Please find attached the Joint GMCA & AGMA Scrutiny Pool Minutes from the meeting held on 9 December, Members attention is drawn to Minute 16/52 - Joint GMCA & AGMA Scrutiny Pool – CALL-IN OF DECISION 16/45 TfGMCA (METROLINK SECOND CITY CROSSING PATTERNS) referred by the Scrutiny Pool to the GMCA for further consideration.

The report and relevant background documents are attached.
EXTRACT FROM THE GMCA CONSTITUTION

PART 5B - SCRUTINY ARRANGEMENTS FOR GMCA, TfGMC AND TFGM

5. Call in of decisions

5.1 Call in of decisions of GMCA and TfGMC

(a) Members of the Scrutiny Pool appointed under this Protocol will have the power to call in:-

(i) any decision of the GMCA;
(ii) any major or strategic decision of the TfGMC which is taken by the TfGMC in accordance with the delegations set out in Part 3 Section B II of this Constitution.

5.2 Publication of Notice of Decisions

(a) When:-

(i) a decision is made by the GMCA; or
(ii) a major or strategic decision is made by the TfGMC in accordance with the delegations set out in Part 3, Section B II of this Constitution;

the decision shall be published, including where possible by electronic means, and shall be available from the normally within 2 days of being made. It shall be the responsibility of the Secretary to send electronic copies of the records of all such decisions to all members of the Scrutiny Pool within the same timescale.

(b) The notices referred to at subparagraph 5.2(a) above will bear the date on which they are published and will specify that the decision will come into force, and may then be implemented, as from 4.00 pm on the fifth day after the day on which the decision was published, unless 5 members of the Scrutiny Pool object to it and call it in.

5.3 Call-in of decisions of the GMCA, and the TfGMC

(a) During the “Call-in” period specified at subparagraph 5.2(b) above the Secretary shall:-

(i) call-in a decision of the GMCA for scrutiny by a joint meeting of Scrutiny Pool members if so requested by any
five members from the Scrutiny Pool, and shall then notify members of the GMCA of the call-in. The Secretary shall call a joint meeting of Scrutiny Pool members on such date as he/she may determine, where possible after consultation with the Chair of the Scrutiny Pool, and in any case within 2 weeks of the decision to call-in;

(ii) call in a major or strategic decision made by the TfGMCA in accordance with the delegations set out in Part 3, Section B II of this Constitution for scrutiny by a joint meeting of Scrutiny Pool members if so requested by any five members from the Scrutiny Pool, and shall then notify members of the TfGMCA of the call-in. The Secretary shall call a joint meeting of Scrutiny Pool members on such date as he/she may determine, where possible after consultation with the Chair of the Scrutiny Pool, and in any case within 2 weeks of the decision to call-in.

(b) If, having considered:-

(i) a decision made by the GMCA; or
(ii) a major or strategic decision made by the TfGMCA in accordance with the delegations set out in Part 3, Section B II of this Constitution

the joint meeting of Scrutiny Pool members is still concerned about it, then it may refer it back to the GMCA or the TfGMCA (as appropriate) for reconsideration, setting out in writing the nature of its concerns. If a decision is referred by a joint meeting of Scrutiny Pool members to the GMCA or the TfGMCA (as appropriate), then the GMCA or the TfGMCA (as appropriate) will reconsider the decision before adopting a final decision.

(c) If, following an objection to:-

(i) a decision of the GMCA; or
(ii) a major or strategic decision made by the TfGMCA in accordance with the delegations set out in Part 3, Section B II of this Constitution;

the joint meeting of Scrutiny Pool members does not refer it back to the GMCA or the TfGMCA (as appropriate) for reconsideration, the decision shall take effect on the date of the joint meeting of Scrutiny Pool members.

(d) The call-in procedure set out above, shall not apply where:-

(i) the decision being taken by the GMCA; or
(ii) the major or strategic decision made by the TfGMC in accordance with the delegations set out in Part 3, Section B II of this Constitution;

is urgent.

(e) For the purposes of subparagraph 5.4(d) above a decision will be urgent if any delay likely to be caused by the call-in process would seriously prejudice the interests of the GMCA, the Constituent Councils, or the residents and/or businesses of Greater Manchester. The record of the decision and the notice by which it is made public shall state whether in the opinion of the decision making body, (having considered the advice of the Head of Paid Service and/or the Monitoring Officer and/or the Treasurer) the decision is an urgent one, and therefore not subject to call-in. The GMCA or the TfGMC (as appropriate) must agree both that the decision proposed is reasonable in all the circumstances and to it being treated as a matter of urgency.
JOINT GMCA AND AGMA SCRUTINY POOL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY 9 DECEMBER 2016
AT MANCHESTER TOWN HALL

PRESENT

Bolton Council        Cllr Andrew Morgan
                      Cllr Debbie Newall
Bury MBC              Cllr Roy Walker
Manchester CC         Cllr Zahra Alijah
                      Cllr James Wilson
Oldham MBC            Cllr Colin McLaren
                      Cllr Garth Harkness
                      Cllr Cheryl Brock
Rochdale MBC          Cllr Neil Butterworth
                      Cllr Sara Rowbotham
                      Cllr Michael Holly
Stockport MBC         Cllr Yvonne Guariento
Tameside MBC          Cllr Gillian Peet
                      Cllr John Bell
Trafford MBC          Cllr Pam Dixon
                      Cllr Michael Young
Wigan MBC             Cllr John O’Brien

