



House of Commons
Transport Committee

Transport for the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games: The Draft Transport Plan

Third Report of Session 2006–07

*Report, together with formal minutes, oral and
written evidence*

*Ordered by The House of Commons
to be printed 7 February 2007*

HC 199
Published on 20 February 2007
by authority of the House of Commons
London: The Stationery Office Limited
£0.00

The Transport Committee

The Transport Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration and policy of the Department for Transport and its associated public bodies.

Current membership

Mrs Gwyneth Dunwoody MP (*Labour, Crewe*) (Chairman)
Mr David Clelland MP (*Labour, Tyne Bridge*)
Mr Jeffrey M Donaldson MP (*Democratic Unionist, Lagan Valley*)
Clive Efford MP (*Labour, Eltham*)
Mrs Louise Ellman MP (*Labour/Co-operative, Liverpool Riverside*)
Mr Philip Hollobone MP (*Conservative, Kettering*)
Mr John Leech MP (*Liberal Democrat, Manchester, Withington*)
Mr Eric Martlew MP (*Labour, Carlisle*)
Mr Lee Scott MP (*Conservative, Ilford North*)
Mr Graham Stringer MP (*Labour, Manchester Blackley*)
Mr David Wilshire MP (*Conservative, Spelthorne*)

Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 152. These are available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publications

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at www.parliament.uk/transcom. A list of Reports of the Committee for the current session is at the back of this report.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Tom Healey (Clerk), Annette Toft (Second Clerk), Clare Maltby (Committee Specialist), Louise Butcher (Inquiry Manager), Tony Catinella (Committee Assistant), Ronnie Jefferson (Secretary), Henry Ayi-Hyde (Senior Office Clerk) and Laura Kibby (Media Officer).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Transport Committee, House of Commons, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 6263; the Committee's email address is transcom@parliament.uk

Contents

Report	<i>Page</i>
Introduction: sufficient progress?	3
Contingency planning	3
Delivery timetables and margins for testing and contingencies	4
Reliability of modelling assumptions	4
Waterways	5
Park-and-ride	5
The Olympic legacy	5
Conclusion	6
List of recommendations	7
Formal minutes	8
Reports from the Transport Committee Session 2006–07	9

Introduction: sufficient progress?

1. The 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games was awarded to London on 6 July 2005. The proposal which had given London the edge over Paris was based on ambitious, large-scale infrastructure developments in East London, not least transport projects. In recognition of the pivotal role of transport in determining the success of the Games, we took the earliest opportunity to inquire into the planned transport links, publishing an in-depth report in March 2006.¹ Our Report welcomed the award of the 2012 games to London, and congratulated the London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG) and Interim Olympic Transport for what was relatively advanced planning for the Olympic transport plan in the first few months after the award.² We also raised a number of issues of concern.

2. The Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) holds the primary responsibility for the development of infrastructure for the Games.³ The ODA published the consultation draft of the Olympic Transport Plan in October 2006, and expects to revise the plan on the basis of consultation responses and publish the final Plan in the summer of 2007. The Authority intends to revise the plan further in 2009, in light of experiences at the Beijing Games in 2008, with the final version of the plan emerging in 2010 or early 2011.

3. A significant amount of work has been done in the interim, and in some areas, the ODA is well on schedule—an example is the recruitment of staff to the transport team. However, the Committee had expected the draft Transport Plan to signify a great leap forward in the planning and organisation of the transport projects so crucial to the Games, and we had certainly expected to be reassured with regard to most of the concerns identified in our original report. Although work has been done in the interim period, **we are concerned to see that the plans for delivery across most of the modes remain vague, and the ODA is not exhibiting any sense of urgency about producing more detailed plans.**

4. The following crucial issues are among those that we had expected to be answered fully and satisfactorily at this stage. In each case, we found the response wanting, and we hope that the next version of the transport plan will contain full and satisfactory information and progress reports on these points.

Contingency planning

5. Contingency planning for major systems failures during the Games—caused, for example by power failure, security alerts, defective vehicles, signalling problems and a host of other potential problems with which those who regularly travel around London are all too familiar—appears embryonic.⁴ This is hardly reassuring. Contingency plans should not

1 Transport Committee, Third Report of Session 2005–06, *Going for Gold: Transport for London's 2012 Olympic Games*, HC 588-I.

2 *Ibid*, para 42

3 The ODA was established through the London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Act 2006, the relevant provisions of which came into force in March 2006. The ODA is responsible for ensuring the delivery of the new venues and infrastructure for the Games and the legacy that will follow.

4 Q32 Mr Sumner told us that contingency planning had commenced, and that over the next six years, this would be refined and detailed for all transport modes. However, little detail was forthcoming.

be developed *after* all the infrastructure is in place. This is particularly true because the transport plan is so heavily reliant on one single mode, with rail expected to carry around 80% of all spectators as well as the Olympic workforce.⁵ **It is crucial that the transport systems put into place are robust enough to allow for major failures in parts of the system without the entire system collapsing. We remain to be convinced that such plans are sufficiently developed at this stage.**

Delivery timetables and margins for testing and contingencies

6. We are concerned that the ODA is moving too slowly from the research stage to the construction and delivery phase. The time margins for testing and contingencies may be too short on some key projects. The ODA and LOCOG are putting in place sophisticated monitoring programmes to manage progress on projects,⁶ but this will not help if the planned margin for contingencies and testing is too short from the outset, and major problems then arise down the line. Transport infrastructure generally takes a number of years to deliver, and it is crucial that plans allow ample time for testing and for any delays or unforeseen problems. It is clearly vital that time is spent on the modelling of the transport requirements so that only the appropriate and necessary infrastructure is built. However, more than 18 months after London was awarded the Games, little progress appears to have been made in some key areas. Research and modelling work was very advanced as part of the bidding process; it is therefore reasonable to expect that progress should have been made in terms of delivery rather than yet more modelling. Although we recognise that a balance must be struck between thorough preparation and implementation, the more time that is spent now on research and analysis, the less time there will be for construction and testing. To hear the ODA Director of Construction, Mr Shiplee, tell us at this stage that “it would be wrong ... to comment on the potential for [the] actual delivery” of the plan to transport 50% of construction materials by water or rail is not reassuring. **The delivery phase must be commenced as soon as possible. Contingency planning needs to be at the very heart of the Olympic Transport Plan, and the ODA must now prioritise its work in this area.**

Reliability of modelling assumptions

7. In our original report on transport for the Olympics, we found that a reduction of 15% in general road traffic levels in London was a minimum requirement to avoid congestion on the Olympic Route Network.⁷ The ODA is now working with an assumption that background traffic in London will decline by around 8% due to the summer holidays, and that a further 8% decline will occur as a result of people leaving London because of the Olympics.⁸ These assumptions seem to us highly speculative.⁹ **We believe assumptions**

5 Olympic Delivery Authority, *Transport Plan for the London 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games: Consultation Draft*, October 2006, Fig 6.2

6 Olympic Delivery Authority, *Transport Plan for the London 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games: Consultation Draft*, October 2006, paras 16.4–16.10

7 Transport Committee, Third Report of Session 2005–06, *Going for Gold: Transport for London’s 2012 Olympic Games*, HC 588-I, paras 50–51

8 Qq 62–65

9 Qq 66–68

about the numbers of Londoners choosing to leave the city during the Olympics pose a significant risk to the Transport Plan. The Olympic Transport Strategy must be robust enough to cope with the Olympic traffic *in addition to* the usual seasonal ‘background’ traffic of the city.

