

GREATER MANCHESTER INTEGRATED TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

COMMITTEE: Cycles on Trams Working Group
DATE: 18 June 2010
SUBJECT: Update on Stakeholder Engagement
REPORT OF: Clerk to the Authority and Metrolink Director, GMPTE

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To update Working Group Members on the progress made against the work programme agreed at the last meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Members are recommended to:

- (a) note and comment on the stakeholder responses attached and summarised in this report;
- (b) consider arrangements to meet with the stakeholder groups that have responded to date; and
- (c) comment on the proposed passenger survey set out in this report.

CONTACT OFFICERS

Philip Purdy	0161 244 1040	philip.purdy@gmpte.gov.uk
Simon Warburton	0161 234 3775	s.warburton@manchester.gov.uk

1. As reported previously to the Working Group, a process of stakeholder engagement is underway to inform the considerations of the Working Group. This report provides an update on stakeholder feedback to date and also on proposals for future passenger survey work.

Stakeholder Feedback to Date

2. As previously agreed, the following groups were recently asked to submit evidence/views on the matter, so as to inform the Working Group:
 - Greater Manchester Cycle Campaign
 - Love Your Bike
 - Passenger Focus
 - Greater Manchester Coalition of Disabled People
 - HMRI
 - Stagecoach Metrolink
 - Breakthrough UK (Disability Reference Group)
3. Responses have been received from the GM Cycle Campaign, Love Your Bike Campaign, Stagecoach Metrolink and, at the further suggestion of the Working Group, the national cycle campaign group CTC. In addition, the matter has been the subject of discussion with the Metrolink Disability Design Reference Group.
4. The following paragraphs briefly summarise the comments received. Copies of the main responses received are attached as appendices to this report. However, in order to ensure that the Working Group can fully consider the views of these groups, it is suggested that specific meetings are arranged to receive presentations from the respondents in person.
5. The **GM Cycle Campaign** response presents the findings of their analysis of 99 European light rail systems, of which it is suggested that 62 allow cycle carriage. A case example of Cologne is provided in the submission, as one that is suggested to have particular synergies with the Metrolink system. Officers will consider the nature of the examples provided further – in terms of their nature, use and funding, in particular – to help advise the Working Group. This work will also explore the implications of parallel statutory requirements for specific provision of wheelchair space in vehicles to advise Members as to whether the same requirements are made of operators in other countries to provide dedicated space as is the case under the UK's RVAR requirements.
6. The GMCC submission also presents the Campaign's views on how to mitigate loss of capacity by restricting cycle carriage to the off-peak; and highlights survey work underway in Sheffield on cycle carriage and a proposal in Edinburgh to trial some cycle carriage on the system there once it is completed. Some extracts from a previous GMPTe survey undertaken in 2003 is presented to support the points made by GMCC. Officers advise that the data from the 2003 survey should not be over-analysed in this way; rather, Members are recommended to use this

evidence session to consider any specific lines of enquiry that they may wish to pursue through the user survey discussed later in this report.

7. The GMCC submission finishes with a discussion of some identified operational issues and presents suggested solutions based around incremental trials.
8. The **Love Your Bike** submission opens by referring to the 2003 survey (see paragraph 5 above) and a survey undertaken by LYB and GMCC of local election candidates in May of this year to present the level of support in principle for cycle carriage on Metrolink. The submission next presents a similar analysis of international experience – based upon the same 99 systems and Cologne case example – as set out in the GMCC submission (see paragraph 4 above), and also highlights some analysis of the arrangements in place in the US.
9. The LYB response next presents a similar analysis of UK comparisons to that set out in the GMCC submission. This also highlights an assessment of Croydon Tramlink, which does not allow cycle carriage at present; and also London Underground, where off-peak cycle carriage (outside 7.30-9.30 / 16.00-19.00) is permitted only on the surface or near-surface lines (Circle, District, East London, Hammersmith & City and Metropolitan line).
10. The LYB response finishes with an analysis of current GMPTC concerns relating to capacity, boarding delays, safety and interaction with disabled users of the system; and concludes by urging the consideration of off-peak cycle carriage.
11. **CTC** provided a large volume of material in their response, totalling over 200 pages of supporting material. Much of the supporting material has taken the form of 3rd party presentations on a range of cycle/transport planning matters and so is not attached to the report but has been circulated electronically to Members for information and will be considered further by Officers.
12. The cover response provided by CTC, and attached here, focuses on a series of analyses that have been undertaken to ensure that LRT systems maximise their capacity potential; and concludes that cycle policies based around cycle carriage, cycle parking and cycle lease/hire schemes can offer potential for additional demand. The submission also presents some comparative rail system examples of providing cycle space and also seeks to highlight links to wider public health policy objectives associated with the promotion of cycling.
13. The CTC response concludes with a proposal for an incremental trial approach based on permit-managed off-peak cycle carriage in outer areas of the system only.

14. The **Stagecoach Metrolink** response reiterates the points made by the operator as reported to the Authority's Capital Projects Committee in January 2010. In particular, the response highlights the operator's concerns over safety risk, timetable management and policing of access, alongside a view on the wider impact on the attractiveness of the system to non-cycling travellers.
15. Finally, the **Disability Design Reference Group** considered the issue at a meeting in April. The group raised concerns about the potential for bikes to block access and acting an unexpected obstacle. There were also concerns about people who bring bikes onto trams flouting the rules and how these rules would be enforced. When considering the potential for off-peak carriage only, the Group's fears largely remained as it noted that many disabled people travel during the off peak period.
16. All of the above respondents have indicated that they would be happy to attend a future meeting of the Working Group to discuss their views in greater detail. Members are therefore asked to consider whether they would wish to arrange specific sessions to hold these "hearings".

Proposed Passenger Survey

17. The Working Group has previously agreed that specific passenger survey work will be undertaken to include peak and off peak travel and include concessionary pass holders, senior ticket holders and pram/pushchair users in particular to inform the Group's considerations.
18. It is proposed that surveys will be undertaken as soon as possible following agreement regarding the content of the survey. Subject to Members' comments, the proposed survey will be refined with the assistance of external professional market research support.
19. ***PRESENT OUTLINE QUESTIONNAIRE HERE.....***

**HOWARD BERNSTEIN
CLERK**

**PHILIP PURDY
METROLINK DIRECTOR**



The Greater Manchester Cycling Campaign

Cycles on Trams Working Group - Report

Greater Manchester Cycling campaign
c/o 304 Barton Road
Stretford
Manchester
M32 9RF

16th May 2010

Dear GMITA Cycles on Trams Working Group members

Please find below our groups written statement in support of cycle carriage, following the invitation from Sir Howard Bernstein requesting a statement and supporting evidence for consideration by the Working Group.

We would also be more than willing to accept any invitation to attend any meeting of the working group if necessary.

Yours sincerely

Steve Bowater
Transport Facilitator
[Greater Manchester Cycling Campaign](http://www.gmcc.org.uk)

The carriage of cycles on trams appears to raise a considerable number of concerns amongst transport operators, particularly in the UK where the carriage of bicycles is consistently frowned upon, with numerous claims about the problems posed by cycle carriage.

However, as we hope to show below, this appears to be a uniquely British view of cycle carriage.

Many claims about the dangers of cycle carriage appear to be based on unsubstantiated claims rather than fact, and indeed, the considerable number of systems around the world that allow cycle carriage appears to show that cycle carriage is not something to be feared, but rather embraced as part of a modern integrated transport system.

SAFETY

“It should be noted that from the information obtained from systems where cycles are permitted on trams, none have reported any safety issues or referred to any claims resulting from bicycle carriage”

- GMPTE Report into cycle carriage on Metrolink (Mott MacDonald 2009)

In 2009 the GMPTE commissioned a report to look into the implications of cycle carriage on Metrolink, and after extensive examination of numerous systems they were unable to find any reports of any safety issues or claims resulting from cycle carriage on trams.

Additionally, the GMPTE claimed that the majority of light rail systems in Europe do not permit cycles to be carried.

As shown in appendix A, we have reviewed 99 European Light Rail systems of the same “Standard Gauge” as Metrolink and found that :

- a) **the majority (62 out of 99 LRT systems) “allow” cycle carriage on their systems.**
- b) only 8 out of 99 LRT systems specifically ban cycle carriage.
- c) for the remaining 29 systems we were unable to find any details on their website.

Clearly, if cycle carriage was a danger to other passengers then no operator would allow a bicycle anywhere near a tram, but the reality is that cycle carriage is common place on the majority (over 60%) of standard gauge systems in Europe, with even the GMPTE being unable to find any evidence of any safety issues after extensive research.

INTERACTION WITH WHEELCHAIR USERS / FOOT PASSENGERS

Having reviewed 62 European LRT systems that allow cycle carriage, the common policy is that passengers in wheelchairs, along with prams, have priority over cyclists.

The policy appears to work on all systems, and we have no reason to believe that Manchester cyclists will behave any differently to European passengers / cyclists.

Further evidence that cyclists can successfully integrate with passengers even at busy periods is provided by the DfT’s Traffic Advisory Leaflet 4/04 – *Bike and Rail, A Good Practice Guide*.

