

---

## Minutes

Agenda item: 5  
Drafted: 27.09.18

---

### Minutes of the Policy Committee meeting held on 11 September 2018

#### Contents

- 1 Apologies for absence and declarations of interest
- 2 Chair's introduction and pre-meeting announcements
- 3 Minutes
- 4 Matters arising (PC141)
- 5 Key activities (PC142)
- 6 Panel discussion with representatives from Transport for London: James Meade, General Sponsor of Dial-a-Ride, Martin Junge, Sponsor, Surface Strategy and Network Development, Hail and Ride and Joyce Mamode, Head of Assisted Transport
- 7 Stranded trains in the Lewisham area on 2 March 2018 (PC144)
- 8 Casework Q1 performance report (PC145)
- 9 National Rail Q1 performance report (PC146)
- 10 TfL Q1 performance report (PC147)
- 11 Update on current issues
- 12 Any other business
- 13 Resolution to move into confidential session

#### Present

##### Members

Jackie Ballard, Alan Benson, Richard Dilks, Glyn Kyle, Arthur Leathley (AL), John Stewart (Chair)

##### In attendance

Mark Wild                                      Managing Director of London Underground (Item 8)

##### Secretariat

Tim Bellenger	Director, Policy & Investigation
Gytha Chinweze	Governance Officer
Janet Cooke	Chief Executive
Mags Croucher	Casework Officer
Richard Freeston-Clough	Operations and Communications Manager
Luke Muskett	Committee and Public Liaison Officer
Trevor Rosenberg	Policy Officer
Vincent Stops	Senior Policy Officer

## **Minutes**

### **1 Apologies for absence and declarations of interest**

Apologies for absence had been received from Abdi Osman. AL apologised that he would have to leave at midday to attend another engagement.

Alan Benson restated that he was the Chair of Transport for All, though would be speaking in the capacity as a Board Member of London TravelWatch.

### **2 Chair's introduction and pre-meeting announcements**

The Chair welcomed those present to the meeting and made the standard safety announcements.

### **3 Minutes**

The minutes of the Policy Committee of 12 June 2018 were amended. The word 'on' was replaced with 'and TfL rail' in the final sentence in section 11 on page 9. The Chair signed the amended minutes as a correct record.

### **4 Matters arising (PC135)**

AL asked about the progress of item 2. The Chief Executive replied that initial contact had been made to set up a meeting. He asked that it be followed up on as it was an important issue.

#### **ACTION: Director, Policy and Investigation**

With regards to item 4, a member asked that the Board was informed by email when delayed performance reports had been published on London TravelWatch's website.

### **5 Key activities (PC136)**

A member enquired what had been the context of discussions with Ian Wright and Louise Casey with regards to airport customer experience. The Director, Policy and Investigation said that it related to a piece of research that Transport Focus was carrying out in relation to how people commuted to the airport, though they had broadened it out to also include the customer service experience. In terms of the content of the report, he remarked that nothing within it seemed to contradict with London TravelWatch's view on the topic.

AL asked if there was anything to report with regards to GTR coming out of the alliance board meeting. The Director, Policy and Investigation replied that they were continuing their phased introduction of additional services, which would put things back to where they were initially meant to be when the May timetable was introduced. Things were progressing at a 'steady rate', and GTR was aiming to have the full May timetable implemented by December.

The Chair asked what had been the nature of the meeting with regards to Clapham Junction. The Chief Executive said that she had had some concerns about how it operated as a station given it was the busiest interchange in the city. She remarked that she would be able to provide more detail during the private session.

The Director, Policy and Investigation said that London TravelWatch had received the full feasibility study report on the possibility of having step-free access on central line platforms at Bank station. Although the works would cost several millions of pounds to undertake, this was not as high as had been first thought. However, he remarked that TfL had stated that they did not have the funds to carry out the works and were reluctant to get involved. During the meeting, it had also been revealed that TfL had not explored alternative ways of providing funding for the project, and had not talked to the City of London Corporation about it.