IN ATTENDANCE

GMCA                  Andrew Lightfoot
TfGMC                 Cllr Chris Paul
TfGM                  Steve Warrener
                      Bob Morris
                      Peter Cushing
GMIST                 Susan Ford
                      Nicola Ward
16/45 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllr Jillian Collinson, Cllr David Jolley and Cllr John Walsh (Salford), Cllr Stella Smith (Bury), Cllr Ahmed Ali (Manchester) and Cllr Barry Brotherton (Trafford), Cllr Pam Stewart (Wigan).

16/46 CHAIRS ANNOUNCEMENTS AND URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair welcomed Members to the meeting, and thanked Cllr Chris Paul and officers for their attendance.

16/47 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest in respect to any item on the agenda.

16/48 MINUTES OF THE GMCA AND AGMA SCRUTINY POOL MEETING HELD ON 11 NOVEMBER 2016

The Minutes of the GMCA and AGMA Scrutiny Pool meeting held on 11 November 2016 were submitted for consideration.

RESOLVED/-

To approve the Minutes of the GMCA and AGMA Scrutiny Pool meeting held on 11 November 2016.

16/49 GMCA/AGMA SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME AND FORWARD PLAN

Members received a report to review and amend the Work Programme for the GMCA and AGMA Scrutiny Pool for 2016/17.

Members were asked to draw their attention to the suggested items for the meeting in February which was to include interim reports from both the ‘Communications’ and ‘Renewable Energy’ task and finish groups.

RESOLVED/-

1. To note items for the 2016/17 Scrutiny Work Programme.
2. To note the progress with Scrutiny’s Task and Finish work as set out in section 2.

16/50 BREXIT MONITOR
Members were provided with the Greater Manchester Brexit Monitor, which was shared with the GMCA on 25 November 2016, for information.

16/51 GREATER MANCHESTER STRATEGY – BEGINNING THE CONVERSATION

Andrew Lightfoot, GMCA Deputy Head of Paid Service gave a presentation which provided an overview of the approach and agreed objectives of the Greater Manchester Strategy Refresh. At their meeting on 28 October the GMCA agreed to review the aims and aspirations of the Greater Manchester Strategy in light of significantly changed economic conditions. The GMCA were keen to take a different approach to developing the refreshed strategy. Inspired by the recent ‘Taking Charge’ consultation for health and social care and similar consultations in Wigan and Manchester the consultation process has begun with an ‘open conversation’ with residents and stakeholders about their aspirations for the future of their City Region.

This began in mid-November and so therefore the presentation given to Scrutiny Pool was based on interim findings. Members were reminded that it is still a live consultation open until early January 2017.

The ‘conversation’ has used a wide variety of methods to engage people, including digital, offline approaches and face to face meetings in all localities across Greater Manchester. All local authorities and partner organisations are actively engaged as in this process.

Activity to raise the profile of the consultation is planned through a range of channels including the GMCA website, social media, and inspirational short films. Officers would welcome members’ support within their local authority to promote the consultation.

Questions and comments from the Scrutiny Pool included-

Q. A member questioned what efforts had been made to engage young people who are not in school?

A. Officers reported that there had been a range of methods used including working with established agencies such as the Princes Trust and local youth projects to ensure engagement has reached those young people who are not engaged with current provisions.

Q. A member reported how they had not received any briefing on the GMS Refresh in their role as a local councillor or via local press and that their ward committee meeting would have been a useful platform for engagement. They further expressed concerns that as over 1/3 of the responses were from Manchester residents and it might not be reflect the concerns of residents from across the whole of GM.

A. Officers recognise the challenge around the response rate and are looking for a collective effort with all GM partners to ensure the widest level of engagement. Manchester City Council has increased their levels of engagement through a strong
campaign and it is hoped that other local authorities will be encouraged to do the same as the consultation aims to include views of all areas of GM.

Q. Members asked whether there was a correlation with the lower response rates and those Local Authorities who felt they knew little about the GMCA when recently surveyed via the Local Government Association?

A. Officers were unaware of any direct correlation, but reminded members that this was an interim presentation and the final levels of engagement may be different. Officers offered to reflect as to whether there was any direct correlation with the LGA survey and look to target specific areas if necessary.

Q. Members asked when there would be a future report to GMCA/AGMA Scrutiny?

A. It was reported that the draft GM Strategy was planned to be presented to the GMCA in March 2017. Members suggested that they should review the draft strategy prior to final sign off.

Q. Members commented that the communication link between the GMCA and local authorities is strong for policy development such as the GM Spatial Framework but wondered whether there were formal links to ensure that the GMS refresh is supported effectively on a local level?

Another member further emphasised that this is one of the objectives of the task and finish group, looking at how GMCA communications can have a clear direction and collective message across all agencies.

