
Confidential Minutes

Agenda item: 16
Drafted: 24.04.13

**Confidential minutes of the Policy committee held on 23 April 2013
at Dexter House, London EC2**

These minutes are in addition to the public minutes of a meeting of the Committee on the same date. In that meeting it was resolved, under section 15(2)(b) of schedule 18 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999, that by reason of the confidential nature of the item(s) to be discussed, it was desirable in the public interest that the public should be excluded for this part of the meeting.

Contents

- 1 Confidential minutes and matters arising**
- 2 Transport for London performance report (TRS045)**
- 3 Meeting review**

Members

Richard Dilks, Glyn Kyle, Stephen Locke (Chair), Abdikafi Rage, Ruth Thompson

Secretariat

Keletha Barrett	Policy Assistant (minutes)
Tim Bellenger	Director, Policy & Investigation
Janet Cooke	Chief Executive
Vincent Stops	Policy Officer

Minutes

1 Confidential minutes and matters arising

The confidential minutes of the Consumer Affairs committee held on 12 February 2103 and the Transport Services committee held on 12 March 2013 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

It was noted that the Casework report would be presented to the Policy committee in June as the current meeting fell too soon after the end of the quarter for the data to be captured and analysed.

It was noted that the presentation on buses at the previous Transport Services committee had been overlong and that speakers should be reminded to limit themselves to around 15 minutes. Presentations should be sent to London TravelWatch in advance where possible.

2 Value for money on the railway

Andy Firman, Research Director at Aecom, gave a presentation on research he was conducting on behalf of London TravelWatch about passenger perceptions of value for money on the railway. He said that six two-hour focus groups had been carried out and the included people using national rail and TfL modes, leisure users, Oyster pay as you go tickets, season ticket holders and people aged between 18 and 60.

The research found that passengers continually recalibrated cost and value for money (VFM) calculations and were often unable to make a distinction between cost and VFM. The research found that passengers perceived Transport for London (TfL) to offer better VFM than better than national rail and that south east performed poorly, compared to the national average (43% versus 47% national average as shown in the National Passenger Survey).

Passengers thought they got good VFM on for trains but poor VFM on buses. Most people were unaware of the extent of savings achieved from purchasing a season ticket and people did not think about its other uses outside work. Annual season tickets were viewed as unaffordable unless the facilities were there to pay monthly using a season ticket loan or zero-interest credit card. The research showed that if people could afford to purchase a season ticket, they were unwilling to do so, due to the uncertain economic climate.

Passengers viewed Oyster fares as the standard price and the cash price a rip off. The VFM perception for Oyster was undermined by lack of fare knowledge, cap unreliability, usage concerns relating to interchanges, incomplete journeys (failure to properly touch in and out) and a reluctance to register Oyster cards.

When looking across all modes, the research found that people were not aware of the benefits of railcards and the strongest VFM driver related to the ability to purchase advanced fares and the price offered by online retailers instead of train companies directly.

It was found that people had a varied view of who provided a better service between train companies, London Underground, buses and trams.

During the research, people were asked whether they would be willing to travel to work earlier or later than currently in order to avoid overcrowding during the peak. People were not willing to change their travel patterns as it would negatively impact on their work obligations or social lives.

There was a pragmatic response to lower density seating, especially amongst commuters. People tended to prefer the new Metropolitan line seating instead of the old fashion three-seater styles.

Mr Firman concluded that there was room for improvement but the transport industry was generally moving in the right direction. He said that TfL assumed that everyone knew about Oyster when in fact there were some knowledge gaps. He was surprised that people were not given more information about how to make best use of it.

This research would be circulated to members in draft format before being made public.

Action: Director, Policy and Investigation

3 Possible future transport initiatives (PC004)

The Director, Policy and Investigation, presented his report on possible future transport initiatives. He said the aim of the report was to highlight initiatives that were not already in major transport plans, in writing the report he had had particular regard to suggesting alternative routes that avoided Central London and to join up current services better. He said the report was intended to give a broad overview of what might be done, it was not for London TravelWatch to cost or prioritise suggestions, although any additional non transport benefits had been highlighted. .

The Chief Executive said that the document had been produced at the request of Dedring, the Deputy Mayor for Transport.

It was agreed that members would be given a couple of weeks to review the paper and submit any comments or suggestions to the Director, Policy and Investigation.

Action: All

4 Meeting review

Risk issues: It was noted that the room was too small for effective public and in future meetings would be held in the LPFA board room where possible. However no cost free alternatives had been available on this occasion because the meeting had been planned at a relatively late stage, given that there was only one item on the agenda for the public part of the meeting the decision had been taken to use London TravelWatch's own room despite its disadvantages.

Press and Media opportunities: No specific media opportunities were identified during the meeting.