
Secretariat memorandum

Author: Vincent Stops

Agenda item: 12

LTW448

Drafted: 03.10.13

Consideration of TfL Performance Report targets

1 Purpose of report

- 1.1. Members have asked to review London TravelWatch's approach to the assessment of Transport for London's (TfL) performance against its Business Plan targets for the various modes. This report sets out some of the issues and invites comment.

2 Recommendation

- 2.1. The TfL Board sets performance targets for each mode as part of its budget setting process. For some years London TravelWatch has distilled the performance information that TfL produce into a format that is more accessible to members. London TravelWatch has generally monitored actual performance against these TfL targets.
- 2.2. This process has been an invaluable tool for both members and officers. It has enabled the Board and its Committees to challenge the performance of TfL modes. Operational management of particular services have been invited to attend its meetings and explain any under performance.
- 2.3. Members have asked to review this approach and consider if the targets TfL are setting itself are appropriate from a user perspective.

3 Streets

- 3.1. The main TfL streets target is Journey Time Reliability (JTR). It has only been established relatively recently and attempts to measure the proportion of journeys that are completed reliably. TfL measure the proportion of standard 30 minute journeys that are completed in less than 35 minutes. At present about 89% of a standard 30 minute journey are completed within 35 minutes. TfL have selected an achievable target and hope to improve slightly over the Business Plan period. TfL are attempting improve this measure by managing the network better in terms of road works, disruption (planned and unplanned) and a programme of technology improvements at traffic signals. This target is the closest TfL gets to measuring congestion and is closely related to traffic volumes.
- 3.2. Streets users want to have both reliable and quicker journeys, ideally free from congestion. The issue with the JTR is that it is not a measure of journey time. There are no proposals in the MTS that are expected to deliver less congested streets. A

reasonable target would be that congestion becomes no worse than the London plan central forecast rise of 14% over the plan period.

- 3.3. The second important streets target is road (and footway) maintenance condition. Essentially this measures the proportion of the carriageway that is in need of maintenance. The target has previously been 8% (lower is better), but due to two very bad winters this target was not achieved. TfL have since reassessed this target and have relaxed the Business Plan target to 10%. TfL believe this is sustainable and acceptable. The present performance is 10% (9% for footways).
- 3.4. Road maintenance condition is clearly important to all users of London's streets. Improving roads maintenance condition is very expensive. Members may wish to ask TfL to present to them regarding the cost and benefits of tightening this target back to 8%.
- 3.5. The final important target for streets is to increase cycling levels. The target is to increase cycling levels by 400% from 2001 levels by 2026. This is important target as it is part of the assumptions in the MTS and London Plan. It is an ambitious target. At present the growth in cycling is not being achieved, but there are ambitious plans to grow cycling, though to achieve the levels of growth suggested in the manner suggested by the Mayor may impact on other modes. Members will know that bus services will be affected by the implementation of the cycle scheme at Stratford. It is likely that similar schemes will impact negatively on other streets targets.
- 3.6. All of these issues are captured, in a sense, in the overall customer satisfaction score. Overall Customer Satisfaction has improved to 76 in 2012 from 72 in 2010. As stated above the primary factor is congestion levels and so is unlikely to improve, indeed in the longer term as traffic volumes and congestion rises it can be expected to fall.

4 Bus services

- 4.1. Bus service performance, as measured by Excess Waiting Time (EWT), is better now than at any time since records began. However, this level of performance will not be maintained as demand for bus services increase without additional resources to address crowding and delays caused by traffic congestion.
- 4.2. In addition to improvements in reliability and frequency of services, bus passengers also want to see shorter journey times. However, there is no TfL target for journey time. Timetabled journey times could be extended to allow for longer journeys in order to maintain EWT .It would be of concern if the EWT target were maintained at the expense of journey times.
- 4.3. London TravelWatch has been in dialogue with TfL regarding journey times, particularly as this can now be measured automatically using IBus. It is suggested that we take up this issue again with a view to agreeing a journey time target.
- 4.4. Passengers are also frustrated by curtailment of bus services before their final destination and overcrowded sections of bus routes. TfL may well maintain data on these facets of bus service operation. It could be possible to set a target for curtailments of services. Members may also want to consider if a published performance target would be appropriate for crowding on sections of bus route. There is presently only a Customer Satisfaction survey for crowding.

