

LONDON BUSES TRIPARTITE MEETING

Date: 11 October 2017

Venue: 11RM1, Wapping Room

Attendees	Initials	Representing
Gareth Powell	GP	Director of Strategy and Public Transport
Claire Mann	CM	Director of Bus Operations (Buses)
Tom Cunnington	TC	Senior Commercial Development Manager
James Fretton	JF	TfL General Management Graduate
Bob Scowen	BSC	Regional Managing Director, Arriva London
Sean O'Shea	SOS	Chief Operating Officer, Metroline
Wayne King	WK	Senior Regional Coordination Officer (UNITE)
John Murphy	JM	Regional Officer (UNITE)
Bruce Swann	BS	Vice Chair of London Advisory Committee (UNITE)
Kevin Stagg	KS	Chairman of London Advisory Committee (UNITE)

1.	INTRODUCTIONS & UPDATES	
1.1	Introductions and Apologies The minutes of June 20 were approved by all parties.	
1.2	Previous Actions Update Provide operators with TfL period-based statistics on open and closed assault investigations cases (Andy Brook).	OPEN
2.	BUSINESS UPDATE	
2.1	Patronage and Reliability Ridership has been slightly ahead of forecast for the first few periods of the year, partly due to the Hopper ticket effect. Revenue is also running in line with budget. Reliability has been good, particularly excess wait times which included record performance for one period over the summer due to reduced disruption on the road network and enhanced intervention by the Road Control Network, focused on bus routes. TfL continues to prioritise safety to tackle the high absolute number of accidents on the network. Trends for fatalities are roughly the same year on year. There have been four fatalities so far this year and TfL is looking at specific issues at the sites of serious accidents to ascertain root causes as far as possible.	
2.2	Business Planning We are now preparing the next Business Plan with publication anticipated towards the end of this year. Economic uncertainty has resulted in a reduction in ridership not only on buses but also rail. At the end of 2017/18, TfL's Government grant ceases, making direct revenue vitally important.	
2.3	Reduction in Mileage and Ridership JM asked if anyone had seen a direct correlation between reduced mileage and falling ridership. GP said that TfL had restructured the bus network in response to a fall in ridership in central London, caused by varying reliability of the bus service and upgrades to other public transport modes such as the Tube.	

	<p>TfL was preparing for the impacts of the Elizabeth line coming into service and pedestrianisation of Oxford Street. It continues to address bus reliability and average bus speeds through road planning and road network controls. There would be a general increase in the volume of traffic and congestion on limited road space due to construction. However, TfL was optimizing signal timings to allow buses to continue their journeys through disruptions.</p> <p>TfL had observed a correlation between bus speed and bus variability and ridership decrease. Its aim was to rebalance the network with increased capacity in areas of high demand and reduced route services in areas of falling demand. Overall, TfL would ensure the network remained affordable while matching supply to demand.</p> <p>The Mayor's Healthy Street policy would also promote walking, cycling and public transport (buses). The MTS had an 80% sustainable mode share challenge for 2040. A growing bus network would help deliver this.</p> <p>WK asked what the tipping point would be if ridership continued to decline. GP said TfL did not anticipate reducing the bus network at a rate that would cause redundancies and would work with operators to respond to network changes.</p> <p>WK asked how many miles TfL had reduced in central London and if Uber had impacted ridership?</p> <p>GP said it was hard to anticipate this. CM added that customer satisfaction was at an all-time high due to better EWT and improvements to journey time reliability.</p> <p>ACTION: Send forecast for 2017 mileage reduction</p>	CM
3.	SAFETY AND BUS DRIVER ASSAULTS (SPIT KITS)	
3.1	<p>Assaults</p> <p>CM provided a snapshot of 426 driver assaults from the start of 2017, of which 62 offenders were cautioned or charged and 92 suspects were not identified. In 27 cases, there was no trace of the suspect. In 48 cases the victim chose not to pursue the allegation. In three of the cases there has been a community resolution and in nine cases there was not a victim.</p> <p>ACTION: Obtain meaning of 'community resolution'</p>	Andy B
3.2	<p>Spitting</p> <p>This year there have been 116 cases recorded. 84 spit kits were used correctly resulting in 64 suspects being identified (80% detection rate). Three kits were not available at the time and there were 20 kits that were available but not used by the driver. In nine instances samples were unusable.</p> <p>WK asked for details of how many cases led to successful prosecutions. GP said it would be good for local bus driver communications to show the success of spit kits.</p> <p>ACTION: Ascertain noof cases successfully prosecuted</p>	Andy B
3.3	<p>Spit Kits</p> <p>JM said spit kits were not yet introduced by all London operators and asked for a timeline of when this would be achieved by company and route. He suggested it should become a contractual obligation.</p> <p>WK asked if all London bus operators were issued with a significant amount of spit kits and where they were.</p>	

