

Minutes of Transport Focus Board Meeting

Date: Thursday 21 July 2016
 Location: Fleetbank House, Salisbury Square, London
 Time: 10.00 – 13.20

Attended

Board members

Jeff Halliwell	JH	Chair
Isabel Liu	IL	Board member
Stephen Locke	SL	Board member
Bob Linnard	BL	Board member
Diane McCrea MBE	DM	Board member
Dr Stuart Burgess CBE	SB	Board member
Philip Mendelsohn	PM	Board member
Marian Lauder MBE	ML	Board member
Paul Rowen	PR	Board member
Theo de Pencier	TP	Board member

Management team and other staff

Anthony Smith	AS	Chief Executive
David Sidebottom	DS	Passenger director
Guy Dangerfield	GD	Road user director
Jon Carter	JC	Head of business services
Ian Wright	IW	Head of insight
Mike Hewitson	MH	Head of policy and issues
Sara Nelson	SN	Head of communications
Michelle Calvert	MC	Business services executive

Guest Speakers

Chris Curtis	CC	Head of Crossrail2, Network Rail
Michelle Dix	MD	Managing director, Crossrail2

No members of the public attended.

Part A: Preliminary

1.0 Chair's opening remarks

JH opened the meeting and welcomed those attending. There were no apologies for absence. He advised that Michelle Dix, Managing director for Crossrail2 and Chris Curtis of Network Rail would be attending the meeting to give a presentation on the Crossrail2 project.

2.0 Minutes of the previous meetings (11 February and 17 March 2016)

The Board **approved** the minutes and authorised the Chair to sign them, subject to some minor changes.

3.0 Board and Members Event Action Matrix

The action matrix was discussed and updated.

4.0 Chair's Report

JH stated that he had written to the new ministers and hoped that the level of engagement with them would be as good as with previous ministers. He had also been engaged in the issues surrounding the Southern timetable change. SN gave the Board members an update on the information she and her team had been collating in relation to passenger stories and the emotional tracker. She stated that the information gathered was intended to explore passenger's experiences and the impact it had on their lives, rather than just stating whether or not they were satisfied with the service. There is also now a Twitter hashtag *#passengervoice* which passengers can use to feedback their journey experiences. SN expressed the importance of spreading this message and asked that Board members continue to spread the word to interested groups and ask everyone to use the hashtag.

IW said that there had been some feedback from GTR, which had complained that the website was too negative. He felt however that passengers are not yet feeling any of the future benefit (as promised) and their current journeys have not yet stabilised. He also suggested that there is a risk of users only downloading the emotional tracker app in order to make negative comments or complaints and, therefore, the information may not be wholly balanced. However, it was felt that if this was the case, there are also staff and other diaries, which will help to give a more balanced view.

5.0 Chief Executive's Report

AS confirmed most of his report would be covered elsewhere on the agenda. He had, however, been heavily focussed on Southern and Thameslink issues and, in particular, compensation arrangements. Getting passengers to complain was important as it was often the only way, given the flows of money it produced, operators would sit up and take notice. He had noted the comments from recent meetings and agreed further research was needed on the structure of the contracts and what, if any, arrangements for triggering breach were included.

Part B: Public affairs

1.0 Recently Published Work

a) Tram Passenger Survey (May 2016)

DS updated the board on the survey of 5,000 passengers, noting that stakeholder events had been hosted along with Transport for Greater Manchester, who we know value this work. The results of the survey show general improvements in customer satisfaction levels and these have been fed back to the various operators. Next week, DS would be presenting the results at the UK Light Rail Conference.

TP wondered if there had been any progress with funding from Sheffield and Nottingham; DS confirmed this was still work in progress.

b) NRPS Spring Wave (June 2016)

DS reminded the board that the spring wave had been published three weeks ago. The clear message from the South East concerned compensation due to disruption, and 15 minute delay repay was more urgent than ever.

The results are currently being fed out to individual service providers. There will be a meeting with Arriva Trains on 25 July and there is also now a joint NRPS action plan in conjunction with Network Rail in order to help improve satisfaction.

IW advised that there have been some technical issues with Southeastern and, therefore, the figures may need to be reviewed. An investigation into what caused the problem is ongoing, although it is clear it is not one of Transport Focus's making.

