Transport for Greater Manchester Committee
Metrolink and Rail Networks Sub Committee

Date: Friday 10 April 2015
Time: 10:30 am
Venue: Reception Room, Level 2, Town Hall, Albert Square, Manchester M60 2LA

Group Meetings
Labour: 9.30 am, 312 Level 3, Manchester Town Hall.
Conservative: 9.30 am Cttee Room 6, Level 2, Manchester Town Hall.

Membership of the Sub Committee

Councillors: Briggs, Chadwick, Cordingley, Dickinson, Dowling, Duckworth, Fitzpatrick, Holland, Jones, Rawlins, Reilly, Robinson and Teubler

Substitutes: Councillors Chilton, Garrido, Grimshaw, Hassan, Smethurst, Sykes and Warner

Transport for Greater Manchester Committee is a Joint Committee of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority and the 10 Greater Manchester District Councils.
A G E N D A

PART A

Section 1 – Standing Items

1. Apologies For Absence
2. Urgent Business (if any) at the discretion of the Chair.
3. Declarations of Interest in any contract or matter to be discussed.
   (if any Member has a personal/prejudicial interest please complete the form
   enclosed and hand to the committee clerk at the beginning of the meeting)
4. Minutes

Section 2

Items for Information

5. Metrolink Service Performance
6. Deployment of Metrolink Customer Service Representatives
7. Passenger Focus Tram Passenger Survey Autumn 2014 - To follow
8. Greater Manchester Travelsafe Partnership
9. Local Rail Service Performance and Station Issues
10. Rail Passenger Survey – Autumn 2014 Greater Manchester Results
    - To follow

Further Information
For copies of papers and further information on this meeting please refer to the website www.tfgmc.gov.uk
Alternatively, contact the following Committee Officer:

Paul Harris
Tel: 0161 234 3291
Fax: 0161 236 6459
Email: p.harris@manchester.gov.uk

This agenda was issued on 31 March 2015 on behalf of Sir Howard Bernstein,
Clerk to the Joint Committee and Donna Hall, Secretary to the Joint Committee
C/O GMIST PO Box 532, Town Hall, Albert Square, Manchester, M60 2LA.
TfGMC Metrolink and Rail Networks Sub Committee meeting on Friday 10 April 2015

Declaration of Interests in Items appearing on the Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute Item No. / Agenda Item No.</th>
<th>Nature of Interest</th>
<th>Type of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSPORT FOR GREATER MANCHESTER COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE METROLINK AND RAIL NETWORKS SUB COMMITTEE OF THE TRANSPORT FOR GREATER MANCHESTER COMMITTEE, HELD ON 13 FEBRUARY 2015

PRESENT:

Councillor David Chadwick   Bolton
Councillor Tracey Rawlins   Manchester
Councillor Norman Briggs   Oldham
Councillor Kevin Dowling   Stockport
Councillor Dean Fitzpatrick   Stockport
Councillor Doreen Dickinson   Tameside (Chair)
Councillor Peter Robinson   Tameside
Councillor Michael Cordingley   Trafford
Councillor June Reilly   Trafford
Councillor Patricia Holland   Wigan

IN ATTENDANCE:

Peter Cushing   Metrolink Director, TfGM
Amanda White   Head of Rail, TfGM
Caroline Whittam   Metrolink Team, TfGM
Mark Angelucci   TfGM, Rail Team
Paul Harris   GMIST

ALSO PRESENT:

Kathryn O'Brien   First TransPennine Express
Sarah Cunningham   First TransPennine Express
Sarah Forde   First TransPennine Express
Nicola Watson   MRDL Metrolink
Roy Chapman   MRDL Metrolink
Roy Greenhalgh   Network Rail
Karen Hornby   Network Rail
Marianne Webb   Network Rail
Matthew Worman   Northern Rail
Jason Nash   Virgin Trains
MR14/36 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received and noted from Councillors Ian Duckworth (Rochdale), Roger Jones (Salford) and Josie Teubler (Manchester).

MR14/37 CHAIR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND URGENT BUSINESS

a. Welcome to Operators

The Chair extended a welcome to representatives from the train operators and thanked them for their continued attendance at Sub Committee meetings.

MR14/38 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

MR14/39 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Metrolink and Rail Networks Sub Committee meeting, held on 19 December 2014 were submitted.

Resolved/-

To approve the Minutes of the Metrolink and Rail meeting held on 19 December 2014 as a correct record.

MR14/40 METROLINK SERVICE PERFORMANCE

Members received a report which informed them of service performance and developments for monitoring periods 8 and 9 (10 November 2014 to 4 January 2015). Detailed results for Metqual service quality inspections for were also presented.

Members were informed that performance benchmark as measured by operated mileage was 98%. It was noted that operated mileage for period 8 was 98.29% and 96.61% in period 9.

A Member highlighted that on-tram announcements were not being made to advise passengers for Wythenshawe Hospital to alight at the Roundthorn Metrolink stop, despite previous assurances from Metrolink to do so. In response, Metrolink explained that in most instances, such announcements were made by drivers and undertook to remind drivers of the need for these announcements to be made as part of each service.

A Member enquired as to why trams recently terminated at Ashton Moss. In response, officers undertook to investigate and respond to the Member directly.
Following a comment from a Member regarding the limited platform seating at Piccadilly Metrolink stop, officers undertook to explore this matter further.

Resolved/-

To note the report on Metrolink Service Performance.

**MR14/41 DEPLOYMENT OF CUSTOMER SERVICE REPRESENTATIVES**

A report was presented which informed Members of the deployment of Customer Service Representatives (CSRs) and their activities on the Metrolink system during periods 8 and 9 (10 November 2014 to 4 January 2015). The report also provided a summary of the three core duties of PSRs, namely revenue protection, security and customer care.

A Member recalled a recent tram journey where a number of CSRs present at tram stops across the network. It was suggested that the permanent deployment of CSRs on trams would significantly deter fare evasion. In response, officers explained that the configuration of trams would make on-tram checks difficult during peak periods.

A Member welcomed the recent visit to the Manchester College Campus at Benchill to advise tutors and students of ticketing and travel pass requirements, as set out in the report. Officers were asked if there were plans to extend this initiative across the Metrolink Network. In response, officers explained the role and work of the Metrolink School Liaison Officer.

Resolved/-

To note the report.

**MR14/42 LOCAL RAIL SERVICE PERFORMANCE AND STATION ISSUES**

A report was presented which advised Members of local rail service performance and station issues within Greater Manchester and the surrounding area for 9 November 2014 – 3 January 2015 (monitoring periods 9 and 10). Particular attention was given to the previously identified key areas of focus, namely, train performance and capacity provision, station quality, engineering work and revenue protection. Information on upcoming infrastructure works were also highlighted.

With regard to Northern Rail performance in Greater Manchester, Members noted that performance had improved slightly from 80.3% in period 8 to 80.9% in period 9 and 85.4% in period 10. It was also noted that the period 10 score was lower than that of the corresponding period in the previous year. Major incidents affecting performance during these periods and the impact of these incidents were noted. It was also noted that performance was also adversely
affected by train crew shortages as a result of high levels of driver turnover and staff sickness.

In response to an enquiry from a Member, Northern Rail undertook to provide a breakdown of Period 10 complaints by station.

A Member commented that car parking spaces at Hazel Grove station would be reduced whilst the construction of a decked car park was taking place and sought information on what information had be provided regarding this, particularly in relation to the mitigation of on street parking. In response, officers noted that a publicity plan has been enacted to advise of the possible disruption to car parking at the station. It was noted that information also dissuaded on street parking. Officers undertook to share this information with the Member concerned.

Following a comment from a Member regarding Newton for Hyde station, Northern Rail undertook to take away the issue regarding staff access and platform gritting and respond to the Member directly.

It was noted that the works to Mosley Road railway bridge had not been completed. Network Rail was working with Tameside MBC in relation to road closures and that an update would be provided to Members once a suitable date had been confirmed.

A Member noted local concerns regarding the punctuality of services through Bolton. In response, it was noted that a number incidents, including crew availability issues at Manchester Victoria, had affected detrimentally influenced services. The introduction of rest day working had helped performance. In addition, the Northern Rail explained the work taking place with Quality Improvement Teams to improve performance on this corridor.

A Member wished to record thanks to the Quality Improvement Team for their efforts in improvement the performance of Southport to Manchester rail services.

Resolved/-

To note the performance of Greater Manchester rail services during 9 November 2014 – 3 January 2015 (monitoring periods 9 and 10).

MR14/43 UPDATING FARNWORTH TUNNEL – PRESTON, BOLTON MANCHESTER - PRESENTATION

Members received a presentation which gave an overview of the work to update the Farnworth Tunnel to accommodate the infrastructure to enable the electrification of Preston Bolton Manchester line and to provide an improved rail service. The presentation highlighted:-

a. work on the tunnel will take 22 weeks to compete and would commence on 2 May, with a completion date of 4 October.
b. A single line track will remain open whilst work is carried out and therefore would restrict the level of services passing through the tunnel each way.

c. The stations at Moses Gate, Farnworth, Kearsley and Clifton will close and Bolton station will close during weekends, with no services calling at stations.

d. Details of the information plan were noted.

Resolved/-

1. To thanks the representatives of Network Rail, Northern Rail and First TPE for their informative presentation.

2. To note the presentation.

MR14/44 PRESENTATION ON NETWORK RAIL’S SUICIDE PREVENTION STRATEGY

Members received a presentation which provided an overview of Network Rail’s Suicide prevention strategy. The presentation highlighted the cornerstones of the programme.

Resolved/-

1. That Network Rail be thanked for their informative presentation on their Suicide Prevention strategy.

2. That the presentation be noted.
PURPOSE OF REPORT

To inform Members of the service performance and developments which affected the Metrolink system over recent months.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Members are asked to:

i) Note the performance of Metrolink services.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS


CONTACT OFFICERS

Peter Cushing 0161 244 1040 peter.cushing@tfgm.com
Daniel Vaughan 0161 244 1519 daniel.vaughan@tfgm.com
Caroline Whittam 0161 244 1748 caroline.whittam@tfgm.com
1. Introduction and Background

1.1 This report contains a Metrolink performance summary for Period 10 (Monday 5 January – Sunday 1 February) and Period 11 (Monday 2 February – Sunday 1 March 2015). Also detailed are results for Metqual service quality inspections for the same periods. Reporting Period dates can be found in Appendix 6 of this report.

2. Executive Summary

2.1 The redesigned and expanded Manchester Victoria Metrolink stop fully resumed operations on 21 February which allows more frequent and flexible services to run through the railway station as part of the new Second City Crossing and wider tram network expansion.

2.2 Performance as measured by Operated Mileage was 99.56% in Period 10, 99.29% in Period 11, the benchmark is 98%.

2.3 There were eight major incidents in Period 10 and seven in Period 11 that caused delays in service of over 30 minutes and impacted on performance, (see section 3.3).

2.4 The overall availability of trams for service in the morning peak Monday to Friday during Periods 10 and 11 was 100%. Tram availability shows a positive trend with the best performance since the new trams were introduced in 2009.

2.5 The total number of written complaints in Period 10 was 448 with 107 relating to service disruption. In Period 11 it was 598 with 144 relating to service disruption.

2.6 Patronage was estimated at 2.5m in January. This was 68,000 below budget but was 224,000 ahead of January 2014. Patronage was estimated at 2.6m in February. This was 97,000 below budget but 311,000 ahead of February 2014.

2.7 Period 10 saw lift availability of 96.4% and escalator availability was 99.38%. Period 11 saw lift availability of 95.01% and escalator availability was 99.80%.
3. Service Performance

**Operated Mileage**

![Graph showing operated mileage over time]

- **Scheduled Mileage**: Mileage which Metrolink RATP Dev Ltd is contracted to operate to run the timetable.
- **Operated Mileage**: Actual miles operated and as a percentage of scheduled mileage.
- **Moving Annual**: Average of previous 13 periods.

3.1 Operated Mileage is used as a measure of Operator performance and illustrates the actual miles operated as a proportion of the scheduled mileage and therefore is an indicator of the service delivered to passengers.

3.2 Operated Mileage was 99.32% in Period 10, the main reason for mileage lost was due to a rostering error. In Period 11 it was 99.29%, driver availability, signalling failures and 3rd party events were the three main causes of lost mileage in the period.

3.3 Service disruptions of over 30 minutes during the Periods are outlined below:

- Period 10 incidents (of over 30 minutes);
  - 5 January services were suspended between Clayton Hall and Piccadilly between 19:00 and 19:35 due to a car which drove onto the tracks at Clayton Hall. Commercial bus services accepted Metrolink tickets until normal service resumed.
- 7 January services were suspended between Clayton and Piccadilly between 13:22 and 14:37 due to a car which drove onto the tracks at Holt Town. Commercial bus services accepted Metrolink tickets until normal service resumed

- 18 January due to ice on the overhead line services on the Ashton line were suspended between 08:10 until 08:31. The reason for this was a sudden drop in temperature at 07:00 from +1 degrees to -2 degrees with freezing fog. This also affected the Rochdale line causing minor delays. Commercial bus services accepted Metrolink tickets until normal service resumed

- 19 January points failed between Rochdale Town Centre and Rochdale Railway Station which caused a suspension of service between 06:30 and 10:30. Commercial bus services accepted Metrolink tickets until normal service resumed

- 23 January at 19:09 there was a Road Traffic Collision at Mosley Street/Princess Street (near St Peter’s Square tram stop) in the city centre. The scene was cleared at 19:48 and at 20:48 the route was operational. Commercial bus services accepted Metrolink tickets until normal service resumed

- 27 January at 08:30 there was a Road Traffic Collision between Audenshaw and Droylsden on Ashton New Road where a car turned into a section dedicated for tram use only and drove into the side of a tram. Services were turned at Ashton West on the inbound route. The outbound route was still available for service. The inbound route was operational at 09:50. Commercial bus services accepted Metrolink tickets until normal service resumed

- 27 January at 09:54 there was a Road Traffic Collision at Nicholas Street in the city centre (between St Peters Square and Market Street/ Piccadilly Gardens). The site was cleared at 11:05. Commercial bus services accepted Metrolink tickets until normal service resumed.

