
Minutes

Agenda item : 6
Drafted : 8.12.10

Minutes of a meeting of the Transport Service Committee held on 20 October 2010 at 6 Middle Street, London EC1

Contents

- 1 Chair's introduction, pre-meeting announcements
- 2 Apologies for absence
- 3 Declarations of interest
- 4 Minutes
- 5 Matters arising (TS036)
- 6 Actions taken (TS037)
- 7 Performance Monitoring reports
- 8 Potters Bar inquest (TS038)
- 9 Motorcycles in bus lanes
- 10 Any other business
- 11 Resolution to move into confidential session
- 12 Glossary

Present

Members : Gail Engert; Teena Lashmore; David Leibling (item 1 to 9); Lorna Reith (Chair); Sharon Grant (Chair, London TravelWatch) (items 1 to 6 and 9 to 11)

Guests

Tom Duckham	Policy Manager, Motorised Transport, Transport for London (TfL)
Chris Hodder	Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation (BMF)
Esther Johnson	Major Projects Consultation Manager, TfL
Charlie Lloyd	Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign (LCC)
Peter Sadler	Project Manager, TfL

Stakeholder representatives

Matt Winfield	Stakeholder Engagement Manager, TfL
---------------	-------------------------------------

Staff

Chief Executive; Committee Administrator; Director, Research and Development; Policy Officer (items 1 to 9); Safety and Policy Adviser (item 8); Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer (items 7 and 9)

Minutes

1 Chair's introduction, pre-meeting announcements

The Chair welcomed visitors, members and staff to the meeting of the committee, and made standard housekeeping announcements.

2 Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Terry Bennett and for lateness from Teena Lashmore.

3 Declarations of interest

No additional declarations of interest were made. A public record of members' interests may be found on the London TravelWatch website (<http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/document/3861/get>).

4 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2010 were approved and signed for the record.

5 Matters arising (TS036)

Members were pleased to see so many complete actions in the report. The Chief Executive reported that the design for the redevelopment work at London Bridge station had been changed by Network Rail. An update to members would be provided at the next board meeting on 9 November 2010. The Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer explained that London TravelWatch had been consulted on changes to the bus station at London Bridge. If members were interested in the changes to the bus station, they should contact him.

The Chair of London TravelWatch reported that she had attended a meeting of the London Underground (LUL) closures panel (which included business and other organisations representing Londoners). The timetable for the closure programme for the Northern line upgrade had not yet been agreed. However, it was likely that the High Barnet branch would be closed for long periods, but the Edgware branch would close at weekends. London Underground's deliberations would conclude in the next few weeks.

6 Actions taken (TS037)

The Chief Executive explained that London TravelWatch had raised the issue of the cycle policy on London Overground (LOROL) with TfL. The Director, Public Liaison had talked to TfL and they are bringing their terms of conditions into line with train companies (TOCs). There had been some changes already. Members discussed the current arrangements for other TOCs operating within London TravelWatch's remit, for example, there are restrictions on bikes during peak hours. The Chair felt that this issue should be closely monitored.

7 Performance Monitoring reports

Members discussed the National Rail Performance Report for Quarter 1, 2010/11.

The Policy Officer noted that there had been an overall drop in the public performance measure (PPM) compared with the same period in the previous year, 93.6% (down from 93.8%). c2c had the highest PPM, whilst National Express East Anglia had the lowest. London Midland had improved considerably. London TravelWatch had met regularly with them. The overall percentage of cancellation and significant lateness was higher than the

period in the previous year, 1.85%. c2c were lowest, whilst LOROL were highest. However, LOROL had the highest percentage of trains which arrived on time, with Southern being lowest.

The Chief Executive explained that there had been meetings with Southern and these issues had been raised. There had been major problems with performance when a new timetable and trains were introduced. Southern had faced significant challenges and London TravelWatch continued to have regular meetings with them. The Mayor had contributed funds to the Southern franchise. The problems had been caused by a timetable change on the Brighton mainline. This section of railway has major capacity demands. Southern had added new rolling stock to increase capacity, which had also meant driver training. The Chair asked for Southern's performance to be monitored.

Members discussed the reasons behind LOROL's performance, particularly the fact that it had the highest cancellation and significant lateness, but also the highest right time arrivals. The Chair asked for a report back on what the reasons were, for example, if it was caused by freight or by Network Rail.

Action : Policy Officer

The customer satisfaction level for LOROL was discussed. At the time this survey had been taken, the East London Line had just opened. The Chair asked for the customer satisfaction level to be monitored.

Action : Secretariat

On the Transport for London (TfL) performance report for Quarter 1, 2010/11, the Policy Officer reported that TfL had performed well across all modes. The bus customer satisfaction level and overall performance had increased.

The Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer reported that TfL had provided for the first time a comprehensive set data measuring the performance of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). TfL had developed a measure for journey time reliability (how reliable a journey time would be). Journeys in central London were more reliable in this quarter than the previous year. Journey time reliability on the TLRN generally was slightly worse. Traffic volume on major roads in London had fallen compared with the previous 2 years. London TravelWatch would be concerned if general journey times improved at the expense of bus services. Following discussion it was agreed to try and obtain an equivalent measure of journey time reliability for bus services.

A member asked for clarification why TfL streets had been recorded as good in the report. The Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer would investigate and feedback.

Action : Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer

The Policy Officer noted that it was particularly pleasing that route 30 had improved, following concerns in earlier reports, and that there had been an increase in the number of accessible bus stops in Kingston demonstrating that it was possible for the network to become nearly 100% accessible if the highway authorities were determined enough. Members felt that in future the data in the reports should be rounded up to 1 decimal point.

Action : Policy Officer/Senior Policy Officer

The Docklands Light Railway (DLR) had met most of its targets. There had been complaints about the ticket vending machines (TVMs), but these had tailed off and customer satisfaction had improved. The Senior Policy Officer had been on a site visit to the North London Line and the East London Line extension. He had asked for passengers to be notified before closures took place and Oyster compensation scheme should be publicised. It was important

to keep disruption to a minimum.

Dial-a-Ride had achieved its targets. London Underground (LUL) had improved compared to the previous quarter.

Members felt that there should be an in-depth investigation of a line arising from this report. A member felt that LUL should be invited to discuss the Circle and Hammersmith line performance at a future meeting.

Action : Committee Services

The Chief Executive proposed that the secretariat would discuss the performance of the line with LUL in the first instance.

Action : Senior Policy Officer

Members noted that problems had been encountered on some of the Underground network (a track failure on the Northern line; a power outage on the Jubilee line; and a train failure on the Victoria line). They were also concerned that the ambience for the network had declined.

A member asked for all modes to be included on one chart to compare satisfaction across TFL services.

Action : Senior Policy Officer

The Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer explained that there had been problems in receiving commentary and data from London Buses. London TravelWatch is currently negotiating with London Buses and would seek to resolve this. It was agreed that a letter would be sent to David Brown, Managing Director, Surface Transport.

Action : Senior Policy Officer

8 Potters Bar inquest (TS038)

The Chair welcomed the Safety and Policy Adviser to the meeting. If you would like a copy of the presentation please e-mail committeeservices@londontravelwatch.org.uk.

The Safety and Policy Adviser began by noting that the recent inquest is the final chapter of a tragic event. The accident at Potters Bar occurred when a set of points (switch rails) were not working properly. The wheels on the carriage were forced upwards and derailed the train. The stretcher bar (which kept the switch rails in place) was not attached, a bolt was missing. Six passengers were killed and one pedestrian died after being hit by debris (which fell from the bridge onto the pavement and road below). No one was on the platforms at the time of the accident.

A member asked if the accident would have resulted in the same result, if it had occurred on open track. The Safety and Policy Adviser replied that it was largely where the train went and what it came into contact with. A train which derailed on a mainline would carry on in the same direction and eventually stop.

The Chair asked if the design of the bridge had been investigated and similar bridges had been looked at. The Safety and Policy Adviser responded that the design of new bridges is different. It was impossible to change all existing bridges.

She went on to ask about the rumours of sabotage which were alleged in the immediate aftermath of the accident. The track technicians claimed that they had tightened the nuts pre-accident. However, the technical evidence proved that this had not been done. The vibration

of trains going over the rails would not have allowed for the nuts to be that loose. The stretch of railway that the accident took place on is part of the East Coast Main line. It would take 7 to 8 minutes to sabotage, but this would be suicidal with the number of trains going up and down the line during the day. The contractor, Jarvis, accepted that there had been no sabotage. There had been a specific report from an employee about the points, but the information was mis-reported and led to an investigation of the line towards Finsbury Park, not the other way around.

9 Motorcycles in bus lanes

The Chair welcomed Mr Sadler, Ms Johnson and Mr Duckham to the meeting. A copy of their presentation can be viewed at <http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/document/13865/get>.

Mr Sadler began by noting that the original trial had taken place from January 2009 to July 2010. The trial had been thoroughly evaluated. The trial included conflict analysis. The evaluation criteria for the initial trial had been published. TfL had also used video to monitor how the trial worked (which was both time and cost intensive).

There had been a 50% increase (5% used it illegally prior to the trial) in the number of motorcyclists using bus lanes during the trial. There had been a small increase in cyclists using them. Bus journey times had not changed. The number of motorcyclists exceeding the speed limit had increased by around 5 to 8%. The number of collisions involving motorcyclists had increased, but there had been a small decrease in the control sites. This was regarded as a statistically significant rise overall.

Mr Sadler explained the conflicts analysis. Conflicts are graded from 1 to 5 in severity. They can involve cars pulling out in front of a motorcyclist when they mis-judged the speed of the oncoming vehicle. 3000 hours of video were studied and 475 conflicts were recorded. The number of conflicts had fallen for motorcyclists and cyclists. Synovate had carried out attitudinal research on behalf of TfL and the majority of motorcyclists believed it had benefited their journey times.