Waterways

8. Despite the River Zone’s vaunted maritime setting, the draft Transport Plan contains very little about the practicalities of the use of London’s waterways to transport spectators and staff during the Games. The plan does acknowledge the potential role of the London waterways, not only in terms of freight transport, but also as a means to transporting spectators and staff during the Games, but these remain unsubstantiated hopes. It emerged in our questioning of ODA officials that there is very little enthusiasm among operators to participate in such plans.¹⁰ We have already noted our concern about the heavy reliance on rail. It would be a real pity if the ODA failed to grasp the opportunity to use the River Thames to transport spectators to the Games. **The next version of the Transport Plan must contain a clear strategy with detailed delivery plans for using the waterways effectively in transporting passengers and staff for the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.**

Park-and-ride

9. The ODA refers to park-and ride as part of the transport strategy, but there is little evidence that any effort has been put in to this option.¹¹ **Minimising the number of cars entering London is consistent with the stated aim of creating an environmentally-sustainable Olympic Games. We would like to see more details of how park-and ride schemes can contribute to this.**

The Olympic legacy

10. Londoners are paying a significant part of the cost of staging the Games through Council Tax increases. It is only just that London is left with a tangible and lasting legacy of infrastructure improvements after the Games. We are concerned therefore that the ODA appears not to attach a high degree of importance to the legacy issue.¹² The ODA is naturally and rightly focused on providing a first-class transport system for the Games themselves. But this cannot be at the expense of legacy considerations, such as for example the provision of a mechanised link between the two Stratford stations. Also, given the emphasis on walking and cycling as a key mode of transport for the games, it is surprising that the projected legacy in this area can only be described as a modest.¹³ The claim in the LOCOG and ODA mission statement that “providing a sustainable legacy sits at the very

10 Qq 45–61; see also Qq 94–97

11 Qq 41–42

12 Q101 and Qq 103–109

13 Olympic Delivery Authority, *Transport Plan for the London 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games: Consultation Draft*, October 2006, para 15.20 states that the legacy will consist of an unspecified number of miles of walking and cycling tracks linking the Olympic Park to local “communities in the lower Lee Valley and wider sub-region.”

heart of the project and is a driving force for all the agencies responsible for building, staging and hosting the Games in 2012” looks unconvincing.¹⁴ **It should be a fundamental criterion of the success of the Transport Plan that the best possible transport legacy is there when the Games are over.**

Conclusion

11. The revised Olympic Transport Plan must resolve these issues and the level of detail, especially on the means of delivering many of the services, should be increased significantly. We will be monitoring the situation carefully, and stand prepared to launch a full-scale inquiry if more persuasive plans, coupled with convincing delivery mechanisms both in financial and engineering terms fail to materialise in the revised plan.

14 See: <http://www.london2012.com/en/ourvision/regeneration/>

List of recommendations

1. We are concerned to see that the plans for delivery across most of the modes remain vague, and the ODA is not exhibiting any sense of urgency about producing more detailed plans. (Paragraph 3)
2. It is crucial that the transport systems put into place are robust enough to allow for major failures in parts of the system without the entire system collapsing. We remain to be convinced that such plans are sufficiently developed at this stage. (Paragraph 5)
3. The delivery phase must be commenced as soon as possible. Contingency planning needs to be at the very heart of the Olympic Transport Plan, and the ODA must now prioritise its work in this area. (Paragraph 6)
4. We believe assumptions about the numbers of Londoners choosing to leave the city during the Olympics pose a significant risk to the Transport Plan. The Olympic Transport Strategy must be robust enough to cope with the Olympic traffic in addition to the usual seasonal 'background' traffic of the city. (Paragraph 7)
5. The next version of the Transport Plan must contain a clear strategy with detailed delivery plans for using the waterways effectively in transporting passengers and staff for the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. (Paragraph 8)
6. Minimising the number of cars entering London is consistent with the stated aim of creating an environmentally-sustainable Olympic Games. We would like to see more details of how park-and ride schemes can contribute to this. (Paragraph 9)
7. It should be a fundamental criterion of the success of the Transport Plan that the best possible transport legacy is there when the Games are over. (Paragraph 10)

Formal minutes

WEDNESDAY 7 FEBRUARY 2007

Members present:

Mrs Gwyneth Dunwoody, in the Chair

Mr Clive Efford

Mr Lee Scott

Mrs Louise Ellman

Mr Graham Stringer

Mr Eric Martlew

Draft Report (Transport for the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games: The Draft Transport Plan), proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 11 read and agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Third Report from the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chairman do make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That the provisions of Standing Order No. 134 (Select committees (reports)) be applied to the Report.

[Adjourned till Wednesday 21 February at 2.30 pm.]

Reports from the Transport Committee Session 2006–07

First Report	Work of the Committee in 2005–06	HC 226
Second Report	The Port Industry in England and Wales	HC 61-I & 61-II
Third Report	Transport for the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games: The Draft Transport Plan	HC 199
Fourth Report	Department for Transport Annual Report 2006	HC 95
First Special Report	Passenger Rail Franchising: Government Response to the Committee's Fourteenth Report of Session 2005–06	HC 265
Second Special Report	Roads Policing and Technology: Getting the right balance: Government Response to the Committee's Tenth Report of Session 2005–06	HC 290
Third Special Report	Bus services across the UK: Government Response to the Committee's Eleventh Report of Session 2005–06	HC 298

Oral evidence

Taken before the Transport Committee on Wednesday 10 January 2007

Members present:

Mrs Gwynneth Dunwoody, in the Chair

Clive Efford
Mrs Louise Ellman
Mr Philip Hollobone

Mr John Leech
Mr Lee Scott

Witnesses: **Mr Hugh Sumner**, Director of Transport, ODA, **Mr Wilben Short**, Head of Transport, LOCOG, and **Mr Howard Shiplee**, Director of Construction, ODA, gave evidence.

Chairman: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Can I begin with a little bit of housekeeping, members having an interest to declare.

Clive Efford: Member of the Transport and General Workers' Union.

Chairman: ASLEF.

Mrs Ellman: Member of the Transport and General Workers' Union.

Q1 Chairman: Gentlemen, can I ask you first to identify yourselves for the record, beginning on my left and your right?

Mr Shiplee: My name is Howard Shiplee. I am Director of Construction for the ODA.

Mr Sumner: My name is Hugh Sumner. I am Director of Transport for the Olympic Delivery Authority.

Mr Short: My name is Wilben Short. I am Head of Transport for the London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games.

Q2 Chairman: Thank you very much. Gentlemen, did any of you have some apology or opening statement that you wish to make before we start? No? Good, well perhaps we can start with one or two simple questions. We were told by the Government in June that 50% of the Transport Directorate's staff had been recruited. Is that so?

Mr Sumner: Indeed. We have continued to recruit people subsequent to when we last met, Chairman, and we are at full strength now at this stage of the Games. All senior positions have been filled.

Q3 Chairman: Wait a minute, Mr Sumner, let us define things. Full strength?

Mr Sumner: In terms of the numbers of people required—

Q4 Chairman: In terms of what you expected to have at this moment, which is not 100% of all the staff you expect to have?

Mr Sumner: Not by Games time because the numbers will increase considerably over the years leading up to the Games.

Q5 Chairman: But you are up to your existing time frame?

Mr Sumner: Up to the strength we should be at this particular instant in time with all senior positions filled. A few people will be joining us who have just completed working on the Asian Games in Doha at Christmas and they will be joining us in the spring.

Q6 Chairman: In which case can you tell us what the size of your transport team will be when all the posts are filled?

Mr Sumner: At this stage of the Games we should be at 30 and we are at 30 today. My colleague in LOCOG, Wilben Short, may want to comment about his particular transport area as well.

Mr Short: I run the clients team and we are currently three. We expect another two people to join us at the end of the Doha Games and we will stay at five between now and Beijing, which is the current phase of our programme.

Q7 Chairman: How many of these people are professional transport planners?

Mr Sumner: Within our team we have a combination of different people. We have people who are focusing on delivery of transport infrastructure because it is important for us to get on with that early in the piece. Secondly, we have a team of about eight professional transport planners, in particular within the field of sport transport planning, and we have people who are expert in Games operation and project officers as well. We have a mixture of skills necessary to discharge the wide range of responsibilities that we have in terms of moving spectators, athletes and background commuters.

Q8 Chairman: So of the 30 eight are directly transport planners?

Mr Sumner: Eight are transport planners by background.

Q9 Chairman: How many halves of the others have we got?

Mr Sumner: In terms of the other skills base I would imagine that we would have something like six full time equivalents of other transport planners. The others are more general skills in terms of delivering project infrastructure and transport infrastructure rather than transportation planning.

10 January 2007 Mr Hugh Sumner, Mr Wilben Short and Mr Howard Shiplee

Q10 Chairman: You have mentioned Doha twice. Have you recruited any staff with experience from Athens or Sydney?

Mr Sumner: Already within my team we have people who worked in both Sydney and Athens and have experience of those Games. Wilben has people who have experience of operating within the context of Turin and the Winter Games there, and the people who will be joining us soon will bring with them experience of the Commonwealth Games as well as the Asian Games in Doha.