- 29 January at 07:50 there was a points failure at Monsall due to a signal being passed at stop, a speed restriction was put in place which caused severe delays to the services on the Rochdale Line.

• Period 11 incidents (of over 30 minutes);

- 03 February at 08:45 there was a points failure at Newton Heath and Moston. Commercial bus services accepted Metrolink tickets until normal service resumed at 09:20.
- 03 February at 19:30 there was another points failure at Newton Heath and Moston. Commercial bus services accepted Metrolink tickets until normal service resumed at 21:50.

- 06 February at 21:45 a road traffic collision occurred between a car and tram at Exchange Quay. Services were amended to Ashton – Trafford Bar and MediaCityUK – Eccles with commercial bus services accepting Metrolink tickets along the route until normal service resumed at 23:58.

- 10 February at 19:45 there was a collision between a car and tram on Princess Street in the city centre which led to a temporary service suspension through the city centre. The vehicle was removed at 20:54 and full reformation was achieved at 23:21. Metrolink tickets were accepted on commercial bus services until normal service resumed.

- 17 February at 06:00 there was a points failure at Rochdale. Services were suspended between Newbold and Rochdale Town Centre until 06:45, during this time Metrolink tickets were accepted on commercial bus services.

- 26 February at 18:10 a car was driven onto the tracks at Baguley. The car was removed at 19:30, during this time services operated between Roundthorn and Cornbrook with commercial bus services accepting Metrolink tickets.

- 27 February at 08:35 a car crossing the tracks at Langworthy had broken down. The car was removed at 10:50, during this time services operated between Ashton/Piccadilly to MediaCityUK, commercial bus services accepted Metrolink tickets to Eccles.

**Vehicle Reliability**

3.4 The reliability of the M5000 trams in Period 10 was 25,157 MDBSF (mean distance between service affecting failures) with 21 failures. In Period 11 this decreased to 22,356 MDBSF with 24 failures. The reliability issues causing these failures are being analysed by the Performance Improvement Group. The long term trend remains positive. There is a steady auto-coupler fault/failure rate regarding sensors. The auto-coupler uses eleven sensors to operate, failure of one of these sensors will generate an auto-coupler fault. Work is currently being undertaken to improve the fault finding process to reduce time for fault diagnosis.
3.5 In Period 10, 3013 returned to service after 24 months. This tram was out of service from February 2013, after a severe RTC near Langworthy. 3063 was out of service due to a collision on the Ashton line on 27 January, it returned to service on the 15 February. 3087 has returned to service and 3094 was commissioned during the period. In Period 11, 3065 went out of service short term with a cable warranty defect. 3077 went out of service short term as a result of a collision on Mosley Street. 3095 was delivered.

3.6 The overall availability of trams for service in the morning peak Monday to Friday during Period 10 and 11 was 100%.

4. Service Updates

4.1 Please refer to the report on the Deployment of Metrolink Passenger Service Representatives which is on the agenda for this meeting, for information on special events and other service related matters.

4.2 In Period 11 the single line working at Victoria and the temporary closure of Victoria tram stop came to an end, with the reopening of Victoria tram stop on Wednesday 18 February and services operated through Victoria from Saturday 21 February with a new timetable commencing on Monday 23 February. The new timetable reinstates the Victoria to Piccadilly link Monday to Sunday, for timetable information please visit the website at www.metrolink.co.uk/tramtimes
4.3 There were seven days affected by planned closures in Period 10 as follows;

**On Saturday 10 January 2015**

Network Rail engineering work at Victoria Station;

Tram services operated:

- Bury to Crumpsall
- Rochdale Town Centre to Central Park
- Eccles to Ashton Under Lyne via MediaCityUK
- Altrincham to Piccadilly
- East Didsbury to Piccadilly
- Cornbrook to Manchester Airport

Bus replacement services operated:

- Crumpsall to Piccadilly calling at all stops except Victoria and Market Street
- Central Park to Piccadilly calling at all stops except Victoria and Market Street

**Saturday 17 January 2015**

Network Rail engineering work at Victoria Station and Manchester Airport;

Tram services operated:

- Altrincham to Piccadilly
- Bury to Abraham Moss
- Central Park to Rochdale Town Centre
- East Didsbury to Piccadilly
- Eccles to Ashton-under-Lyne via MediaCityUK
- Cornbrook to Wythenshawe Town Centre

Bus replacement services operated:

- Crumpsall to Piccadilly calling at all stops except Victoria and Market Street
- Central Park to Piccadilly calling at all stops except Victoria and Market Street
- Wythenshawe Town Centre to Manchester
- Airport - calling at all stops
On Sunday 18 January 2015

Network Rail engineering work at Manchester Airport;

Tram services operated:

- Bury to Altrincham
- Rochdale Town Centre to East Didsbury
- Eccles to Ashton-under-Lyne via MediaCityUK
- Cornbrook to Wythenshawe Town Centre until 12 noon

Replacement bus services operated:

- Manchester Airport to Wythenshawe Town Centre calling at all stops

On Saturday 24 and Sunday 25 January 2015

Improvement work at Deansgate-Castlefield;

Tram services operated:

- Altrincham to Cornbrook
- Bury to Ashton-Under-Lyne
- East Didsbury to Cornbrook
- Rochdale Town Centre to Velopark
- Eccles to Cornbrook via MediaCityUK
- Firswood to Manchester Airport

Replacement bus services operated:

- Trafford Bar to Piccadilly calling at all stops
- Chorlton to Piccadilly calling at all stops
- Exchange Quay to Piccadilly calling at all stops except Pomona

On Saturday 31 January 2015

Network Rail engineering work at Victoria Station;

Tram services operated:

- Altrincham to Piccadilly
- Bury to Crumpsall
- East Didsbury to Piccadilly
- Rochdale Town Centre to Central Park
- Eccles to Ashton-under-Lyne (via MediaCityUK)
- Cornbrook to Manchester Airport

Replacement bus services operated:

- Crumpsall to Piccadilly calling at all stops except Victoria and Market Street
Central Park to Piccadilly calling at all stops except Victoria and Market Street

**On Sunday 1 February 2015**
Improvement work at Deansgate-Castlefield;
Tram services operated:

- Altrincham to Cornbrook
- Bury to Ashton-Under-Lyne
- East Didsbury to Cornbrook
- Rochdale Town Centre to Velopark
- Eccles to Cornbrook via MediaCityUK
- Firswood to Manchester Airport

Replacement bus services operated:

- Trafford Bar to Piccadilly calling at all stops
- Chorlton to Piccadilly calling at all stops
- Exchange Quay to Piccadilly calling at all stops except Pomona

58 complaints were received in Period 10 regarding closures and engineering works.

4.4 There were ten days affected by planned closures in Period 11 as follows;

**On Saturday 7 and Sunday 8 February 2015**
Improvement work at Deansgate-Castlefield;
Tram services operated:

- Altrincham to Cornbrook
- Bury to Ashton-Under-Lyne
- East Didsbury to Cornbrook
- Rochdale Town Centre to Velopark
- Eccles to Cornbrook via MediaCityUK
- Firswood to Manchester Airport

Replacement bus services operated:

- Trafford Bar to Piccadilly calling at all stops
- Chorlton to Piccadilly calling at all stops
- Exchange Quay to Piccadilly calling at all stops except Pomona
Victoria re-opening works 14 to 20 February 2015

The re-opening of Victoria tram stop;

14 – 17 February 2015 – Victoria stop was closed with no services operating through to the City, services were as follows;

Tram services operated:

- Altrincham to Piccadilly
- Altrincham to Etihad Campus (peak only)
- Bury to Crumpsall
- East Didsbury to Piccadilly
- Rochdale Town Centre to Central Park
- Eccles to Ashton-under-Lyne via MediaCityUK
- Manchester Airport to Cornbrook

Replacement bus services operated:

- Crumpsall to Piccadilly calling at all stops except Victoria and Market Street
- Central Park to Piccadilly calling at all stops except Victoria and Market Street

18 – 20 February 2015 – Victoria stop was open but no services operating through to the City, services were as follows;

- Altrincham to Piccadilly
- Altrincham to Etihad Campus (peak only)
- Bury to Victoria
- Bury to Abraham Moss (peak only)
- East Didsbury to Piccadilly
- Rochdale Town Centre to Victoria
- Eccles to Ashton-under-Lyne via MediaCityUK
- Manchester Airport – Cornbrook

Replacement bus services operated:

- Victoria to Piccadilly Gardens: calling at Victoria, Shudehill and Piccadilly Gardens

On Sunday 21 February 2015

Improvement work at Altrincham Interchange;

Tram services operated:

- Bury to Timperley
- East Didsbury to Rochdale Town Centre
- Eccles to Ashton-under-Lyne via MediaCityUK
- Manchester Airport to Cornbrook
Replacement bus services operated:

- Altrincham to Timperley calling at all stops

**On Sunday 1 March 2015**

Improvement work at Deansgate-Castlefield;

Tram services operated:

- Altrincham to Cornbrook
- Bury to Ashton-under-Lyne
- East Didsbury to Cornbrook
- Manchester Airport to Firswood
- Rochdale Town Centre to Piccadilly
- Eccles to Cornbrook via MediaCityUK

Replacement bus services operated:

- Trafford Bar to Piccadilly, calling at all stops
- Chorlton to Piccadilly, calling at all stops
- Exchange Quay to Piccadilly, calling at all stops

80 complaints were received in Period 11 regarding closures and engineering works.

5. **Customer Service**

5.1 The total number of written complaints in Period 10 was 448 with 107 relating to service disruption. 75.4% of the written complaints were responded to within five working days, 19.9% within ten working days and 4.7% within ten to fifteen working days. There were 199 telephone complaints with 105 relating to service affecting incidents.

In Period 11 there were 598 written complaints with 144 relating to service disruption. 73.8% were responded to within five working days, 19.4% within ten working days and 6.8% within ten to fifteen working days. There were 289 telephone complaints with 186 relating to service affecting incidents and 75 relating to ticketing issues.

5.2 Nine commendations were received in Period 10 and three in Period 11.

5.3 Charts showing complaints about service disruptions and ticket vending machines (TVMs) are in Appendix 2.
6. Metrolink Performance Monitoring

6.1 The contractual performance regime with the Operator measures several aspects of performance including reliability (headway between trams), capacity (number of trams run each service hour) and the punctuality of the first and last trams of the day.

6.2 The Operator is required to operate a specified number of trams each hour. This requirement varies for peak and off-peak service hours and also for services between Altrincham and Bury and those for Eccles, MediaCityUK, East Didsbury, Rochdale and Ashton.

6.3 The actual performance of the Operator compared to the contracted performance is shown in Appendix 3.

6.4 Under the contract with the Operator, the first and last departures from each of the specified starting points are measured for punctuality. These points are Altrincham, Bury, Eccles, East Didsbury, Rochdale, Ashton, Deansgate Castlefield and Victoria. The performance of the Operator compared to the contractual requirement is shown in Appendix 3.
7. Patronage

7.1 The following graphs show the reported Metrolink patronage by line. These are derived from a process that allocates assumed trips from Ticket Vending Machine sales by distance travelled on each line for a given origin and destination station.

7.2 Patronage is estimated at 2.6m in February. This was 97,000 below budget but was 311,000 ahead of February 2014. The Oldham Rochdale line contributed 24,000 to the year on year growth, the South Manchester line 18,000, the East Manchester Line 10,000 and the Airport Line 102,000 (based on origin TVM and season ticket sales only).
7.3 The following graph shows 2013-2015 Metrolink patronage on the established Altrincham, Bury and Eccles lines. Patronage fell on all three lines in December and January 2015. This follows the normal seasonal trend of patronage reducing during these months, as can be seen in 2013/14. There is evidence of recovery in February when Victoria stop fully re-opened (on the 20 February), we are therefore hopeful that improvement on the Bury line should be more evident in March’s figures.

![Metrolink patronage by line - Phase 1&2](image)

7.4 The following graph shows 2013-2015 Metrolink patronage on the newer lines. Patronage fell on all lines in January 2015. This follows the normal seasonal trend of patronage reducing at this time of year, as can be seen in 2013/14. It is anticipated Oldham/Rochdale and East Manchester lines will improve in March.