Following a case study of trials on unrestricted cycle carriage on all Mersey Rail services the DfT concluded: *“Unrestricted carriage of bikes on trains was introduced for a trial period in May 1998 as a result of demand from local cyclists, and as no problems were encountered, has since become permanent. Although it might be expected that permitting cycle carriage at peak times would cause conflicts, experience on Merseyside has shown that demands on space are largely self-regulating with cyclists avoiding taking their bikes on trains during the busiest periods”*.

THE VIEWS OF DISABILITY GROUPS / CURRENT PASSENGERS

Following the GMPTA's decision in 2002 to allow cycle carriage on Metrolink, the views of both disabled users and current / potential passengers were sought in a further survey. The results of the survey were included in a 2003 GMPTE report "*Metrolink Phase 3 – Cycles On Trams - Report On Further Consultation*".

Question One asked: "Did people think bicycles should be allowed on trams?"

Respondents endorsed the decision of the GMPTA, with 69% (381 out of 552) thinking that bicycles should be allowed on trams. This broke down into:

- 69.2% (72 out of 104) of disabled respondents thinking that cycles should be transported, and
- 61.5% (219 out of 356) of on-stop/on-street respondents agreeing
- 97.8% (90 out of 92) of cyclists thinking that cycles should be transported

When asked if they would take a bicycle on the tram, 46% (254 out of 552) of respondents said they would. This broke down into:

- 39.4% (41 out of 104) of disabled people
- 39% (93 out of 238) of potential tram users and
- 28% (34 out of 118) of existing tram users.
- 93.5% (86 out of 92) of cyclists

The use of specially adapted bicycles (such as hand-cycles) greatly increases the ability for disabled users to travel further distances and access new locations than by a standard wheelchair. The same is also true for foot passengers.

Although the perceived conflict between cyclists and disabled / foot passengers is frequently highlighted as a reason for banning cycle carriage, it is clear that both disabled users and foot passengers both see cycle carriage as a great opportunity to increase their accessibility.

SIMILARITIES TO OTHER SYSTEMS

Concern was raised by the GMPTE that despite there being numerous LRT systems around the world, no system had the same type of network as Manchester, and that cycle carriage would be difficult to monitor without a conductor.

However, one system in particular is remarkably similar to Manchester.

	Manchester	Cologne (Köln)
Tram Type	Bombardier "Flexity Swift"	Bombardier "Flexity Swift"
Model	T68, M5000	K4000 / K4500 / K5000
70% Low floor	n/a	K4000 / K4500 (193 trams)
100% High floor	T68, M5000 (80 trams)	K5000 (74 trams)
Daily ridership	55,000	507,000
Conductor on board	No	No
Driver regulated	Yes	Yes
Shared with traffic	Yes	Yes (12% of network)
Uses converted rail lines	Yes	Yes
Cycle carriage allowed	No	Yes

Cologne is a far more complex and larger system than Manchester, with 11 lines and carrying nearly ten times the number of daily passengers, yet like Manchester, Cologne utilises virtually identical Flexity Swift trams to Manchester, switching between rail lines with high platforms (linking Bonn) as well as travelling through the city centre, with passenger use both being regulated via the driver.

LOSS OF CAPACITY

Fears over loss of capacity due to bicycles displacing foot passengers are generally unfounded, and it is to be expected passenger levels could increase.

Firstly, cycle access will be off-peak, when trams are running under capacity, with adequate unoccupied space. This was confirmed by the 2009 Mott MacDonald report for the GMPTE *"The Implications of the Carriage of Bicycles on Trams"* which looked at the space required for cycle carriage, but concluded that "the affect of bicycle carriage on capacity is largely academic as it is not suggested that it would be permitted when trams are heavily loaded".

Also, as was shown above in Traffic Advisory Leaflet 4/04, where there are occasionally busy off-peak periods (e.g. during football matches), cyclists will know when the trams will be full and the system will self-regulate itself.

There is also some evidence that passenger use and revenues will increase, with the increased potential for cyclists to use the tram system to access the countryside / leisure routes away from the city centre.

An example of this is on the Sheffield SuperTram (also operated by Stagecoach), where they have previously run a monthly "cycle special" tram service for cyclists to access the countryside.

Another example of the potential increases in passengers (and therefore revenue) was shown in the previously mentioned 2003 GMPTE report *"Metrolink Phase 3 – Cycles On Trams - Report On Further Consultation"*.

For this report a survey was undertaken of the views of cyclists, disabled users and current / potential Metrolink users.

When asked if they would take a bicycle on the tram, 46% (254 out of 552) of respondents said they would. This broke down into:

- 93.5% (86 out of 92) of cyclists
- 39.4% (41 out of 104) of disabled people
- 39% (93 out of 238) of potential tram users and
- 28% (34 out of 118) of existing tram users.

Leisure journeys by cycle and tram scored highly, with:

- 25.6% (65 out of 254) saying they would make such a journey more than three times a week, and
- 54.7% (139 out of 254) less than three days a week.

Regarding shopping trips:

- 11.4% (29 out of 254) of respondents would use cycle and tram for shopping trips more than three days a week
- 19.3% (49 out of 254) stating they would do so less than three times a week.

Given that cycle carriage will only be permitted off-peak when there is spare capacity along with the results of the GMPTE's survey showing the potential to increase shopping and leisure trips by bicycle, it is highly feasible that rather than restrict capacity, cycle carriage would increase passenger numbers.

THE CHANGING U.K. SITUATION

Although the UK has generally been hostile to cycle carriage, the situation is gradually changing, with Edinburgh due to start trials of cycle carriage shortly after the network is fully operational in 2012/13.

Additionally, SYPTe are currently surveying User Groups about their attitude to bicycles on Sheffield's trams which are also operated by Stagecoach.

(Stagecoach has already successfully run some "Cycle Special" services on Sundays).

OPERATIONAL ISSUES / TAKING CYCLE CARRIAGE FORWARD

There are clearly operational issues that need to be addressed before cycle carriage on Metrolink can commence, yet none of these issues are unique to Manchester.

One particular issue is that of dwell times, and the likelihood of increased journey times as cyclists board.

Research undertaken by Nottingham University (*Bike Access on Light Rapid Transit – Feb 2003*) of cyclists boarding and lighting trams in both Europe and North America indicated that the physical act of boarding and alighting a tram with a bicycle can be undertaken without causing significant additional delays.

Features that can assist in keeping dwell times to a minimum are items such as :

The inclusion of bicycle symbol logos on platforms and tram doors would indicate the correct boarding point for cyclists.

Simple ways of securing cycles within carriages, such as those proposed for Edinburgh's LRT system, and currently in use within some heavy rail systems.

Ensuring cyclists are aware of the conditions of carriage (eg by use of a permit system – discussed below).

However, every European city that allows cycle carriage will have had the same concerns and issues to address, including the Cologne system mentioned earlier, which appears to be a far more complex system, with more passenger numbers, and with a higher level of cycle use.

The fact that at least 60% of standard gauge LRT systems in Europe allow cycle carriage shows that any operational issues can safely and practically be overcome, and as mentioned above, although often overlooked as an issue, many of these cities – particularly in Northern Europe – have significantly higher levels of cycling than Manchester, and therefore more demand from cyclists on the system.

Encouragingly for Manchester, the new Bombardier M5000 trams have been designed with the capability to carry bicycles, and the proposed full internal refurbishment of the original T68/T68a trams would provide an opportunity to enable the whole Metrolink system to provide cycle carriage.

Many concerns have been raised against cycle carriage, yet time and again these appear to be based on perceptions rather than facts, and given that cycle carriage is normal in the vast majority of European cities, we believe that the time is now right to start trials of cycle carriage on Manchester's Metrolink.

Therefore, in order to take this issue further, we would like to propose the following to ensure that cycle carriage is integrated in a controlled and safe way :

1. Sunday only trials commence, involving "authorised cyclists", Metrolink staff, GMPTC officers, disability groups along with the HMRI (ORR) in order to get initial impressions of how cycle carriage could work.
Trials could initially and quickly commence on the new M5000 trams that are capable of carrying bikes.
2. Controlled trials can then be extended to Saturday, followed by Monday-Friday "off-peak" periods prior to allowing public access.
3. Once the older T68 trams have been internally refurbished, full public cycle carriage can be phased in – Sunday only – for an initial 6 month period to assess operational issues.
4. Following the 6 month period cycle carriage is allowed on all off-peak services.
5. In addition, a "permit system" is setup, requiring cyclists to complete a series of questions based on the conditions of carriage, to ensure that cyclists are fully aware of the rules. (This system worked well in the USA).
Cycle access will only be permitted to passengers with a permit – failure to possess a permit punishable by a fine.
6. A nominal charge for the permit could be raised to cover administration costs, and potentially to include 3rd party insurance cover (removing any financial responsibility for damage from the operator).

APPENDIX A:

List of 99 Light rail systems in 19 European countries with a standard 1435mm gauge (same as Metrolink) showing whether cycle carriage is allowed or not, as indicated on the operators website / terms of condition.