Mr Short: The experience in my teams ranges through Sydney, Manchester, Turin and lastly the Melbourne Commonwealth Games.

Q11 Chairman: So every one of your five did you say you have got?

Mr Short: We are three at the moment but of the five four of them will be very experienced in Games operation.

Q12 Chairman: It appears that a great deal of work is still to be done in terms of analysing and modelling potential demand and mapping this against current transport capacity. When are you going to complete your analysis and move on to producing concrete detailed plans?

Mr Sumner: The Olympic Transport Plan, which is out for consultation and which we launched at the back end of October, has comprehensive plans in terms of service delivery to all the competition and non-competition venues. What we have is a process that we developed during the bid of refining and predicting demand, recognising we will never be perfect, and then planning for that demand. We have taken that work further since we last met and are in a position such that within the next four months or so we will have completed the demand forecasting at this particular stage of the Games. Subsequent to that we will continue to refine the demand forecast, and in particular, as the ticket sales start to happen closer to the Games themselves, we will be using those ticket sales data to understand where tickets have been bought and where people will be travelling to and from. It is a constant process of refinement of the plans as we lead up to the Games.

Q13 Chairman: So you have actually got very concrete deadlines which you can tell us about?

Mr Sumner: We have very clear, detailed programmes for both the planning and the operational aspects of the Games as well as the capital investment. We have a comprehensive suite of programmes which we are working on with our colleagues in the Organising Committee, and I am happy to report to the International Olympic Committee on a six-monthly cycle map.

Mr Short: The International Olympic Committee has a project review process and we get a visit approximately every six months from the venerable Professor Bory who was part of the original Evaluation Team. He was here last October, he will be back in March, and he was very complimentary about our progress in his October report.

Q14 Chairman: So you can tell us when they are all going to be made very firm and they are going to be completed and when we shall get some idea in public of what your timetables are?

Mr Sumner: We will be moving into operational planning of the timetables, and by that I take it you mean railway timetables—

Q15 Chairman: In other words we are still doing the analysis and the estimates of what we need?

Mr Sumner:— but in terms of the levels of service they are outlined in the Transport Plan, they will be refined and the very detailed operating hours and the planning work with that starts now and will continue on for the next nine months, working with London Underground, Docklands Light Railway and the mainline train operating companies to provide an integrated transport system to meet the needs of the Games.

Q16 Chairman: You have had a little bit of time, have you not, Mr Sumner? What can you point to other than analysis that has happened that the public can see is very precise?

Mr Sumner: We are very precise in terms of the level of service that we will be delivering on each of the lines feeding the Games, what the mode share will be in that, and that is in the Transport Plan. It is unprecedented for any Games to be this advanced in terms of transportation planning some six years out from the Games. We want to embark upon a process of getting in all the fixed transport infrastructure early for two reasons: first, it de-risks the transportation programme, but, secondly, it means that the fixed infrastructure we put into the Games will be in operation well in advance of the Games and leave that legacy for London and elsewhere in the nation.

Q17 Chairman: We were, of course, assured that that would happen. We are delighted to have you reiterate it but, of course, all of the planning has been done on that assumption, has it not? If you remember, this Committee has raised with you before more than once that we do not think you can afford the luxury of having systems that are not up and operating some time before the Games begin.

Mr Sumner: Absolutely. We concur entirely with the Committee's opinion that you have to get the fixed infrastructure in early, and that is exactly what we are doing and we will be operating well in advance of the Games. For example, many of the upgrades of the Docklands Light Railway will start operation well in advance of the Games, in the 2008–09 period, and that means that we will be kick-starting the regeneration of east London and at the same time delivering well in advance of the Games and proving the robustness of the systems well in advance.

Q18 Chairman: And the public will know about that timetable when?

Mr Sumner: There are clear, publicly visible programmes in terms of delivery of the various transport schemes for the Docklands Light Railways, for example, and London Underground

10 January 2007 Mr Hugh Sumner, Mr Wilben Short and Mr Howard Shiplee

and Network Rail. Indeed, within the context of the Olympic Transport Plan we also state there exactly when we are going to be delivering the various schemes and who is accountable for delivery. They are in the public domain.

Q19 Chairman: Mr Short, do you want to comment on that?

Mr Short: I do not wish to comment on the infrastructure. I will just add that when it comes to Games operational schemes those are generally expected to be signed off by the IOC as close as 12 months before the Games because a lot of the detail of who is coming and what is required is not finally determined until then.

Q20 Chairman: You will remember, of course, Mr Short, that this Committee took you through that at the time and said that with a capital city of this size and the sorts of figures that we are talking about 12 months is not going to be enough.

Mr Short: That is correct, and for that reason our programmes are generally 12–24 months ahead of when the IOC is asking for them. We had an interesting discussion with the professor during the last visit when, on a number of the issues we were discussing, they were having exactly the same discussions with Beijing and we are four years different in actual delivery times.

Chairman: We are all for discussion in this House of Commons but it is nice if somebody takes the occasional decision.

Q21 Mrs Ellman: Do you have absolute confidence that the PPPs will deliver the Underground enhancements as promised and on time?

Mr Sumner: Let us talk about delivery of the transport infrastructure. Delivery of the background to the schemes that are relevant to the Games for transport is guaranteed to the IOC by the Secretary of State for Transport, both the mainline rail and other modes of transport, including highways, and by the Commissioner for Transport on behalf of Transport for London. They have a very clear process of managing schemes that are relevant to the Games, and indeed every four weeks we share with them and they share with us progress on delivery of the key schemes. As I said earlier, the key schemes that are relevant to the Games have been started early, for example, the tunnel boring machines are operating for the extension of the Docklands Light Railway under the river as we speak. They are starting work physically on the conversion of the north London line to Docklands Light Railway this spring, having achieved parliamentary powers at the back end of last year, so what we see is a pattern of delivering early. That does not mean to say that we will not monitor and work with them to ensure and assure ourselves that those schemes will be delivered on time with other ones, but what it does mean is that we are trying to get everything done early in the piece. Specifically with regard to the PPPs, the most critical scheme within that from our perspective is the Jubilee line upgrade. The good news there is that the 17% capacity

increase was delivered a year ago now and the remaining capacity increase in the new signalling system is scheduled to be completed by 2009, well in advance of the Games. The physical work on installing that signalling system is going well, and indeed the signalling equipment rooms have been completed and are being kitted out now, so we have a high degree of confidence that that will be delivered in advance of the Games. In terms of general comments on the PPP, that would not be for us to comment on. We would rather TfL commented on the PPP.

Q22 Mrs Ellman: But the London Assembly have raised queries, have they not, on the upgrade of the Jubilee, District, Hammersmith & City and Central lines?

Mr Sumner: The Central line is nearing completion now and we are comfortable with that. The subsurface upgrade and the capacity increase that brings was never used in terms of the modelling capability we needed for the Games time, so we do not worry about that. The only really big scheme that Transport for London are completing now as part of the PPP is the Jubilee line upgrade which is scheduled for 2009, which is a 25% capacity increase. Having said that, there are other schemes that TfL are progressing outside of that which are progressing well. For example, the main construction contract on the east London line extensions, phases one and two to the north and south has just been let to a consortium so that we are seeing progress there.

Q23 Mrs Ellman: Are you telling us then that you have absolute confidence that the upgrades will be completed on time?

Mr Sumner: What we are seeing generally across the piste is a huge degree of commitment to deliver—

Q24 Mrs Ellman: Yes, but what about delivery? I am not questioning the commitment.

Mr Sumner: And delivery.

Q25 Mrs Ellman: Is there going to be delivery on time?

Mr Sumner: I am confident that the key schemes that are necessary to deliver transport for the Games will be completed well in advance of the Games and be delivering effective transport during the Games time, yes.

Q26 Mrs Ellman: You have said that you are going to trial projects ahead of the Games. How are you going to trial capacity enhancements on the Central, District, Hammersmith & City lines which we are told are due to be completed in 2012?

Mr Sumner: The subsurface upgrades we do not need for Games operation time. They are nice to have if they occur before 2012 but it does not matter to us during Games time if they do not materialise. In terms of testing of all the other systems, there will be a comprehensive test programme of all sports venues which will be delivered by the London

10 January 2007 Mr Hugh Sumner, Mr Wilben Short and Mr Howard Shiplee

Organising Committee and that ranges from individual venues to multiple venues in the 12 months leading up to the Games.