AS congratulated IW and his team on this latest wave; the launch and graphics were the best yet and set a benchmark for future work.

c) SE Quadrant Emotional Tracker (June 2016)

IW recalled that this piece of work was being used to capture passenger experience affected by ongoing works at London Bridge and across the South East. Results included core passenger needs, variations in experience and showed how sensitively people react to the punctuality of trains. Results have garnered some interest from Nexus, NTR and Crossrail. Also, Great Western feel that it would be a useful tool for them.

d) Bus Passengers have their say: trust (March 2016)

DS explained that this piece of work had been launched in Manchester and had a three-pronged approach. One aspect was looking at trust and the relationship passengers have with industry. The second was looking at bus passengers priorities for improvement. The final part was a more in-depth view of non-users of bus services. Together, these give a strong policy base on which to be able to determine what we expect to see from future services, development work in West Midlands and setting the agenda for passengers for the longer term future.

DS and Robert Pain met with First Bus on 20 July and the newly appointed customer experience director was very interested in this piece of work. They discussed how customer experience can shape the trust level through discussion on social media. Therefore, the industry is extremely interested in this type of passenger-focussed work.

e) Roadside facilities (July 2016)

GD gave an overview of the key findings of this piece of work. Those surveyed are broadly happy and feel that services on motorways met their expectations; however, services provided on trunk roads are much poorer. These services are inconsistent. Furthermore, the study found that HGV drivers are very unsatisfied with services provided for them. These users have to stop by law and they seem to be most unhappy with the provision in place for them. Comments were noted about the lack of cleanliness of the bathroom facilities and the need for improvement.

GD also suggested that the Highways England need to embrace the idea that the roadside services are part of their remit as they form part of the road user experience and, therefore, they need to be involved in the necessary improvements.

SL suggested that improvements in services may be easier to push forward if all services were held to a common quality standard. At present there is no baseline, but if a rating system similar to the stars for accommodation were applied, at least service users would know what to expect. Highways England should be able to lead on for this.

GD would now like quantitative research carried out into satisfaction levels among service users.

f) Demand Responsive Transport (June 2016)

DS said that this had involved looking at the impact on those who have lost bus services and different solution models which have been developed over the past five years in areas such as Worcestershire, Suffolk and Hampshire. They had surveyed a mixture of service users and non-users. Users tend to be satisfied with the service, but it needs better publicity, particularly for younger users in rural communities. Good practice has been shared extensively across local operators and trade bodies.

Part C: Workplan report

1.0 Workplan report 2016-17

The Workplan Report was **noted** by the Board.

IW reported that Key Objective (KO) 1 (modernisation of the NRPS) was on track following the earlier consultation. The results have been fed through into the ITT. The new contract is expected to be awarded in October.

In respect of KO2 (BPS) budgets for local authorities are very tight at present. Transport Focus is in negotiations with Transport Scotland who may be providing £40k of funding and also the regional consortiums have pledged a further £15k. Transport for Wales is still considering its position, but Arriva have suggested they may have up to £10k available.

Further north, DS confirmed that Transport for Greater Manchester were financially involved for the first time in 5 years. Recent discussions have also indicated that Lancashire County Council may be prepared to commit to a four year partnership.

Approaches to an established operator on Humberside, however, had been less successful, as their patronage is down by 8%, and they are not in a position to commit to the BPS it at present.

Although they would be interested in being involved, they just couldn't commit to this at present. DS said that this reflected several conversations he'd had with operators. The decline in both patronage and support may suggest a need for a radical rethink of BPS funding and methodology before too long.

GD updated the board on KO3 (SRUSS). Good progress had been made in working towards fixing the issues with the software, although there have been delays in fixing other bugs. Hopefully this would be back on track soon. As soon as it is completed, it will be shared with the Board and wider community.

KO4 (always-on) would require a new approach, and meetings with Hacktrain (data specialists) had explored the prospect of embedding research tools into existing channels such as apps.

AS said that additional funding, as set out in KO6 is work in progress, and would be given a thorough shake-down at the BIG workshop planned for August. KO7 (staff satisfaction) was likely to be complete by autumn 2016.

KO8 (customer satisfaction) was currently at around 73%, but the key challenge going forward would be managing performance as the team goes through considerable change both in terms of structure and workloads.

KO9 (stakeholder satisfaction) would likely involve an outside agency, and was scheduled for completion towards the end of the year.