Austria (AT)	Graz	Tram	Not allowed
Austria (AT)	Wien (Vienna)	Tram	Allowed
Belgium (BE)	Brussel/Bruxelles	Tram / Metro	Allowed
Bosnia And Herzegovina (BA)	Sarajevo	Tram	No details shown
Bulgaria (BG)	Sofia	Tram	No details shown
Czech Republic (CZ)	Brno	Tram	Allowed
Czech Republic (CZ)	Most	Tram	Allowed
Czech Republic (CZ)	Olomouc	Tram	No details shown
Czech Republic (CZ)	Ostrava	Tram	Allowed
Czech Republic (CZ)	Plzen	Tram	No details shown
Czech Republic (CZ)	Praha (Prague)	Tram	Allowed
Denmark (DK)	København	Light Metro	Allowed
France (FR)	Aulnay-Bondy	Light Rail	No details shown
France (FR)	Bordeaux	Tram	No details shown
France (FR)	Grenoble	Tram	Allowed
France (FR)	Le Mans	Tram	No details shown
France (FR)	Lyon	Tram	Line C only
France (FR)	Marseille	Tram	No details shown
France (FR)	Montpellier	Tram	Allowed
France (FR)	Mulhouse	Tram	Allowed
France (FR)	Nantes	Tram	Allowed
France (FR)	Nice	Tram	Not allowed
France (FR)	Orléans	Tram	Allowed
France (FR)	Paris	Tram Train	Not allowed
France (FR)	Rouen	Tram	Allowed
France (FR)	Strasbourg	Tram	Allowed
France (FR)	Valenciennes	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Berlin	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Bochum-Gelsenkirchen	Light Rail	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Bonn	Tram / Light Rail	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Bremen	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Chemnitz	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Dessau	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Dortmund	Tram / Light Rail	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Duisburg	Tram / Light Rail	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Erfurt	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Essen	Light Rail	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Frankfurt/Main	Tram / Light Rail	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Hamburg	Metro	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Hannover	Tram / Light Rail	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Heilbronn	Tram Train	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Karlsruhe	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Kassel	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Köln (Cologne)	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Magdeburg	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Mülheim/Ruhr	Light Rail	No information
Germany (DE)	München (Munich)	Tram	Allowed

Germany (DE)	Nürnberg	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Nürnberg	Metro	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Potsdam	Tram	No information
Germany (DE)	Rostock	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Saarbrücken	Tram Train	No details shown
Germany (DE)	Schwerin	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Strausberg	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Stuttgart	Light Rail	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Woltersdorf	Tram	No details shown
Greece (GR)	Athina (Athens)	Tram	Allowed
Hungary (HU)	Budapest	Tram	Not allowed
Hungary (HU)	Debrecen	Tram	No details shown
Hungary (HU)	Miskolc	Tram	No details shown
Hungary (HU)	Szeged	Tram	No details shown
Ireland (IE)	Dublin	Tram	Not allowed
Italy (IT)	Bergamo	Tram	Allowed
Italy (IT)	Cagliari	Tram	No details shown
Italy (IT)	Catania	Metro	No details shown
Italy (IT)	Genova	Light Rail	Not allowed
Italy (IT)	Messina	Tram	No details shown
Italy (IT)	Milano	Tram	Allowed
Italy (IT)	Napoli	Tram	Allowed
Italy (IT)	Roma	Tram	Allowed
Italy (IT)	Sassari	Tram	No details shown
Italy (IT)	Torino	Tram	No details shown
Italy (IT)	Torino	Tram	No details shown
Netherlands (NL)	Amsterdam	Tram	Allowed
Netherlands (NL)	Den Haag	Tram	Allowed
Netherlands (NL)	Houten	Light Rail	No details shown
Netherlands (NL)	Rotterdam	Metro	Allowed
Netherlands (NL)	Rotterdam-Den Haag	Light Rail	Allowed
Netherlands (NL)	Utrecht	Light Rail	Allowed
Norway (NO)	Oslo	Tram	No details shown
Portugal (PT)	Almada (Sul do Tejo)	Light Rail	Allowed
Portugal (PT)	Lisboa	Metro	Allowed
Portugal (PT)	Porto	Tram	Allowed
Slovakia (SK)	Kosice	Tram	No details shown
Spain (ES)	Barcelona	Light Rail	Allowed
Spain (ES)	Barcelona	Metro	Allowed
Spain (ES)	Madrid	Metro	Allowed
Spain (ES)	Murcia	Tram	Allowed
Spain (ES)	Palma	Metro	No details shown
Spain (ES)	Parla	Tram	No details shown
Spain (ES)	Santa Cruz Tenerife	Light Rail	Allowed
Spain (ES)	Sevilla	Light Metro	Allowed
Spain (ES)	Vélez-Málaga	Tram	No details shown
Sweden (SE)	Göteborg	Tram	No details shown
Sweden (SE)	Lidingö	Tram	As Stockholm
Sweden (SE)	Norrköping	Tram	No details shown
Sweden (SE)	Stockholm	Tram	Not allowed
Switzerland (CH)	Geneve-Bellegarde	Light Rail	Allowed
Switzerland (CH)	Lausanne	Tram	Allowed

GMPTA Cycles on Trams Working Group

15th May 2010



Dear GMITA Cycles on Trams Working Group members

We are writing to you in response to the invitation to submit a statement and supporting evidence for consideration by the Working Group.

Our detailed arguments are presented in five sections, namely:

- 1) Public and political support for cycle-carriage on Metrolink tram services.
 - a) GMPTA public survey undertaken in 2002.
 - b) Survey of Greater Manchester local election candidates in May 2010.

- 2) Cycle Carriage experience from other networks
 - a) International experience,
 - b) Experience from the United States,
 - c) UK experience: Edinburgh, Croydon, Sheffield and London

- 3) Operational Issues
 - a) Demand levels and capacity reduction,
 - b) Delays,
 - c) Safety and Compensation claims

- 4) Wheelchairs, handcycles and other cycles for people with disabilities.

- 5) Revisiting the policy of cycle-carriage on off-peak Metrolink services.

On this basis of our submission we would urge the Working Group to consider the following options as a possible way forward.

- 1) Trial cycle carriage on specified Sundays, for example during Bike Week in June to gather experience of how cycle carriage could work particularly for leisure / tourism purposes.



Love Your Bike is a campaign of Manchester Friends of the Earth. We aim to promote cycling and to help make it an attractive, accessible and fun way to get around.

Manchester FoE, Green Fish Resource Centre, 46-50 Oldham Street, Manchester, M4 1LE 0161 234 2974 (voicemail only), gmloveyourbike@googlegmail.com

- 2) A 6 month trial period for off-peak cycle carriage.
- 3) Remove the policy requirement for folding bicycles to be “fully encased”. Bicycles such as Brompton would still be required to be carried in the ‘folded’ position.
- 4) Consider introducing a permit system, requiring people to complete a series of questions based on the conditions of carriage, to ensure that people travelling with bicycles are fully aware of the rules. A small charge for the permit could be raised to include 3rd party insurance cover (removing any financial responsibility for damage from the operator).

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss our submission with the Working Group.

Yours sincerely

Dr Graeme Sherriff,
Manchester Friends of the Earth – Transport Campaign co-ordinator

Pete Abel
Manchester Friends of the Earth – Love Your Bike campaign

Love Your Bike submission to GMITA Cycles on Trams Working Group.

1) Public and political support for cycle-carriage on Metrolink tram services.

a) GMPTE public survey undertaken in 2002.

Following the Capital Projects committee on 15th January 2010 it was apparent that many members were unaware of the survey research undertaken in 2002 by GMPTE that investigated the level of public support regarding cycle carriage on Metrolink services.¹

Following the GMPTA Development Committee announcement on 15th October 2002 that they would agree (in principle) to allow cycles on Phase 3 trams during non-peak hours, GMPTA members requested that further consultation to collect the views of cyclists, disabled people, users and potential users of Metrolink be undertaken.

A survey of the groups listed above was undertaken and analysed. This consisted of sending postal surveys to cyclists in Greater Manchester, a cross-section of disabled people, on-stop surveys for current Metrolink users; and on-street surveys of potential users. This took place up in December 2002 and the results were presented to GMPTE on 22nd April 2003.²

The survey asked the respondents their opinions of four questions, namely:

- 1, Did people think bicycles should be allowed on trams?
2. What the potential take up would be if bicycles were allowed on trams?
3. When people would want to take bicycles on trams?
4. How should bicycles be transported?

The full results are available in the Cycles on Trams report but some of the key findings are presented below:

Question One: Did people think bicycles should be allowed on trams?

Respondents endorsed the decision of the GMPTA, with 69% (381 out of 552) thinking that bicycles should be allowed on trams. This broke down into:

- 97.8% (90 out of 92) of cyclists thinking that cycles should be transported
- 69.2% (72 out of 104) of disabled respondents thinking this, and
- 61.5% (219 out of 356) of on-stop/on-street respondents agreeing

¹ GMPTE Consultation on Transporting cycles by Tram. March 2002

² Cycles on Trams – Report on Further Consultation 22/4/2003.