A. Officers informed the Pool that there is a structured communications link between the GMCA and local authorities and partners through a monthly communications leads meeting which tries to reduce disparity.

Q. The data highlighted that only 2% of those seeing the ad clicked the link, and of those only 10% completed the survey. A member asked whether this was a good level of reach in relation to other consultations and whether there was any way to make the GMS consultation more appealing.

A. Officers reminded members that the GMCA now had a stronger brand presence and was working to develop its brand further for the GMCA to sup consultations.

Q. A member further reminded the Pool that this presentation illustrated the interim findings and that the consultation was still live. However, both this and a recent session for the communications task and finish group highlighted that there needs to be clear direction from the GMCA as to which organisation is taking the leads on each consultation and communications campaign. He urged members to circulate information on the GM Strategy Refresh within their own localities and networks.

RESOLVED/-

1. To note the presentation.
2. That members’ promote the GM Strategy Re-fresh where possible within their local authorities and networks.
3. That officers seek to understand whether there is any direct correlation between local response rates and those authorities who felt they did not know enough about the GMCA in response to the recent LGA survey.
4. That members of the GMCA/AGMA Scrutiny Committee are invited to comment on the draft GM Strategy prior to its final sign off in early 2017.

16/52 JOINT GMCA & AGMA SCRUTINY POOL – CALL-IN OF KEY DECISION 16/45 TfGMC (METROLINK SECOND CITY CROSSING PATTERNS)

The Chair introduced the call-in and reported that five of the Members of the GMCA/AGMA Scrutiny Pool had exercised the call-in powers in relation to a decision taken at the meeting of the Transport for Greater Manchester Committee (TfGMC) on Friday 11 November 2016. This decision was in relation to item 7 – Metrolink’s Second City Crossing Patterns and a copy of the report and decision note had been circulated to Members.

The Monitoring Officer’s representative explained the procedural rules for dealing with the call-in request including that in the event the joint scrutiny pool was minded to refer the decision back then, in the interests of expediency, Members could refer the decision to the GMCA (for their meeting on 16 December) rather than back to TfGMC who were not meeting until 13 January 2017.

Cllr Chris Paul (TfGMC) outlined the statement of decision as taken by the Committee. The Metrolink service patterns had been discussed by the TfGMC at their meeting on 11 November and members were content with the decision to endorse the proposals. Their decision was driven by a desire to ensure that any service pattern maximised the usage of the network as it stands and considered the operational constraints whilst ensuring the best levels of patronage and highest revenues. TfGMC would be concerned with the implications of re-configuring the service patterns for the remainder of the network and have agreed to undertake a review in six months to examine the service usage and make any necessary changes.

A member expressed their dissatisfaction with the procedures relating to the call-in. The City Solicitor responded that in response to members’ concerns the meeting had been re-scheduled by 5 working days to provide additional preparation time. The Chair asked that members vote as to whether to further debate the procedures, or to move to the call-in item. The vote was carried and proceeded to the call-in.

Further discussions regarding the procedures was put to vote and declared lost.

Councillor Colin McLaren was invited to present the call-in on behalf of the Members who made the request. He explained how it had been a long-held ambition of both Rochdale and Oldham that there should be a direct Metrolink service from Rochdale and Oldham to Manchester Piccadilly which would support the two districts’ economic aspirations. It had been widely expected that this would be delivered as part of the changes implemented through the second city crossing. There was disappointment that the proposed new
service patterns were outlined in the report to TfGM on 11 November 2016 did not include a direct link to Manchester Piccadilly from Oldham and Rochdale.

He raised concerns that if the direct link is not included in these proposals that there will never be another opportunity to introduce this at a later date. In excluding this link from the current proposal residents from Rochdale and Oldham would remain disadvantaged as they would still need to change trams to enable them to access mainline routes from Manchester Piccadilly and the employment opportunities at Manchester Airport.

Councillor McLaren was concerned that the data used to calculate model the proposed new service routes were using actual patronage rather than potential users which could provide a flawed basis on which to make the decision.

He shared an email from Councillor Jean Stretton (Leader of Oldham Council) which informed Members that she had met with the Chief Executive of Transport for Greater Manchester and he had committed to work up alternative service pattern options and ensure that GM Leaders were included in further discussions to look at these options. He concluded his presentation with a recommendation to refer this decision back to TfGMC to consider other options.

Cllr Chris Paul (TfGMC) was invited to provide a response to the presentation. He reminded members that TfGMC have an aspiration to ensure that the majority of journeys across Greater Manchester have a maximum of 1 change, and that when compared to other similar conurbations GM is very successful in achieving this.

He further commented that there are other areas of GM who also do not have direct links to Manchester Piccadilly, some with larger patronage levels than the Rochdale and Oldham line.

TfGM have committed to review in six months, and will make any changes necessary as deemed by survey data once the service patterns have been introduced and given time to become established.

Questions (Q) and comments (C) from the Scrutiny Pool included-

Q. A member reported that the economic ambitions for Rochdale and Oldham (as well as those for GM) could not be reached without these areas having a direct Metrolink to Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Airport.

He further added that the methods of the six month review were unclear as to how this would be undertaken?

