

## **Transport and Travel Statistical Advisory Committee minutes –2016**

**Chair:** Richard Morrison(RM)

**Secretary:** Ben Collier (BC)

### **Attendees:**

Kathy Johnston (KJ) – Transport Scotland  
Charlie Lewis (CL) – Transport Scotland  
Linzi Pidgeon (LP) – Transport Scotland  
Andrew Knight (AK) – Transport Scotland  
Amanda Horn (AH) - SPT  
Alan Rehfisch (AR) – Scottish Parliament Information Centre  
Derek Halden (DH) – Derek Halden Consultancy  
David Connolly (DC) - SYSTRA  
Tom Hart (TH) – Scottish Transport Studies Group  
Robert Raeside (RR) – Transport Research Institute, Napier University

On conference call:

Jay Symonds (JS) - DfT

### **Introductions**

RM welcomed everyone to the meeting and confirmed that he would be taking over the position of chair from Chris Newson. Introductions were given around the table.

### **Minutes of previous meeting**

The minutes of the previous meeting, were accepted by the group. RM ran through the action points carried over from the previous meeting. All actions were complete other than:

DH queried the recording of the accessibility data action as “completed” – RM confirmed that we had commissioned work to address this need, which was currently ongoing. DH noted that this had been work in progress for several years and that data was still fairly sparse.

TH asked about progress on Action 7, estimating distances travelled by rail in the SHS Travel Diary. RR and DC recommended not using “as the crow flies” – either use straight line distances or distance along the rail network. RM suggested that this be changed to ongoing given the current status of road network distances as “data under development”. DC pointed out that station to station distances along the rail network should be easy to estimate.

### **Update on publications**

RM noted the continuing desire for a paper copy of STS. Car ownership figures were main subject of press interest. AK reported that the publication went well and was well received, with infographics and new freight updates being the main two

developments for the most recent publication. DC queried the absence of trip rates from the SHS – BC pointed out that this was not currently possible from the SHS, however work was ongoing on producing these. A first set of experimental trip rate estimates have been disseminated with the publication of TATIS for comment.

RM asked if the messages highlighted in the infographics were generally useful and invited the committee to feedback on these. TH pointed out that the prominence of gross figures for number of cars was an issue as per-head these were actually declining. AR said that MSPs were mostly interested in anything unusual happening or major changes and would appreciate a summary of these in infographic form, perhaps as a 1-page summary of “interesting facts” at the beginning of STS. RM noted the publication of KRRCS in April and DC asked about coordination with the speed camera team. LP outlined some areas of collaboration and the A9 publication, which is published four times a year. DH pointed out that the relationship between casualty stats and the wider context was very important. DC identified cycling as a particular area of interest and DH said that accident severity was very important. RM reported back on the development of the road casualty indicator framework. DC asked about the LTT debate around regression to mean, with LP pointing out that the identification of new safety camera sites, following revised site selection criteria, was the immediate priority but they hoped to look into the effects of regression to the mean at a later date. DC asked about the data around cameras and RM said that the Road Safety Board was planning to look at mean speed on the network.

BC gave an update on TATIS, including indicator updates and future plans. No plans for questionnaire changes for next year, but consultation on future of the survey post-2017 will be carried out early next year. BC noted the slight sample size reduction this year due to difficulty obtaining responses, but Local Authority results still robust. DH identified cycling stats as a major issue, in particular the contradictory messages appearing in the data. DH pointed out that comparability over years was very important. AR identified confidence intervals and over-caveating of estimates as a complicating factor and urged simplicity in the main messages. RR asked if there was any information on number of days a week worked on average – BC indicated the new question in the SHS. DH asked if we could consult the SHS team about the cycling frequency questions. There was a general desire for questions about mobile phone ownership in the SHS to quantify bias in mobile phone datasets. BC suggested that we put this to IPSOS to assess their concerns about this sort of question. DH suggested that new questions about ridesharing and mobility as a service would be useful, but only with robust typologies. DC suggested “was a car available for this trip?” as a question for the Travel Diary.

### **Accessibility statistics**

RM provided an update on the ongoing accessibility work. TS have looked at what exists and found the software used by DfT for recent statistics publications is accessible to us via the GIS team. We have commissioned some initial work on this but are open to suggestions, for example, using the GIS data to process the Travel Diary. DH put that these models are available to contractors but that there is no official National Stats asset for planning etc. DH identified the TomTom drive time

database as something to consider using. RM moved that a subgroup be convened to tackle this work. AR identified the need for a clear mission statement for this.

### **Ongoing projects and work plan**

BC reported back on the progress of the annualised estimates work – RM identified that they had been useful for internal analysis (mindful of caveats). DC reiterated the importance of journey purpose in breakdowns. BC said that they were working to include journey purpose in the future.

RM then introduced the work TAS was carrying out around Air Passenger Duty devolution – the department is currently working with SG Finance on high-level analysis, including forecasting passenger demand and general analytical support. DH pointed out the need to get evidence into the public domain and Virgin's opposition to the proposed APT cuts. KJ said that TAS have not yet modelled the effect on rail travel of any cuts, but that this was part of TS's workstream. RM identified the accessibility work as a clear priority for the future work plan. DH advised keeping an eye on fuel changes for future energy models and TH expressed an interest in data on the links between transport spending and wellbeing. DH also advised that he could offer advice on mobile phone data purchasing. Due to time constraints, it was agreed that LATIS and Social Research updates would be provided by BC by email. For future TTSAC meetings, it was discussed whether holding TSUG 6 months after TTSAC would be preferable, and it was generally the opinion of the committee that holding it on the same day would be better. DC and RR asked about the possibility of getting an environmental stats representative along.

### **AOB**

DH enquired about publishing a quarterly stats bulletin for the transport stats community. TH also had a paper for discussion which will be circulated by BC.