![Metrolink patronage by line - Phase 3](image)
8. Recommendations

8.1 Please see the front sheet of this report.

Peter Cushing
Metrolink Director
Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Tram Availability
- Appendix 2 – Customer Complaints
- Appendix 3 – Capacity/Punctuality
- Appendix 4 – Metqual Results table
- Appendix 5 – Metqual Results Charts Per Schedule
- Appendix 6 – Period Date Listing
Appendix 1

Period 10 – Vehicle availability in the morning peak (07:30 hrs)

Period 11 – Vehicle availability in the morning peak (07:30 hrs)

75 trams are required Monday-Friday to operate Metrolink services. 74 trams are required Saturday and 45 on Sunday. A Sunday service operates on Bank Holiday Mondays.
Customer Complaints

Appendix 2

Total Service Disruption Written Complaints – 4 Weekly Period

TVM Written Complaints – 4 Weekly Period
### Schedule A - Cleaning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Period 10 %</th>
<th>Period 11 %</th>
<th>MAA %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Platform canopies</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>92.31</td>
<td>94.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters, seats &amp; waiting rooms</td>
<td>97.22</td>
<td>97.22</td>
<td>95.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster cases &amp; signage</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>99.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifts &amp; escalators</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>97.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embankments &amp; ramps</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>76.67</td>
<td>82.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs, subways, footbridges &amp; foyers</td>
<td>88.89</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>95.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platforms</td>
<td>97.06</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>93.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parks</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>91.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle parking</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>96.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket vending equipment</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>99.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; staff telephones</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track within stop</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>95.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform mirrors</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper dispensers</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Schedule B - Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Period 10 %</th>
<th>Period 11 %</th>
<th>MAA %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Platform canopies</td>
<td>92.31</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>97.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters, seats &amp; waiting rooms</td>
<td>88.57</td>
<td>94.44</td>
<td>94.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifts &amp; Escalators – Maintenance. &amp; repairs</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifts &amp; Escalators - Availability</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>90.91</td>
<td>95.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embankments &amp; ramps</td>
<td>96.67</td>
<td>96.77</td>
<td>97.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs, subways, footbridges &amp; foyers</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>99.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platforms</td>
<td>97.06</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>94.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parks</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>96.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle parking</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>99.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVMs - Maintenance. &amp; repairs</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>99.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Schedules C - K</td>
<td>Period 10 %</td>
<td>Period 11 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C CCTV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.89</td>
<td>96.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1a PID - Operation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1b PID - Functioning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>94.74</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E1 Fares &amp; timetable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E2 Other information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E3 Poster cases</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E4 Info on TVMs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E5 Stop signing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>97.22</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F1a Operation of PA system</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F1b Functioning of PA system</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2a Operation of passenger emergency call point</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>88.89</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2b Functioning of passenger emergency call</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>88.89</td>
<td>91.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G On-tram PA announcements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.64</td>
<td>97.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1 External operation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2 Internal operation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I1 Internal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>95.86</td>
<td>96.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I2 External</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>95.89</td>
<td>97.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J1 Lighting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.44</td>
<td>97.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J2 Heating and ventilation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J3 Seating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>99.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J4 Signing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>97.67</td>
<td>99.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J5 Graffiti</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>96.50</td>
<td>94.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J6 Door operation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.61</td>
<td>99.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K Line of route information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>97.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5

A: METROLINK STOP CLEANING

B: METROLINK STOP REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE

C: CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION SYSTEMS

D: PASSENGER INFORMATION DISPLAYS
### Period Date Listing

**Appendix 6**

#### 2014/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28-Apr-14</td>
<td>25-May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26-May-14</td>
<td>22-Jun-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23-Jun-14</td>
<td>20-Jul-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21-Jul-14</td>
<td>17-Aug-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18-Aug-14</td>
<td>14-Sept-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15-Sept-14</td>
<td>12-Oct-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13-Oct-14</td>
<td>9-Nov-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10-Nov-14</td>
<td>7-Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8-Dec-14</td>
<td>4-Jan-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5-Jan-15</td>
<td>1-Feb-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2-Feb-15</td>
<td>1-Mar-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2-Mar-15</td>
<td>29-Mar-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30-Mar-15</td>
<td>26-Apr-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2015/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27-Apr-15</td>
<td>24-May-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25-May-15</td>
<td>21-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22-Jun-15</td>
<td>19-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20-Jul-15</td>
<td>16-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17-Aug-15</td>
<td>13-Sep-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14-Sep-15</td>
<td>11-Oct-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12-Oct-15</td>
<td>08-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>09-Nov-15</td>
<td>06-Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>07-Dec-15</td>
<td>03-Jan-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>04-Jan-16</td>
<td>31-Jan-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>01-Feb-16</td>
<td>28-Feb-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>29-Feb-16</td>
<td>27-Mar-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>28-Mar-16</td>
<td>24-Apr-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE OF REPORT

To inform Members of the deployment of Customer Service Representatives (CSRs) on the Metrolink system over recent months.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Members are invited to consider the report and to note the deployment of CSRs.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS


CONTACT OFFICERS

Peter Cushing  0161 244 1040  Peter.Cushing@tfgm.com
Louise Poole  0161 244 1490  Louise.Poole@tfgm.com
1. Introduction and Background

1.1 The role of the Customer Services Representative (CSR) was introduced to the Metrolink system in July 2008. Formally Passenger Services Representatives, the name change was introduced following an internal restructure aimed at enhancing operational excellence and improving the standards of customer service to enable the Operator to meet the customer requirement from a growing network.

1.2 This report has been prepared to update Members on the activities of the CSRs during Period 10 and 11 of Metrolink operations (Monday 05 January 2015 – Sunday 01 February 2015 and Monday 02 February – Sunday 01 March 2015). The report addresses the three core duties of the CSRs; revenue protection, security and customer care.

2. Revenue Protection

2.1 During Period 10, 1,535 Standard Fares were issued and a further 1,342 were issued in Period 11.

2.2 The graph in 2.5 indicates that the number of Standard Fares issued decreased in Period 11 by 12.5% and is largely attributed to the high visibility and customer centred activities during week commencing 16 February for the re-opening of Victoria station. A high level of CSR presence at Victoria and around the city centre ensured the smooth and efficient transition operationally and to showcase the new stop for a positive customer experience. Additionally, to assist with normalisation of the timetable gateway checks were suspended for two weeks (commencing 23 February and 02 March), to be temporarily replaced by alternative revenue protection exercises that do not require holding a tram.

2.3 Recent analysis demonstrates that of the Standard Fares issued, typically, it is expected that 30% will be £50 payments made within 14 days, 1% will be £100 payments, 13% will be paid in instalments, 13% will be warnings to juveniles when this is the first offence, 34% will be referred to the Courts to seek prosecution, 5% will be withdrawn and in 5% of cases, an appeal will be successfully upheld. This information is obtained from the Operators Cross database which contains the details of all recorded fare evaders during each period. Whilst overall the breakdown has not significantly changed there has been an increase in instalment plans (from 3% - 13%, 2014) accounting for the reduction of £100 payments made after 14 days.

2.4 A short term deployment strategy is developed by the Operator based on TVM sales figures to establish journey patterns, standard fares statistics and intelligence from CSRs on the ground. Results of previous operations and the fare evasion surveys represent a significant part of the scheduling of the deployment planning and assist in effectively targeting hot spot
areas by line of route, day of the week and time of day. Improvements to the way this information is analysed and used to plan revenue protection activity has led to a significant increase in the number of Standard Fares issued.

2.5 The following chart documents the number of standard fares issued.

![Chart of Standard Fares Issued By Period]

2.6 A multi-agency approach to dealing with anti-social behaviour on the northern extremity of the Rochdale line has seen a reduction in the number of reported incidents from all partners. Several Dispersal Orders have been issued by Greater Manchester Police to restrict the movements of known trouble makers in Rochdale Town Centre which has resulted in the arrest of a key ringleader.

2.7 1,342 Standard Fares were issued in Period 11; the majority being from the Rochdale line as the revenue protection effort was focused on areas reporting a high fare evasion and anti-social behaviour level. By the end of Period 11 the number of Standard Fares issued had significantly reduced from the level at the beginning of the Period, indicating a successful outcome following revenue protection activities along this line.

3. Security

3.1 There continues to be a number of joint police and revenue protection operations carried out with Greater Manchester Police across the system. These are targeted operations based on intelligence and known hotspots.

3.2 Incident reports have been submitted by the Operator for Period 10 and 11. The figures are summarised as follows.

- In Period 10 there were 159 incident reports; two reports of assault, 13 reports of verbal assaults towards staff and passengers; 23 reports of anti-social behaviour; two reports of graffiti; one report of theft; 14 instances of missiles thrown at trams; three instances where objects were placed on tracks; 14 reports of trespass on tracks; three reports of vandalism; 30 instances where door cocks were improperly activated; 26 instances of criminal damage; 8...
reports of interference with tram doors; 11 instances of disorderly behaviour; five reports of the public drunk / using drugs; 4 reports of obstruction of tram doors.

- In Period 11 there were 117 incident reports; 17 reports of assault including spitting and verbal assaults towards staff and passengers; 24 reports of anti-social behaviour; two reports of graffiti; two report of theft; 11 instances of missiles thrown at trams; three instances where objects were placed on tracks; four reports of trespass on tracks; 13 reports of vandalism; 32 instances where door cocks were improperly activated and 9 instances of criminal damage.

3.3 To develop the current policing strategy a Travel Safe Partnership (TSP) has been established on a 3 year pilot basis from 01 April 2015. This initiative, led jointly by TfGM and GM Police will build upon the successful elements of the current Crime Reduction On Public Transport (CROPT) model, combining them with proven methodologies utilised in other transport authorities. A separate paper has been prepared for the Rail and Network Committee.

4. Customer Care

4.1 During Periods 10 and 11 a total of twelve commendations were received from members of the public. Some examples are listed below:

- @MCRMetrolink thanks, the service is really good. People standing at stops giving info, announcements on tram.platform and Twitter

- St.Peter’s Square@MCRMetrolink staff being extra helpful; ensuring people get the last tram and directing Spanish speakers, in Spanish, to the right platform”

- Travelled through #Manchester today. Fantastic to see the regeneration across the city; its looking fantastic”

5. Recommendations

5.1 Please see front sheet of report.

Peter Cushing
Metrolink Director
PURPOSE OF REPORT

To update the Metrolink and Rail Networks (MRN) Sub Committee on the results from the second national Passenger Focus Tram Passenger Survey conducted in autumn 2014.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Members are asked to:

- note key findings from the Tram Passenger Survey 2014, the comparisons made against other networks and contrasts from the 2013 results.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Passenger Focus Tram Passenger Survey Autumn 2013 report to Committee on 9th May 2014

Metrolink Customer Satisfaction Survey report to Committee on 20 September 2013
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1. Executive Summary

1.1 The 2014 Passenger Focus survey reveals that trends over time are encouraging for Metrolink, with passengers significantly more satisfied with many aspects of the service compared to the previous year. For example, there have been improvements in: satisfaction amongst commuters and peak time users in satisfaction with their usual journey; satisfaction with punctuality and how often the tram runs, as well as with Metrolink journeys operating without delays.

1.2 These results have been achieved despite the Metrolink network going through a period of significant improvement and expansion. The Bury line had been constrained by approximately 30% due to single track running through Victoria station between February 2013 and 2014. There were numerous weekend closures and possessions which will have severely impacted passengers’ ability to travel over sustained periods in 2014. Despite this, the majority of customer satisfaction scores have moved in a positive direction since 2013.

1.3 There are noteworthy improvements in the Altrincham line scores and scores for the Bury line have remained stable during this period of significant service disruption.

1.4 Eight out of ten Metrolink passengers were satisfied with their usual journey overall (79% up from 72%) – a score which has risen most significantly among commuters (up from 59% to 73%). This is a particularly positive score as commuters and those travelling in the peak (+12% since 2013) are typically more difficult to please. Opinions about the punctuality of Metrolink services have improved since 2013, from 75% to 78%. This is in spite of satisfaction with punctuality across all the networks having not improved since 2013 (all networks: 83% in 2014, and 82% in 2013).

1.5 Across all networks, 61% of fare paying passengers rated the value for money of journeys as good. This is in contrast to the score of 48% for Metrolink. However, both these results are consistent with 2013 and none of the networks were able to bring about significant changes in scores for value for money between 2013 and 2014.

2. Introduction and Background

2.1 Passenger Focus is an independent body which aims to get the best deal for the passenger by carrying out research and campaigning for improvements. Passenger Focus has conducted the National Rail Passenger Survey for many years and since 2011 they have also carried out a nationwide Bus Passenger Survey. In Autumn 2013, Passenger Focus set out to measure tram passenger journey satisfaction for five tram systems within the Passenger Focus remit area in England:
Blackpool; Manchester Metrolink; Midland Metro (Birmingham/Wolverhampton); Nottingham Express Transit (NET); and Sheffield Supertram.

2.2 In 2014 an additional system in Scotland (Edinburgh) was added to the Tram Passenger Survey.

2.3 Transport for Greater Manchester jointly fund this research and included specific questions relating to usual experience, whereas Passenger Focus concentrate more on the experience on the day of the survey. The aim of the research is to explore barriers to tram use, opportunities to encourage usage, and potential improvements to the passenger experience.

2.4 In total, 2,824 responses were received from passengers surveyed on board the Metrolink network between 10th September and 27th November 2014. This was a response rate of 25% and generated more than four times the amount of responses than on any of the other networks surveyed (Edinburgh: 596; Metro: 503; Blackpool: 502). Fieldwork took place on board trams between 6am and 10pm, Monday – Sunday.

2.5 Commuters have been consistently shown in previous research to have lower satisfaction levels than those travelling in the off peak or for leisure purposes. Of all the networks surveyed, Metrolink has the highest proportion of passengers travelling to/from work (48%), similar to Midland Metro (44%). The same proportion of people are travelling for leisure on Blackpool trams (48%) which is much higher than on other networks (14% on Metrolink and Sheffield Supertram; and 9% for Midland Metro).

2.6 Metrolink carries a significantly higher proportion of younger, commuting passengers than the other tram systems surveyed by Passenger Focus. Typically, those aged 60+ have higher satisfaction levels than all the younger age groups. Of all the networks, Metrolink has the lowest number of 60+ travellers (16%) and Blackpool has more than double the number of 60+ passengers (37%) compared to Metrolink.

2.7 Metrolink has also been going through a period of significant expansion and improvement, increasing the scale and complexity of the network, far beyond that of the other networks surveyed. For example, Manchester Airport line opened on 3rd November, during the fieldwork. 15 new stops opened with a service frequency of every 12 minutes (no quotas were set for this line specifically, but respondents interchanging to/from that line could state which Airport line stop they had travelled to/from).

2.8 Metrolink now covers 97 km and 93 stops across seven lines, and carries significantly more passengers than the other networks. Metrolink is more than double the size of the next biggest network surveyed. The table below demonstrates this.
### Tram / light rail network comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Manchester Metrolink</th>
<th>Sheffield Supertram</th>
<th>Nottingham NET</th>
<th>Midland Metro</th>
<th>Blackpool Tramway</th>
<th>Edinburgh Tram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lines</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Km</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14+17 extension</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stops</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23+28 extension</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of trams</td>
<td>94-104</td>
<td>25+7 for tram train 2015+</td>
<td>15+22 for extension</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16 new, 11 heritage</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Passengers (m)</td>
<td>30 (2013/14)</td>
<td>15 (2011/12)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>tbc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9 It should be noted that two particular issues generated significant problems with Metrolink reliability around the time of the 2013 survey. The poorer reliability of the T68 trams in comparison to the newer M5000 trams and the major signalling problems at Cornbrook affecting the network performance. Until significant improvements were made to the signalling system at Cornbrook, it was a bottleneck for services running from the end of one line, through the city centre to another and had a real impact on network performance. All the lines except for Ashton were affected.