- 4.5. At present customer satisfaction is above target, i.e. 84 against a target of 82. Maintaining this target against a backdrop of rising demand, increasing general traffic volumes and reducing resources will be a challenge for London's bus services.

5 Underground services

- 5.1. London's Underground services are also performing very well at present in terms of the Network Excess Journey Time (NEJT) measure. This improvement in performance has been the result of the huge investment in the Underground, in new rolling stock, signalling systems etc. In response to this investment LUL have progressively tightened the target over the Business Plan period.
- 5.2. Like buses, the Underground overall satisfaction scores are presently above target.
- 5.3. Capacity is increasing on the Underground by means of longer and more frequent trains, though levels of crowding on some sections of the Underground is high are forecast to rise (for example between St Pancras and Euston stations). Members may want to consider if a published performance target would be appropriate for crowding on sections of the Underground. There is only a Customer Satisfaction score for crowding.

6 Docklands Light Railway

- 6.1. Docklands Light Railway is a little different from TfL's other modes insofar as its performance is specified in the contract between TfL and the operator SERCO.
- 6.2. Dockland Light Railway has performed well for many years. There was a dip in performance during the 3-car project whilst trains were lengthened. Both performance and customer satisfaction levels are presently high
- 6.3. Serving the Thames Gateway area means that the DLR is likely to come under particular pressures in terms of demand and crowding as the area goes through a rapid period of growth. Members may want to consider if a published performance target would be appropriate for crowding on sections of the DLR. There is presently only a Customer Satisfaction statistic on crowding.

7 Tramlink

- 7.1. Tramlink is generally performing well in terms of its performance target: Percentage of Scheduled Services Operated and Customer Satisfaction. Again crowding is an issue which does not presently have a monitored target. There is only a Customer Satisfaction Score for crowding.

8 London Overground

- 8.1. London Overground is performing very well against both TfL and National Rail performance targets. Its TfL Customer Satisfaction Scores and National Passenger Survey scores are high, the latter the highest of all train operators. Again crowding is an issue which does not presently have a monitored target except in so far as there is a customer satisfaction score for crowding.

9 Dial-a-Ride

- 9.1. Dial-a-Ride's main performance measure is the 'number of journeys delivered'. For some years Dial-a-Ride struggled to deliver the budgeted number of journeys, but over the last year or so it has been achieving the target numbers. However, demand for its services will be rising and so the challenge is to deliver more journeys for the same or smaller budget.
- 9.2. Again, until recently the overall Customer Satisfaction score, though higher than other modes, has been lower than target. At present Dial-a-Ride is almost at target for overall customer satisfaction. However, the overall score masks a particular problem with Dial-a-Ride which is the booking service. Most journeys are identical, regular weekly or monthly journeys and as such are scheduled by the systems. However, one-off requests must be made by phone on a first come first served basis and so there is a problem with queuing on the phones waiting for an operator.

10 Prioritisation criteria

- 10.1. Members find the TfL Performance Report a useful tool to enable them to challenge the various modes with TfL. Hitherto judgements on performance have been based on an assessment against TfL's own targets. A review of this process has been requested by members with a view to it setting targets more relevant to passengers and that would provide greater challenge.

11 Equalities and inclusion implications

- 11.1. This is clearly an equality and inclusion issue, particularly for elderly users and those with visual and mobility impairments who find navigating London's cluttered streets problematical.

12 Legal powers

- 12.1. Section 248 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 places upon London TravelWatch (as the London Transport Users Committee) a duty to consider – and where it appears to the Committee to be desirable, to make recommendations with respect to - any matter affecting the functions of the Greater London Authority or Transport for London which relate to transport (other than of freight).

13 Financial implications

- 13.1. There are no financial implications for London TravelWatch arising from this report, beyond the cost of publication which will be undertaken within the existing budget.