Q27 Mrs Ellman: Before you add to that, you said that if some of these schemes did not materialise it would not be very important. Surely that is not right.

Mr Sumner: What I have said is that we are confident that all key schemes that are relevant to delivery of transport for the Games will be delivered on time, and they are generally being delivered well in advance of the Games operation. There are some schemes that are scheduled within the context of the PPP where there is a delivery window that the engineering organisation is committed to delivering some time between a point in, let us say, 2011 and 2013.

Q28 Mrs Ellman: Which are those?

Mr Sumner: For those particular schemes, which could be delivered before the Games or might not be delivered before the Games, we have always planned on the basis that they will be delivered in accordance with the contract but after the date of the Games.

Q29 Mrs Ellman: Which are those? Could you define that?

Mr Sumner: The ones that we have not allowed for within the context of the Games transport pack are the subsurface upgrades programme, such as Circle, Hammersmith & City, District and Metropolitan lines, where the timescales enshrined within the PPP are such that it does not ask the contractor to deliver against a particular date prior to the Games.

Q30 Mrs Ellman: Do you have any fallback plans if these projects do not materialise?

Mr Sumner: Sorry—we do not need them to materialise; therefore we do not need fallback plans. What we are doing with Transport for London and in particular London Underground is monitoring the progress on all those schemes which have these contractual windows of delivery to understand whether the scheme will be delivered before or the Games or after the Games.

Q31 Mrs Ellman: Are you developing any contingency plans in the case of a failure of the system or, say, a security scare?

Mr Sumner: You are quite right: we need to provide a robust and resilient capacity to move everyone around, in particular spectators. We have been developing and analysing what are the consequences of delays on the various lines and we will then be taking that work on as we develop the detailed contingency plans against a particular line if we have a particular problem in order to develop that and extend it from a security perspective. All contingency plans will be laid for all modes of transportation well in advance of the Games.

Q32 Chairman: Are we really saying that the answer to Mrs Ellman's question is, "No, we have not got contingency plans but we know we should have"?

Mr Sumner: Yes, we have outline contingency plans today. They will be refined and detailed for all modes of transport to all competition venues over the next six years.

Q33 Mrs Ellman: Who are you formulating those plans with?

Mr Sumner: With the operators, because they are best placed to understand what are the appropriate arrangements. For example, even prior to the submission of the bid we had held contingency planning sessions, for example, with Transport for London and London Underground on the streets to understand the consequences and how you might then manage any consequences. We had started that process but, as I have said this afternoon, that process is continuing and will continue right through to 2012.

Q34 Mrs Ellman: How important do you regard the security issue?

Mr Sumner: We regard the issue of safety and security as absolutely paramount. We started working with all the various police forces and security agencies some three years ago during the bid phase. That work is now being carried on, and indeed from a transport perspective we have our own transport security working group with representatives from all the various agencies working together to understand how to manage transport security and locking in with the overarching security arrangements that are part of the Home Secretary's remit which is being discharged by the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police.

Q35 Mrs Ellman: What sort of training is being given to drivers?

Mr Sumner: By that I take it you mean vehicle drivers of cars to Games time?

Q36 Mrs Ellman: Drivers in general.

Mr Sumner: There will be an extensive period of training of drivers and transportation staff. That will range from general knowledge about the Games and the Games locations, et cetera, but also specific skills regarding the needs of their particular customer groups and also awareness of the needs of mobility and sensory impaired customers. It will also pick up, in particular for the vehicle drivers who move the athletes around, route knowledge so they get to know where they are going, it will include safety and security awareness, efficient driving practices, and in total it will take something around a week to effectively train a driver to deliver the athletes where they need to be on time.

Q37 Clive Efford: On the alternatives if the system fails, you did say that the subsurface upgrades were not necessary to deliver the transport infrastructure that you need but are they not necessary in terms of capacity if the system is failing because there is a potential for the demand for transport in London to fill the extra capacity that is being created around the

10 January 2007 Mr Hugh Sumner, Mr Wilben Short and Mr Howard Shiplee

Games without the people who want to get to and from the Olympic Games, so are they not essential in terms of contingency?

Mr Sumner: The interesting work we have done to date shows that, in particular on the east/west corridor which you are referring to in terms of the way people drive, we have quite a lot of extra capacity available from the mainline system at the times of day that we need to be moving people in the event of problems. In particular I am thinking now about trains on the Great Eastern main lines out of Liverpool Street and the c2c lines out of Fenchurch Street heading east after the morning peak, and in fact during the morning peak when the usage is very low, so that provides us with a degree of back-up in terms of the east/west corridor.

Q38 Chairman: Mr Sumner, I am sorry; does my memory fail me? Do I not seem to recall you saying—or perhaps not you—that the last use of the stadium would be midnight and the first would be quite early in the morning? Who was it told me that?

Mr Sumner: Did we get into discussions last time about the sports schedules? Yes, we did, and we will need to work around that over the coming months.

Q39 Chairman: No, I am sorry, Mr Sumner. We were told originally that the reason that we needed to talk to you in such detail about the railway lines was that you accepted that the last time you would empty the stadia on this particular bit that we are talking about would be midnight and that the first time it started running would be very early in the morning because there would be occasions when people would be starting early in the morning. If you are really telling me that the extra capacity does not start till 10 o'clock in the morning I just feel we are getting ourselves into a slightly different situation or are we expecting a lot of thin people to come?

Mr Sumner: No, you are not, Chairman. We need to be very clear about this. It is quite true that the last sports event under the current sports schedule is scheduled to close at midnight, which is the basketball.

Q40 Chairman: So my memory does not fail me.

Mr Sumner: So your memory does not fail you. The main stadium and other stadia generally close around 10.15–10.30 at night, so there is a phased close-down as the various sports schedules start to complete. What we did say last time quite clearly was that we will need to work with the operators to extend the operating hours of the rail systems and also the bus systems to carry people to and from the Games so that we get the workforce there in advance of the morning peaks and that we carry the spectators from the sessions that close late at night. However, there is a huge amount of capacity available at those particular times because the usage from 10 o'clock—

Chairman: I am sorry, Mr Sumner, I do not want to be boring but you raised this. You said that there was a lot of existing capacity because once the peak hours finished there was lots of room in the trains, so could we be very precise and address that point? Are

you saying that your assessment of capacity means that you are expecting the existing services to carry the public? Mr Efford, I am sorry. Did you want to come in?

Q41 Clive Efford: It is just on the contingency issue. I just want to go back because back in the summer we had some breakdowns on the London Underground system which had the domino effect of virtually gridlocking the entire London Underground system. Reading your report, you have discarded two major park-and-ride sites, one at the M11 and one at the M25 south of the river, but you have failed to put anything significant in your transport strategy for use of the river. Are you not putting all your eggs in one basket and are you not in danger, if there is a problem on the system, that you will have a logjam and be unable to use alternative routes?

Mr Sumner: No, we are not. We are committed to delivering reliable and robust transport to all client groups during the Games in 2012. Specifically, the plan clearly states that we are reviewing the park-and-ride sites to see if we can provide a better solution which leaves a better legacy for London and the south east and provides higher value for money. We have not discarded them. Secondly, in terms of the river—

Q42 Clive Efford: I am sorry, just to stop you there, in terms of the M25 the park-and-ride it is in your report.

Mr Sumner: And we are seeing whether we can provide alternative sites that provide a higher quality solution and leave a bigger legacy. Therefore, we are not saying no to the park-and-ride; rather we are having second thoughts to see if we can provide a better solution which provides higher value for money and a legacy. Secondly, in terms of river—

Q43 Chairman: And when will you expect to come to a conclusion about the advantages of legacy park-and-ride sites?

Mr Sumner: Legacy or alternative means of providing those park-and-ride sites are scheduled to be completed in the first half of this calendar year.

Q44 Chairman: Alternative means of providing park-and-ride sites?