2.10 By 2014 these issues had been overcome, and there were no significant signalling problems on the network. Vehicle reliability had vastly improved with the retirement of all of the T68 trams and roll out of M5000 trams, which now run exclusively throughout the network. However, the Bury line was constrained through the fieldwork period due to single track running through Victoria between February 2014 and February 2015. There were also numerous weekend closures for essential engineering work which will have impacted service provision during the fieldwork period.

2.11 A fare freeze for 2015 was announced in mid-December 2014, however, the fieldwork took place prior to this.

3. **Overall satisfaction**

3.1 Manchester Metrolink scored 85% for overall passenger satisfaction. This is lower than other networks (a reflection of the high proportion of commuters, high numbers of passengers under 60 and the fact the survey was carried out during a period of significant change to the network), but is up from 83% in 2013. Also, promisingly, there were significant improvements in satisfaction amongst commuters (+5%).

3.2 There have also been significant improvements in levels of satisfaction with passengers’ usual experience (rather than just focusing on the survey day), and again across important user groups.
3.3 Eight out of ten Metrolink passengers were satisfied with their usual journey overall (79% up from 72%) – a score which has risen most significantly among commuters (up from 59% to 73%). This is a particularly positive score as commuters and those travelling in the peak (+12% since 2013) are typically more difficult to please.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with today’s journey overall</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Significant difference</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall sample</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>=*</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuters</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note the result above is very close to being a significant improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with usual journey overall**</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Significant difference</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall sample</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak time users</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off peak users</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuters</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TfGM only question

3.4 Overall passenger satisfaction of 90% was achieved across the 6 networks, with Nottingham, Edinburgh, and Blackpool and having the highest levels of satisfied passengers (96%, 95% and 95% respectively).
4. Satisfaction with punctuality

4.1 Opinions about the punctuality of Metrolink services have improved since 2013, from 75% to 78%. This is a more significant improvement than that of satisfaction with punctuality across all the networks (all networks: 83% in 2014, and 82% in 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with...</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Significant difference</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punctuality of the tram today</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>*=</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuality (running on time) – Metrolink services overall**</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please note the result above is very close to being a significant improvement

** TfGM only question

4.2 In 2014, an extra 12% of passengers said they were satisfied with Metrolink services running on time compared to 2013. This is a significant achievement, and likely to be because the major signalling issues that were prevalent at Cornbrook in the autumn of 2013 have now been resolved. Also M5000 vehicles are now running throughout the network. They are more reliable and less prone to break downs than the old T68 vehicles that were still being used in 2013.

4.3 The newly opened Edinburgh Tram was the highest scoring network in 2014 (94%). Manchester Metrolink and Sheffield Supertram jointly scored lowest of the group, with 78% of passengers satisfied with the punctuality of the tram.

5. Satisfaction with value for money

5.1 Sixty one percent of fare paying passengers rated the value for money of journeys as good across the 6 networks surveyed. Metrolink scored 48%. Both these results are consistent with 2013 and none of the networks were able to bring about significant improvements in scores for value for money between 2013 and 2014.

5.2 There were also no significant changes in the Metrolink results for satisfaction with value for money amongst any of the key sub groups (peak, off peak, commuters). Commuters and peak time users are still least satisfied with value for money (42% for commuters and 46% for peak time users compared to 48% overall) and there are still high levels of dissatisfaction in the Metrolink sample (33%).
5.3 This could be due to weekend engineering works in the run up to Christmas 2014, leading customers to feel that they could not maximise the use and value of their season tickets.

5.4 It is interesting to note that this trend of stable value for money scores is akin to passengers in the rail industry. The TfGM National Rail Passenger Survey (NRPS) scores were at a similar level, 45% in 2014 and results were also stable between 2013 and 2014.

6. Satisfaction with information

6.1 Some questions in the Metrolink satisfaction survey were exclusive to that survey and not asked of passengers on the other networks. This was because TfGM specifically requested that Passenger Focus asked these questions to enable us to monitor and improve these services to our passengers. TfGM only questions found significant improvements in scores over time for information at Metrolink stops. All the factors relating to information at stops have had significant increases since 2013, and shown year on year improvements since 2011. There has been a rise of 23 percentage points in satisfaction with announcements at stops since 2011, and a similar change in opinions of information about the next service. It seems that the passenger information displays are making a real difference to passenger perceptions about information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with…</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Significant difference</th>
<th>% change since 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information about delays**</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcements for passengers at stops **</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about the next service**</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information provided at the tram stop</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver announcements on vehicles**</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** TfGM only questions asked of passengers since 2011, before Passenger Focus approach was adopted
6.2 Metrolink scored 80% for satisfaction with information provided inside the tram, similar to the all networks score of 82%. The highest scoring network was Blackpool (89%), and the lowest scoring was Midland Metro (77%).

**Online information and customer services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with...</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Significant difference</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metrolink website**</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrolink customer services helpline**</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrolink app **</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** TfGM only question

6.3 The table above shows improvements in perceptions of the website. This could be due to the introduction of a service status on the homepage which was initiated in September 2013. Also, for the first time detailed information was provided to passengers about improvement works via a dedicated transformation website to try and help keep customers on board [http://www.transformationinformation.co.uk/transformation/victoria](http://www.transformationinformation.co.uk/transformation/victoria).

6.4 The delivery of a real time Metrolink app has been delayed and this is reflected in the rating of the current app, where there has been no change in opinion about it over time.

6.5 Metrolink and TfGM now have other online sources of travel information which may be impacting on scores for the website. A Twitter account for Metrolink has been in existence for over a year. A TfGM Facebook profile with regular Metrolink service information and news was launched in mid-January this year which may have a positive impact on 2015 satisfaction scores.

7. **Satisfaction with sufficient room to sit/stand**

7.1 When comparing the 2014 results with 2013, all the scores relating to crowding and personal space on board Metrolink have moved in the right direction. Crowding is still an issue for passengers though, as 47% of passengers overall are still dissatisfied with crowding on board Metrolink.
7.2 Of the 6 networks, Metrolink has the lowest levels of satisfaction with availability of seating or space to stand (65%) but this does reflect the sheer numbers of passengers carried each year, and the high commuter base on the network.

8. Ticketing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with…</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Significant difference</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room to sit/stand today</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>=*</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of personal space around you today</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowding on Metrolink**</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usual experience on board**</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note the result above is very close to being a significant improvement

** TfGM only question

8.1 One anomaly in the positive trend of the results is satisfaction with the ticket purchase process facilities. There have been significant decreases in scores for satisfaction with ticket buying facilities and the reliability of ticket machines.

8.2 The Metrolink Customer Services team have acknowledged that the number of ticket vending machines (TVMs) on the existing lines has been reduced to provide TVMs on the Airport line, and also in preparation for SMART ticketing. In addition there have been numerous incidents of
vandalism to ticket machines on several of the lines and there were 2 incidents of non-acceptance of credit cards during the fieldwork period.

9. Comparisons by Metrolink line

9.1 The table below shows the variations in satisfaction levels by line for several key measures. The newest lines have tended to have higher levels of satisfaction. However, in 2014, the Rochdale line had the lowest score of all lines for overall satisfaction (80%), a shift from the Altrincham line in 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall satisfaction</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
<th>Information about delays**</th>
<th>Punctuality (running on time generally)**</th>
<th>Sufficient room to sit/stand**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altrincham</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashton</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Didsbury</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccles</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures underlined represent a significant increase on 2013 **TfGM only question

9.2 The Altrincham line suffered the most from the aforementioned Cornbrook and T68 issues in 2013, and since then there have been improvements in all these key measures (especially +23% for running on time; +11% for overall satisfaction; and +7% for sufficient room to sit/stand).

9.3 Results for the Altrincham line are now much more comparable to the Bury line, and there have been particular improvements in satisfaction with information about delays (+16% on 2013), most likely due to the implementation of PIDs on the Altrincham line as far as the Brooklands stop. This has definitely improved the passenger experience.
9.4 The Bury line has had no significant increases or decreases in these key measures since 2013. This is good news given the disruptions that many passengers will have faced over the previous 12 months. It has even had small improvements in satisfaction with punctuality (+4%) and information about delays (5%). Although these movements are not significant, there is optimism about the way in which the services have been delivered on that line during difficult circumstances (single track running at Victoria). The Bury line currently has the lowest levels of satisfaction with punctuality of all the lines so there is clearly room for improvement. However, passengers should see improvements in punctuality in 2015 now that the Victoria stop has been transformed and is fully operational again.

9.5 East Didsbury line passengers have shown significant improvement in their scores for satisfaction with punctuality (+8%) and room to sit/stand (+10%) since 2013. This is likely to be due to the introduction of more double units scheduled to service this line in peak periods. In contrast to this these passengers are less happy with value for money in 2014 than 2013 (-7% although not a significant change) with a score similar to that of the most well established lines, as was the case in 2013.

9.6 Most significantly for the Eccles/Media City line, is the improvement (+13%) in the satisfaction with punctuality scores since 2013.

9.7 The Ashton line also has no significant changes from 2013 to 2014. Scores remain high in all areas shown in the table above, which is very positive news, as typically scores fall after the first year of operation.

9.8 The value for money score for each line has remained static. The wider introduction of SMART ticketing will also help with perceptions of value for money, as a fare freeze for those swopping to a SMART ticket is proposed for 2015. However, SMART may not be introduced sufficiently in advance of the 2015 fieldwork (due to start in September 2015) for it to impact on satisfaction scores.

9.9 It should also be noted that there is a risk of a drop in value for money perceptions amongst users of the East Didsbury, Airport, Eccles/Media City and Altrincham lines in the next autumn 2015 survey, as the works at St Peters Square will have a wide-reaching impact. However, the tram timetable and bus replacement services will be designed to maximise reliability.

10. Key priorities for improvement for passengers

10.1 Each year, key priorities for passengers are generated from the results. In 2014, there have been changes in the top two positions from 2013.

10.2 Most recently, lower fares are the top priority where in 2013, service reliability was the most important. This is likely to be due to the service issues that existed in autumn 2013. Service reliability has reduced in its
prominence as improvements have been made to performance (decommissioning of T68s, remedy of signalling issues at Cornbrook).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lower fares</td>
<td>Service reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Service reliability</td>
<td>Lower fares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Info on next service due and delays</td>
<td>Info on next service due and delays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Smart ticketing/personal security</td>
<td>Personal security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reliable ticket machines</td>
<td>Smart ticketing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.3 More frequent users prioritise lower fares, service reliability and information about next service due and delays than users or non-users, although the overall ranking was the same for all groups.

10.4 East Didsbury line users prioritise lower fares more highly than all the other lines (25% East Didsbury vs. 22% overall).

11. Conclusions

11.1 The trends are encouraging for Metrolink, with passengers significantly more satisfied with many aspects of the service compared to the previous year. For example, there have been improvements in: satisfaction amongst commuters and peak time users in satisfaction with their usual journey; satisfaction with punctuality and how often the tram runs, as well as with Metrolink journeys operating without delays.

11.2 Particularly noteworthy are the improvements in the Altrincham line scores now that the 2013 signalling issues at Cornbrook have been resolved and the T68 vehicles have been decommissioned. The Bury lines scores have also remained stable during a period of significant disruption due to the single track running through Victoria over the past year. There have been no significant changes in the key Ashton line results, they remain as high as in 2013.

11.3 Even room to sit/stand and personal space scores have improved, although there are still significant levels of dissatisfaction about the levels of crowding on the network.
11.4 Satisfaction with at stop information has improved, most likely due to the Passenger Information Displays now on the new lines and on the Altrincham line as far as Brooklands.

11.5 One anomaly in the positive trend is satisfaction with the ticket buying facilities. There have been significant decreases in scores for satisfaction with the ways in which you can buy tickets, the ease of buying tickets and the reliability of ticket machines.

11.6 The other tram networks do score more favourably in key customer satisfaction measures than Metrolink. However the scale and complexity of the Metrolink network and the passenger profile compared to the others surveyed must be taken into account when considering the variations in network scores.

11.7 On a final note, overall satisfaction scores amongst Metrolink passengers now equal that of bus passengers in Greater Manchester (85%), and score more positively than rail users in the conurbation (69%).

12. **Next Steps**

12.1 Further detailed analysis of the data from the Tram Passenger Survey is underway by the Transport Strategy Directorate in TfGM.

12.2 TfGM will continue to work with MRDL, who operate the tram system, to understand what more can be done and further develop the joint customer service plan to drive further service improvements based on the survey results.

13. **Recommendations**

13.1 Members are asked to note key findings from the Tram Passenger Survey 2014, the comparisons made against other networks and contrasts from the 2013 results.

*Peter Cushing  
Metrolink Director*
PURPOSE OF REPORT

To inform Members of an initiative to develop the current policing strategy by creating and implementing a dedicated ‘Travelsafe Partnership’ to assist in the policing and patrolling of Greater Manchester’s transport network.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Members are invited to consider the report and note the structure and expected outputs.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

NA

CONTACT OFFICERS

Peter Cushing 0161 244 1040 Peter.Cushing@tfgm.com
Howard Hartley 0161 244 1660 Howard.Hartley@tfgm.com
1. Introduction and Background

1.1 Crime Reduction On Public Transport (CROPT) is a multi-agency strategic initiative focused on reducing crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) across all modes of public transport throughout the county. Interventions undertaken by the CROPT members have contributed towards increased safety perceptions amongst service users and frontline staff and reduced levels of crime and anti-social behaviour.

1.2 Since 2009 a series of high profile interventions have been implemented by CROPT:

- **Greater Manchester Travel Safe Scheme (GMTSS)** – a team of part-time Special Constables and one full-time Police Officer dedicated to policing Bus Stations, Bus Services and Metrolink under the Governments Employer Supported Programme.

- **Special Projects** – Geographically based multi-agency operations focused upon prolific crime and anti-social behaviour hotspot locations.

- **District Gateway Checks** - Crime and revenue protection operations focused upon defined Police boundaries. Typically these operations involve two Police Officers (from a respective Division) and two or more Revenue Protection Inspectors from service operators.