SB wondered about the relationship between the work as set out in the workplan and the resources available to deliver it. AS agreed there is a lot of work to do, but there should be enough capacity within the team to complete it. The board will be kept informed.

For clarification, JC noted if the RAG status was not yet identified, it was generally because those workstreams had not yet started.

1.1 Record of Projects

MCa gave an overview of project status which the board **noted**. The CalMac Ferry project was missing from the record; this was because the project review had been approved, marking the formal end of the project, even though it had not yet been published. JC reassured PR that it was still the intention to publish but there was no confirmed date yet.

It was also agreed that the date of generation of the report should be included, as this is a snapshot and project progress is being updated all the time.

2.0 Finance Report

The finance report was discussed and **noted**. ML advised that in terms of the first quarter it was broadly on track. This is going to be a complex year and it is crucial to stay on track. PM commented that, in respect of NRPS, much work had been done but no expenditure was shown. It may be better to balance annual or other fixed payment costs across the year to provide a better indication of ongoing costs.

Part D: Corporate Affairs

1.1 Statistics Governance Group

SL was positive about the work of the Statistics Governance Group. At its meeting on 16 June, it had reviewed the details of the NRPS Spring Wave and the Bus Passenger Survey. It was noted that in general terms the online responses tended to be more critical than the paper responses. This has provided useful knowledge for the Autumn Wave. As had been previously noted, the NRPS ITT was in the field and the Group had confidence that the new contract would be let and managed as indicated.

There was also a very positive update on the Strategic Road User Survey, which had cleared its final hurdles with the DVLA.

The **board** noted the update and the minutes.

1.3 1.4 and 1.5 Audit and Risk Assurance Committee

ML provided an update on the internal audit programme: five audits will be completed this year: road remit change management, information risk, SGG data validation, project governance, and core controls at the end of the year. There are some concerns about delays to the programme, but it can be brought back on track.

A revised risk strategy will be brought to the Board later in the year.

The board **noted** the update and the minutes.

2.0 Items for approval by the Board

2.1 Additional Work Principles

JC explained there was a need for clear guidance on what basis additional work is undertaken, even if it still fits with the mission of the organisation. He stressed that this should be regarded as a work in progress. It was **agreed** in principle subject to some revisions as follows:

- Any work which conflicts with our ability to represent passengers fairly should not be taken on.
- 'Stakeholders' is ambiguous
- Point 6 is too vague; it was suggested a change from 'stakeholder' to 'conflicts' would be more helpful

JC agreed to make the suggested changes and recirculate the document.

2.2 Board Reserve Powers V7

The revised reserve powers policy was **approved** provided that it was amended to make it clearer to interpret.

2.3 Project B71: A120 Roads Research

GD explained the background of the project to the board.

The board felt that the purpose of the project was not clear from the brief and that continuing work is required on sweating the document format.

The project itself was to be commended and was **approved** by the board.

2.4 Project R75: Hinksey blockade

DS gave a brief explanation of this project and confirmed that £8,000 is the cost for staff time. JH requested more transparency in terms of the costings and PM expressed some concerns over the commercial model.

This project was **approved** by the Board.

2.5 Project B72: Road User Performance Metrics

GD explained that this is a large piece of qualitative work. BL queried the funding. SL queried what specific kind of qualitative work. GD confirmed that this was a mixture of group research and individual interviews. IL suggested that the project summary might have included this information.

This project was **approved** by the Board.

2.6 Project A77: Recruitment of new Board Member for Wales

JC gave a summary of this project and undertook to maximise efforts to promote diversity in applications.

This project was **approved** by the Board.

2.7 Annual Report and Accounts 2015-16

JC stated that the accounts had been laid before Parliament, and apologised for including a non-final draft. The board had however seen and approved the very final version. **Noted** by the Board.

2.8 Audit and Risk Assurance Committee: Annual report to Board

ML confirmed that this was complete. This was **noted** by the Board.

2.9 and 2.10 E65: Porterbrook and E67: Mersey Travel

These previously approved projects were **noted** by the Board.

2.11 Project 81R: Tram Passenger Survey

This was **noted** by the Board.

2.12 Equalities Scheme and Action Plan

AS believed that the aims of this scheme and plan were achievable. PM noted that it does not currently include religious holidays and asked for further clarification on how such leave would be granted.

This was **noted** by the Board.

