
Secretariat memorandum

Author: Keletha Barrett/Vincent Stops

Agenda item: 9

PC045

Drafted: 12.11.14

Trams Satisfaction Comparison

1 Purpose of report

- 1.1. To share interesting but inconclusive work, that was undertaken to attempt to compare passenger satisfaction with London's Tramlink and tram services operated in Blackpool, Manchester Metrolink, Midland Metro (Birmingham/Wolverhampton), Nottingham Express Transit (NET), and Sheffield Supertram.

2 Recommendation

- 2.1. That members note the report.

3 Information

- 3.1. Passenger Focus (PF) has a remit to represent passengers using the tram service in England but not in London. In 2013, they conducted surveys on the tram systems operating in their area, to measure and compare tram passengers satisfaction with their journey.¹
- 3.2. PF hoped Transport for London (TfL) would conduct a similar survey on London's Tramlink. However, TfL already conducts its own quarterly survey of the London Tram network and did not wish to commission nor pay for a separate survey. London TravelWatch hosted several meetings between TfL, Tramlink and PF to discuss the respective surveys.
- 3.3. Whilst recognising that the surveying methods were very different, we nevertheless did some analysis and comparison of the findings that used analogous questions, to see if there were any lessons to be learnt.
- 3.4. The surveys were done differently. TfL's surveys are conducted face to face, on a rolling basis, whilst PF asked participants to return survey forms. The survey undertaken by PF is split into sections, from very satisfied to very dissatisfied - very and fairly satisfied, which have been combined to give an overall percentage score. TfL records satisfaction findings as mean score, rated on a scale of 0-10, with the former extremely dissatisfied and latter extremely satisfied, and composite score for each area (stops; train; journey), based on the

¹ [PF Tram Passenger Survey \(TPS\) - Autumn 2013 Report](#)

total responses for the individual measures. PF scores are recorded as percentages.

- 3.5. It should also be noted that all of the networks have their own characteristics. They all vary in age of the network, size/length, and the volume of passengers using each system.
- 3.6. Although there were similarities in the questions used, it was agreed that there were too many differences between the tram networks for the comparison to be conclusive.

4 Conclusion

- 4.1. Setting aside the difference in methodology and network characteristics, it is clear that tram services with newest rolling stock are the most highly rated.
- 4.2. London Tramlink does relatively well on the value for money score, only second to Blackpool.
- 4.3. The Passenger Focus methodology is useful to them as they can directly compare their results with their similar rail and bus surveys. In a similar manner TfL can compare across London modes. For TfL to undertake a PF type survey would be of some interest, but one would think it may not be easy to justify.

5 Equalities and inclusion implications

- 5.1. None – report is for information only.

6 Legal powers

- 6.1. 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).

7 Financial implications

None – report is for information only.