Question two: Potential take-up When asked if they would take a bicycle on the tram, 46% (254 out of 552) of respondents said they would. This broke down into:

- 93.5% (86 out of 92) of cyclists
- 39.4% (41 out of 104) of disabled people
- 39% (93 out of 238) of potential tram users and
- 28% (34 out of 118) of existing tram users.

Question three: When should bicycles be allowed on trams? Respondents were asked at what times they thought bicycles should be transported.

- 49.3% (272 out of 552) thought they should be carried at any time.
- 32.6% (180 out of 552) thought they should be transported between 9.30am and 4pm
- 29% (160 out of 552) they should be transported at weekends at any time.

Question four: How should bicycles be stored? 73.6% (406 out of 552) thought there should be a dedicated space for cycles only on board trams, but opinions were split on whether there would have to be fewer seats to allow such a space.

Example comment:

‘ European trams generally have fewer seats and are more ‘open plan’. There are too many seats on Manchester trams. This causes problems for wheelchair users, mothers with buggies and anyone with baggage.’

b) Survey of Greater Manchester local election candidates in May 2010.

In the run up to the Local Council elections in Greater Manchester on May 6th, Love Your Bike and the Greater Manchester Cycling Campaign invited local council election candidates to complete a brief ‘Cycling issues’ survey.³ One of the survey questions asked candidates “Do you think that people should be able to travel with bicycles on Metrolink during off-peak travel times?”

A total of 105 local election candidates responded to this question. Table 1 shows that there are high levels of support from local council election candidates, across all political parties, for cycle carriage on off-peak Metrolink trams.

	Community Action	Conservative	Green	Independent	Labour	Liberal Democrat	Respect
Yes	100	66.7	100	100	95.8	86.7	100
No	0	16.7	0	0	0	10	0
Don't Know	0	16.7	0	0	4.2	3.3	0

³ Survey available at www.surveymonkey.com/s/BVR9TMR

Table 2 provides a comparison of the support for off-peak cycle carriage on Metrolink trams between respondents who were existing councillors (88%) with the responses of “new” candidates (95%).

	No. existing Councillors	%		No. new candidates	%
Yes	22	88		76	95
No	2	8		2	2.5
Don't Know	1	4		2	2.5
Total	25	100		80	100

Table 3 indicates that support for off-peak cycle carriage on Metrolink trams was expressed by local election candidates across all ten Greater Manchester councils.

	Bolton	Bury	Manchester	Oldham	Rochdale	Salford	Stockport	Tameside	Trafford	Wigan
Yes	84.6	100	87.5	100	100	100	93.3	100	100	100
No	0	0	9.4	0	0	0	6.7	0	0	0
Don't Know	15.4	0	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Many of the candidates expressed support but did also highlight concerns that safety issues would need to be resolved. For example:

“this is provisional on cycle riders remaining with their bikes to enable removal out of way of passengers with mobility issues or blind travellers.”

“Yes, I support the aspiration of cycle carriage on trams as long as safety on the tram is not compromised, and there needs to be further work done on that”

“I know there are difficulties but I am sure that a way can be found with discussion to allow this reasonable policy.”

Love Your Bike and Greater Manchester Cycling Campaign welcome the support from local council election candidates and would encourage the GMITA Working Party to take heed of this level of support for cycle carriage on off-peak Metrolink tram services.

2) Cycle Carriage experience from other networks

a) International experience

Concern was raised by the GMPTE summary report⁴ that despite there being numerous LRT systems around the world, no system had the same type of network as Manchester, and that cycle carriage would be difficult to monitor without a conductor.

The GMPTE summary report stated that the:

“majority of light rail systems in Europe do not permit cycles to be carried but a limited few do at weekends, during off-peak periods or in very few cases at any time.” (Point 2.2).

The full report from Mott MacDonald stated (p19) that:

"A survey in 1998 (5) reported that bicycles were permitted on trams in Amsterdam, Basel, Berne, Bonn, Bremen, Cologne, Darmstadt, Halle, Karlsruhe, Leipzig, Strasbourg, Stuttgart and Zurich. About half these allowed cycles at any time and half at off-peak addition, cycles were permitted at weekends only in Boch um-Gelsenkirchen and Essen. **A total of 28 networks from over 400 worldwide permitted cycle carriage.** [MVA report]" (Emphasis added).

However, what the MVA report actually said was:

“Information received from 28 out of the 50 systems **responding** confirmed that cycles were carried 12 of these confirmed that this was at all times of operation.”⁵ (emphasis added).

It is our understanding that worldwide the majority of service operators do allow some form of cycle carriage. The MVA report was indicating the number of operators (28) that allowed cycle carriage out of those (50) that had responded. Thus, 56% of the operators surveyed allowed cycle carriage. The statement in the Mott Macdonald report that “a total of 28 networks from over 400 worldwide permitted cycle carriage” may have resulted in both the GMPTE and GMITA members being misinformed.

Appendix 1 provides details of 99 LRT systems that are of the same standard (gauge) as Metrolink and indicates which systems allow cycle carriage. We have positively identified that at least 60% of these LRT systems allow cycle-carriage. This figure may be higher as it was not always possible to identify from the LRT systems' website whether cycle-carriage was allowed. Only 7% were identified as specifically not allowing cycle-carriage.

We would also like to draw the Working Group's attention to the Koln system which is remarkably similar to Manchester. The one noticeable difference being that the Koln system allows cycle-carriage. See Table 4.

⁴ www.gmita.gov.uk/downloads/file/2892/iem_08_carriage_of_bicycles_on_trams

⁵ MVA Consultancy. 1998, The Interaction of Cyclists and Rapid Transit Systems. Page 65. Point 9.4.2

Table 4: Comparison details for Manchester and Koln tram systems		
	Manchester	Koln (Cologne)
Tram Type	Bombardier "Flexity Swift"	Bombardier "Flexity Swift"
Model	T68, M5000	K4000 / K4500 / K5000
70% Low floor	n/a	K4000 / K4500 (193 trams)
100% High floor	T68, M5000 (80 trams)	K5000 (74 trams)
Daily ridership	55,000	507,000
Conductor on board	No	No
Driver regulated	Yes	Yes
Shared with traffic	Yes	Yes (12% of network)
Uses converted rail lines	Yes	Yes
Cycle carriage allowed	No	Yes

The Koln system is both more complex and larger than Manchester. It has 11 lines and carries nearly ten times the number of daily passengers. Koln utilises similar trams to Manchester, switching between rail lines (linking Bonn) as well as travelling through the city centre, and both being regulated via the driver.

b) Experience from the United States.

One major omission from the reference material included in the Mott Macdonald report was the substantial US Transportation Research Board report.⁶ This report and others (See Appendix 2) provide details of the wide range of operators that allow, if not actively encourage, cycle carriage on their services. Pages 25-31 of the Transportation Research Board report provide details of cycle carriage on North American light and heavy rail services which "do not require complicated design changes to accommodate bicycles. Bicycles are generally stored in empty wheelchair accessible space or held in doorway areas." (p26).

Given the US reputation for litigation it seems unlikely that the safety requirements for US based operators are any less rigorous than those in the UK.

Other concerns have been raised by GMPTE about the need to ensure that cyclists do not abuse any such cycle facilities offered. Other tram / light rail networks in other countries have found solutions that work. For example, the Denver's RTD Light Rail system requires cycle users to register and agree to a set of "conditions of carriage". Before registering there is a "Go To The Test" page where cycle users have to correctly answer a set of questions which are based on the conditions of carriage. Answer all questions correctly and the cycle user can then register for a User Permit.⁷

The Transportation Board highlights an interesting usage demographic for the Denver system:

⁶ TRCP 62 Bikes and Transit (Revised TCRP04), Autumn 2005, Integration of Bicycles and Transit. Available at http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_syn_62.pdf

⁷ www.rtd-denver.com/LightRail/BikePermit/index.html

“The light rail system in Denver serves urban and suburban communities with varying incomes, and RTD identified the age and income categories of the greatest numbers of bike-on-rail users. The largest user group is that between the ages of 40 and 49, has household income between \$50,000 and \$74,999, and lives in households with two automobiles.” (p 27).

These are exactly the types of commuters that GMPTE should be encouraging to replace car journeys with *integrated* public transport and cycle use.

As the US Federal Transit Administration has recognised:

“Linking bicycles and transit together is a win-win proposition. Bicycle friendly transit provides cyclists with increased options for travel, and it also expands transit ridership. Together, bicycles and public transportation can help establish more liveable communities.”⁸

We couldn't agree more.

c) UK Experience

- **Edinburgh**

In 2007, a report published by Transport Edinburgh Limited (TEL), the company that will run the bus and tram network, had ruled out carrying bikes on trams for safety reasons. However, In November 2008, a TEL spokesman said there were now plans for trials in either 2012 or 2013 once the trams are in place and reliable passenger numbers have been established. TEL stated that:

"We are committed to off-peak trials as soon as usage reaches a steady state with sufficient experience built up and a quick system for safe retention of bicycles has been devised and approved for trials in public operation. **TEL are keen to explore all means to improve public transport integration with sustainable transport modes.**"⁹ (Emphasis added)

It is also interesting to note that the Edinburgh Tram Design Manual states that:

“Trams should be able to carry bicycles, particularly during off-peak operation.”¹⁰

With the transition from the GMPTA to the GM **Integrated** Transport Authority we would recommend that Greater Manchester adopts a more progressive approach to “improve public transport integration with sustainable transport modes.”