	<p>CM said it was at the discretion of bus operators where they were placed.</p> <p>WK asked if all spit kits could be provided in the driver's cab. TC said the TfL had indicated to bus operators that it regarded the best place as the driver's cab but the decision rested with the bus operators. KS mentioned that some operators reported they had not been advised by TfL to fit kits.</p> <p>ACTION: Provide update on spit kits roll out</p> <p>ACTION: Unite to advise of instances where operators are not rolling out spit kits to their fleets</p>	<p>CM</p> <p>WK</p>
4.	LICENSE FOR LONDON (LfL)	
4.1	<p>Finalising the License</p> <p>GP described outstanding issues as being confined to:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Application of the license should someone leave the industry and then return 2) Application of the license should someone resign mid-disciplinary. <p>GP said TfL would review operation of the LfL after six and 12 months to capture issues and review. WK felt the review should be continual on a six monthly basis.</p>	
4.2	<p>Drivers Leaving and Returning to Bus Industry</p> <p>GP said this issue related to how long the license lasts before a driver returns to the industry. The two main factors were:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The need keep it valid to welcome back experienced drivers 2) The longer a bus driver is out of industry, the more training they will need. <p>JM asked for instances of where people had long-term illness or required help to be recognised in license provisions.</p> <p>GP said TfL proposed a three-month window with bus operators able to take a view based on individual circumstances.</p> <p>WK suggested wording in clause 3C needed to be changed from "service" to "working in the London bus industry" as a London bus driver. GP agreed to this change.</p> <p>WK added that three months was too short and that a driver would not have forgotten how to operate a bus after three months. It was agreed to accept six months, and to review this after 12 months of LfL's operation.</p>	
4.3	<p>Apply the license to Drivers Resigning Mid-Disciplinary</p> <p>GP described the LfL as being about encouraging people with seniority to be respected for their grades when and if they move between operators, and not a system to help perpetuate poor drivers moving from place to place. JM suggested changing the wording in the draft in 2C from "disciplinary" to "suspended" and this was agreed. The aim of this provision was to ensure if a driver had done or was being investigated for something that would lead to him or her being suspended, that would suspend the LfL. If they were being investigated for or undergoing a disciplinary process that would not lead to suspension, the LfL would remain valid.</p> <p>GP stated TC would circulate the final proposition for agreement at the Tripartite Meeting with the intention to gain operator agreement and launch the LfL from December 1. WK endorsed the need to ensure it worked and was consistently applied collectively.</p>	

	ACTION: Change the wording in clause 2C from “disciplinary” to “suspended”.	TC
4.4	Launch of LfL ACTION: Set up meeting with Mayor Office to agree FAQs and Communications. ACTION: Operators to form a working group to draft FAQs for their purposes	TC SOS/BS
5.	TUPE MATTERS	
5.1	Unite and Bus Operator Dialogue WK expressed concern that the clause within the guidelines only allowed operators to come to TfL with issues with the TUPE process and not Unite. GP said that he wanted consistency in London but not for TfL to become an arbiter. WK said his aim was to ensure there was accountability for TfL in cases where TUPE rules were being abused. ACTION: Change the last paragraph of clause 4 to say ‘TfL will take an overview as to the successful operation of this code of practice, into the introduction’	TC
6.	HEALTH BUS	
6.1	Provision of Bus SO’ S and Metroline were thanked for providing a bus that should be available shortly. GP said TC would summarise the maintenance and operation of the vehicle in response to a WK concern about costs of maintenance and driver duties. ACTION: Detail maintenance and driving requirements	TC/AM
7.	LONDON LIVING WAGE	
7.1	No comments.	
8.	ANTI-RACISM STATEMENT	
8.1	Promoting the Statement ACTION: Contact between both press offices will be facilitated to get the statement issued.	CM/WK
9.	LATE FINISHES	
9.1	Driver Finishes JM said late finishes was rising again and that the traffic loss mileage and EWT statistics did not reflect actual finish times. GP stated that TfL would address specific issues. ACTION: Keep late finishes on Tripartite agenda	AC
10.	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
10.1	Issues Arising from Centrecomm Dispute with TfL WK mentioned that the copy of the risk assessment before the dispute was not shared and drivers were not made aware of the protection that was going to be put in place. CM stated that before the event TfL made a plan for operators to give to drivers to explain code red was available. GP and CM apologised that the risk assessment was not sent earlier and would consider this as a lesson learnt moving forward.	
10.2	Response to GLA Transport Committee TfL’s response to the Driven to Distraction report will be sent to the GLA Transport Committee once it is finalised this month and is	

	expected to be shared or published by the GLA.	
11	NEXT MEETING	
11.1	This is now scheduled for February 6 from 1000 to 1200 in Wapping Room, on the 11 th Floor of Palestra.	
	Ends	