- **Knife Enabled Checks (KEC)** - Similar to District Checks, focused on detecting and deterring crime and anti-social behaviour combined with revenue protection operations but implemented on a countywide basis. Typically these operations involve four Police Officers and four or more Revenue Protection Inspectors from service operators.

- **Patrol & Response Team** - Two full-time security officers dedicated to the prevention of crime and anti-social behaviour, providing reassurance to the public and frontline teams, gathering intelligence, both written and video via Body-cams and serving of TfGM Exclusion Orders.

2. Current Challenges

2.1 A review of the current CROPT model was undertaken and involved consultation with key stakeholders. The review identified opportunities for improvement in light of some gaps in service delivery:

- Reduction in available policing resources to adequately address and resolve transport industry crime needs,

- Restrictive and inefficient delivery method requiring advance planning and scheduling,

- Inflexible delivery model unable to respond to emerging concerns at short notice,
3. **Travelsafe Partnership (TSP)**

3.1 To develop the current policing strategy a Travelsafe Partnership (TSP) will be established on a 3 year pilot basis from 01 April 2015. This initiative, led jointly by TfGM and GM Police will build upon the successful elements of the current CROPT model, combining them with proven methodologies utilised in other transport authorities.

3.2 A dedicated team of 16 fulltime frontline officers; Constables, PCSO’s and Security personnel will patrol Greater Manchesters bus and tram network on an almost daily basis for the duration of the trial. Analysis of crime and anti-social behaviour data by contributing operators; First Bus, Stagecoach Bus and Metrolink, will determine the deployment of these resources to tackle problems at known hotspots across the transport network.

3.3 The consistent team of officers working across multi-modal channels dedicated to reducing transport crime and disorder is expected to make the identification of offenders easier. The provision of bodyworn cameras in conjunction with existing CCTV cameras on buses, trams and Metrolink stops will facilitate prosecutions for those caught offending. Post prosecution TfGM is committed to implementing methods of Restorative Justice and Civil Injunctions, as appropriate.

3.4 The Travelsafe Partnership will also provide a robust Youth Education Programme (YEP) across the county. Uniformed officers will deliver a strong message into schools focused on reducing fare evasion, and engaging in crime and anti-social behaviour on Greater Manchester’s transport network.

3.5 The three key elements of this strategic approach; Detection, Prosecution and Education are expected to deliver the following of benefits:

- Intelligence led Greater Manchester wide response capability,
- Increased number of police supported deployments,
- Increased safety for passengers, staff, infrastructure & vehicles,
- Reductions in levels of transport related crime and anti-social behaviour,
- Greater control of policing resources (allocation & composition) by TfGM,
- Ability to utilise Civil Injunctions & Restorative Justice,
• Ability to detect / prevent crimes against young people & minority groups; and
• Greater awareness of terrorist threats and the ability to prevent attacks

3.6 To deliver the above benefits, greater collaborative working with GMP is required and it is proposed that TfGM's Crime Reduction Partnership Officer, who will manage the Travel Safe Partnership, will have an increased presence in Police Head Quarters. This move will strengthen TfGM's relationship with GMP, gain the full support of the Chief Superintendent, obtain access to Force wide specialist Police units and local Divisional Officers, utilise real time crime intelligence and elevate the status of transport industry crime within GMP strategic thinking.

3.7 A brand identity for the Travelsafe Partnership has been developed (see Appendix A) will be used to publicise the activity and outputs.

4. Conclusion

4.1 As a public funded body, Section 17 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998 states that TfGM has a statutory duty to make the reduction of crime and disorder a core function of its work, allocating dedicated resources in an effort to help address crime within its sphere of influence, alongside those of Greater Manchester Police and Local Councils.

4.2 Patrols by a consistent “policing family” team will greatly increase individuals' knowledge of and commitment to the transport industry, leading to higher detection rates, reduced opportunities for offenders to commit crime.

4.3 It is expected that Greater Manchester Police, via its local Divisions and Forcewide units primarily, would experience a net decrease in requests from CROPT stakeholders to deal with transport crime and anti-social behaviour incidents, as these would be picked up in the first instance by the Travel Safe Partnership policing element, thus freeing Officers to tackle other priorities.

5. Recommendations

5.1 The Travel Safe Unit should be established on a 3 year pilot bases, commencing on 1st April 2015, with a formal annual review, involving full consultation and performance scrutiny by CROPT’s Strategic Steering Group and Crime Risk Management Group.

5.2 Updates on progress will be provided to the Metrolink and Rail Networks Sub Committee at regular intervals.
Appendix A: Travelsafe brand identity

TRAVELSAFE
PARTNERSHIP

Keeping public transport safe

For more information or to speak with a member of the team:
visit www.gmtravelsafe.co.uk
Call 0161 244 1000
Twitter @OfficialTfGM

Who we are
Travel Safe is a partnership between Transport for Greater Manchester, Greater Manchester Police, Metrolink, Stagecoach and First.

What we do
Our officers regularly patrol public transport, checking tickets and tackling anti-social behaviour. We also work with schools, colleges and youth groups to encourage young people to think about staying safe and the consequences of crime and bad behaviour when travelling.

Our aims are to
• Reduce transport-related crime and anti-social behaviour
• Improve safety of passengers and transport staff and drivers
• Reduce fare evasion and ticket fraud
• Protect transport vehicles and facilities
• Tackle terrorism and hate-related crime
PURPOSE OF REPORT

To inform Members of local rail service performance and station issues within Greater Manchester and the surrounding area for heavy rail Periods 11 and 12 (4 January 2015 – 28 February 2015).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Members are asked to note the contents of this report.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Local Rail Service Performance Issues report to Metrolink and Rail Networks Sub-Committee on 13th February 2015.

CONTACT OFFICERS

Amanda White 0161 244 0893 amanda.white@tfgm.com
Mark Angelucci 0161 244 1521 mark.angelucci@tfgm.com
Report on Local Rail Service Performance

4 January 2015 – 28 February 2015

1. Introduction

1.1 At the previous meeting of this Sub-Committee on 19 December, 2014 Members received information on performance in Periods 9 and 10. This report contains detail of performance and incidents across the rail network covering Periods 11 and 12 (4 January 2015 – 28 February 2015).

1.2 The report is structured under subject headings aligned with the following key areas of focus for TfGM in relation to rail quality measures;

- Train Performance and Capacity Provision;
- Station Quality;
- Engineering Work; and
- Revenue Protection.

1.3 The use of technical terms has been kept to a minimum in the report and a glossary of those terms which have been unavoidable can be found in Appendix A.
2. Summary

2.1 Network Rail's performance was better than target in P11 however track circuit failures led to exceeding target in P12. This is particularly notable in Period 12 as the target figures include provision for weather related failures, masking the severity of infrastructure failures.

![Graph showing actual and target infrastructure delays]

2.2 Major incidents in these periods included:

- Five fatalities
- Signalling failure at Huyton on 19 January
- Signal panel failure at Rochdale on 7 January
- Two track circuit failures at Ordsall 19/20 Feb
- Platform damage at Hyde North on 26 February
- Tunnel damage at Watford (Virgin Trains only)
- Overhead Line problems 11 Jan (Virgin Trains only)

2.3 A significant performance improvement has been seen for both operators now that the new arrangements are in place for a 5\textsuperscript{th} train per hour for Trans Pennine Express.

2.4 For its Greater Manchester services (TfGM), \textbf{Northern Rail's Public Performance Measure (PPM) performance was 90.7\% in Period 11 (against a target of 93.0\%) rising 5.3\% from Period 10. Period 12 saw a slight decrease in PPM to 89.9\%.} Northern Rail’s MAA figure at the end of Period 12 was 89.4\%
2.5 In both periods approximately half of all Northern Rail delays can be attributed to Network Rail incidents, a third are Northern Rail fleet and crew related and the remainder are a result of other TOC incidents.

2.6 NB Northern Rail Public Performance Measure (PPM) is for the Greater Manchester area against a target of 92%. See details in Appendices B and C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern 11</th>
<th>Northern 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18,593</td>
<td>19,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,080</td>
<td>9,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,106</td>
<td>24,442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 First TransPennine Express (FTPE) performance improved by 5.5% since Period 10 to 90.4% in Period 11 (target 91%). Performance improved further in Period 12 to 91.5%, resulting in an MAA figure of 88.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTPE Period 11</th>
<th>FTPE Period 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6,927</td>
<td>7,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,087</td>
<td>18,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,637</td>
<td>10,045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8 In both periods over half of all TPE delays can be attributed to Network Rail incidents, over a quarter are a result of other TOC incidents and the remainder are TPE fleet and crew related.
### Train performance: PPM Period 11 and Period 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Punctuality &amp; Reliability (%PPM)</th>
<th>P11 14/15</th>
<th>Change on period</th>
<th>P12 14/15</th>
<th>Change on period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Rail (in GM)</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransPennine Express</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Trains</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arriva Trains Wales</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midland Trains</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Moving Annual Average (MAA) Period 11 and Period 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Moving Annual Average (MAA)</th>
<th>P11 14/15</th>
<th>Change on period</th>
<th>P12 14/15</th>
<th>Change on period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Rail (in GM)</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransPennine Express</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Trains</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arriva Trains Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To follow in next report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midland Trains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To follow in next report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9 Manchester Airport station new platform 4 was commissioned on time on Monday 9th February.

2.10 Station and Vehicle Service Quality audits were not carried out in Periods 11 and 12 due to a DfT Station Benchmark survey request to inform the franchise specification.

2.11 Northern Rail saw a significant reduction in complaints in P11, 56 compared to 129 in Period 10. This may be due to strengthened Metrolink staff at Victoria during P11 due to the platforms re-opening. The complaints in P12 returned to 113.

2.12 A summary of future engineering work in Greater Manchester can be found on pages 17 to 24.
3. Network Rail Performance

3.1 In Period 11, Network Rail beat its performance target of 26,217 minutes and saw 18,540 minutes of delay in the Manchester Delivery Area. Major incidents affecting performance in Period 11 were an Axle Counter failure at Huyton on the 19th of January and multiple signal failure at Rochdale on the 7th of January. These two Network Rail incidents accounted for 1778 minutes delay, 7 full cancellations and 20 part cancellations. Two suspected suicides occurred at Barton & Oxheys Goods Loop (just outside Preston) and one at Capenhurst Station.

3.2 Period 12 saw 25,327 minutes of day against a target of 17,612. Major incidents in Period 12 included two track circuit failures at Ordsall Junction on consecutive evenings during the evening peak, on the 19th and 20th of January. The failures were caused by a multi-core cable failure as a result of damaged cable insulation. The incidents caused a total of 5024 minutes, 17 full cancellations 49 part cancellations. In Period 12, there were three suspected suicides; one at Leighton Buzzard Station, one at Ainsdale Station, and one at Padgate Station.

4. Northern Performance

4.1 The trend in performance is shown in Appendices B and C, and Appendix D shows the performance of all routes individually.

4.2 Compared to P9 / P10, Northern Rail’s performance has improved significantly over both P11 and P12. While PPM targets were not met in P11 or P12, it should be noted that both periods saw an increase in overall performance, with scores over 90%. In summary, there has been a positive uplift from 82.23% in P9 to 92.6% in P12.

4.3 Northern Rail’s performance in Greater Manchester improved over the last two periods, from 85.4% in Period 10 to 90.7% in Period 11. This dropped slightly in Period 12 to 89.9%.

4.4 Northern Rail’s performance improved significantly from 88.7% in Period 10 to 92.3% in Period 11. This improved further to 92.6% in Period 12.

4.5 Issues associated with train crew shortages (a result of high levels of driver turnover and both long and short term sickness) have settled. This is due to recruitment and training continuing to gather momentum. Furthermore, the operator’s Rest Day working agreement has played a major role in enhancing driver availability. Putting these factors in context, it should be noted that for P11 and P12 the number of cancellations across the Manchester and Liverpool PMU decreased by 271 incidents compared to the previous two periods.
4.6 Major incidents affecting performance in Period 11 were an Axle Counter failure at Huyton on the 19th of January and multiple signal failure at Rochdale on the 7th of January. These two Network Rail incidents accounted for 1778 minutes delay, 7 full cancellations and 20 part cancellations.

4.7 A Northern unit failure at West Houghton caused 589 minutes delay, 2 full cancellations and 6 part cancellations. Other notable incidents included a freight train struck the platform at Moston station, a cable theft at Miles Platting and Train Crew issues at Salford Crescent.

4.8 Major incidents in Period 12 included two track circuit failures at Ordsall Junction on consecutive evenings during the evening peak, on the 19th and 20th of January. The failures were caused by a multi-core cable failure as a result of damaged cable insulation. The incidents caused a total of 5024 minutes, 17 full cancellations 49 part cancellations. Other significant incidents included a train failure at Manchester Piccadilly during the peak on the 16th of January causing 1458 minutes delay and a train failure on the Bolton corridor on the 5th of February causing 1,287 minutes delay.

4.9 Overall in P11, the total delay for Northern Rail in Greater Manchester was 50,779 minutes. Network rail were responsible for 25,106 of these. Northern Rail were responsible for 18,593. Other TOCs were responsible for 7,080.

4.10 Overall in P12, the total delay for Northern Rail in Greater Manchester was 53,464 minutes. Network Rail were responsible for 24,442 of these. Northern Rail were responsible for 19,636. Other TOCs were responsible for 9,406.

4.11 Appendix D shows PPM and MAA performance on an individual service group basis. This includes all 23 Northern Rail service groups, as well as three FTPE service groups and two Virgin Trains service groups.
5. **Northern Performance – By Route**

5.1 The best performing Northern Rail routes over the past two periods are:

- Manchester – Crewe via Stockport (96.4% in P11 and 93.9% in P12)
- Liverpool – St. Helens – Wigan (96.3% in P11 and 94.4% in P12)
- Manchester – Crewe via Manchester Airport (95.2% in P11 and 93.2% in P12)

5.2 Northern Rail’s worst performing routes over the last two periods were:

- Blackpool/Preston – Manchester/Hazel Grove (83.8% in P11 and 80.8% in P12)
- Southport – Bolton – Manchester Airport/Victoria (84.6% in P11 and 84.1% in P12)
- Blackpool North – Manchester Victoria (86.4% in P11 and 86.0% in P12)

5.3 Appendix E included a list of the worst performing trains operated by Northern Rail and Appendix F is a graphical representation of all Greater Manchester rail services.