⁸ Bicycles and Transit: A Partnership that Works. US Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, 1999. www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA_Bicycles_and_Transit_Booklet_1999.pdf

⁹ <http://edinburghnews.scotsman.com/edinburgh/Tram-chiefs-agree-to-be.4727223.jp>

¹⁰ Page 104. Approved 1 December 2005 (amended 12 January 2006).

- **Croydon Tramlink**

The Croydon Tramlink is very similar to the Manchester Metrolink system. The tram units are similar, driver only operation and combined on-road in city centre and on-rail routes. The service can also reach 50mph on the rail sections.¹¹ Currently cycle carriage is not allowed on Tramlink

In 2007, consultants TTK were commissioned by Transport for London to assess whether cycle carriage should be allowed.¹² This report concluded that:

- Banning cycles cannot be justified by current off-peak demand alone;
- A trial period should be fixed in which cycle carriage was allowed;
- Wheelchairs come first (legal requirement), then prams, then cycles;
- Cycle carriage off-peak only;
- Cycle carriage should not be free;
- Early discussions should be held with the safety authorities to discuss any potential

However, it should be noted that currently these recommendations have not been acted on by Transport for London.

The current Tramlink Conditions of Travel state that:

“You may, at the discretion of staff, take with you the following items, provided they do not cause an obstruction, and are not put on seats:

- personal luggage
- pushchairs and buggies, prams
- **folded bicycles.**”¹³

It is interesting that there is no reference to any requirement for the folding bicycle to be “fully encased”.

- **Sheffield**

Sheffield trams which are also operated by Stagecoach have trialled cycle carriage on certain specified Sundays. It was reported that during 2009:

www.edinburgh.gov.uk/internet/Attachments/Internet/Environment/Planning_and_buildings/Planning_hidden/Planning_policies/TDM_Section_Appendices.pdf

¹¹ www.railway-technology.com/projects/croydon/ Bombardier built the 24 CR4000 trams, retrospectively classified in the Flexity Swift family, they were based upon the successful K4000 series as used in Cologne, Germany. “Two areas per unit are available for disabled passengers, or those with prams or bicycles. Each CR4000 can carry 209 passengers, 74 seated and 135 standing. Top speed is 80kmh (50mph).”

¹² Cycles on Trams - Assessment of the Feasibility to carry cycles on London Tram Systems
Transport Technologie-Consult Karlsruhe (TTK) for TfL - End 2007

¹³ www.tfl.gov.uk/assets/downloads/tramlink-conditions.pdf

"Supertram supported Bike Week by putting on a 'Cyclists' Special' to assist Pedal Pushers' members on their way to Rother Valley for a Pedalling Picnic; the culmination of a week of great cycling events. 18 bikes, including a tandem, plus a pushchair and all their riders were comfortably accommodated on a tram from the Cathedral to Waterthorpe on Sunday at 10.25 and back again at 3 pm."¹⁴

We would suggest that similar trials should be undertaken in Greater Manchester.

- **London**

The London Underground allows passengers to take bikes onto most sections of the system, even in the heart of the city such as on the Circle, District and Hammersmith and City lines, during off-peak hours.¹⁵

3) Operational Issues

The GMPTE summary report raised a number of concerns regarding operational and safety issues. These are considered below.

a) Demand levels and capacity reduction

It is not envisaged that large numbers of people would choose to travel on the Metrolink with bicycles at any one specific time – a point recognised in the Mott Macdonald report which states:

“it should be noted that even in cities with extensive light rail networks, where the carriage of bicycles is permitted, demand in practice is fairly low most of the time, again making it easier to manage potential conflicts. Only at weekends with finer weather are substantial numbers of passengers with bicycles more likely.” (p13, point 3.2)

However, we would argue that what is important is creating an integrated transport network that enables customers to combine sustainable modes. Allowing users to combine Metrolink and cycle carriage could help some people overcome the “problem of the last mile”. These are situations where the person’s final destination is up to a mile away from the nearest public transport stop and having the option to use a bicycle for this final stretch makes it more likely that the journey can be made by a combination of tram and bike, instead of the entire journey being made by car. The same principle applies to the start of the journey.

In terms of capacity reduction, the Mott Macdonald report states that:

¹⁴ www.transpenninetrail.org.uk/template.asp?ID=662&parentID=630

“A bicycle stored on its wheels would occupy approximately 1.80m x 0.75m, which is equal to 1.35m². This is equivalent to 6 standing passengers (when rounded up) at 4 passengers per square metre. For every tram carrying a bicycle, the capacity would therefore be reduced by 5. i.e -6 normal passengers + 1 cyclist.” (p16, point 3.5.2)

It is our understanding that cycle guidance does not assume a bicycle to be a rectangular object (0.75m x 1.80m) but that one bicycle typically takes out a plan area of around 0.67sq m. Half of that claimed by the Mott Macdonald report. In addition, 2 bikes placed top and tail take up little more space than a single bike. When placed against the bodyside of a vehicle the useable passenger space taken up is equivalent to 2 tip-up seats (SWT Class 455 units) or at most 3 standing passengers. Therefore the capacity reduction figures are misleading.

However, as was recognised in the Mott Macdonald report:

“The total capacity reduction is around 2.5% for the carriage of a single bicycle and around 5% for the carriage of two bicycles. However, the effect of bicycle carriage on capacity is largely academic as it is not suggested that it would be permitted when trams are heavily loaded.” (p16).

Therefore, allowing small numbers of bicycles to travel on off-peak services would have a very small impact on network capacity.

b) Delays

The GMPTE summary report states:

“As the network is expanded and the operation becomes more complex the impact of extended dwell times would be more profound on overall service reliability. The Stagecoach Metrolink letter in Appendix 2 confirms this view from the operator’s point of view.”¹⁶

However, the Mott Macdonald report draws attention to a report from Nottingham University whose research found that:

“cyclists boarding and lighting trams in both Europe and North America indicated that the physical act of boarding and alighting a tram with a bicycle can be undertaken without causing significant additional delay.” (p14. 3.4.2)¹⁷

In addition, the Mott Macdonald report includes a 1998 report from the MVA consultancy in the list of references but fails to mention one of the reports key findings that stated:

¹⁵ www.tfl.gov.uk/roadusers/cycling/11701.aspx#underground

¹⁶ www.gmita.gov.uk/downloads/file/2892/iem_08_carriage_of_bicycles_on_trams Page 4. Point 4.2

¹⁷ In the Mott Macdonald report this is erroneously referenced as “Nottingham University research project: Bike Access on Light Rapid Transit. February 2003.” The correct reference is The Integration of Cycling & Light Rapid Transit (Presentation) H McLintock & D Morris (Nottingham University) February 2003. Available at www.cyclenation.org.uk/papers/031003.pdf

“Of the overseas operators who permitted cycle carriage, all found it to be worthwhile, and intended to continue with it. It was reported that there **were no appreciable delays to the tram service schedules attributable to the loading & unloading of cycles and that most passengers accepted the carriage of cycles**”.¹⁸ (Emphasis added)

A remarkably straightforward indication that cycle carriage does not have a “profound” impact on “overall service reliability”.

c) Safety and Compensation claims

The GMPTE summary report states that:

“Even with the risk mitigations described above, the potential for passenger and bicycle interaction, and therefore the risk of injury, continues to exist with resultant increase in the number of compensation claims.” (p5, Point 5.8)

In a remarkable contrast the Mott Macdonald report states that:

“It should be noted that from the information obtained from systems where cycles are permitted on trams, none have reported any safety issues or referred to any claims resulting from cycle carriage.” (p28).

It is difficult to understand how summary report managed to derive its findings from the Mott Macdonald report.

Presumably it would be relatively simple to seek data from the Greater Manchester train operators on the numbers, if any, of compensation claims made arising from cycle carriage on their services over the last five years or so.

4) Wheelchairs, handcycles and other cycles for people with disabilities.

Having reviewed 60 European LRT systems that allow cycle carriage, the common policy is that passengers in wheelchairs, along with prams, have priority over people wishing to travel with bicycles. This policy appears to work on all systems, and we have no reason to believe that people in Manchester would behave any differently to their European counterparts.