Mr Sumner: Absolutely, so. For example, rather than creating a new park-and-ride site or a temporary park-and-ride site, are there parking capabilities elsewhere which we could use during that particular window of 2012? Those are the sorts of questions we are asking, and can we get better solutions to that? Secondly, going back to your point, Mr Efford, on the river, we are very comfortable working with putting in place transportation using the river and the canal system. Indeed, we are working with London River Services and the British Waterways Board to exploit that. There are four venues which are best served by river and which we will be working with, and those are Greenwich, the equestrian and modern pentathlon,

10 January 2007 Mr Hugh Sumner, Mr Wilben Short and Mr Howard Shiplee

the Dome at Greenwich Peninsula, and Woolwich Arsenal itself, which are all amenable to providing a form of use of the water. At the Olympic Park itself we will be using the canal system as well and we are working with the British Waterways Board on that. In that sense we have not put all our eggs in one basket. What I have said is that we are going to be using many modes of transport to get customers to and from sports events and those will embrace the mainline rail systems, Underground systems, Docklands Light Railway, buses, walk and cycle and direct coach, and it is by using that array of modes that we will provide the robustness that you want and the Games demand so we get the spectators to where they need to go on time.

Q45 Clive Efford: Can I just come back to you on the river transport? The Transport Committee, in response to your plan, have said with regard to developing river transport, “None of these initiatives are mentioned in the Olympic Transport Plan despite the fact that they could make a significant impact on the capacity and the demand for river-based transport”. Are they wrong then?

Mr Sumner: We are working with the operators, the British Waterways Board and London River Services, in designing the transport services that we—

Q46 Clive Efford: Presumably AEG?

Mr Sumner: Sorry?

Q47 Clive Efford: Anschultz Entertainment group.

Mr Sumner: Yes. We will be working with them to provide the facilities that are necessary to support the sports events at the Dome.

Q48 Clive Efford: Can I just push you on that? You are saying that there will be significant improvements and extra capacity on river transport as a consequence of your discussions?

Mr Sumner: We are looking at what is possible by way of providing transport capacity and then providing ticketing that would allow people to visit London, for example, and then travel down the Thames by river to go and visit a sports event, let us say, in Greenwich or go and watch the equestrian event. That is the sort of thing we are evaluating now to see what is the art of the possible.

Q49 Chairman: What worries me, Mr Sumner, is that, first, you should have thought of this before, and, second, it is hardly revolutionary, I have to say, as a way of getting people to continue to use the water, but I do not think you have answered the question. “To work with the operators to see if there is extra capacity” means to say, “You have not got any more room but how many more boats are you going to have?”. What answers did you get to those questions?

Mr Sumner: Generally the situation is as follows: the Olympics is a very limited window of 16 days and the Paralympics is 12 days.

Q50 Chairman: Yes, we know that.

Mr Sumner: The answer we are getting back from the operators generally is that unless there is a clear legacy case in terms of large volumes of traffic—

Q51 Chairman: They do not want to know?

Mr Sumner:— they would not wish to move forward with—

Q52 Chairman: So working with them is not going to produce extra capacity because they do not want to do it because they cannot see a commercial justification?

Mr Sumner: Unless they can bring in capacity from elsewhere for the duration of the Games.

Q53 Chairman: Yes, so you are not working with them; you have been given a very clear message by the people using the river that they will not put on extra services unless they can justify both the capital expenditure and the continuation of the service on what you insist on calling a legacy basis. Is that what we are agreeing on?

Mr Sumner: Or that they can acquire the vehicles for the short period of time that is necessary for the Games.

Q54 Chairman: In which case I ask you Mrs Ellman’s question again: where is the capacity to come from? This is where we started, with the greatest respect.

Mr Sumner: Talking it through specifically with regard to water, there are a number of operators there who have access potentially to vehicles from elsewhere, either in this country or elsewhere from abroad, and they are looking at this whole issue of what the river system might be used for (a) in the long term for London and (b) in the context of the Games. That is something we are going to continue discussing with them over the coming years.

Q55 Mrs Ellman: That sounds like just hoping that something is going to come out of the air, does it not?

Mr Sumner: No, I would disagree with you there. I believe it is a very positive step working with the operators, London River Services, to see how London can capitalise on the Games to continue the renaissance of water-borne transport which has seen a significant opening up of the piers along the river.

Q56 Chairman: Mr Sumner, before we go any further, I am not clever so perhaps we need to break it down a bit. How many operators in total are prepared to put on extra capacity?

Mr Sumner: I do not have the figures ready to hand.

Q57 Chairman: One, or two?

Mr Sumner: It is a number of operators who would wish to exploit the opportunities of the Games.

Q58 Chairman: Let us try it the other way round. How many operators have said to you, “We are not spending the extra money because we cannot justify the investment as we are not going to continue this service after the Olympics finish”?

10 January 2007 Mr Hugh Sumner, Mr Wilben Short and Mr Howard Shiplee

Mr Sumner: I do not have the figures readily to hand.

Q59 Chairman: Oh, I see, so we do not know who is saying yes and we do not know who is saying no but we are quite clear that somebody is looking at it?

Mr Sumner: However, I am very comfortable with furnishing the Committee in writing with a list of the operators we are working with and where they are at.

Q60 Chairman: Mr Sumner, are you personally talking to these people?

Mr Sumner: Personally I am not. Members of my team are who are specifically charged with exploiting the river services and the waterside.

Q61 Chairman: And have they not given you a wild indication of somewhere in the region of the numbers we are talking about them producing?

Mr Sumner: We have spoken to a number of operators. However, it must be admitted that at the minute, as I said earlier, the degree of enthusiasm to put in large capacity for the Games is not there.

Q62 Mrs Ellman: Your current plan assumes that you will be able to reduce the non-Olympic traffic in London and we estimate that it would have to be reduced by about 15% to fit in with your plans. How are you going to do that?

Mr Sumner: One of the things that happens in public transport in the summer anyway is that demand drops very significantly anyway. Indeed, the drop in commuter demand can range from 20% to 30%, depending on which particular station one is looking at. There is a standard backdrop demand anyway that occurs during Games time.

Q63 Chairman: But this has been used as your benchmark. You came before us and you said, "The reason that we know we are going to be able to cope with the transport is that lots of people go on holiday and there is a lot of extra room". I paraphrase but that was the burden of the song.

Mr Sumner: Absolutely, and furthermore, as I then went on to explain very clearly, if you look at the effects in other cities a greater number than that tend to go on holiday, and indeed that number is roughly 8%, depending on which city you study. There is a general backdrop demand during the summer period during which the Games will be held. At the same time that is occurring we are significantly increasing the volume of services to the venues in particular, so for example, the Olympic Park will have 10 rail lines and the service volume will increase by some 50% during Games time, so the increase in capacity at a time of year when people are on leave is very significant. What we are doing now and have been doing for the last 12 months is studying still further the drop in demand, but also individual links of the boat-to-road system and the Underground system, and in particular also studying what are the effects of sports events on background demand. For example, we studied what happened when the world rowing championships occurred this summer at

Eton Dorney and the traffic patterns there. That sort of work will continue between now and the Games time as we refine the plans and get into the detail.

Q64 Mrs Ellman: Are you saying that the normal reduction in other traffic that takes place in other cities when other activities are taking place will be enough? Surely you were looking before at taking specific action?

Mr Sumner: There are specific areas and specific locales where we will need to work with businesses for two reasons: first to ensure that they thrive during the Games time and make maximum opportunity of the Games, and, secondly, such that they can then work with their staff in terms of transport planning because a number of their people wish to take leave, a number of their people wish to be volunteers, a number of them wish to work early shifts because they are going to the Olympics in the afternoon, and so on. We will need to work with in terms of planning the transportation in that particular corridor. In addition to working through the people implications we will need to work through how those businesses are replenished during Games operation time. We have an extensive programme that we will be delivering in the two years leading up to the Games, just as was done successfully in both Manchester and Sydney, working with businesses so that they thrive during the Games.

Q65 Mr Scott: Mr Sumner, you are saying that you believe, based on other sporting events such as the rowing last year, that people will not want to experience a once-in-their-lifetime chance to watch the Olympic Games. I am concerned that I think Londoners will want to stay in the capital and see the Olympic Games because it is a one-off and perhaps this reduction that would normally happen in the summer may not happen.

Mr Sumner: That is wonderful news if it occurs because what it means is that people will be watching the Games, not commuting, because there is a large capacity outside the peak times which we will then be able to exploit in terms of moving people to and from the Games as spectators. You are quite right: London will operate very differently during Games time. There will be live sites dotted through London. There will be large cultural events occurring throughout the city 24 hours a day, so it will operate very differently, and Londoners and the UK will operate during that particular window of 16 days with very different patterns, whether that be working, leisure, commuting or such like. We wish to capitalise upon that and we want to encourage it. It is good news for transport and it is good news for the nation celebrating the fact that we will be hosting the Games for the first time in 60-odd years.