Part B: Public affairs continued

Crossrail2: presentation by Michelle Dix, MD of Crossrail2 and Chris Curtis, Head of Crossrail2, Network Rail

A presentation was provided setting out the scope, challenges and progress of the Crossrail2 project.

MD indicated that one of the major challenges that this project hoped to tackle was population growth. This growth meant an increase in the need for transport capacity and housing. She then went on to explain that merely increasing housing would not solve the problem without making sure that the housing was accessible by public transport and that links are put in place to employment and amenities. She then explained how the project hoped to address these issues.

CC explained that there will be 70km of tunnels providing capacity for 30 trains per hour, which would carry 270,000 people and this is due to open in the early 2030's.

This joint project between Network Rail and TFL will transform travel and increase capacity by 10%.

There are also plans to double suburban services and divert traffic away from Waterloo, thus relieving pressure. This will involve passengers altering their routes, but only to more efficient routes offered by Crossrail2.

CC stressed that this isn't just a London project and it will have benefits for areas much further afield such as Basingstoke, Cambridge, Portsmouth and Southampton. It will also unlock land for the development of 200,000 more new homes and improve links to Stanstead airport, which is currently very difficult to access from certain parts of the country. . There will also be boosts to the economy in the form of construction and supply chain jobs.

The Government had already recognised this project as a priority, with Lord Adonis as the Chair of Crossrail2 and the new Mayor of London endorsing the groundwork.

So far, 4 major public consultations have been carried out on this project, however, there is still work to be done around locations of things such as access routes and vents as people tend to be keen on having easy access to the transport system, but not so keen on having the vents on their street! So far, there have been 21,000 responses to the consultations and 72 drop-in events attended by around 12,000 people.

London will need to contribute over 50% of the funds; there will however be investment opportunities around the creation of stations and advertising opportunities.

There remain some questions to be asked around affordability - the DfT is asking for £4bn of savings from the £31bn estimated costs. Furthermore, there is a question mark over who will ensure that the houses are built around the transport network. It is expected that those who will benefit from this work should pay towards it. Therefore, the funding model will include predictions in farebox revenues, business contributions for those who will gain from increased footfall in the form of a 2% supplement and developers of the community infrastructure will pay a levy. There will also be the increased council tax contributions. This should equate to 56% of the funding.

There may also be indirect contributions such as stamp duty on new houses, which is estimated at 200% of the scheme cost. Therefore, it could be argued that it is acceptable for the finance to be provided upfront in order to pay for the scheme against finances to be collected later. MD stated that she felt they could be much more ambitious about the growth possibilities.

The next steps for this project are community engagement, refining the proposals, commissioning a growth projection report, submitting the Hybrid Bill and then hopefully, the start of construction in the 2020's.

JH asked for more clarification on the airport connectivity improvements. MD gave an overview of the West Anglia Taskforce Report, which gave plans for enabling faster trains which will in turn shorten journey times.

SL asked for a clearer picture of the benefits for Waterloo Station passengers. CC explained that there will be winners and losers, for example, Earls Court was likely to have less trains.

PR asked what effect the works would have on commuters. CC explained that there is a Board in place who will ensure that the eastern end of the transport network fit better and there would be lots of engagement work carried out to ensure the least pain possible. For example, minimising lorry movements during construction through careful planning. There are also many lessons to be learned from Thameslink, which will be taken on board.

PM asked if the network would be designed to plug into Tottenham Court Road. MD stated that yes it would, however, this would be a busy interchange. There are, however, shafts, which were planned so that they could be reopened to minimise works.

JH thanked MD and CC for their contribution and asked that Transport Focus be kept informed of progress.

3.0 Private Session Resolution: Approval and Award of the contract for the National Rail Passenger Survey

The board **RESOLVED** that this discussion was commercially confidential since the affairs of an individual or organisations would be disclosed, and such disclosure may 'seriously and prejudicially' affect their interests; the board further **RESOLVED** that the time and place of the meeting to discuss this confidential business shall be deferred to November 2016 in London.

This resolution was proposed by JH and seconded by SL.

Any Other Business

DM stated that there had been a phenomenal amount of work completed by a small group and wanted to note this and congratulate all members on such an achievement.

The meeting closed at 1320 hrs.

Signed as a true and accurate record of the meeting:

Jeff Halliwell

Chair, Transport Focus

Date