A member asked whether the withdrawal of ticket machines on the tram network could become a major issue for London TravelWatch. The Director, Policy and Investigation said that the machines had had very little use by the time that they were withdrawn by TfL, and London TravelWatch had not received any comments from the public regarding the issue. The Chair asked that if complaints did start to come in that the Board be informed about them.

## **6 Panel discussion with representatives from Transport for London: James Meade, General Sponsor of Dial-a-Ride, Martin Junge, Sponsor, Surface Strategy and Network Development, Hail and Ride and Joyce Mamode, Head of Assisted Transport**

Mr Meade introduced himself and gave an overview on how TfL wished to progress Dial-a-Ride services going forward. The overall goal was to make the service more efficient and cost effective. This in turn would enable more people to being able to use the service and allow Dial-a-Ride to have a sustainable funding model for the future. At present the organisation was limited by its current booking scheduler that had been in place for the previous 10 years, which they would be looking to re-procure that once the current contract expired. He commented that TfL would also be looking at ways to integrate services across London boroughs.

Mr Junge stated that there were a total of 88 hail and ride sections on the network, which had been broken down into three groups to gauge their current level of support from the boroughs and the public for them being converted into permanent bus stops. Of the 88, 65 were labelled red meaning that they were unsupported for the conversion. 8 of the sections had been marked as amber. This was where TfL believed the boroughs may be receptive to the change if encouraged to do so. Finally, 15 sections had been marked as green. All green sections currently had political support for the scheme and had approached TfL for funding in order to begin works. Mr Junge said that of the 15 sections, 4 were expected to make progress 'fairly soon': the K1 in Kingston, the E10 in Ealing, the B13 in Bexley and the W4 in Haringey.

Ms Mamode commented that TfL was actively contacting vulnerable bus users to enable them to have access to a wider range of transport services. This included giving people the confidence to use different modes of transport and providing them with the correct information for what was available to them. A scheme that

TfL had introduced to help with this aim was the use of travel mentors that would accompany vulnerable bus users to see what difficulties they faced, and who could suggest more optimal means of transport. For individuals who had been turned down for services such as Dial-a-Ride, travel mentoring had been offered as a first means of appeal to passengers. She stated that approximately six London boroughs had signed up to TfL's eligibility criteria for Taxicard.

Ms Mamode remarked that TfL was undertaking a transport pilot for people using Taxicard and Dial-a-Ride. At present, users would be granted 104 trips per year. In some cases this could be inflexible for passengers as it meant combining multiple trips together would use up more than one of their allocated trips for the year. The pilot scheme that was being trialled allowed the 300 participants to use a virtual cash budget where they would be more able to combine journeys and also travel further distances based on how much of their budget they had used up.

A member asked Mr Junge what had been the reason for why boroughs had been reluctant to replace hail and ride sections. Mr Junge replied that he had not been able to do a full analysis on the reasons why. From experience, the general cause for pushback was due to it reducing parking spaces and some boroughs would be politically against the change.

To Mr Meade, a member asked what would a positive outcome look like in terms of TfL's goals for greater optimisation of their services. Mr Meade said the first six months would be based around data gathering and improving the organisations relationships with the boroughs. A year on, TfL would have expected to have a 'very clear tech roadmap' that would demonstrate the requirements they wished to be able to offer. Within 18 months they planned to be working with at least three partners who could integrate with TfL's new IT system and offer their transport services to TfL passengers. He remarked that if they were able to demonstrate that their model was successful and was more cost effective, others would come on-board.

A member asked whether unfulfilled journeys on Dial-a-Ride were being captured by TfL. Mr Meade replied that 89-95% of journeys that were scheduled did go ahead, and the organisation had been slowly working on improving the statistics for some years. The member commented that he had met Ms Mamode previously at an event and had been impressed by the mentoring scheme they had demonstrated. However, he wondered how many people were aware of the service. Ms Mamode replied that a lack of awareness of the scheme was something that TfL was aware of. She added that she would be working with colleagues in the communications and marketing team to make sure the scheme was better publicised to the people it was intended to reach.