6. **Northern Performance - Complaints**

6.1 Northern Rail received a total of 807 complaints relating to its Manchester and Liverpool operations in Period 11, which was less than the 834 complaints received in the corresponding Period 11 last year.

6.2 3 most common causes of complaints were;

- **Train performance** – 422
- Overcrowding – 94
- Staff issues – 81

6.3 The routes attracting the most complaints were:

- Manchester Victoria – Southport (116)
- Clitheroe – Manchester Victoria (66)
- Manchester Victoria – Huddersfield (64)
6.4 Northern Rail received 820 complaints in Period 12. 13 less than the corresponding Period 12 from last year.

6.5 3 most common causes of complaints were;

- **Train performance – 413**
- Staff issues – 81
- Value for money – 73

6.6 The routes attracting most complaints were;

- Manchester – Wigan – Southport (75)
- Liverpool – NLW – Manchester Victoria (51)
- Huddersfield – Manchester Victoria (49)

**Northern Performance – Southport Line**

6.7 Period 11 and 12 saw steady performance in both of the Manchester – Southport lines of route. For services from the Airport via Bolton, performance was 89.9% in Period 11 to 89.2% in Period 12. For services from Manchester Victoria via Atherton, PPM was 89.4% and increased to 90.4% in Period 12.

6.8 The incidents at Ordsall Lane on the 19th / 20th of February severely affected the Southport Line performance as did the unit failure at Kersley on the 5th of February. Train Crew issues on the 16th and 19th of February.

6.9 The Southport Quality Improvement Team is made up of representatives from Northern Rail, Network Rail. The meeting is held 8 weekly and has been incorporated into the Manchester Right Time Railway group meeting structure.

7. **A Look Ahead to Performance in Period 13, 2014/15**

7.1 Northern Rail's TfGM performance on day 25 of Period 13 (Wednesday 25th March, 2015) was 87.6%.
8. **First TransPennine Express Performance**

8.1 First TransPennine Express (FTPE) achieved a PPM of 90.4% in Period 11. This increased to 91.5% in Period 12. Resulting in a Period end MAA of 88.5%.

![FTPE Period 11 and Period 12 delays chart]

8.2 In both periods over half of all TPE delays can be attributed to Network Rail incidents, over a quarter are a result of other TOC incidents and the remainder are TPE fleet and crew related.

8.3 In **Period 11** there were 37,319 minutes of delay.

8.4 **Network Rail** were responsible for 20,087 (target 22,087), which included:

- An unfortunate **spike in fatalities** across the FTPE network. 5 were recorded in the period (4 involving FTPE trains). Network Rail continues to work with the Samaritans, restrict access to the running lines, and introduce smart cameras.

- **Several points failures** occurred, a failure at Carnworth on January 29th and at Darlington on January 22nd.

8.5 FTPE were responsible for 6,927 (target 5,356) which included;

- Both electric and diesel fleet failures. The largest incident involved a **fault on the Airport line** believed to be caused by a **power supply issue** on January 10th. A brake fault occurred at Chorley on January 10th.

8.6 **Other TOCs** were responsible for 9,632 (target 9,800), which included;

- A **Northern Rail unit failure** at Gorton on January 7th.
8.7 **Period 12 saw 35,415 delay minutes** against a target of 31,495.

8.8 **Network rail** were responsible for 18,127 (target 18,978), which included:

- **Track circuit failures**, the biggest incident (which repeated itself the following day) was a track circuit failure as a result of damage to cabling at Ordsall Lane on February 19th and 20th.

8.9 **FTPE** were responsible for 7,244 (target 4,957), which included:

- **Electric fleet failures**, the biggest incident being a **pantograph fault** between Manchester Airport and Manchester Piccadilly on February 27th.

- **Diesel fleet failures**, the biggest incident being **brake faults on two units** across the station throat at Piccadilly on February 16th.

8.10 **Other TOCs** were responsible for 10,045 (target 7,560) which included:

- A **Northern Rail unit failure** at Slaithwaite on February 8th.

8.11 **Period 11 saw 242 cancellations** (target 288). Network Rail were responsible for 125 (target 190), FTPE 88 (target 68) and other TOCs 29 (target 30).

8.12 **Period 12 saw 219 cancellations** against a target of 267. Network Rail were responsible for 89 of these (target 180), FTPE 105 (target 62) and other TOCs 25 (target 26).

9. **Virgin Trains Performance**

9.1 **There were no major incidents in Greater Manchester. However the knock on effects of the incidents mentioned were experienced in GM.**

9.2 In P11 **4.0% of services were cancelled**, this reduced to 1.8% of service in P12.

9.3 Performance throughout **Period 11 was generally poor**;

- 16 days had PPM worse than the target of 86%.
- 10 days had a PPM less than 80%.

9.4 **Period 11 network PPM was 78.8%.** 7.2% worse than target, the performance in Greater Manchester only was better with a PPM of **81.4%**

9.5 The worst 3 days of the period were 11th, 12th and 13th January, with PPM of 33.3% 31.2% and 54.2% respectively.
9.6 Poor performance was caused by:

- **Tunnel damage at Watford** – the largest incident which continued to affect performance over several days with 9780 minutes, 37 full cancellations and 4 part cancellations.

- **Overhead line problems at Blisworth** – second largest incident with 5440 minutes of delay, 48 full cancellations and 17 part cancellations.

- **Power problems at Euston** on 27th January resulted in 2102 minutes of delay, 18 full cancellations and 19 part cancellations.

- Points problems at Hanslope

- A freight train failure at Blisworth

9.7 **Delays caused by Virgin account for 12.6% of total delay.** The largest incident was a **pantograph fault** at Leyland on 18th January. It is believed the pantographs were damaged by ice on the overhead line.

9.8 External delays were 21.4% worse than target. This was due to weather related incidents.

9.9 **Performance throughout Period 12 was generally good** with 20 days of PPM higher than 90% and 9 of these with PPM above 95%. There were 4 days with poor PPM below 80%.

9.10 Period 12 network PPM was 89.7%. This was 1.7% better than target; again Greater Manchester PPM was higher at 91.5%.

9.11 The worst of these days was 13th February, with two large infrastructure incidents;

- **A signalling power failure at Watford Junction**

- **Points failure at Wembley**

9.12 Other incidents included;

- Person struck by train at Leighton Buzzard on 7th February

- Overhead line issues between Rugby and Coventry on 14th February

9.13 **Delays caused by Virgin account for 16.8% of total delay.** The largest delay incident being a passenger communications fault on 25th February resulting in a set being sent back to the depot for repair.

9.14 External delays were 19.5% worse than target. The largest external incident was a drunken passenger causing disruption on 7th February requiring police attendance at Watford Junction.

9.15 Performance on Virgin Trains Anglo – Scottish services, as recorded at Wigan North Western, was as follows:
10. Other Train Operating Companies

10.1 PPM for Arriva Trains Wales (Regional & Inter-Urban)
- P11: 93.4%
- P12: 93.0%

10.2 PPM for East Midlands Trains (Norwich-Sheffield-Manchester-Liverpool services)
- P11: 91.5%
- P12: 90.3%

11. Capacity Provision – Northern Rail Peak Time Strengthening

11.1 In Period 11, Northern Rail strengthened 95.1% of its targeted services. This increased to 95.2% in Period 12. Performance continues to be high.
12. Overcrowding Complaints

12.1 The number of complaints received by Northern Rail in relation to overcrowding in the Manchester and Liverpool period was 94 in Period 11 (58 P11 13/14). This reduced to 49 in Period 12 (66 P12 13/14). The route attracting the most complaints in regard to overcrowding was Manchester – Southport, attracting 44 complaints in Period 11 and 10 complaints in Period 12. It is worth noting that although P12 represents a low number of complaints for P12 on this particular route, it was still the largest number for a single route.

13. Station Complaints

13.1 Northern Rail received 56 complaints about its stations in Manchester and Liverpool in Period 11. A significant decrease from the 129 received in Period 10. The stations attracting the most complaints were;

- Manchester Victoria (17)
- Bolton (16)
- Wilmslow (12)

13.2 Manchester Victoria received the most complaints in regard to staff conduct and availability (8) followed by a lack of information regarding train times (4). It is worth noting that these complaints may have been due to the recently completed construction works.

13.3 The number of complaints rose in Period 12 to 113. The stations attracting the most complaints were;

- Manchester Victoria (22)
- Manchester Oxford Road (16)
- Bolton (13)

13.4 Again Manchester Victoria received the greatest number of complaints in regard to staff conduct and availability (10) and a lack of information regarding train times (5).
14. Booking Office Closures – Period 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Date of Closure</th>
<th>Total Hours Closed</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heald Green</td>
<td>05/01/15</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford Central</td>
<td>07/01/15</td>
<td>06:00</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford Crescent</td>
<td>10/01/15</td>
<td>08:45</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whaley Bridge</td>
<td>08/01/15</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindley</td>
<td>15/01/15</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>Rota error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel Grove</td>
<td>24/01/15</td>
<td>07:29</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lostock</td>
<td>26/01/15</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Schedule 17 – Changes to Booking Office Opening Hours

15.1 The Northern Direct award included a review of ticket office provision to take into account £200k reduction in subsidy, the changes to opening hours has resulted from the following process:

- Original thoughts centred around closure of booking offices or removing PM shifts
- Analysis was taken of Period 12/13 data (2013) to evaluate passenger usage trends
- It was eventually decided to look at Minor Changes to the current provision and in particular hours in which fewer than 7 tickets were being sold at individual booking offices. Consultation with staff followed and a final proposition delivered
- In some locations opening hours have been reduced (4 in Greater Manchester) but in a few they have been extended
- The detail for the proposal has only been finalised in the past few days. Northern Rail will organise a briefing next week (probably next Tuesday in Leeds) so the analysis team can share their findings and offer more explanation on the process followed
- Northern acknowledge the failure regarding adequate consultation with PTE areas but the agreement had to be processed in 7 days
15.2 Under the required procedures associated with Schedule 17 Notices 280 (Proposed Changes to Various Stations), Northern Rail have confirmed the following changes to Northern’s ticket office opening hours:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Current Schedule 17 Hours</th>
<th>Proposed Schedule 17 Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheadle Hulme</td>
<td>0600 - 2200</td>
<td>0600 - 2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale</td>
<td>0610 - 2045</td>
<td>0610 - 2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigan Wallgate</td>
<td>0600 - 2200</td>
<td>0600 - 2200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Times in blue indicate the change*

FX = Fridays excluded
FO = Friday only

15.3 The transition process is now complete and the changes highlighted above will be effective from Monday **30th March 2015**.

16. **Northern Rail Service Quality**

16.1 There are no updates to service quality or failed stations in Period 11 and 12. A benchmarking activity has now been completed to support the DfT specification of the new franchise and a new service quality regime will be established from April 2016.
17. Engineering

17.1 North West Electrification Phase 2a

Electrification of the Manchester to Liverpool route is now complete with the first Northern Rail electric units entering into service on 5th March. Northern Rail’s 06.16 Liverpool Lime Street to Manchester Airport services, operated by unit no 319362, and was the first service to use the newly electrified route between Lime Street and Newton-le-Willows. Northern Rail passenger feedback following the introduction has been positive.

17.2 North West Electrification Phase 2b

Work continues on the section between Huyton and Wigan, which when completed will allow the Class 319s to operate services between Liverpool and Wigan.

17.3 North West Electrification Phase 4: Manchester – Bolton – Preston

17.3.1 A full list of road closures associated with NW electrification works can be found in Appendix H.

17.3.2 Preparatory work for Phase 4 (Manchester – Bolton – Preston) involves late night work and possessions from Sunday – Thursday nights. The work requires extended hours of access, which has formed part of the timetable change since 14 December 2014. This resulted in closures and rail replacement services as follows;

- Lostock Junction to Euxton Junction from 2135
- Bolton to Lostock Junction from 2200
- Salford Crescent to Bolton from 2250

17.4 Todmorden Curve

Members may recall that the 500 metre long Todmorden Curve, funded by Regional Growth Fund funding, bid for and received by Burnley Borough Council, has been built to re-instate a direct link between the Manchester to Bradford and the Preston to Todmorden routes. This will enable direct services to operate between Manchester and Burnley (and beyond), and it is expected that these will commence with the introduction of the May 2015 timetable. As an interim step towards this, Wigan to Rochdale services were extended to operate to Todmorden from May 2014. The chord is now fully commissioned and was available for traffic in both directions as of 0030 on Monday February 9th. To celebrate the completion of the project, a VIP launch event is planned for Tuesday 26th May.
18. **Farnworth Tunnel**

18.1 The major challenge of the electrification work between Manchester and Bolton in 2015 will be the Farnworth Tunnels. The two tunnels date from 1838 and 1880. In preparation for electrification, the smaller tunnel will be reinforced with concrete and signalling will be installed to allow bi-directional working on the single line. This work will take place at weekends commencing mid-February and will necessitate weekend line closures. Once this is complete, a limited service will be able to operate in both directions through the one tunnel. This will allow the larger tunnel to be widened to eventually take two tracks and overhead line equipment.

18.2 The main works will commence on 2 May until 4 October, 2015 and the train plan has now been finalised:

- There will be a limited Monday – Friday train service, from 0600 – 2200hrs with 4 paths an hour for trains in each direction through the operational Farnworth tunnel. Northern Rail plans to operate 6 car services where possible to enhance capacity. Beyond these times and on Saturdays and Sundays, replacement bus services will operate.

- Northern Rail plans to operate
  - 1 tph Preston – Hazel Grove,
  - 1 tph Blackpool North – Victoria,
  - 1 tph Clitheroe – Victoria.

- These will be supplemented at peak times by First TransPennine Express (FTPE) services using 3 and 6 car Class 185 units.

- Southport – Airport services will be diverted via Atherton line and Kirkby – Manchester services will be diverted to terminate at Bolton with an additional stop at Westhoughton.