A. Officers explained that this review would include a number of elements including ticket sales, boarding counts, season ticket counts and concession data.

Q. A member commented that their area has no Metrolink provision, and asked whether any service pattern changes would be detrimental to other areas of GM, whether there would be a cost to any delay and any loss of revenue?
A. Officers reported that any changes to the service patterns could affect journey times, an increased cost and reduce revenue. Furthermore, a loss of net revenue would result in more borrowing and a greater loss across the length of borrowing term.

Q. A member commented that the link for Rochdale and Oldham is necessary to ensure that the growth ambitions of the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework were delivered, and this decision also runs counter to the Government’s ambitions for greater social mobility for the area.

Q. A member commented that some other areas of GM do not have a direct link to Manchester Piccadilly and questioned alternative transport links from Rochdale/Oldham including mainline trains.

A. Officer reported that there are planned additional trains from Victoria to Manchester Piccadilly for 2017. Metrolink from Rochdale and Oldham are between 6 and 12 minutes in frequency and would result in an average wait of 3-4 minutes at Victoria (on the same platform) for another tram to Manchester Piccadilly.

Q. A member asked that officers ensure that both the short-term and long-term impact of the decision are considered especially in relation to the projected revenue from alternative service patterns and the wider impact on economic regeneration for GM.

A. Officers reported that the Metrolink network has an ambitious expansion programme and that service patterns can be adjusted to meet the strategic demands of the conurbation. The proposed service patterns are in response to predicted patronage, rather than current levels.

Q. A member commented that reviewing the decision is more difficult without the predicted patronage figures, however asked whether any delay as a result of a referral of the decision would delay the opening of the second city crossing?

A. If there were to be any amendments to service patterns, this would delay the opening of the second city crossing by several months.

C. A member wished to support the call-in and reported that the impact of the recession is still very evident in the Rochdale and Oldham and that the access to Manchester Piccadilly would be one way of supporting economic growth for the areas and open up job opportunities for Rochdale and Oldham residents. Another member further iterated that many residents of Oldham do not feel part of GM and the lack of transport links further re-enforces this issue.

Q. A member commented that the planned service patterns were based on the calculations by officers and as a result would ensure the most effective use of the network. He further asked whether there were any plans to ease the constraints at Manchester Piccadilly?

A. Officers reported that the restraints of Manchester Piccadilly were due to the turning of vehicles, and that alternative turning points were often used. However, there were no current plans to increase capacity at Manchester Piccadilly.
Q. A member asked whether there were any plans to improve the rail line between Victoria and Manchester Piccadilly?

A. It was reported that there would be improved opportunities to move between Victoria and Manchester Piccadilly on heavy rail once the Ordsall Chord works have been completed.

The Chair summarised the discussions taken place and asked members to vote whether to accept the decision taken by Transport for Greater Manchester Committee on the proposed Metrolink service patterns (with particular reference to the lack of a direct service between Rochdale and Oldham and Manchester Piccadilly) or to refer it back to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority for further consideration.

A vote was taken and declared that the decision be referred back to the GMCA.

Resolved/-

To refer the Transport for Greater Manchester’s Committee’s decision on proposed Metrolink service patterns (with particular reference to the lack of a direct service between Rochdale and Oldham and Manchester Piccadilly) back to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority with a recommendation that the GMCA reconsiders the decision in light of the concerns raised by the Joint Scrutiny Pool.

16/53 SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS 2016/2017

13 January 2017
10 February 2017
10 March 2017
7 April 2017

All meetings will be held 1:00pm - 3:00pm at Manchester Town Hall unless otherwise advertised.

CHAIR
A report was presented which informed Members of the proposed service pattern for Metrolink following the opening of the Second City Crossing and highlighted the work undertaken to examine how the network can be optimised within operational constraints.

A Member moved an amendment to the report which sought to defer a decision on the proposed Metrolink service pattern in order to allow further work to be undertaken to analyse the potential demand for direct Metrolink access to Piccadilly Station from the Oldham line and that the paper be resubmitted to endorse a suitable pattern which supports the rebalancing of the Greater Manchester economy. This amendment was seconded. The Members suggested that without direct access to Piccadilly Station, with onward travel to Manchester Airport, passenger journeys from Rochdale and Oldham will not increase, which would result in a reduction in revenues and given the length of journey time, make alternative transport modes more attractive.

A Member added that not to have a direct link to Piccadilly Station would impact on the future growth for Rochdale and Oldham. He suggested that the proposed modelling decision was wrong and that parts of Oldham and Rochdale ought to be prioritised. He also suggested that, as an alternative pattern, trams from Shaw could operate directly to Piccadilly Station and those from Oldham via Victoria station.

In opposing the amendment a Member noted that unlike buses and heavy rail, the operation of Metrolink received no Government subsidy and for this reason had to be self funding. The service pattern model presented was predicated to optimise revenue collections.

A Member noted that he would not support the amendment to the report as it was unknown how any change of the proposed service patterns would impact other districts.