The Chair asked Mr Junge how London TravelWatch could assist to move hail and ride sections currently labelled as amber into the green category. Mr Junge replied that TfL would initially need to build relationships with the boroughs to see if they can find a way forward. The Chair suggested that if there was a role for London TravelWatch to play he would encourage Mr Junge to use them, as they would be able to bring additional pressure that perhaps TfL could not do internally. The Senior Policy Officer agreed and added that the policy team would like to have all information TfL had on hail and ride as Mr Junge and his colleagues could provide them in order to facilitate this.

The Director, Policy and Investigation stated that TfL had stopped publishing the amount of accessible bus stops. The last published data suggested the overall figure was in the region of 95%, though this did not reflect the true situation in particular boroughs, such as Bromley, where the figure was far lower. The Senior Policy Officer concurred and said that having the complete data from TfL would enable London TravelWatch to 'name and shame' those boroughs who were failing to make stops accessible. Ms Mamode said that she would need to escalate that with her superiors before she would be able to provide an answer as to whether they could provide the data.

## **7 Stranded trains in the Lewisham area on 2 March 2018 (PC144)**

The Director, Policy and Investigation provided members with a synopsis of the report into the stranded trains in the Lewisham area on 2 March 2018. Due to the weather conditions on the day, and earlier delays on the network, there were significantly more passengers travelling at the time when the incident occurred. Southeastern and Network Rail were also dealing with much more severe incidents across the Kent network in which trains had become snowed in on the track and could not move, causing a knock-on impact for trains travelling through Lewisham.

He stated that there had also been conflicting priorities between the train operator and emergency services that had been called out to the incident. The fire service had prioritised evacuating passengers whilst the railway had been more concerned with getting services moving again in order to prevent further disruption. He commented that several recommendations had been made in the report which the industry would be wise to implement. A second report into the incident was being produced by the Rail Accident Investigation Bureau, and London TravelWatch would comment on it upon its publication.

A member remarked that having read the report, it appeared that if signallers had allowed the seventh train to move into the station the issue could have been resolved far quicker and perhaps prevented passengers from self-evacuating from the train. However, staff had appeared to have been reluctant to do this as they had more concerned with adhering to safety rules than using their initiative to resolve the problem. The Director, Policy and Investigation agreed and remarked that although there was flexibility in the rules to use initiative in such incidents, due to this power being rarely used, staff would likely have not been aware of that they were allowed to do so.

The Director, Policy and Investigation stated that the inability of staff to take initiative to help resolve the incident also fed into another related issue. Through the policy of modernising control and signalling centres there had been a loss of corporate knowledge as, in general, senior staff would leave the organisation when the centre was relocated. A member queried whether the additional loss of staff with local knowledge of the network would have also been a factor. The Director, Policy and Investigation said that he could not comment for certain though it seemed likely.

The Board agreed that it was important that London TravelWatch ensured that the industry had learnt from the incident and continued to put pressure on it to implement the recommendations made in the report. A second session on the topic would be arranged for 2019 to see how it had progressed.

## **8 Casework Q1 performance report (PC145)**

The Casework Officer presented the Casework Q1 performance report and gave some detail on the work the team had received. There had been more cases received involving South Western Railway than had occurred previously, though this was likely due to delay repay compensation having been introduced for passengers. She commented that for cases that had taken longer than expected, the casework team had been required to repeatedly go back to the operators to convince them that the passenger was correct in their complaint.

A member stated that he had found the examples of individual cases within the report to be very interested – with many resulting in positive outcomes for the people involved. He enquired as to whether the information could be publicised on the London TravelWatch website to show the successful work the organisation carries out for passengers.