18.3 In order to provide extra capacity, FTPE will be operating some services through the tunnel during peak times (Monday to Friday). In the morning we will run four departures from Bolton towards Manchester through the tunnel (07.35, 08.08, 08.35 and 09.35). In the evening we will run a series of departures from Manchester through the tunnel towards Bolton (15.29, 16.29, 17.29, 18.29, 19.29 and 20.29 off Manchester Airport). In addition, one Transpennine service runs through the tunnel in each direction in the middle of the day. The remainder of our services avoid the tunnel and will travel via Wigan

18.4 Deansgate stops will be removed from FTPE’s 16.29, 17.29 and 18.29 Manchester Airport to Blackpool services

18.5 FTPE and Northern Rail have worked together to ensure capacity is maintained or enhanced, where possible. By strengthening Northern services and replacing 185s with 2x156 on our services we have largely
protected capacity from the May timetable change. However, for the first two weeks of the blockade (prior to the May 2015 timetable change and the introduction of Class 156s operating on some services between Manchester and Blackpool) there will be some 3-car Class 185 trains in operation which will then be replaced by 4-car Class 156s.

18.6 Farnworth, Moses Gate, Kearsley and Clifton stations will be closed throughout the works and a rail replacement bus service will be in operation.

18.7 A full and timely joint communications package put together by Network Rail, FTPE, Northern Rail and the DfT will advise passengers of alternative routes, which include services from Atherton to Manchester and rail replacement buses from Bolton. The aim is that on day one, no regular customer arrives at the station, not knowing about the blockade.

18.8 The communications package will embrace, for example;

- Briefings for customer service teams and management presence at key locations.
- National Rail website;
- Online and social media;
- Station posters; Information sessions and leaflets;
- Radio and print advertisements in local newspapers (including the Bolton News and Metro);
- Announcements (at stations and on trains);
- Meet the Manager sessions at Bolton Station and leaflet handouts at other affected locations. Further sessions will take place from the week beginning the 20th April;
- Particular messages on station customer information screens;
- Consideration has been given to major events on the route including the Rugby World Cup and Super League Grand Final which are both taking place in October;
- Pre-notification letters.

18.9 The work also involves re-siting one of the Farnworth platforms, lowering a section of track, removing a pedestrian crossing at Kearsley and replacing it with a footbridge and installing new track around Moses Gate. Once completed, an upgraded track speed of 100mph will allow faster journey times between Bolton and Manchester.

18.10 Full details can also be found at: www.networkrail.co.uk/farnworth
19. Easter Engineering Works

19.1 There is significant engineering work taking place in the Manchester Victoria and Salford Crescent areas over the Easter period, Friday 3rd to Monday 6 April 2015 inclusive, which will result in various line closures. Service alterations are described below.

19.2 First TransPennine Express

- Services between Manchester and Preston / Blackpool North / Barrow-in-Furness / Windermere will be diverted between Deansgate and Preston and will not call at Salford Crescent, Bolton, Horwich Parkway, Chorley or Buckshaw Parkway. Replacement buses will operate between Manchester Piccadilly and Preston via affected stations.

- Services between Liverpool Lime Street and Newcastle are diverted to run between Manchester Piccadilly and Newcastle. Passengers should use other trains between Liverpool Lime Street and Manchester Piccadilly.

- The 23:20 (Friday and Monday) Manchester Airport to York will be diverted and not call at Manchester Victoria.

19.3 Northern Rail

- Services between Manchester Victoria and Clitheroe will be replaced by buses between Manchester Victoria / Salford Crescent and Blackburn.

- Services between Leeds and Manchester Victoria (via Bradford Interchange) will be replaced by buses between Manchester Victoria and Rochdale / Hebden Bridge.

- Services between Leeds and Manchester Victoria (via Dewsbury) will start from / terminate at Moston. Passengers are advised that connections between train and bus are not possible at Moston. Passengers should change at Rochdale.

- Services between Manchester Victoria and Huddersfield will be replaced by buses between Manchester Victoria and Ashton-under-Lyne.

- Services between Manchester Victoria and Blackpool North will run between Preston and Blackpool North only. Buses will run between Manchester Victoria and Salford Central, Salford Central and Preston.

- Services between Manchester Victoria and Liverpool Lime Street will be diverted to start from / terminate at Manchester Oxford Road, with an hourly service running in each direction.
• **Services between Manchester Victoria and Wigan Wallgate via Bolton** will not run.

• **Services between Manchester Airport and Southport** will be diverted via Atherton. Up to 2 trains per hour will run between Manchester Oxford Road and Wigan Wallgate.

• **Services between Manchester Victoria and Wigan Wallgate / Southport / Kirkby via Atherton** will run to an amended timetable providing up to 2 trains per hour diverted to run to / from Manchester Oxford Road.

20. **Northern and FTPE Franchises**

20.1 The FTPE Direct Award has now been agreed, which will allow the franchise to run until the start of the new franchise in April 2016.

20.2 The Northern Rail and TPE franchise Invitation to Tender (ITT) document was issued on 27th February. This sets out the minimum specification to be delivered as part of the next franchise which will run from 2016 to 2025 for Northern Rail and from 2016 to 2023 for TPE. The ITT has specified a significant increase in capacity which must be provided on services in Greater Manchester. As part of this a minimum of 120 new diesel carriages will be delivered during the course of the franchise, this will see an improvement in the capacity offered across the network.

20.3 TfGM officers have been engaged in detailed discussion with the three bidders for each franchise.

• **Northern:**
  − Abellio Northern Ltd,
  − Arriva Rail North Ltd
  − Govia Northern Ltd.

• **TPE:**
  − First Group;
  − Stagecoach Rail;
  − Keolis UK

20.4 Short meetings have also been facilitated with the TfGMC Leading Members to reinforce GM’s priorities.

The bidders are currently working on their proposals for each franchise and will be submitted to the Department for Transport by the end of May for Northern and 26 June for TPE. A period of evaluation follows this and the winning bidder will be announced in December 2015. The new franchise is due to commence in April 2016.
21. **Trespass & Fatality**

21.1 Periods 11 and 12 saw a slight decrease in the number of suicidal and trespass incidents in Greater Manchester. For Network Rail in Period 11, there were two suspected suicides; one at Barton & Oxheys Goods Loop (just outside Preston) and one at Capenhurst Station. Additionally, there were seven and 22 threats. In Period 12, there were three suspected suicides; one at Leighton Buzzard Station, one at Ainsdale Station, and one at Padgate Station. Additionally, there were 15 attempts and 32 threats.

21.2 Following the spate of incidents at or around Stockport, Network Rail has now completed the following:

- New platform end barriers with anti-trespass matting
- Replacement of fencing around car park, signal box No.2 and behind B&Q at the north end of the Viaduct.
- De-vegetation work at both ends of the Viaduct
- Further community work with health professionals and societies.
- Further engagement with Stockport MBC for mitigation concerning listed structures so as to be able to install spiking along the Viaduct parapet.

22. **Stations Update**

22.1 The Irlam station opening event was held on 26th March, it was a very successful event with a good attendance from members and all partners in the station development.
22.2 Work to construct a single upper storey decked car park on part of the existing car park at Hazel Grove rail station began in January 2015. The installation of lighting and CCTV is included as part of this scheme to enhance passenger safety and security within the car park. Pedestrian routes will be improved to ensure safe movement across the car park. The scheme also includes additional planting along the village green side of the site, with trees complementing existing landscaping. It is anticipated that the facility will be available to passengers in summer 2015.

23. **Revenue Update**

23.1 Northern Rail has increased its number of ticketless travel surveys across its network, with over 1 million customers surveyed in the past year. Northern Rail estimates ticketless travel to be 4.9% across its network. Revised methods of working at Manchester Piccadilly continue to ensure as many Northern Rail services as possible are checked.

23.2 Since February, 2015, Northern Rail have introduce six assistant fare collectors (AFCs) on routes in the North West. These are operating on key strengthened non-corridor services where guards cannot operate between vehicles.

23.3 ‘Failure to Purchase’ continues to operate on Leeds – Rochdale – Manchester Victoria services, bringing the total to 13 lines of route in the West.

23.4 Automatic ticket gates at Manchester Victoria are now in operation.
24. Recommendations

24.1 Members are asked to note the contents of this report.

Amanda White, Head of Rail
### Appendix A: GLOSSARY

| **Period** | There are thirteen railway periods in a calendar year. Period 1 always commences on 1 April, and period 13 always finishes on 31 March. All periods commence on a Sunday and finish on a Saturday and are of four weeks duration, with the exception of periods 1 and 13 which are governed by their start and finish dates described above. |
| **PPM** | Performance is expressed as the “Public Performance Measure” (PPM). This is the railway’s nationally applied standard which represents a combination of the two performance measures: trains that were not cancelled and those that run less than five minutes late (10 minutes for long distance trains). |
| **PPM MAA** | “Moving Annual Average” (MAA) refers to average performance over the last 13 periods. This value is updated each period to give a moving representation of the average over the latest available 13 periods. Northern Rail’s franchise requirement is to achieve a 0-4 PPM MAA across the franchise of at least 83.3%, and to use all reasonable endeavours to achieve 86.1% during the same period. TPE must contractually meet a target for 0-9 PPM MAA. They have a franchise commitment to achieve 91.10% 0-9 PPM MAA by the end of the franchise. |
| **PMU** | The Northern Rail franchise is split into Performance Management Units (PMUs); the Greater Manchester area is part of the Manchester and Liverpool PMU. |
| **TOC** | Train Operating Company. |
| Service Group | A particular set of train services which are grouped together for the purpose of measuring performance. Most service groups that operate in Greater Manchester are in the Manchester and Liverpool PMU, however four operate within Greater Manchester but are included in other PMUs, two are in the Lancashire and Cumbria PMU, and two are in the West and North Yorkshire PMU. |
| Service Quality Monitoring: | The quality of both stations and trains in Greater Manchester is audited on a non-contractual basis by TfGM, in co-operation with Northern Rail. Passes are recognised as scores over 90%, whilst scores below 80% are classed as failures. |
| Train Service Quality | Scores apply to 23 in-service Northern Rail services undertaken by TfGM |
| Station Service Quality | Scores are based solely on inspection audits carried out at stations in the TfGM area operated by Northern Rail. |
| Significant Performance Monitoring: | An incident that affects the performance of trains and causes more than 2 hours and 30 minutes of delay to various trains and / or more than 10 cancellations. |
| Strengthening: | Means providing more than the basic two carriage train than is usual in the off-peak period. It should be noted that the priority is always for the timetabled service to run and then to provide the strengthening. |
Appendix B: Northern Rail and TransPennine Express

![Graph showing service performance for Northern and TPE]

The graph above depicts the service performance for Northern and TransPennine Express over time, with data from 2014 to 2015.
Appendix C: Cross Country and Virgin Trains 0-10 PPM (%)
### Appendix D: Periods 11 and 12 PPM: Performance by Service Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Group</th>
<th>P11 0-5 PPM (%)</th>
<th>P12 0-5 PPM (%)</th>
<th>P12 0-5 MAA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N HADFIELD / GLOSSOP – MANCHESTER PICCADILLY</td>
<td>94.4 93.5 92.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N WIGAN-BOLTON- MANCHESTER VICTORIA/ROCHDALE</td>
<td>92.7 93.1 92.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N LIVERPOOL – ST HELENS CENTRAL – WIGAN NW</td>
<td>96.3 94.4 92.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N MANCHESTER – ALDERLEY EDGE / CREWE VIA STOCKPORT</td>
<td>96.4 93.9 93.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N MANCHESTER – CREWE VIA MANCHESTER AIRPORT</td>
<td>95.2 93.2 92.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N MANCHESTER PICCADILLY – ROMLEY / ROSE HILL MARPLE</td>
<td>94.3 92.5 92.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N KIRKBY – MANCHESTER VICTORIA &amp; ROCHDALE</td>
<td>91.7 91.1 89.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N BUXTON – HAZEL GROVE – MANCHESTER PICCADILLY</td>
<td>90.4 90.8 90.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N LIVERPOOL – MANCHESTER VICTORIA / STALYBRIDGE VIA NEWTON – LE – WILLOWS</td>
<td>90.1 86.2 87.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N HAZEL GROVE – MANCHESTER PICCADILLY</td>
<td>86.6 95.0 88.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N CLITHEROE – BLACKBURN – MANCHESTER VICTORIA</td>
<td>86.6 88.7 87.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N SOUTHPORT – ATHERTON – MANCHESTER VICTORIA</td>
<td>89.3 89.5 88.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N MANCHESTER – MACCLESFIELD / STOKE ON TRENT</td>
<td>93.7 92.4 90.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N MANCHESTER – STALYBRIDGE – MARSDEN – HUDDERSFIELD</td>
<td>92.8 90.7 89.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N MANCHESTER AIRPORT – NEWTON LE WILLOWS – LIVERPOOL</td>
<td>88.7 87.6 85.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N CHESTER – MANCHESTER PICCADILLY VIA ALTRINCHAM</td>
<td>89.9 88.7 86.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N LEEDS – MANCHESTER VICTORIA VIA BRADFORD</td>
<td>86.9 91.7 87.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N LEEDS – DEWSBURY – ROCHDALE – MANCHESTER VICTORIA</td>
<td>84.7 90.2 83.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N MANCHESTER PICCADILLY – NEW MILLS CENTRAL – CHINLEY/SHEFFIELD</td>
<td>89.2 83.2 86.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N BLACKPOOL NORTH – MANCHESTER VICTORIA</td>
<td>86.4 86.0 83.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N LIVERPOOL – WARRINGTON CENTRAL – MANCHESTER OXFORD ROAD</td>
<td>87.0 83.6 82.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N PRESTON – HAZEL GROVE</td>
<td>83.8 80.8 83.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N SOUTHPORT – BOLTON – MANCHESTER AIRPORT</td>
<td>84.1 84.1 82.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Group</td>
<td>P11 0-10 PPM (%)</td>
<td>P12 0-10 PPM (%)</td>
<td>P12 0-10 MAA (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong> FTPE CLEETHORPES / SHEFFIELD – MANCHESTER</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong> FTPE SCOTLAND / CUMBRIA / BLACKPOOL – MANCHESTER</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong> FTPE NEWCASTLE / MIDDLESBROUGH / SCARBOROUGH / YORK / HULL / LIVERPOOL – MANCHESTER</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V</strong> VIRGIN TRAINS MANCHESTER SERVICE GROUP</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 85%</th>
<th>85% - 89%</th>
<th>90% and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>Operated by Northern Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong></td>
<td>Operated by TransPennine Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V</strong></td>
<td>Operated by Virgin Trains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E: Period 12 Worst Performing Trains