Q66 Mr Scott: You do not think that is going to increase the pressure, not reduce it?

Mr Sumner: All our work shows that, given the current sports schedules and the times at which people are travelling, it is good news if people take leave and are spectating, not commuting.

10 January 2007 Mr Hugh Sumner, Mr Wilben Short and Mr Howard Shiplee

Q67 Chairman: Wait a minute, I am missing something here. Most of your projections are based on the assumption that 8% of people go away?

Mr Sumner: Our projections are that commuting will drop anyway during the summer in the normal pattern—

Q68 Chairman: I do not know which word we use, but the movement of people.

Mr Sumner:— and will drop a further 8%, because that is the Olympic fact, which may be greater (which was Mr Scott's point) and we then work on the basis that knowing where people are travelling to and from and the schedules and times at which they are going to be travelling is good news, but we are not reliant on that, as I say.

Q69 Chairman: I am glad you are so happy. What bodies are you working with?

Mr Sumner: Our key transport partners are various. We are working with the Highways Agency because they provide the road systems for us. We are working with boroughs, Transport for London, Network Rail, train operating companies, British Airports Authority, so it is very much an industry-wide response to the opportunities the Games bring. To date the attitudes displayed have been very positive in terms of delivering outstanding transport for the Games for everyone, whether that be athletes or spectators.

Q70 Chairman: So the Highways Agency, for example, have told you that there will not be any roadworks on the bits that you want during that period?

Mr Sumner: No, but what they have committed to is that they will work with us to ensure that the transport capacity we need will be available at the right place at the right time. For example, the M25 upgrade is being deliberately designed to achieve a particular transport window during 2012 and we will be working with them on that to provide the right capacity at any particular instance because it is important, as you understand, that the road systems work effectively to move people around.

Chairman: “A transport window”—I am sure the Highways Agency are very good at transport windows.

Q71 Clive Efford: I would like to go back slightly over some of the things we have already questioned you about, but it is the legacy issue that I am concerned about. There are major infrastructure projects that are clearly there but there are parts of London which are not immediately in the vicinity of those major infrastructure developments that do have the potential to benefit from them. In terms of the legacy, modal shift has to be part of that, encouraging people onto public transport and out of cars. I am concerned, and you say you are not, that you seem to have disregarded park-and-ride in the outer London area. Is that true?

Mr Sumner: No. You are quite right: our objective is that these are Games based on public transport, walk and cycle, and our objective is to move all

spectators to the venues on time using public transport. For the very last leg of the journey what we want to try and do is extract people out of their cars and move them in the most effective manner, and that is where the park-and-ride schemes play a part. What we have said is that we want to reflect on whether two large park-and-ride sites are the best way of accomplishing that, and whether there are better sophisticated solutions that could provide a legacy and at the same time ensure we move people using public transport for that last leg, so you are quite right, we are very supportive of that. That work in terms of sustainability is embraced within the programmes we are driving forward regarding both walking and cycling and our active spectator programme, because we want to encourage that as much as we possibly we can.

Q72 Clive Efford: It seems to me, as somebody who has a constituency in south east London which has been bypassed by most major transport infrastructure projects since we started first creating public transport, that this is one of the major legacies that has the potential to deliver in terms of stopping people from bringing their cars inside the area bounded by the M25. Is that part of your strategy?

Mr Sumner: Part of our strategy is looking at how we persuade people not to use the motorways.

Q73 Clive Efford: But that is not the answer to my question, is it?

Mr Sumner: It was a long way of saying yes, we are trying to work out how we can achieve that.

Q74 Clive Efford: There was something you said earlier on, and I will just give you a chance to correct me in case I have got something wrong. You said that the enthusiasm to put large capital schemes in place in time for the Olympics is just not there. What were you specifically referring to when you said that?

Mr Sumner: We were referring to capital investment in new river boats, large capacity vehicles on the river.

Q75 Clive Efford: And it is just in new river boats?

Mr Sumner: Yes.

Q76 Clive Efford: With regard to the PPP you said something similar, about schemes that are not part of the timetabling for the PPP but actually could deliver for the Olympic Games but there seems to be a reluctance to bring those forward.

Mr Sumner: No, it is just the reverse. Indeed, what we have seen is an acceleration of work significantly during both the bid and during the post-bid win phase of the Games with London Underground accelerating many schemes, for example, upgrades of their accessibility such that something in the order of a third of the Underground network will be accessible by 2012. There are specific schemes and I am thinking in terms of increased accessibility at Green Park, Baker Street, Paddington and Southfields. Those schemes have been brought forward.

10 January 2007 Mr Hugh Sumner, Mr Wilben Short and Mr Howard Shiplee

Q77 Clive Efford: These are about station design and accessibility rather than rolling stock?

Mr Sumner: These are station accessibility and capacity upgrades. What I have said is that there were various schemes that we committed to and guaranteed to the IOC in the bid that were most relevant to the Games, for example, the Jubilee line upgrade, and those are the ones that we are monitoring very effectively and will deliver well in advance of the Games. There are other schemes that are not quite as relevant to the Games where there is a delivery window within the PPP where the contractor may deliver that upgrade, and there are some of them that span from 2011 to 2013 in which they are contractually required to deliver. When within that window they will deliver is a matter for the contractor and not ourselves. What we are doing and what I have said earlier is that we are working with London Underground to understand whether those schemes are going to be delivered prior to 2012 and the Games or after 2012 and the Games because we can then do the detailed refinement of our plans based on whether that upgrade is going to be in place or not.

Q78 Clive Efford: I am sure you are impressing upon them how desirable it will be for them to deliver in time for 2012.

Mr Sumner: I have to say that the attitude and diligence displayed by Transport for London in delivering the transport for the Games is exemplary. I cannot praise them too highly. The amount of effort they are putting in in terms of mobilising both an operational perspective and capital in is a credit to them, and the same holds true for Network Rail who have mobilised a whole team to work with us in delivering transport for the Games.

Q79 Clive Efford: Transport for London and Infracos on London Underground?

Mr Sumner: I cannot comment on specific Infracos but, as I explained, the behaviour of Transport for London is exemplary.

Q80 Clive Efford: The Chairman asked you about the Highways Agency and the road network, but one of the problems we often come across with the road network is public utilities. Have you had any contact with public utilities in terms of ensuring that they do not foul up the system by digging up the A12?

Mr Sumner: We are working with them tightly already and generally their attitudes are very positive, but I do not know whether Howard might want to comment further on the utilities.

Mr Shiplee: We are engaged already with the utility companies, particularly people like the National Grid and EDF, close to the project and around the project because it is part of the project works. As we go out from the project there is a liaison operation which is starting to run now which is, of course, identifying where there may be major works. One of the most major pieces of work, which affects us not in games mode but in the run-up to it, is, of course, the widening of the M25 in the north-eastern section. Those, whilst not sorted, if you will, before Games

mode, are issues that are important for us during construction and delivery mode, so we are looking very carefully at that as well. As far as the digging up of roads is concerned, and I think it is right to say that we ourselves anticipate being the starting point of the process of digging up roads, certainly around the Olympic Park and in that general area, and the answer to that is that we want to co-ordinate it but make sure that it minimises impact on the local community and minimises impact on our activities because we have a logistics operation to gain access to and from the entire site throughout the delivery phase.

Q81 Chairman: Mr Shiplee, is it true that the plans for construction are one year behind?

Mr Shiplee: No.

Q82 Chairman: You are absolutely certain?

Mr Shiplee: Yes.

Q83 Chairman: And your target for freight movements relating to construction, 50% by rail and barge, are they realistic?

Mr Shiplee: I would answer the percentages question by saying that, of course, some of these percentages are to be aspired to and are objectives, and what we are now doing, because, as you know, we engaged at the back end of last year with our delivery partner, which brings a great deal of technical competence and expertise to the ODA, in detailed reviews of the practicalities of all these issues, but I can certainly report to you that we have already established that there are viable routes in to use rail and also water transportation to support the construction operations within and around the Olympic Park.

Q84 Chairman: So what percentages are you aspiring to?

Mr Shiplee: I am not in a position to give you absolute details at this time but this is absolutely now work in progress.

Q85 Chairman: You must have some construction phasing and you must know what your logistics requirements are because we are talking millions of lorry miles here, are we not?