A Member commented that Metrolink was Greater Manchester’s single biggest economic driver. In supporting the amendment, he added that there was a historic agreement dating from 1989 which indicated a direct link with Piccadilly Station and Oldham and Rochdale. He suggested that a deferment on the decision on the proposed service pattern would provide an opportunity explore and evidence how such a direct link to Piccadilly Station would positively impact on the prosperity of Oldham and Rochdale. In response, the Chair explained that the discussions from 1989 were just one part of a process to procure an adequate number of vehicles for the light rail network and noted that no promises regarding service patterns were made.

The Chair highlighted that the service pattern had been developed for a contract...
bidding process and adjusted for the opening of the Second City Crossing, and although there were a number of operational constraints, including locations to turn trams without affecting existing services, they would not be set in stone.

The amendment was put to the vote and declared lost.

A Member suggested that a modelling exercise on service patterns to Piccadilly Station from Oldham/Rochdale would be helpful.

With regard to the substantive recommendation, the Chair suggested that an additional recommendation for Members to note that patronage will be monitored and that an update report will be brought back to this Committee in 6 months time, as referenced at paragraph 5.3 to the report be included and in doing this, the Committee would also acknowledge the representations made by Rochdale and Oldham Members.

Councillor Sykes indicated that he was not supportive of the additional recommendation.

Resolved/-

1) To endorse the proposed service pattern for Metrolink services post the opening of the second city crossing.
2) To note that patronage will continue to be monitored and that a further update report will be brought back to this committee after 6 months of operation.
3) To acknowledge the representations made from Rochdale and Oldham Members.
PURPOSE OF REPORT

To inform members of the proposed Metrolink service pattern for the opening of the second city crossing.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Members are asked to endorse the proposed service pattern.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS


CONTACT OFFICERS

Peter Cushing 0161 244 1040  Peter.Cushing@tfgm.com
1. Introduction and Background

1.1 Metrolink has expanded over the past six years to bring in new destinations across Greater Manchester including MediaCityUK, Oldham-Rochdale, Ashton, East Didsbury and Manchester Airport. The Metrolink network has almost trebled in size during that time, becoming the largest Light Rail network in the UK with 93 stops, 97km of track, 120 trams, 2 depots and a new Tram Management System.

1.2 This expansion has contributed to the economy of Greater Manchester and helped reduce congestion on our roads with five million fewer car journeys every year. With an anticipated 37 million passenger journeys in 2016, the number of trips made daily on Metrolink has increased from 55,000 to approximately 100,000.

1.3 The Second City Crossing (2CC), currently under construction and due to open early in 2017 will increase the operational capacity, flexibility and reliability of Metrolink and enable the network to meet anticipated growth in demand.

1.4 The 2CC line will begin from Lower Mosley Street and run through St Peter’s Square, before turning down Princess Street and then along Cross Street and Corporation Street before re-joining the existing Metrolink line (the 1CC route) just outside Victoria station. As part of the project, a new stop has been opened in Exchange Square and a refurbished St Peter’s Square stop with 4 platforms has reopened with significant improvements made to the urban realm.

1.5 This is part of a wider transformation that will see an improved public transport system across Greater Manchester which includes the new tram line, bus priority schemes and dedicated cycle lanes to accommodate the growth in our city region. The work also supports the transformation of some of our public spaces and the new homes, offices and hotels that are being built.

1.6 Additionally, TfGM is concluding the procurement of a Metrolink Operating and Maintenance Agreement that will see new arrangements put in place from July 2017. This new agreement is for up to 10 years from 2017 and includes an enhanced specification in terms of customer service, performance and asset management and includes the operation of the Trafford Park Line, when it enters passenger service.

1.7 Representation has been received from some Local Authorities in relation to service patterns. Whilst we consider all requests, it is not always possible to meet the individual demands of each district due to the considerations set out in this paper, including operational constraints, and the overarching requirement to utilise the network as a whole to its best advantage.
2. **Infrastructure constraints**

2.1 During the planning stage for post-2CC services, officers examined how the network can be optimised within the following operational constraints to achieve the maximum network availability:

- Two services can be turned at Piccadilly station without affecting the performance of the through services to Ashton or Etihad Campus.
- One service can be turned at Etihad Campus without affecting the performance of the through services to Ashton.
- One service can operate into MediaCityUK via the single line from Harbour City without affecting the services to and from Eccles.
- Two services can be turned at Victoria station without affecting the performance of the through services to Bury and Oldham/ Rochdale.
- There is also the central network capacity to take into consideration when planning the trams per hour on each route. The diagram below outlines these capacities whereby 5 trams per hour is the equivalent of a 12 minute frequency.

2.2 There are now 120 trams available for service, including 10 which have been purchased to operate the Trafford Park Line. An allowance of 10% of
trams is required for planned maintenance to ensure the optimum levels of reliability. This means there are limited opportunities for strengthening services on busier lines.

3. **Popular Destinations**

3.1 The workplace population in the regional centre shows that the majority of employment is located predominantly near St Peter’s Square, Market Street, Piccadilly Gardens and Exchange Square stops. This is reflected in analysis of ticket sales.
3.2 Current information is based on the 2011 census returns. Subsequent development activity suggests that employment concentration around St Peter’s Square has increased – especially in the Spinningfields area.