#### North Manchester - ED08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headcode</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Over 5 Late</th>
<th>Times Run</th>
<th>Booked</th>
<th>% Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>352A02MA</td>
<td>07:19</td>
<td>SOUTHPORT</td>
<td>MANINTAPT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312N50MV</td>
<td>17:56</td>
<td>TODMORDEN</td>
<td>BLACKBURN</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181F01NS</td>
<td>16:15</td>
<td>HUDDFIELD</td>
<td>SOUTHPORT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311F02MV</td>
<td>17:42</td>
<td>MANCR VIC</td>
<td>SOUTHPORT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312F87MT</td>
<td>16:56</td>
<td>TODMORDEN</td>
<td>WIGAN WAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352E74MT</td>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>WIGAN WAL</td>
<td>HUDDFIELD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352A18MQ</td>
<td>15:23</td>
<td>SOUTHPORT</td>
<td>MANINTAPT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182M59NB</td>
<td>07:43</td>
<td>HUDDFIELD</td>
<td>MANCR VIC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312N59MW</td>
<td>18:03</td>
<td>MANCR VIC</td>
<td>CLITHEROE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312E86MP</td>
<td>14:57</td>
<td>MANCR VIC</td>
<td>HUDDFIELD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Merseyrail City Lines - ED09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headcode</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Over 5 Late</th>
<th>Times Run</th>
<th>Booked</th>
<th>% Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>332F91MU</td>
<td>17:16</td>
<td>MANCROXRD</td>
<td>LVPOOL LS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332F95MW</td>
<td>18:16</td>
<td>MANCROXRD</td>
<td>LVPOOL LS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362H42MS</td>
<td>16:27</td>
<td>LVPOOL LS</td>
<td>MANCROXRD</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332F97MY</td>
<td>19:44</td>
<td>MANCROXRD</td>
<td>LVPOOL LS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332F99MT</td>
<td>16:44</td>
<td>MANCROXRD</td>
<td>LVPOOL LS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332F93MV</td>
<td>17:46</td>
<td>MANCROXRD</td>
<td>LVPOOL LS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312F29MV</td>
<td>17:38</td>
<td>MANCR VIC</td>
<td>LVPOOL LS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332F45MZ</td>
<td>20:44</td>
<td>MANCROXRD</td>
<td>WARRTNCEN</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362J24MA</td>
<td>07:20</td>
<td>LVPOOL LS</td>
<td>MANCR VIC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362H40MW</td>
<td>18:25</td>
<td>LVPOOL LS</td>
<td>MANCROXRD</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### South Manchester - ED10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headcode</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Over 5 Late</th>
<th>Times Run</th>
<th>Booked</th>
<th>% Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>322S54MW</td>
<td>18:14</td>
<td>MANCR PIC</td>
<td>NEWMLSCEN</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322H54MW</td>
<td>18:05</td>
<td>MANCR PIC</td>
<td>ROSEHLLMP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342H03MY</td>
<td>19:30</td>
<td>BUXTON</td>
<td>MANCR PIC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252S59MY</td>
<td>19:14</td>
<td>SHEFFIELD</td>
<td>MANCR PIC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322S50MV</td>
<td>17:32</td>
<td>MANCR PIC</td>
<td>NEWMLSCEN</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322H61MV</td>
<td>17:47</td>
<td>NEWMLSCEN</td>
<td>MANCR PIC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322S60NZ</td>
<td>20:45</td>
<td>MANCR PIC</td>
<td>SHEFFIELD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322S52MV</td>
<td>17:50</td>
<td>MANCR PIC</td>
<td>SHEFFIELD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322S48MU</td>
<td>17:17</td>
<td>MANCR PIC</td>
<td>NEWMLSCEN</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322K18MX</td>
<td>18:46</td>
<td>MANCR PIC</td>
<td>STOKE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Greater Manchester Rail Services
Appendix G:

Northern Rail Service Quality – Stations and Trains

A new regime is being established graph to be updated for the next meeting.
## Appendix H: NW Electrification Phase 4 & 5 Road Closures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Bridge Ref</th>
<th>Information event approx date</th>
<th>Approx Start Date</th>
<th>Approx End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manchester</strong></td>
<td>Osborne Street</td>
<td>MVM Br 12</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochdale Road</td>
<td>MVM Br 11</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phillips Park Road</td>
<td>PPA1 Br 8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palmerston Street</td>
<td>PPA1 Br 10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tameside</strong></td>
<td>Henrietta Street</td>
<td>MVL1 Br 25</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oldham Road</td>
<td>MVL1 Br 20</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Currier Lane</td>
<td>MVL1 Br 33</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granville Street</td>
<td>MVL1 Br 34</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mossley Road</td>
<td>MVL1 Br 29</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salford</strong></td>
<td>Oldfield Road</td>
<td>MVE1 Br 5</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>27 October 2014</td>
<td>29 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broughton Road</td>
<td>MVL1 Br 20</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>15 December 2014</td>
<td>16 July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chorley</strong></td>
<td>Railway Road</td>
<td>MVE2 Br 46</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rawlinson Lane</td>
<td>MVE2 Br 49</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>5 January 2015</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chorley Road</td>
<td>MVE2 Br 50</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>23rd January 2015</td>
<td>16th June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stump Lane</td>
<td>MVE2 Br 62</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>1 December 2014</td>
<td>12 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harpers Lane</td>
<td>MVE2 Br 63</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bolton</strong></td>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>MVE2 Br 36</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2 February 2015</td>
<td>15 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grimeford Lane</td>
<td>MVE2 Br 41</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2nd March 2015</td>
<td>12th June 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction and Background

1.1 Rail Passenger Survey – Autumn 2014: Briefing note on National Results (9.2.15)

1.2 This briefing note summarises the national results from the most recent (Autumn 2014) Rail Passenger Survey, and the high level results for the whole of Northern and First Transpennine Express (i.e. wider than just GM). This note also includes the TfGM funded, boost results which covers performance in the GM area in more detail.

2. Summary

2.1 Nationally, overall satisfaction has significantly declined again (81% from 83% in 2013, was 85% in 2012) along with ten other individual measures since last autumn. Only two measures significantly increased by 2%, both relating to station facilities/services, although the ratings for these are still fairly low (below 60%). The remaining measures were unchanged, including value for money (now 46%, was 45% nationally). Value for money also was unchanged within the TfGM boost, with exactly the same result as nationally.

2.2 The TfGM boost shows a similar picture with overall journey satisfaction declining from 76% to 69%. Satisfaction with the train overall has also declined from 70% to 64%.

3. Overall Journey Satisfaction Results

3.1 Key measures which show a significant decline across all satisfaction levels nationally, but more so for the TfGM boosted results:

- Punctuality/reliability - nationally now 77%, compared to 79% 2013, 83% 2012. **TfGM result decreased from 75% to 69%**

- Satisfaction with train speed/length of time journey scheduled to take (nationally 83%, down 2%, **TfGM from 81% to 76%**)

- Sufficient room for all passengers to sit/stand (nationally now 64%, was 66% in 2013, 69% in 2012). **For TfGM the result is down from 56% to 51%**.

- The comfort of the seating area and ease of being able to get on/off were also down by 2% each nationally. **The TfGM results were down 4%**. The comfort of the seating area was down from 60% in 2013 to 56% in 2014.

- The ease of being to get on and off was down 2% nationally. **The TfGM results were down 4% from 73% to 69% in 2014**.
• Provision of information during journey (69%, down 2% nationally and 51%, down 2%, in the TfGM area but this is not a significant change)

• For TfGM ratings of the frequency of trains had decreased from 69% to 66%, as had the cleanliness inside the train (from 63% to 59%).

• In terms of the station ratings, the only significant change was a decrease in ratings of availability of seating down from 47% to 41%.

3.2 Nationally, punctuality/reliability had the biggest influence on overall satisfaction, followed by cleanliness inside the train. For TfGM ease of getting on/off closely followed by cleanliness, punctuality and comfort of the seating area were the biggest influences on overall journey satisfaction.

3.3 How well the train company deals with delays had the biggest influence on overall dissatisfaction with the service both nationally and within the TfGM data. However the next biggest influence varied, nationally it was punctuality/reliability, whereas for TfGM it was ease of getting on/off, followed by crowding factors such as the comfort of the seating area and sufficient room to sit/stand.

4. Results for Services

4.1 All significant changes in the results for First Transpennine Express (TPE) and Northern reported nationally are noted below, with the rest showing no significant change. There were no significant changes from 2013 to 2014 in results for overall satisfaction with First Transpennine Express (TPE) and Northern.

5. First TransPennine Express

5.1 Nationally, First TPE – specifically significant decreases in satisfaction with:

• Punctuality/reliability – significantly decreased again (now 74%, compared to 82% 2013, 89% 2012). By route it was the TPE North and South routes that had significantly decreased, North West remained unchanged

• How request to station staff was handled (85%, down 9%)

• Upkeep and repair of train (84%, down 5%)

• Provision of information during journey (77%, down 6%)
6. Northern

6.1 From the national results Northern had significant increases in satisfaction with:

- Helpfulness and attitude of staff on train (76%, up 5%)
- Availability of staff (62%, up 6%)
- Personal security on board train (now 78% as in 2012, was 73% in 2013)
- Personal security whilst using station (74%, up 6%)

6.2 Northern – one significant decrease of 5% with the length of time the journey was scheduled to take - now 80% in the national results.

6.3 Northern had the fourth lowest overall satisfaction of all the TOCs nationally (has remained at 78%).

6.4 TfGM Boost results:

- **Northern’s** overall satisfaction score for the journey has decreased from 75% to 67%
- Although no change in value for money overall, there was a significant decrease for those travelling in the evening peak from 47% to 38% due to Northern’s changes in the evening peak fares.

7. Recommendations

7.1 Members are asked to make note of the contents of this report and consider it alongside the primary Rail Performance report.
Appendix A – Summary slides for process and results
NRPS methodology in brief

The sample
- Rail passengers given questionnaires at stations throughout Great Britain
- Each TOC set specific quotas, and also weighted, according to route, day of week, journey purpose and station size, to ensure representative sample of passenger journeys
- For main NRPS, stations are chosen proportional to number of passengers - most sampling is at larger stations, which appear each wave
- TfGM boosts undertaken on board Northern Rail services
  - To ensure wide range of stations covered
  - Also more cost effective when area has lots of small stations

Size
- For main NRPS, approx. 27,000 responses are analysed per wave (Spring/Autumn waves)
- Sample size per TOC varies from 500 to over 2,000
- Greater Manchester (GM) + Travel to Work Area (TWA) sample size is 1139 including boost for services, and 679 for stations

When
- Autumn 2014 (Wave 31): 1st September – 9th November 2014
Geographic coverage

Results for **station** questions are based on passenger journeys which:
- Start at a station within GM area
- And end at a station within GM or wider TWA

(Station questions refer to the passengers’ departure station)

Results for **train and service** questions are based on passenger journeys which:
- Start at a station within GM, and end at station within GM or TWA
- Or, start at a station within TWA, and end at a station within GM

Sample sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main NPS</th>
<th>Additional boost interviews</th>
<th>Total used in Autumn ‘14 analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main NPS</strong></td>
<td>340</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional boost interviews</strong></td>
<td>590</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>1139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total used in Autumn ‘14 analysis</strong></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of individual departure stations included**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main NPS</th>
<th>Additional boost stations</th>
<th>Total used in Autumn ‘14 analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main NPS</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional boost stations</strong></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB larger number of smaller stations means some ratings may be slightly depressed (although just over a third of all results are still from Piccadilly or Victoria)**

* See Appendix for full list of stations in GM and TWA definitions
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**Weighting**

- All main NRPS data is weighted according to:
  - Route (i.e. for Northern this is Lancashire & Cumbria, Manchester & Liverpool, South & East Yorkshire, West & North Yorkshire)
  - Day of week
  - Journey purpose (commuter, business, leisure)
  - Station size

- TfGM data is weighted according to:
  - Day of week
  - Journey purpose (commuter, business, leisure)

- These weighting profiles are taken from previous 10 waves of NRPS (as other PTEs)

- No weighting by passenger demographics:
  - This is not done for NRPS generally – demographics are allowed to fall out naturally
  - Small age bias in response rates, no gender bias
Significant changes in train and services results versus Autumn 2013

The table below shows changes over time in overall journey and train satisfaction, as well as key results with statistically significant differences year on year (at 95% statistical confidence)

### Overall TfGM results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Autumn 2014</th>
<th>Sig. change</th>
<th>Autumn 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall journey satisfaction</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction with the train</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuality</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey length</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of the inside of the train</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of trains</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient room to sit/stand</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upkeep and repair of the train</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results use ‘services’ definition. see slide 5 and Appendix for details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant changes since 2013:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key sub-samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall journey satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall train satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with punctuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with cleanliness inside trains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Significant changes in stations results versus Autumn 2013

The table below shows key results which show statistically significant difference year on year (at 95% statistical confidence).

## Overall TfGM results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Autumn 2014</th>
<th>Sig. change</th>
<th>Autumn 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction with the station</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of seating</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No other significant changes*

## Significant changes since 2013: Key sub-samples

### Overall station satisfaction
- **South sector**

### Satisfaction with availability of seating
- **North West sector, Off peak journeys, frequent users**

### Satisfaction with personal security at stations
- **North East sector**
- **Not frequent user**

---

Results use ‘stations’ definition. See slide 5 and Appendix for details.

National Rail Passenger Survey, Autumn 2014: TfGM Results