Further evidence of how cyclists can successfully integrate with passengers at busy periods is provided by the DfT’s Traffic Advisory Leaflet 4/04 – *Bike and Rail, A Good Practice Guide*. Following a case study of trials on unrestricted cycle carriage on all Mersey Rail services the DfT concluded:

¹⁸ 1998. MVA Consultancy, The Interaction of Cyclists and Rapid Transit Systems. Page 66. Point 9.4.5

*“Unrestricted carriage of bikes on trains was introduced for a trial period in May 1998 as a result of demand from local cyclists, and as no problems were encountered, has since become permanent. Although it might be expected that permitting cycle carriage at peak times would cause conflicts, experience on Merseyside has shown that demands on space are largely self-regulating with cyclists avoiding taking their bikes on trains during the busiest periods”.*¹⁹

The GMPTE survey report published in 2003 had stated that:

“Disabled people do not want to share space with cyclists. This is understandable, as it is only recently that they feel they have gained access to public transport.”²⁰

However, this would appear to ignore the fact that some people with disabilities already travel on the Metrolink with handcycles or other types of bicycles such as tricycles. We have been informed that there is extant Metrolink policy which permits handcycles and other cycles used by people with disabilities to travel on Metrolink trams.²¹

We fully support the provision of cycle-carriage for people with disabilities and would support a policy for general cycle-carriage on off-peak Metrolink services giving priority to people travelling in wheelchairs, with cycles for people with disabilities and prams or pushchairs.

5) Revisiting the policy of cycle-carriage on off-peak Metrolink services.

In 2003, it would appear that GMPTE had developed and incorporated the design and operational requirements necessary to facilitate cycle-carriage on off-peak Metrolink services. The ‘Incorporation into the Design of Metrolink’ section stated that:

“The Executive’s Requirements for Metrolink Phase 3 are developing as the Best and Final Offer stage of contract preparation is approached. To ensure that the preferred bidders allow for the possibility of the future carriage of bicycles on trams and to ensure that no structural modifications will be necessary, the wording has been altered as described in sections 5.1.1 to 5.1.3 below.

5.1.1 Seating requirements

The inclusion of cycles within the Metrolink passenger compartment will inevitably result in the loss of some seating. This has been allowed for in drafting changes to the Seating Capacity and Loading section as shown below:

¹⁹ www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roads/tpm/tal/cyclefacilities/ikeandrailagoodpracticeguide.pdf

²⁰ Cycles on Trams – Report on Further Consultation 22/4/2003. 4.2 Conclusions from the focus group

²¹ Cycling for People with Disabilities and Differing Needs, 2002, Wheels For All (page 29 discusses handcycles on Metrolink).

5.3.1.1 The Concessionaire shall ensure that the Phase 3 LRVs have a [minimum of 80 seats]. **Note: To be adjusted to take into account arrangements for bicycles Phase 3 LRVs.**

5.3.1.4 The space provided on Phase 3 LRVs for wheelchairs, luggage, strollers [bicycles] and prams shall have tip up seats, which shall automatically return to the folded up position when not in use.

5.1.2 Operation and Maintenance

A general clause has been added as shown below.

2.6 Carriage of Bicycles

2.6.1.1 The Concessionaire shall allow passengers to bring bicycles onto Passenger Services that consist of Phase 3 or Phase 1 or Phase 2 LRVs that have been modified to permit the carriage of bicycles in accordance with these Requirements and that operate on Saturdays, Sundays, bank holidays or on other days before 07:00, between 10:00 and 16:00, and after 19:00 [but shall not allow the carriage of bicycles outside these times].²²

We would urge the Working Group to identify positive steps to implement the 'Carriage of Bicycles' policy outlined above on off-peak Metrolink services.

²² Cycles on Trams – Report on Further Consultation 22/4/2003. Section 5.

Appendix 1: Light rail systems using the same standard as Metrolink and cycle carriage policies (data compiled by Greater Manchester Cycling Campaign).

Light rail systems using the same standard as Metrolink and cycle carriage policies			
Austria (AT)	Graz	Tram	Not allowed
Austria (AT)	Wien (Vienna)	Tram	Allowed
Belgium (BE)	Brussel/Bruxelles	Tram / Metro	Allowed
Bosnia And Herzegovina (BA)	Sarajevo	Tram	No details shown
Bulgaria (BG)	Sofia	Tram	No details shown
Czech Republic (CZ)	Brno	Tram	Allowed
Czech Republic (CZ)	Most	Tram	Allowed
Czech Republic (CZ)	Olomouc	Tram	No details shown
Czech Republic (CZ)	Ostrava	Tram	Allowed
Czech Republic (CZ)	Pizen	Tram	No details shown
Czech Republic (CZ)	Praha (Prague)	Tram	Allowed
Denmark (DK)	København	Light Metro	Allowed
France (FR)	Aulnay-Bondy	Light Rail	No details shown
France (FR)	Bordeaux	Tram	No details shown
France (FR)	Grenoble	Tram	Allowed
France (FR)	Le Mans	Tram	No details shown
France (FR)	Lyon	Tram	Line C only
France (FR)	Marseille	Tram	No details shown
France (FR)	Montpellier	Tram	Allowed
France (FR)	Mulhouse	Tram	Allowed
France (FR)	Nantes	Tram	Allowed
France (FR)	Nice	Tram	Not allowed
France (FR)	Orléans	Tram	Allowed
France (FR)	Paris	Tram Train	Not allowed
France (FR)	Rouen	Tram	Allowed
France (FR)	Strasbourg	Tram	Allowed
France (FR)	Valenciennes	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Berlin	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Bochum-Gelsenkirchen	Light Rail	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Bonn	Tram / Light Rail	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Bremen	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Chemnitz	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Dessau	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Dortmund	Tram / Light Rail	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Duisburg	Tram / Light Rail	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Erfurt	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Essen	Light Rail	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Frankfurt/Main	Tram / Light Rail	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Hamburg	Metro	Allowed

Light rail systems using the same standard as Metrolink and cycle carriage policies			
Germany (DE)	Hannover	Tram / Light Rail	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Heilbronn	Tram Train	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Karlsruhe	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Kassel	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Köln (Cologne)	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Magdeburg	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Mülheim/Ruhr	Light Rail	No information
Germany (DE)	München (Munich)	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Nürnberg	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Nürnberg	Metro	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Potsdam	Tram	No information
Germany (DE)	Rostock	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Saarbrücken	Tram Train	No details shown
Germany (DE)	Schwerin	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Strausberg	Tram	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Stuttgart	Light Rail	Allowed
Germany (DE)	Woltersdorf	Tram	No details shown
Greece (GR)	Athina (Athens)	Tram	Allowed
Hungary (HU)	Budapest	Tram	Not allowed
Hungary (HU)	Debrecen	Tram	No details shown
Hungary (HU)	Miskolc	Tram	No details shown
Hungary (HU)	Szeged	Tram	No details shown
Ireland (IE)	Dublin	Tram	Not allowed
Italy (IT)	Bergamo	Tram	Allowed
Italy (IT)	Cagliari	Tram	No details shown
Italy (IT)	Catania	Metro	No details shown
Italy (IT)	Genova	Light Rail	Not allowed
Italy (IT)	Messina	Tram	No details shown
Italy (IT)	Milano	Tram	Allowed
Italy (IT)	Napoli	Tram	Allowed
Italy (IT)	Roma	Tram	Allowed
Italy (IT)	Sassari	Tram	No details shown
Italy (IT)	Torino	Tram	No details shown
Italy (IT)	Torino	Tram	No details shown
Netherlands (NL)	Amsterdam	Tram	Allowed
Netherlands (NL)	Den Haag	Tram	As Rotterdam-Den Haag
Netherlands (NL)	Houten	Light Rail	No details shown
Netherlands (NL)	Rotterdam	Metro	Allowed
Netherlands (NL)	Rotterdam-Den Haag	Light Rail	Allowed
Netherlands (NL)	Utrecht	Light Rail	Allowed
Norway (NO)	Oslo	Tram	No details shown
Portugal (PT)	Almada (Sul do Tejo)	Light Rail	Allowed
Portugal (PT)	Lisboa	Metro	Allowed
Portugal (PT)	Porto	Tram	Allowed
Slovakia (SK)	Kosice	Tram	No details shown
Spain (ES)	Barcelona	Light Rail	Allowed

Light rail systems using the same standard as Metrolink and cycle carriage policies			
Spain (ES)	Barcelona	Metro	Allowed
Spain (ES)	Madrid	Metro	Allowed
Spain (ES)	Murcia	Tram	Allowed
Spain (ES)	Palma	Metro	No details shown
Spain (ES)	Parla	Tram	No details shown
Spain (ES)	Santa Cruz Tenerife	Light Rail	Allowed
Spain (ES)	Sevilla	Light Metro	Allowed
Spain (ES)	Vélez-Málaga	Tram	No details shown
Sweden (SE)	Göteborg	Tram	No details shown
Sweden (SE)	Lidingö	Tram	As Stockholm
Sweden (SE)	Norrköping	Tram	No details shown
Sweden (SE)	Stockholm	Tram	Not allowed
Switzerland (CH)	Geneve–Bellegarde	Light Rail	Allowed
Switzerland (CH)	Lausanne	Tram	Allowed