Mr Shiplee: We are talking about many thousands of lorry deliveries, or equivalent deliveries, let us call them, and we have work being done at the moment, the first phase of which will be drawing to a conclusion shortly, which is identifying a number of things. The first issue is what is the total demand in detail and, secondly, what we believe then is the totally available capacity in detail. Of course, then the issue for us, and I am sure in the longer term for you, is, is there an effective balance between the two and are we using effectively the three modes of transport potentially available to us.

Q86 Chairman: So when you say that you are talking to people about water transport, for example, we can be assured that the lock is being constructed and that you are expecting to put large amounts of material onto the waterways?

10 January 2007 Mr Hugh Sumner, Mr Wilben Short and Mr Howard Shiplee

Mr Shiplee: That is correct.

Q87 Chairman: And you intend to stick to the programme that you gave us when you were here before?

Mr Shiplee: I have not been here before, with respect.

Q88 Chairman: Forgive me: the “you” was not entirely personalised.

Mr Shiplee: I am sorry.

Q89 Chairman: It was to do with the organisation.

Mr Shiplee: Of course.

Q90 Chairman: Sometimes I do use the word “you” in the wrong sense. Shall we start again? If you are not guaranteeing that 50% of the materials for construction are going to go by rail and barge what figure are you suggesting, or someone in your organisation who was here before?

Mr Shiplee: It is not appropriate for me to comment on who was here before. What I would say is that I would much prefer, if you would allow, for us to continue the work that we are doing and that rather than responding in a knee-jerk reaction to questions, which I am sure you would not wish, I think it is much more preferable that we go away and finish off the work that we are doing. I am sorry if that is unsatisfactory but I think to give knee-jerk reactions to questions of this magnitude is not helpful to any of the parties involved.

Q91 Chairman: No. Perhaps it is a pity you did not have the time to read some of the things that were said before you arrived, but in fact there was a strategy for using the waterways for the transport building materials and waste to and from the Olympic sites and this Committee was given a clear indication that that was what was expected and what you intended to do. Is that strategy in place and are the 50% percentages in there realistic? If they are not what are you doing about it?

Mr Shiplee: The first point is that the strategy has not changed. We are committed to utilising in this particular case water transportation and rail transportation. What I am saying is that there were figures given to you which related to the objectives or targets set for what it was believed would be achievable in using those modes of transport. What I am now saying is that we are now progressing a much more detailed process, understanding how that is to be delivered and exactly what can be delivered and it would be wrong of me to comment on the potential for its actual delivery until such time as we have finished those exercises.

Q92 Chairman: Yes, the research and modelling that established the potential needs and usage was given to us at that time. Has it been extended and have you done any more work on it?

Mr Shiplee: We are working on it now and have been for some months in great detail in terms of all of these modes of transport and in particular, as I have said, what is the demand side end of this which is

how much do we think it all is and refining the numbers to a position where we can be confident in responding to you.

Q93 Chairman: You can give me some simple details like the current day capacity river services to piers in the River Zone, can you, where a number of the sports will take place?

Mr Shiplee: No, I am not in a position to do that because what we are looking at is that there may be existing capacity but I am sure that the existing capacity is not sitting redundant or lying idle. What we are looking at is what capacities we will need to sustain our operations. This is a massive and very complex logistics operation, as I am sure you appreciate, and what we are doing now is planning how physically to deliver it

Q94 Chairman: When will your full demand forecasts and modelling of potential demand for waterway transport services be completed?

Mr Shiplee: During the first quarter of this year.

Q95 Chairman: And how much will the ODA invest in the development of river pier infrastructure?

Mr Shiplee: It will be necessary for us to invest in infrastructure, particularly at the Olympic site. Obviously, there is some infrastructure at Picketts Lock, but what we will need is infrastructure at the other end in order to sustain both the offloading and the loading of materials and also the marshalling of those materials.

Q96 Chairman: And how far are you along with the planning and implementation of the new dock?

Mr Shiplee: As I have explained already, what we are doing at the moment is the exercises that we are doing and defining what is required. I would point out that the major construction operations do not substantially start until the very end of this year and into the start of 2008.

Q97 Chairman: So that is why you already have a very detailed plan of how much of it is going to go by water because that is the suggestion that was made to us before?

Mr Shiplee: That is what we are working on now, to establish that, because what we want to do is minimise as far as we can the amount of transportation that has to go on the road network for very obvious reasons.

Q98 Mr Scott: Can I go back to drivers please? Can you tell me what role you see volunteers playing?

Mr Sumner: The volunteer positions provide a huge opportunity for people within this country and from abroad to contribute and participate in the Games and support the volunteer culture this nation has. We will need something in the order of 70,000 volunteers. We have already got 100,000 volunteers coming through. From a transport perspective we will be using them very much to marshal spectators, to give information and to provide information to other members of the Olympic family, to staff transport desks and such like. The thing that we will

10 January 2007 Mr Hugh Sumner, Mr Wilben Short and Mr Howard Shiplee

not do, however, is use them to perform licensed roles which require specialist training which is inappropriate for the duration that these volunteers will be with us. They will be given appropriate training but will not be taking licensed positions such as are common within the railways, for example. They will be used as an adjunct to the transportation staffs which will be paid as the norm, and that is a huge opportunity that we have.

Q99 Mr Scott: Can I ask you about security? We all hope and pray that the Games are going to be secure with no problems whatsoever. Could you tell me if you have made any visits or what collaboration you are doing with countries that perhaps suffer great problems with terrorism on their networks, such as Israel? Are you having any talks in looking at how this should be tackled?

Mr Sumner: The people who work with us are hooked into the overarching arrangements for safety and security on transport systems and also the Olympic Games. Many of the people who were out and seconded both during Sydney and latterly Athens are now working on Games-time security in a wider context and are feeding into the element of transportation, so there is that dimension of picking up and learning to create the best arrangements for London which will provide high degrees of safety and security whilst still providing that warm and welcoming atmosphere that we want to achieve for everyone concerned.

Q100 Mr Leech: You will remember the Committee took quite an interest in the link between Stratford International and Stratford regional station. What are the current plans for linking the two stations?

Mr Sumner: Currently the Docklands Light Railway is being extended, as you know, from Canning Town, through Stratford and up through to Stratford International, and that will provide a high capacity link during Games time operating something like 24 trains an hour. We have looked at the whole issue of movement between the two stations and indeed when we look at the numbers of people the majority of people arriving at Stratford International will be accessing by walking into the Olympic Park itself and the remainder, which is around 10%, will be using the Docklands Light Railway to go and visit other venues, for example, if they are using the River Zone. As such we do not need the travelator to be in position that is, as you know, one of the issues that exercised the Committee and has exercised others. What I can inform the Committee is that last night a planning application was put through and assented to relating to a piece of work to allow the Docklands Light Railway to go between Stratford regional station and Stratford International. That planning permission was granted with the proviso that London and Continental Railways evaluate the creation of a second ticket office and a second means of access and egress from Stratford International to feed a more direct passenger walking route between the two stations, and that is a process that is scheduled to take the next eight weeks.

Q101 Mr Leech: Do you not feel though that in order to fulfil the legacy objective the ODA should be doing more to force the introduction of a travelator between the two stations?

Mr Sumner: The matter itself rests with the Government and the relationship with London and Continental Railways, who are the authorities relating to the section 106 requirement. From our perspective, from a Games operation point of view, we do not need a travelator. Indeed, the Docklands Light Railway provides a superior solution for Games operation. The issue of legacy is a matter for others, for example, the Mayor, Newham and London and Continental Railways. I am merely informing this Committee that there has been a change over the last 24 hours in the position that is relevant to others, not for ourselves in the ODA.

Q102 Mr Leech: Do you not think though that without a travelator being put in the international station will end up being a white elephant because people simply will not use it?

Mr Sumner: That is a matter for others to view in their particular domain. In our domain from the Games operation perspective we are very comfortable with the arrangements, and from what we understand the analysis shows that in legacy mode the combination of a Docklands Light Railway extension and a Stratford extension which is under construction, plus the provision of a second means of access and egress from the international station which is closer to the regional station, will provide an appropriate level of access and egress, but that is something the Committee may wish to discuss further with others.

Q103 Mr Leech: In your opinion though would you see a travelator solution between the two stations being a good legacy to link the two stations?