3.3 TfGM will continue to be responsive to changes in travel demands from and between the Districts and Regional Centre.

4. Service Patterns

4.1 In order to ensure the best connectivity to these locations during all hours of operation, 7 days per week, we used the following rules within the regional centre:

- A connection between Victoria station and Piccadilly station must operate during all hours of operation
- A connection between Piccadilly station and St Peter’s Square must operate during all hours of operation
- A connection between Victoria station and St Peter’s Square via Market Street must operate during all hours of operation
- A connection between Victoria station and St Peter’s Square via Exchange Square must operate during all hours of operation

4.2 The above are considered to be the minimum central “core” services, which are then supplemented by additional day time services to cater for demand.

4.3 Consideration of the future service patterns was also taken into account during this process which included the potential to increase frequencies on certain lines subject to demand and the opening of the Trafford Park Line following construction.

4.4 The optimum way to ensure we can meet these future requirements was to create a service pattern inclusive of these changes and work back from
this to establish the service patterns for the 2017 Operating and Maintenance Agreement. This service pattern accompanied a paper presented to Committee in January of this year.

4.5 The table below shows the weekday service pattern contained in the 2017 Operating and Maintenance Agreement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Via</th>
<th>Interval (mins)</th>
<th>First Tram Departs Before</th>
<th>Last Tram Arrives After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altrincham</td>
<td>Piccadilly</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>06:00</td>
<td>00:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>Piccadilly</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>06:00</td>
<td>00:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccles</td>
<td>Ashton-under-Lyne</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>06:00</td>
<td>00:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Didsbury</td>
<td>Rochdale Town Centre</td>
<td>1CC</td>
<td>06:00</td>
<td>00:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Airport</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>2CC</td>
<td>03:00</td>
<td>00:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafford Centre¹</td>
<td>Crumpsall</td>
<td>1CC</td>
<td>06:00</td>
<td>00:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Daytime Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Via</th>
<th>Interval (mins)</th>
<th>First Tram Departs Before</th>
<th>Last Tram Arrives After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altrincham</td>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>2CC</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>20:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Didsbury</td>
<td>Shaw and Crompton</td>
<td>2CC</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>20:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Airport</td>
<td>Victoria²</td>
<td>2CC</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>20:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MediaCityUK</td>
<td>Ashton-under-Lyne³</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>20:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. When Trafford Park Line services commence in future
2. An additional Manchester Airport service was modelled for bid purposes
3. MediaCityUK services terminate at Etihad Campus until demand warrants an enhanced service to Ashton

4.6 Bids for the 2017 Operating and Maintenance Agreement have now been received and are being evaluated. The timetables received as part of those bids follow the service pattern above and no alternative patterns have been proposed.

4.7 Since 2CC will open for passenger service early in 2017, ahead of the new agreement, TfGM is proposing a service pattern that optimises the network for passengers, taking into account operational constraints, the available fleet, the most popular destinations in the regional centre and the core service “rules” as outlined above.

4.8 The table below shows the optimum weekday service pattern proposed for the opening of 2CC, which works towards that contained in the 2017 Operating and Maintenance Agreement:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Via</th>
<th>Interval (mins)</th>
<th>First Tram Departs Before</th>
<th>Last Tram Arrives After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altrincham</td>
<td>Piccadilly</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>06:00</td>
<td>00:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>Piccadilly</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>06:00</td>
<td>00:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccles</td>
<td>Ashton-under-Lyne</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>06:00</td>
<td>00:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Didsbury</td>
<td>Rochdale Town Centre</td>
<td>2CC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>06:00</td>
<td>00:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Airport</td>
<td>Deansgate-Castlefield/ Victoria¹</td>
<td>1CC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>03:00</td>
<td>00:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Daytime Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altrincham</td>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>1CC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Didsbury</td>
<td>Shaw and Crompton</td>
<td>2CC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MediaCityUK</td>
<td>Etihad Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>20:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Deansgate-Castlefield, extending to Victoria upon completion of TMS works there.

4.9 Once 2CC opens the system will maintain a steady state for the first time in many years, other than for regular engineering possessions, this will enable us to thoroughly review these service patterns regularly to evaluate the demand and operational performance. We can then assess if there are areas in which improvements can be made to service patterns or redeployment of vehicles across the system to better serve these requirements.

4.10 TfGM will continue to monitor revenue trends in particular when it comes to informing any potential service pattern changes. Our models show that with the proposed services patterns, given operational constraints, a sufficient operating surplus will be generated to meet the pay back requirements of the Transport Fund. In the future we may need to tailor services in such a way as to optimise revenue against costs and therefore service pattern decisions must take current and predicted patronage growth into account.

5. **Next Steps**

5.1 To implement the new service pattern in early 2017 with a full campaign to raise awareness in advance of these changes.

5.2 To review and evaluate these service patterns on a regular basis, monitoring customer demand and feedback, performance of the services and operational reliability.
5.3 To assess patronage demand over 6 months following the opening of 2CC, reporting back to Committee with further observations and recommendations with regard to service patterns.

6. Recommendations

6.1 To endorse the recommended service pattern for the opening of the 2CC.

Peter Cushing
Metrolink Director, TfGM
Many thanks for your email Councillor.