Appendix 2: Suggested additional evaluation reports

1. Light Rapid Transit & Cyclists - Guidance for Planning and Design, CTC Campaigns Department, Allot & Lomas, 1998.
2. Cycle Carriage on Metrolink , GMCC, 2002.
(references to reports confirming substantial levels of cycle carriage on LRT systems.- p3)
3. Consultation on Taking Cycles by Tram (Leaflet).
GMPTE Survey Team, 2002. (Results -published separately)
4. Bicycles With Transit - TCRP62.
US Transportation Research Board - 2005 (First Edition TCRP4 1994) (p25-p31). Available at http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_syn_62.pdf
5. Bikes on Trams Newsletter - (Issues 1-9) GMCC - Monthly issues from May 2009.
Available at www.gmcc.org.uk
6. **out of print but available** – Bicycles with Public Transportation
Replogle,M for Bike Federation of America -1983 & 1988 (2nd edition).
7. Case Study No.9 Linking Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities with Transit
US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 1992. Report No. FHWA-PD-93-012. (updates and contains much of 1988 BFA report – Replogle/Lowe). Available at http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/docs/case9.pdf or http://drusilla.hsrc.unc.edu/cms/downloads/CS9_LinkBikePedtoTransit1992.pdf
8. Bicycles With Transit, US Department of Transportation – Federal Transit Administration, 1994.
9. Planning for Cycling – Principles practice and solutions for urban planners
McLintock H (Ed) – 2002 (Chapter 8 Public Transport).
10. Improving Conditions for Cycling & Walking US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 1993.
11. Bicycles and Transit : A Partnership that Works. US Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, 1999.
Available at www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA_Bicycles_and_Transit_Booklet_1999.pdf

CTC's response to the consultation on Metrolink and Cycle Carriage (GMITA)

Introduction

CTC, the national cyclists' organisation, was founded in 1878. CTC has 70,000 members and supporters, provides a range of information and legal services to cyclists, organises cycling events, and represents the interests of cyclists and cycling on issues of public policy.

Since its foundation CTC has worked to deliver a uniform and coherent package of integrating cycle journeys with rail travel, and in 1882, secured a national standard for fares and carriage of cycles across the multitude of rail operators in the UK, and has continued to secure such facilities, notably in 1977 with the cycle carriage deal that led the BR commercial director to comment that the move was the greatest commercial success he had seen in his career with British Rail.

CTC members and others are informally noting the percentages of cyclists using off-peak rail services, and recording some substantial numbers filling the trains, contributing to revenue, and improving the carbon footprint per passenger for the operation of the train – in one example bringing this down from moving 25 Tons of train per passenger to moving around 9 tons per passenger.

In accounting for the consumption of resources – land, finance etc, and the total carbon footprint of a door-to door journey, the combination of cycling with rail can deliver figures substantially better than many currently dominant or dominating models. For example the cost in resources to provide for passengers delivered to a rail system by car, is often greater than the cost for delivery of passengers by other modes.

A study at Bedford Station concluded that the land required for every passenger delivered by car would deliver 9 on foot or 7 by bicycle, with the bicycle working to spread the catchment area by a ratio of at least 16:1 compared to walking. This can compensate for lower population densities when the route moves from urban/city to suburban area, and where the location of a station is at or beyond the limits for comfortable walk-to-train access.

Delivering passengers in suitable quantities

The big conundrum for a public transport system, especially those based around the various standards of rail operation is to consolidate and disperse passengers in the volumes that make a route and the stopping points along it viable, for an appropriate frequency of service, and vehicle capacity.

The National Audit Office review of the UK's LRT/Tram systems in 2004 (HC518) concluded that they were not being used to the full potential in capacity available, and CTC research suggests that unlocking the potential of cycling to the stopping points increases the population within 15 minutes of those stops from an 800m walk to a 4 Km cycle ride.

Dutch research (ECF Report 133) shows that the percentage of passengers cycling between 1.5 and 4 Km to catch a train (over 60%) is twice the overall figure (30+%).

The experience of Merseytravel (Liverpool) with their positive promotion of weekend use of the local electric trains by cyclists sees a number of events where up to 30 bikes are carried on a 3-coach electric train, substantially improving weekend and off-peak patronage, and the utilisation of the resources. The last reference to peak hour cycle restrictions in the Merseyrail timetables was in December 1995.

CTC proffers the hypothesis that a planned introduction of measures that deliver a seamless connection between cycling the shoulder journeys at either end of a tram trip offers a way to increase utilisation of the Metrolink resources, especially on the outer parts

of the network, where the vehicles are running in effect as replacements for trains which were modelled on buses and thus very similar to the trams which are replacing them.

Unlocking the potential

We conclude that there are ways forward which should include all of the following – managed and offered as a portfolio of choices, that include options for price, and convenience to respond to demand and offer a complete integrated transport journey as a product that GMITA 'sells' for the journey that all their customers actually make from door to door – not solely that being made from station to station. This will include

Cycle carriage on the system – especially for cycles which are used as mobility aids, and specialist bikes for sports activities (BMX, track racing etc)

Genuinely secure cycle parking - possibly using a price/convenience regulator to balance with carriage option (pull/push by prices rather than police/confrontation)

Folding bike lease scheme – with bikes branded as GMITA or similar product, with Stagecoach already delivering this in London

'OV-Fiets' bikes available from stations – again with branding/pricing to reflect the convenience and whole journey product offer, again in 'Manchester' branding

The delivery of a fully considered range of products integrating cycling with rail, tram and bus services throughout the ITA is a bold and much needed action which can be developed at relatively low cost in gradual and simple stages, potentially reducing journey to work times by up to 30 minutes, when measured from door-to-door from outer suburbs.

We do however recognise the major issues which a public transport system has with changes. A small change on single service can, if multiplied across the system present a massive problem, and most operators are extremely conservative when presented with a radical innovation. Our hope is that by working with GMITA and Stagecoach on a menu of carefully managed stages, the appropriate development of a full package of cycle carriage, parking and hire can be delivered as a product which has at its core a clear business plan to deliver increased use of the available capacity of the Metrolink system and the incentive of faster and more reliable door-to-door journeys within a market/price structure that has sound and sustainable delivery in terms of revenue and cost.

We note the list of operators and cycle carriage deals presented by GMCC and have been adding US and other data – it will be available shortly with added detail

Background – Key reports ^(MM)= Reference quoted by Mott MacDonald report for GMITA:2009

CTC – 1998 In 1998 working with Allot & Lomax, CTC published a study of the integration of cycling with trams & Light Rail systems, drawing on the experience of many members and historic work by Dave Holladay and others. This report is appended as a separate document.

GMCC 2002 - A key detail which was followed up by the 2002 GMCC report specifically for Metrolink and GMPTE is that there is a minimum of a 15-fold increase in the potential catchment area for a tram-stop, when walking is measured against cycling and the GMCC report concluded that around 90% of the population in the Greater Manchester area would be within easy cycling distance of Metrolink. This would additionally deliver cycle-tram journey times which are highly competitive with an equivalent trip made by private car in delivery of a door to door journey.

MVA : 1998 ^(MM) -The same year, MVA produced a study sponsored by DfT which was listed by the 2009 Mott MacDonald study but seems to have misread some key details. Notably the following items.

(p 65) 9.4.2 Information received from 28 out of the 50 systems responding confirmed that

cycles were carried 12 of these confirmed that this was at all times of operation. (Over 50% of the surveyed sample carried bikes – the Mott MacDonald survey appears to have used the 28 responses from 1998 and the 400 systems listed (but not surveyed) in 2009)

(p 66) 9.4.5 Of the overseas operators who permitted cycle carriage, all found it to be worthwhile, and intended to continue with it. It was reported that there were no appreciable delays to the tram service schedules attributable to the loading & unloading of cycles and that most passengers accepted the carriage of cycles. (The Mott MacDonald study seems to have missed this comment)

US DoT and BFA : 1983, 1988, and 1994 - US research into the delivery of cycling integrated with Public Transport has been very thorough beginning with Michael Replogle's report to the Bicycle Federation of America, supported by USDOT in 1983, revised in 1988 and substantially included with updating of figures in the USDOT Case Study No 9 (electronic copy appended)

Salient details from these papers include

(Opening quote for Chapter 6 of Bicycles and Public Transportation - 1988) "One of the strongest competitors the street railways of the country (US) have had to deal with in the last few years has been the bicycle. For this reason, street railway managers have for a long time been studying the problem of recovering a part of this lost traffic, by furnishing accommodations so that the bicyclist will find it more convenient to use the street cars, when looking for good roads, when caught in a storm, or when his wheel has become damaged in an accident. To provide this accommodation the 'Dubleook' bicycle holder has been introduced on a number of (rail) lines, and is giving entire satisfaction" (Source "New Bicycle Holder" from Street Railway Journal Vol XIV Issue 1 1897)

Contemporary relevance – the bicycle fares collected per month in 1897 by the San Francisco Market Street Railway (tramway) amounted to 1800 trips at \$0.10¢ - or \$23,000 Per month at current prices. Bicycle fares may well be an option to evaluate – GMITA would thus need to model a gain in patronage plus an added fare for the cycle.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit (**BART**) system has carried cycles since 1975 – they have no restrictions on cycle access in the scheme which started in 1975 – with sale of permits (\$5) 1980 9,000 permits issued and issue process simplified (postal applications)

1984 28,000 permits issued and only one reported minor claim since 1975.

