

From: Gourley Jennifer **On Behalf Of** Carter Howard
Sent: 30 August 2017 11:45
To: Varley James
Cc: Carter Howard; Kenny Shamus; Gourley Jennifer
Subject: RE: Draft SSHR Panel Minutes

James

Thanks for looking at this. My thoughts are as indicated below and on your re-drafted minutes.

Could you take those comments on board and then re-circulate for Jill and Shamus. I won't be at the pre-meeting on Thursday but I would be grateful if this could be raised and if between you, Jill and Shamus you could finalise the re-drafted minutes. I would then be grateful for a draft of an email that I could send to Michael which attaches the re-draft for him to agree and which also explains any area where we don't think he is accurately remembering the discussion.

Thanks for all your help with this.

Howard

Howard Carter, General Counsel, Transport for London
Windsor House, 42-50 Victoria Street London SW1H 0TL
e-mail: [REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk
Tel: [REDACTED]
Fax: [REDACTED]

From: Varley James
Sent: 14 August 2017 17:41
To: Carter Howard
Cc: Gourley Jennifer
Subject: Draft SSHR Panel Minutes

Hi Howard,

I've amended the Minutes to reflect Michael's comments (listed below) but I don't think they can be re-issued yet as there are some points for clarification (see red text).

1. When reporting the audit of the effectiveness of FirstGroup's fatigue management processes, Leon very specifically said it had not uncovered any cause for concern. **That is a material statement that needs to be reflected in the minutes.** Alternatively, if it is not accurate, then an official clarification needs to be issued forthwith. **See Min 33/06/17 - I have reverted to the original text from my SSHR Panel Report to the Board. This removed text concerning First Group improving their processes as this wasn't mentioned at the meeting (I assume it may have come to light during the routing process for the Board summary as that is where it is first mentioned – if so, I can just add in a post meeting note to the minute).**

Howard's comment: I think we need to include what we think Leon actually said on this issue because Michael wants it to be recorded.

2. During the discussion about bus safety, the subject of toilet facilities for bus drivers was raised. We were told that there are toilet facilities at either one end or the other of all bus routes. This is a material issue, as the comfort and well-being of bus drivers is likely to have a material impact on safety. Again, either the statement was correct and it needs to be minuted, or it was incorrect and a correction should be issued. I have updated minute 36/06/17. Michael is asserting that Leon stated all routes have facilities located at one terminus at the minimum. From my notes, it looks like Leon said most routes have facilities at either one or both ends but he did not state it was all routes. I think it there may have been a misunderstanding and that Michael / the Panel thought Leon was saying all routes had at least a toilet at one end and most had facilities at both ends. I could further amend the minute to follow Michael's assertion and then add a post meeting note to state that following investigation, there are 5 routes that do not have any facilities (I have checked with S urface).

Howard's comment: Again, I think we should record what Leon actually said and I also think it would be helpful to add a post-meeting note in the minutes to give the precise answer.

3. In the discussion of low emission bus technology, The Panel did not "note the paper and recommend that CNG technology continued to be given consideration where appropriate." What the Panel did was reject the presented paper as an inadequate analysis of the merits of CNG or any other approach to reducing bus CO2 emissions or pollutants, and request a full analysis, based on of a selection of representative routes, properly comparing the economics and performance of a full set of potential. See minute 38/03/17 – I've updated the minutes in line with this request however I understand that City Hall has a position on CNG which may conflict with the Panel's direction. Is it worth retaining the amendments and then letting Val speak to Michael about the preferred options.

Howard's comment: Let's go with Michael's version (which I think is fairly accurate) and then the subsequent paper can explain. I have made a slight suggested change to your additional text on the version attached.

James

James Varley
Secretariat
6th Floor, City Hall
The Queens Walk
London
SE1 2AA

www.tfl.gov.uk