**ACTION: Operations and Communications Manager**

## **9 National Rail Q1 performance report (PC146)**

The Director, Policy and Investigation presented the Network Rail Q1 performance report and drew the Board's attention to the highlights of particular operators that had seen their performance decline over the period. He remarked that members were already aware of the poor performance of GTR following the introduction of the May timetable changes. South Western Railway from Waterloo to Basingstoke had seen a significant drop in peak hour performance and Great Western's peak hour performance had seen a sharp decline from 82% to 66%. The Director, Policy and Investigation remarked that he could speculate that the introduction of new infrastructure would have been one of the reasons for Great Western's fall in performance during this period, but had asked them for a formal explanation.

A member commented that a lot of industry jargon had been used in the report. He was concerned that this would not be clear to the public, who would be reading it without such knowledge, and asked that in future things were explained more clearly. The member also recommended having the Right Time Arrival (RTA) measurement data shown first in the report followed by the Public Performance Measure (PPM) statistics, as he suggested the RTA was more relevant to the passenger. The Director, Policy and Investigation remarked that both measurements did not give a completely accurate account of rail operator performance. The Chair asked that the RTA data be moved to the front for the next report, though if it was felt that the new format did not work it be moved back to the previous version.

**ACTION: Policy Officer (KB)**

## **10 TfL Q1 performance report (PC147)**

The Senior Policy Officer stated that London TravelWatch had not been able to compile the performance information on TfL as they had been late in submitting it into them. Upon its completion it would be sent to members.

**ACTION: Senior Policy Officer**

He stated that TfL's board would be meeting that afternoon and they had produced their own version of the report, though without the detail contained in London TravelWatch's reports. Although most of the information within it was to be expected, there had been a slight reduction in the number of people cycling in the central area – which would be a surprise to many. The decline had also been reflected in household travel surveys that had been sent out to residents in the area.

## **11 Update on current issues**

The Director, Policy and Investigation gave a brief summary regarding the transport issues that had been occurring over recent weeks. He stated that on 31 August it was announced that the opening of Crossrail would be pushed back from December 2018 until autumn 2019. The main reason for why this has occurred was due to a failure in integrating the various signalling systems that would be used across the network. Therefore, a decision was made to delay the opening on the central section so those issues could be resolved properly.

The Chair remarked that the delay was announced very suddenly despite the fact that London TravelWatch had been given reassurances from people at Crossrail and TfL on several occasions that the service would open in December 2018. He suggested, given the extent on the delay, they must have known it would not be opening on time but had refused to admit it until the last moment. The Chief Executive said that it was something that could be discussed in the private session.

The Director, Policy and Investigation said that London TravelWatch had known for some time about the proposal by National Rail to close Angel Road station and replace it with the new Meridian Water station 580 metres to the south. The current layout of the station was not particularly accessible and it did not receive a high amount of footfall. The Policy Officer (TR) stated that he had visited the station and suggested it would have needed a series of improvements if the replacement station had not been proposed.

Finally, the Director, Policy and Investigation gave an update of the electrification process of the Barking to Gospel Oak line. The electrification of the line had been completed and electric freight trains were currently in use on the track. By the end of November, TfL have said that they would start to introduce electric trains on a phased basis. This was dependent on the software working correctly and drivers being sufficiently trained to work on the network.

The Director, Policy and Investigation said that the current diesel trains that had been in use on the line prior to electrification would be reallocated to West Midlands Railway when the lease expired in December. However, due to West Midlands likely delaying the introduction of their new timetable, following problems with the national timetable implementation, there would likely be an extension period for when the trains had to be passed on to West Midlands if TfL required one.

## **12 Any other business**

There was no other business.

### **13 Resolution to move into confidential session**

The meeting 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, that it was desirable in the public interest that the public should be excluded from the meeting.

In confidential session, members reviewed financial or reputational risks posed by the meeting.