Mr Sumner: It is not my place to have an opinion on that. It is my place to have an opinion from a Games perspective, and from a Games perspective I am very comfortable with the situation as was, which is the Docklands Light Railway, and I am even more comfortable if there is an eastern ticket hall because that provides added advantages to us during Games time.

Q104 Chairman: So people will get a free ride on the Docklands Light Railway instead of walking the 400 metres? Is that what you are saying to us?

Mr Sumner: That is not a matter for me to comment on. I am not in charge of the fares.

Q105 Chairman: Oh, I see. Really, we are getting in a slightly difficult situation, Mr Sumner. I thought one of your purposes was to get people there and back. Obviously I was wrong.

Mr Sumner: From a Games perspective, as you will recall, the access to and from all venues on London's public transport system comes included within the price of the ticket. Indeed, going back in the conversation earlier, a key objective of ours is to get all spectators to and from the Games using public transport, walk or cycle, and to that extent we are

10 January 2007 Mr Hugh Sumner, Mr Wilben Short and Mr Howard Shiplee

providing integrated ticketing to encourage people to use public transport, and therefore in that sense during Games time you will be able to travel free on the entirety of the Docklands Light Railway if you are an Olympics spectator.

Q106 Mr Leech: I just want to push you on the point of your opinion. Have you been asked to give your opinion by government ministers as to whether or not a travelator would be an appropriate legacy?

Mr Sumner: Only in the context of the Games operation.

Q107 Mr Leech: And your answer was that it was not necessary?

Mr Sumner: It was not necessary for the Games operation. When we studied the flows of people between those particular stations and where people are travelling to and from, the Docklands Light Railway extension to Stratford International provides an appropriate and indeed superior means of moving people to and from the Games, given that 90% of the travellers there will be accessing out of the Stratford International station and walking to the Olympic Park, which is the primary reason they are there.

Q108 Clive Efford: Have Thames Gateway altered their position on the travelator?

Mr Sumner: I have no idea.

Q109 Clive Efford: They considered it an important part of the legacy of the transport strategy, but you have had no discussions with Thames Gateway about it.

Mr Sumner: The decision-making process in terms of the travelator is not a matter for us in the ODA and it is not a matter for transport for the Games perspective. It is a matter that rests between Her Majesty's Government, Newham and London railways about this travelator and the enforcement of that condition.

Q110 Clive Efford: In terms of the Paralympic Games that are taking place, it is not an issue there in terms of access.

Mr Sumner: In terms of creating appropriate means of access and egress, the Docklands Light Railway is fully accessible and we will be providing appropriate capacity within Stratford International for the movement of all people, including those with some form of mobility impairment.

Q111 Clive Efford: I am sorry to push you on this but the last time we questioned people about this we found that the organisations which lobby on behalf of people with disabilities had not been consulted. Is that the case still?

Mr Sumner: The situation is as follows: we have been doing extensive work since we last met in terms of working through and developing transport accessibility proposals. We have been working, for example, with DPTAC, an organisation which you will know well, and they have created a dedicated taskforce to work with us over the coming years to

ensure and assure themselves that we provide transport which meets the needs of everyone, whether they have sensory impairment or a form of physical impairment. We have been working with them and that process will continue through, over the next five years.

Q112 Chairman: You could give us a detailed map of what you have agreed with DPTAC in relation to the various Olympic sites.

Mr Sumner: Absolutely.

Q113 Chairman: That would be helpful. How many car parking spaces in total will be available for Blue Badge holders at the Paralympic sites?

Mr Sumner: I can provide you with data for both the northern and southern transport mouths that feed the park. I do not have it ready to hand but I could write to you on that. In terms of the arrangements at other venues, we are now at the stage of starting to work with our colleagues in the Organising Committee on the detailed transport design at those venues; for example, at Eaton Dorney. As they come through, I can furnish this Committee with the parking capability there for people with mobility impairment, Blue Badge holders.

Q114 Chairman: You have taken into account, for example, the key venues such as the Olympic Village.

Mr Sumner: We have been working through the issues of parking capacity within the immediate area of the Olympic Village and effective use of the car parking capability that is coming as part of the Stratford city development.

Q115 Chairman: Is there a specific reason why the ticketing arrangements are different for the Paralympic Games and the Olympic Games?

Mr Sumner: Perhaps my colleague Mr Short might want to comment on that.

Mr Short: The ticketing arrangements for the Paralympic Games are designed to maximise the exposure of those paralympic sports to the spectating public. Many of the paralympic venues also have very short sessions and by allowing a one-day ticket you are able to visit a number of sessions, whereas the demand for the Olympic Games and its ticketing is totally different. That is the reason why the ticketing for the Paralympic Games is different from that for the Olympic Games.

Q116 Chairman: Are you considering dynamic fare schemes?

Mr Short: Are we talking about transport or event tickets?

Q117 Chairman: Both. Are you trying to encourage people to use the sort of systems that are used by, say, long-distance passenger rail operators or budget airlines?

Mr Sumner: In terms of transportation, one of the things we have put, in association of train operating companies, we are working with train operating companies, is looking at the whole issue of main line ticketing during the time of the Games. Reflecting

10 January 2007 Mr Hugh Sumner, Mr Wilben Short and Mr Howard Shiplee

on the success of the operation that was carried out by Deutsche Bank last year during the World Cup, when they ran a specific ticketing system for the World Cup to encourage people to use mainline rail, we are going to be evaluating that system and then talk with the operators in this country to see if we can do a similar thing to encourage people to use mainline rail from elsewhere in the UK to visit the Games, whether that be within London or at venues such as Eton Dorney.

Q118 Chairman: On the rail system, is it true that there is a £54 million shortfall in the budget for the renovation of Stratford regional stations?

Mr Sumner: The Olympic Delivery Authority Board last week gave full authority for the entire monies required to deliver Stratford regional station upgrade by December 2010. The full scheme goes, with myself, in front of the Olympic Project Review Group (the governing committee from the Treasury Department, the Transport Department and Culture, Media & Sport) tomorrow. It will go before that committee, for approval to deliver the entire scheme, tomorrow.

Q119 Chairman: That would mean that there would not be a shortfall.

Mr Sumner: We have found the monies within our resources to deliver that scheme and we are getting approval tomorrow.

Q120 Chairman: You could confirm to us immediately that has taken place.

Mr Sumner: As soon as we get Secretary of State consent to it, we will let you know.

Q121 Chairman: How much of a legacy in terms of walking and cycling paths are you going to leave? How many miles, for example?

Mr Sumner: I cannot recall the mileage. I can recall that from a budget perspective it is around £10 million that we are going to be contributing to the Transport for London background Walk and Cycle Programme. That will see some 800 km of walk and cycle network put in across London by 2010.

Q122 Chairman: Across London. We are not talking about the Olympic sites or the Lea Valley. What about the Lea Valley?

Mr Sumner: We are working with London Cycling Campaign and Sustrans, in particular, to hook all Olympic venues into the walk and cycle networks and use that money to create a legacy which will feed the new communities. That programme of walk and cycle facilities will be agreed over the next six months, and, again, I would be very comfortable coming back to this Committee with details, in terms of what those routes are, the lengths of the capital investment programmes, as it is agreed.

Chairman: That is very good, but I suspect you may be here much more recently than that. Anyway, gentlemen, thank you very much for coming. It always shows willing.

Memorandum submitted by the Department for Transport

Thank you for your letter of 17 January outlining your concerns about the plans to deliver key transport projects for the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

As you say a great deal of work is underway to ensure that transport for the Games is up to the task. One of the strengths of the plans is that they are based on London's extensive existing transport network, and infrastructure schemes which were already planned regardless of the Games. This means that the majority of the schemes critical for the Games were already under construction, or at an advanced stage of planning, when the decision to award the Games to London was announced.

Most of the major transport schemes, including all those serving the Olympic park directly, are due to be completed by the end of December 2010, which will allow nearly 18 months for testing. The outline programme for Olympic transport was developed during the bid, and is subsequently being updated and refined. The Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) is making good progress in meeting its early transport milestones.

However, delivery of the 2012 Games is a challenging and complex programme. My department maintains a close interest in seeing that the transport programme is delivered on time and on budget. The ODA has published its draft transport plan for consultation, and will publish a final version of this first plan later this year. I expect this to set out the key milestones for the transport programme against which progress can be measured by the public.

Douglas Alexander

January 2007