Regards,

Paul Harris
Greater Manchester Integrated Support Team
Telephone 0161234 3291
Internal 800 3291
Mobile 07956 317323
Fax 0161 236 6459

e-mail p.harris@manchester.gov.uk
www.agma.gov.uk
Cllr C Brock <Cherryl.Brock@oldham.gov.uk>

Cllr C Brock
<Cherryl.Brock@oldham.gov.uk>
21/11/2016 22:17

To  "P.Harris@manchester.gov.uk"
< P.Harris@manchester.gov.uk >
cc
Subject GMCA Scrutiny Pool - Call In Decision

Dear Paul,

I refer to the publication notice of the decisions made at the meeting of the TfGM Committee held on 11\textsuperscript{th} November 2016. I wish to Call In item: TfGM 16/54 Metrolink Second City Crossing Service Patterns. I consider this to be a major decision as set out in the GMCA’s Constitution in relation to scrutiny of TfGM Committee business.

Please confirm the receipt of this email and advise when you have received the Call In requests from the required five Members of the Scrutiny Pool.

Regards

Cherryl Brock

Confidentiality: This email and its contents and any attachments are intended only for the above named. As the email may contain confidential or legally privileged information, if you are not, or suspect that you are not, the above named or the person responsible for delivery of the message to
Dear Paul,

I refer to the publication notice of the decisions made at the meeting of the TfGM Committee held on 11th November 2016. I wish to Call In item: TfGM 16/54 Metrolink Second City Crossing Service Patterns. I consider this to be a major decision as set out in the GMCA’s Constitution in relation to scrutiny of TfGM Committee business.

Please confirm the receipt of this email and advise when you have received the Call In requests from the required five Members of the Scrutiny Pool.

Regards

Garth Harkness
Liberal Democrat Councillor Saddleworth North Ward
Shadow Cabinet Member for Employment and Skills
Political Secretary for Oldham Liberal Democrat Council group
Tel: 01457 875 267
Mobile: 07894839205
http://garthharkness.mycouncillor.org.uk/
Twitter:@garthharkness

The Liberal Democrats exist to build and safeguard a fair, free and open society, in which we seek to balance the fundamental values of liberty, equality and community, and in which no-one shall be enslaved by poverty, ignorance or conformity. We champion the freedom, dignity and well-being of individuals, we acknowledge and respect their right to freedom of conscience and their right to develop their talents to the full. We aim to disperse power, to foster diversity and to nurture creativity. We believe that the role of the state is to enable all citizens to attain these ideals, to contribute fully to their communities and to take part in the decisions which affect their lives.
Dear Paul,

With reference to the above, I refer to the publication notice of the decision made at the meeting of the Transport for Greater Manchester Committee which took place on 11 November 2016. I wish to call-in item TFGM 16/54 Metrolink second city crossing service patterns. This is a significant decision as established in the GMCA constitution relating to the scrutiny of TFGM Committee decisions.

I would be grateful if you would kindly acknowledge receipt of this email, let me know when you have received requests for call-ins from 5 members of the AGMA Scrutiny pool and the procedure to be followed in response to this request.

Yours sincerely,

Colin McLaren
Councillor
Chadderton Central Ward

Sent on behalf of Councillor Colin McLaren

Please be aware that replies to this email will be automatically sent to Cllr McLaren.
From: Harris, Paul
Sent: 25 November 2016 13:47
To: Ward, Nicola
Subject: FW: Decisions agreed at TfGMC 11 November 2016

Many thanks for your email Councillor.

Paul Harris
Greater Manchester Integrated Support Team
Telephone 0161234 3291
Internal 800 3291
Mobile 07956 317323
fax 0161 236 6459

e-mail p.harris@aqma.gov.uk
www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk

From: Councillor Sara Rowbotham [mailto:Sara.Rowbotham@Rochdale.Gov.UK]
Sent: 18 November 2016 10:40
To: p.harris@manchester.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Decisions agreed at TfGMC 11 November 2016

Dear Paul,

I refer to the publication notice of the decisions made at the meeting of the TfGM Committee held on 11th November 2016. I wish to Call In item TfGM 16/54 Metrolink Second City Crossing Service Patterns. I consider this to be a major decision as set out in the GMCA’s Constitution in relation to scrutiny of TfGM Committee business.

Please confirm the receipt of this email and advise when you have received the Call in requests from the required five Members of the Scrutiny Pool.