Following the analysis of the trial and in response to the rise in motorcycle collisions a new trial was proposed. The new trial will involve the testing of mitigating factors, for example, educating vehicle drivers and police enforcement. There is a dedicated team of police officers who will enforce key sites on the network. TfL were also educating people through reforming the motorcyclists' curriculum, posters, adverts etc.

The new trial started on 24 July 2010 and would run for a further 18 months.

The Chair noted that when pedestrians cross bus lanes they were more likely to see a bus than a fast moving motorcycle. Is there evidence of an impact upon pedestrians from the trial? Mr Duckham replied that from the last trial there was no evidence that pedestrians had been affected. Ms Johnson explained that TfL had used its mailing list to alert people to the trial to prevent collisions. The Chair felt that Age UK should be included in any future mailings.

The Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer asked whether the data on buses could be separated into more or less intense areas to see whether buses in central London had been affected. Were motorcyclists more likely to use the bus lane to weave in and out of traffic? He had suggested a question to Synovate (should motorcyclists be allowed to overtake in the inside lane?), but this had not been allowed. Mr Duckham replied that the scatter of bus

lanes in the trial was deliberately random. They had not specifically reported on bus journey times in central London, but could do so.

Action : TfL

He would like motorcyclists to use the bus lanes responsibly. He also hoped that the mitigations would affect the way they used the lanes. Ms Johnson did not know why the question was not included in the Synovate research, but would confirm the reason.

Action : TfL

A member asked how much the first trial had cost. Mr Duckham replied it had cost around £900,000 (£120,000 monitoring and the remainder on mitigating actions).

A member asked whether motorcyclists could approach TfL directly after an accident and report it. Mr Duckham replied that there is a database for all personal injury crashes in London (the police record events they attend and enter it into the database). Ms Johnson explained that TfL were happy to receive feedback from motorcyclists.

The Chair welcomed Mr Lloyd, London Cycling Campaign (LCC), and Mr Hodder, British Motorcyclists Federation (BMF), to the meeting.

Mr Lloyd explained that bus lanes had been a great boon for cyclists and a safe haven. The LCC had concerns about safety and organised a petition for the first trial. However, the first trial was a Mayoral manifesto promise. There was no evidence that motor bikes in bus lanes deterred pedestrians at crossings. He was concerned that TfL had glossed over the collision rates which had risen by a third (30 to 41), whilst the control sites had halved (16 to 8). There is no evidence that motorcyclists are in collisions with cyclists. There had been a change in speed and collision rates. He did not feel that there had been enough interrogation of London Buses information or a sufficient environmental impact study. He felt that there is disconnect between the attitude of motorcyclists (93% supported the use of bus lanes), with the increase in danger. He believed that the traffic order for the trial only allowed for one experimental period. It should be either abandoned or made permanent.

Mr Hodder welcomed the trials. There were more accidents in the main sites, compared with the control sites. Trials had taken place in Reading and Bristol and there had been fewer collisions had taken place. London is a more confused picture for motorcyclists. There had not been enough publicity about the original trial.

The Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer noted that the standard practice in road safety related work was for a 3 year trial to enable a larger set of data. Collisions can go up and down over a period.

The Chair noted that since motorcyclists had entered bus lanes, there had been no improvement in safety. There was no evidence that buses were being slowed, but the committee would like to see disaggregated data for central and greater London.

A member asked about gender specific results. Ms Johnson replied that a split in gender is captured and taken into account. Mr Duckham said that he would look at the casualty analysis.

Action : TfL

The Chief Executive asked if bus drivers had been asked about their thoughts? Ms Johnson replied that TfL's results indicated that they had no major concerns. Mr Duckham offered to look at previous trials in 2005 and 2006

Action: TfL

10 Any other business

Members discussed dead mileage, specifically routes in South West London. The Director, Research and Development explained to members what the problems were in the area and the Chair believed that there was no merit in pursuing this further at the moment.

The Chair of London TravelWatch felt that there should be more information about what to expect when trains broke down. The Safety and Policy Adviser noted that when incidents occur, London TravelWatch would raise any specific concerns with LUL.

11 Resolution to move into confidential session

The Committee resolved, under section 15(b) of schedule 18 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999, that by reason of the confidential nature of the next following item/s, it was desirable in the public interest that the public should be excluded from this part of the meeting.

In confidential session, the Committee reviewed the meeting.

The next Transport Services Committee meeting will be held on 16 December 2010.

12 Glossary

BMF	British Motorcyclists Federation
DfT	Department for Transport
DLR	Docklands Light Railway
LCC	London Cycling Campaign
LOROL	London Overground
LUL	London Underground
NPS	National Passenger Survey
PPM	Public Performance Measure
TfL	Transport for London
TLRN	Transport for London Road Network
TOCs	Train Operating Companies
TVMs	Ticket Vending Machines