow tolerance, for as you say, "innovative ideas" concerning the way forward. It would appear you intend keep everything tied to the failed Networks and hubs network model which has blighted commuters for the past six years. In my opinion, This network model is run purely intended to meet costs, regardless of whether the services are used or not. It does not encourage use of public transport as it fails at every level to deliver passengers to their destination in a direct and timely manner.

So i reiterate why the Network and hubs model does not work:

- This network greatly inconveniences passengers as they are forced to make frequent service changes to reach their final destination. This adds significant delays reaching their final destination and makes journeys even less attractive compared to using a car. **Outcome: would be passengers use a car.**
- Connections are heavily reliant on traffic conditions and services running on time. In the case of evenings, some services finish early and there is no means to make a return journey! The outcome of this is the overall journey is dictated by the weakest link, that is the least frequent service used (the feeder bus routes). **Outcome: would be passengers use a car.**
- Many of the feeder services take you on indirect tours of the suburbs, covering the remains of what was once were several radial routes. This greatly adds to journey times and causes inconvenience, adding to this a service change is then required to reach the final destination. **Outcome: would be passengers use a car.**
- Not much has been made of this in your consultation announcement, but every service that has been withdrawn or is proposed to be withdrawn in recent years are the very "feeder routes" which were setup to support the hubs and spokes network. (Services 118/119 - cut 2014, Services 107/108/135/145/535/150 - cut 2018?). I ask, what further evidence do you need that these services have failed due to there unpopularity. Once i again, i say, it is because they do not offer direct and convenient public transport option compared to the car. The final irony in all of this is, is that as the feeder services fail, we end up with a much reduced radial network with much reduced capacity and coverage consisting of principally 4 colour branded lines. I ask is that ECANs aim all along?
- You blame the earthquake for the drop in passengers, but this network was introduced after the earthquake, it was the solution not the problem! is there no accountability in your organisation for its failure?

Please accept that this network model has failed and restore a viable radial network before public transport in the city degrades to a point beyond recovery. It is my view that this network is the single biggest contributing factor to the fall in passenger numbers in recent years and it is critical that it is dismantled and a radial bus network is retorted before public transport is degraded to a point of no return..

## Innovative ideas - yeah right

So what do with the threatened routes? I could propose lots of changes to the network, but experience tells me that some graduate with a degree in transportation and/or demographics just out of university will have more sway with you than me. I urge you to listen to the grass routes, that is the people who uses the services for a change!

However here are some general suggestions about the network as a whole, followed by ideas about the threatened services:

- Minibuses - Many of the affected routes use minibuses. I believe they have not been fully utilized, these vehicles can get to areas normal buses cannot. They could be used deliver people right to the door of the shops in the mall. The only obstacle is bureaucracy/regulation which ECAN loves to hide behind and the prejudice of the mall owners not wanting buses on their land due the social perception about them.
- Simplify network - The network is a confused mix of branded route (coloured) named brands (Orbiter) and numbers ranging from 17 to 820. All for just 25 routes! Why? I suggest simplifying the network to save costs and reduce confusion - drop branding (coloured lines/orbiter), re-introduce numbered lines with single digit numbers for major routes, double digit numbers for secondary routes. By abandoning branding you will reduce marketing costs and operational cost for operators, which will make tendering for lines more competitive and put money where it is needed - running the services!.
- Vehicles - If you have to reduce frequency on lines, if roads are suitable, adopt double deck vehicles with greater capacity which can compensate for reduced frequency.
- Rail - Christchurch's big lost opportunity! But it will be so much more expensive to adopt if had not been addressed just after the earthquake. Rangiora and Rolleston would be far better served by rail. ECAN has consistently closed this idea down, the opportunity to bring rail into the city post-earthquake has largely been lost... for example, a car dealership has gone up on the site of the old station, oh the irony! Putting a disproportionate amount of resources in running services from Rangiora and Rolleston has been to the detriment of local bus services and created a two tier bus network of those who have access to it and those that do not.

### **Improvements/ changes to the threatened services**

These are my thoughts on Making the 6 services to be withdrawn more attractive and viable. I can hear the shutters rolling down in the ECAN "innovations" department as I write, however, I shall continue... my comments are very general, I can provide more details of my suggestions if you wish...

#### **Service 125**

- Not an affected line but could be used to salvage something from this mess. Making this bus circular adds Value to services 135 and 145 and gives more destination possibilities for passengers with minimal route extension.
- Option A - Make the line circular, connect to service 135 via preston rd and service 145 via pages road then continue to original service at Halswell via sparks road.
- Option B - As above but bypass airport, divert bus at Avonhead via Greers road, Condell ave, Blighs road and onto existing route on Papanui road
- Suggested frequency 30 min daytime, hourly evening and weekends.

#### **Service 28**

- Extend to airport via Harewood road to replace Service 125 if Option B above is adopted. (restores link to city for Bishopdale)

#### **Services 107/108**

- Alternate Belfast journeys of a B service (Confusing isn't it!! - Renumbered to distinguish from existing services) diverted at Papanui to serve 107 and then the next serve 108 routing before continuing journey to Belfast.
- This restores link to city and would result in a 1 hour daytime frequency on the former 107 and 108
- Note: in a perfect world there would be additional direct B service buses to belfast, but I am assuming no budget for this. Also Note: The inconvenience to B service passengers by the diversion is far less than the inconvenience to passengers with no bus after removing the 107/108 services.

### **Service 95**

- Made a slow service between Belfast and Papanui compensating for loss of direct buses from Belfast to Papanui.

### **Service B**

- See changes suggested for the services 107/108 above
- At the southern end of the route extend one journey from Princess Margaret hospital to Westmoreland part replacing service 145
- Westmoreland - restored link to city/ 1 hour frequency

### **Service 145**

- Replaced by circular service 125 and extension of service B (see above)

### **Service 135**

- Replaced by circular service 125 (see above)

### **Service 535**

- Improve the 535 by extending it to Governors bay from Rapaki and then over dyers pass to Barrington mall.
- Note: This was a route that was trialed prior to the earthquake but was never given a chance to prove itself. Also divert the route to serve ferrymeed heritage park, using minibuses go into the park!!!. (1 hour frequency)

### **Service 150**

- Option A - extend to the city to bus exchange.
- Option B - Make it a peak time extension of service on some service 100 journeys.
- Both options give more destination possibilities for passengers and make it more attractive as a service.

### **Service 100**

- See service 150

### **Conclusion**

When i moved to Christchurch thirteen years ago i used the buses every day to get to work and occasionally the weekend when i didn't want to fight for a car park. When an already substandard service 119 was removed from where i live i finally gave up on travelling by buses and bought a second car. I think if you are wondering where all your passengers are gone, perhaps there lies your answer. My life is too busy to catch a service to Papanui, risk life and limb crossing a busy main road and then catch a second bus to wherever i need to go. I want to use the buses, but your not giving me a reason to.... that is your problem and it not going to go away by simply cutting service to meet costs, it is just going to create more people like me. Of course this might not matter to you, as long as the buses run on budget who cares if they are any use to anybody! in that case i guess we can look forward to some more cuts in a few more years time.

Regards  
Stephen Calvert