Thank you

Councillor Sara L. Rowbotham
Chair of Health, Schools & Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee

07812222741

From: p.harris@manchester.gov.uk [mailto:p.harris@manchester.gov.uk]
Sent: 1 Thursday, November 17, 2016 10:44 AM
To: Kevin.mckean@bolton.gov.uk; andrew.morgan@bolton.gov.uk; Debbie.newall@bolton.gov.uk;
From: Councillor Neil Butterworth <Neil.Butterworth@Rochdale.Gov.UK>
Sent: 21 November 2016 11:58
To: p.harris@manchester.gov.uk; Kevin.mckeon@bolton.gov.uk; andrew.morgan@bolton.gov.uk; Debbie.newall@bolton.gov.uk; Stella.smith@bury.gov.uk; roy.edwardwalker.freeserve.co.uk; r.skillen@bury.gov.uk; clrr.a.ali@manchester.gov.uk; clrr.j.wilson@manchester.gov.uk; clrr.z.alijah@manchester.gov.uk; colin.mcclean@oldham.gov.uk; cherryl.brock@oldham.gov.uk; garth.harkness@oldham.gov.uk; Councillor Michael Holly; Councillor Sara Rowbotham; Councillor.collinson@salford.gov.uk; councillor.jolley@salford.gov.uk; councillor.walsh@salford.gov.uk; clrr.iain.roberts@stockport.gov.uk; clrr.yvonne.guariento@stockport.gov.uk; clrr.john.mcghan@stockport.gov.uk; john.bell@tameside.gov.uk; johnsbell@btopenworld.com; gillian.peet@tameside.gov.uk; kevin.welsh@tameside.gov.uk; Michael.young@trafford.gov.uk; Pamela.dixon@trafford.gov.uk; Barry.brotherton@trafford.gov.uk; O'Brien, John CLLR; Stewart, Pam CLLR; Houlton, Edward CLLR; tony.lloyd@greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk; tony@gmpcc.org.uk; cliff.morris@bolton.gov.uk; Councillor Richard Farnell; jean.stretton@oldham.gov.uk; kieran.quinn@tameside.gov.uk; sean.anstee@trafford.gov.uk; r.shori@bury.gov.uk; Smith, Peter, CLLR; r.leese@manchester.gov.uk; Leader@stockport.gov.uk; citymayor@salford.gov.uk; carolynwilkins@oldham.gov.uk; chief.executive@stockport.gov.uk; Hall, Donna; jim.taylor@salford.gov.uk; steven.pleasant@tameside.gov.uk; theresa.grant@trafford.gov.uk; Steve Rumblelow; Margaret.asquith@bolton.gov.uk; m.a.owen@bur.gov.uk; h.bernstein@manchester.gov.uk; Connor, Julie
Cc: Anne Jones E; Margaret.taylor@bolton.gov.uk; nicci.robinson@oldham.gov.uk; janet.rowley@tameside.gov.uk; tom.sutcliffe@trafford.gov.uk; Causey, Diane; Karen.rowles@stockport.gov.uk; lizz.holland@salford.gov.uk; j.hardacre@bur.gov.uk; julie.speakman@tameside.gov.uk; lewis.greenwood@oldham.gov.uk; L.healey@manchester.gov.uk; L.Goggins@bury.gov.uk; yvonne.rainford@tameside.gov.uk; sarah.dixon@salford.gov.uk; Rachael.Liles@trafford.gov.uk; Wright, Alison (Resources); Rosemary.moss@bolton.gov.uk; Janet Tootill; ce.secretary@stockport.gov.uk; Amie.Chalmers@tameside.gov.uk; Vicky.ridge@bolton.gov.uk; elizabeth.drogan@oldham.gov.uk; Lori.hughes@oldham.gov.uk; l.m.webb@bury.gov.uk; Charnock, Christine; Appleton, Janet; craig.ainsworth@stockport.gov.uk; d.connolly@manchester.gov.uk; Mark Hardman; peter.forrester@trafford.gov.uk; robert.landon@tameside.gov.uk; Karen.Lucas@salford.gov.uk; k.hines@manchester.gov.uk; d.barnes@manchester.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Decisions agreed at TfGMC 11 November 2016

Dear Paul,

I refer to the publication notice of the decisions made at the meeting of the TfGMC Committee held on 11th November 2016. I wish to Call In item TfGM 16/54 Metrolink Second City Crossing Service Patterns. I consider this to be a major decision as set out in the GMCA’s Constitution in relation to scrutiny of TfGM Committee business.

Please confirm the receipt of this email and advise when you have received the Call In requests from the required five Members of the Scrutiny Pool.

Regards
Dear Paul

I refer to the publication notice of the decisions made at the meeting of the TfGM Committee held on 11th November 2016. I wish to call in item TfGM 16/54 Metrolink Second City Crossing Service Patterns. I consider this to be a major decision as set out in the GMCA’s Constitution in relation to scrutiny of TfGM Committee business. Please confirm the receipt of this e-mail and advise when you have received the Call in requests from the requires five members of the Scrutiny Pool.

Regards

Councillor Michael Holly

This email, its contents and any attachments are intended only for the above named. As the email may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information, if you are not, or suspect that you are not, the above named or the person responsible for delivery of the message to the above named, please delete or destroy the email and any attachments immediately and inform the sender of the error. Unauthorised access, use, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted and may be unlawful. The views of the author may not necessarily reflect those of Rochdale BC.

Rochdale BC undertakes monitoring of both incoming and outgoing e-mails. You should therefore be aware that if you send an e-mail to a person within Rochdale BC it may be subject to any monitoring deemed necessary by Rochdale BC from time to time. Rochdale BC cannot guarantee that this message or any attachment is virus free or has not been intercepted and amended.

As a public body, Rochdale BC may be required to disclose this email (or any response to it) under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, unless the information in it is covered by one of the exemptions within the Act.