1992 71,000 permits issued – permits no longer issued and range of products expanded to swipe card bike lockers for subscribers, as well as on-train carriage

Portland (OR) also began their LRT operation (**MAX**) in many respects similar to Metrolink with on-street running in the city and 55mph reserved tracks (old rail routes) outside the centre. After 4 years of permit operation (\$3 per permit) they had over 4000 permits issued and no problems – permits (for cycle carriage on bus and MAX) were then discontinued.

Washington **Metro** also proceeded to introduce cycle carriage in the same way by permits with restricted times of use. A steady reduction of the restrictions was introduced as operational experience developed – permits were discontinued a decade ago.(permit system started 1981 – 1000 permits issued by 1982 – no reported problems)

Key section (p 40 onwards)

US TRB : 1994 and 2005 - In addition to these reports the US Transportation Research Board has produced comprehensive studies of Cycling with Transit – first in 1994 (TCRP4) and greatly enhanced in 2005 (TCRP62).

The section on cycling with Trams and LRT systems clearly notes that there are no problems with damage, or delays and with a properly considered management regime, few issues with cycle carriage. The majority of responding agencies were very positive about their cycle-tram/LRT operations. (TCRP62 Key section (p.25 to p.31))

TTK : 2007 (for TfL) ^(MM) - Other papers include one particularly relevant to Metrolink – commissioned by TfL from the respected specialists TTK (Karlsruhe), relating to cycle carriage on Croydon Tramlink, which like Metrolink uses raised floor trams operating on old rail lines and on street with similar speed differentials. The TTK report concludes that cycles should be carried off-peak on Tramlink and a small additional fare charged.

It is perhaps significant to note that the Bombardier M-5000 Flexcity Trams are the RVAR compliant development from the K-4000 vehicles operated by Tramlink in Croydon (adapted as CR-4000 and with RVAR exemption). K-5000 (and derivative) trams operate in Koln and Bonn – bikes are carried. Page 15 is especially relevant as this discusses the operation of similar vehicles in a similar situation (Koln – operates 4000, 4500 and 5000 series Flexcity trams and also carries cycles on most bus services)

This report draws on the **ADFC** review (1999), carried out in cooperation with DB to evaluate provision for cycle carriage on rail vehicles for the various types of traffic (commuting, leisure – local and long distance etc)

VTI Meddelande 926 A : 2002 (for Swedish Rail) ^(MM) - The Swedish report also cited by the Mott MacDonald study includes 3 key details in the French thinking for the use of their tram systems, one of which is the full integration cycling with tram services. Surprisingly this was not noted in the 2009 Mott MacDonald study. All French systems reviewed indicate provision of cycle carriage and related integration, as part of the complete package.

National Audit Office Review HC518 : 2004 – noted previously

Integration of Cycling with LRT : 2003 – Paper by Hugh McLintock & Dave Morris

Bikes and Trams – Sheffield : 2004 – paper by S Geller for Pedalpushers

Velo City 2009 – Sub Plenary papers - A selection of papers illustrating the results from various European public transport systems and the figures for cost, and use.

Cycle space requirements

One key flaw in the 2009 Mott MacDonald study is the vastly over estimated space taken up by cycles – a bicycle has a footprint of 0.67 sq m and this is not doubled by a second bike – as they can be efficiently parked by top & tail or offset handlebars to reduced the space required.

SW Trains in their Class 455 trains – where otherwise unusable space behind the seats is used to fit 2 bikes in the place of just 2 tip-up seats. There are already systems available and widely used to secure the bikes using their own weight – notably the Orion Gamma and similar units.

The cycle 'footprint' is provided as an appendix along with photos of trains and trams equipped with Gamma units, and the SWT details.

Mobility for those prohibited from driving and those unable to walk far

There is a further issue in the use of cycles as mobility aids and reference should be made to the websites www.inclusivecyclingforum.org.uk and http://www.cycling.org.uk/wheels_for_all.html Manchester has a strong link to Cycling Projects (originally formed as the Greater Manchester Cycling Project, over 20 years ago) who are a key co-ordinating and delivery agency for inclusive cycling. One of the inclusive Cycling 'clients', now an instructor has calculated that switching from a mobility scooter to

a cycle has cut her cost to Social Services and NHS from £19,000/year to £4,000/year with other measurable benefits in enhanced fitness and wellbeing.

The safety and mobility of young people is also a case to consider, and access to off-peak trams, trains and buses has been a useful way for young riders, prohibited by their age for being able to drive, to gain access to BMX and other cycling facilities across the UK. Access to the Metrolink network will enable them to travel to the top quality cycling facilities available in Manchester to train – some possibly for attempts at Olympic and other world class medals, without constantly requiring a parent or other support as taxi service.

The former users of rail services

Reports from some of the currently disenfranchised users of the former rail lines reveal that they find the Metrolink progress through the city centre too slow and have moved back to driving into Manchester to work, and this is experience also borne out from US bus services where cycles are carried (over 70% of US bus services carry bikes with 2-3 bikes per bus being common (4-6% of seated passenger capacity, and often a much higher percentage of the passenger numbers). The lack of any robust before the closure cycle carriage figures for the Oldham, Bury, and Altrincham lines presents an unfortunate lack of data, from which we might be able to model the likely demand. We may only be able to get responses from former users in a local survey

Review of US bike carriage on rail and road services, and UK studies suggest that 3-4% is a typical established demand for cycle carriage, with or without peak hour capacity constraints. Many will disembark from the tram or bus at the outer edge of the city centre and complete their trips by cycle as this offers the benefit of flexibility and speed. It will be useful to review cycle carriage by Metrolink on this basis as potentially cycle carriage can deliver passengers to fill the trams outside the city core, who vacate the space for the pedestrian traffic making short journeys within the city

Access to Public Transport – delivering passengers to the tram rather than trams to the passengers

Appended APT paper shows how rapid and reliable journeys can be delivered by combining cycling with bus and rail services, but the key detail is for the PT operators or authorities to have a clear picture of the customers and market issues,

The whole package can draw on examples from current UK and European developments the journey can be sold as a complete door to door product with the ticket sale inclusive of a range of choices, using price/convenience and other market factors to shape the 'products' offered

- carriage of a cycle on the tram, initially by way of a permit or fare system. The former has the benefit of delivering a polling audience to survey about their use and experience of the services available

- a genuinely secure parking place - Stagecoach has had recent success here and there are some systems which can be franchised/bought in (Cycledock/Bikeaway) as a premium product

- a deal to lease a folding bike – Stagecoach has this available with SW Trains, and the Wallonia bus & tram network offers a product for €15/month. In all cases the bikes can be branded with PTE or operator colours enhancing the image of an Integrated transport operation

- a deal to offer the equivalent of the NS OV-Fiets system, bikes available at destination stations for all day use – viably offered at €2.90/day, or a buy-in to a shared-bike system (OYBike (Veolia) / Smartbike (Clear Channel) / Call-a Bike

(DB) / Hourbike (Vipre) / Bixi (UK = Serco)). Unlike the JC Decaux model these systems are offered without a requirement to sign over on-street advertising, and some can be 'grown' by individual sites (Universities, Hospitals etc) paying to have a facility installed and a block of staff/visitor use pre-paid

Moving forward

We have a really exciting prospect of setting the bench-marks for cycle-tram integration and doing this through a gradual development, possibly through a permit/fare regime, that can be surveyed to establish the type of customer who will gain the benefit of faster and more reliable journeys, and the range of services that Metrolink can offer to deliver this feature across the network at all times of day and all levels of passenger demand. This would deliver on tram cycle carriage with a market control regime to direct some users to alternative solutions when on-vehicle space is at a premium.

CTC believes that there is major potential for dialogue with ITA's and other operators of tram & light rail, as noted above and hopes that we can be engaged with any forum or working group discussing the prospects for Metrolink and other GMITA networks integrating with cycling.

Proposals

The indication from some of the Velo City papers, the US experience, and some disenfranchised users of the Oldham-Manchester and other routes now operated by Metrolink, is that they would not use the system where it runs on-street through the city, as their onward travel by cycle is faster. We thus suggest that a pilot project is that for one or more of the outer sections of the network, cycle carriage is permitted off-peak, to a point where the line enters the on-street network in the City Centre, possibly using the existing zone limits where rail passengers can use the system within the same cordon points.

The benefit of having a polling audience and a known number of potential users leads us to suggest that initially a permit system provides a controlled audience and one which can be quickly communicated with, so that the fine-tuning of any times or other limiting controls can be e-mailed or posted to all the 'known' users. Permits could be free or a pre-paid feature, and could be used with a bike fare regime. Market research is needed to establish a pricing model.

If the administrative detail for a permit system gives a concern for resources, we note that the issue of permits does not have to be managed by GMITA – GMCC or CTC could possibly manage a small pilot scheme. However there may be a case to go directly to the regime proposed for Croydon by TTK, and simply sell a bike fare for travel with a bike, and have time/route limits for its use.

However the value of permits does seem to have been proved by the US experience, with the longer term option of relaxing the condition as any operating regime beds down with Metrolink users.

Our suggested solution would thus be to have a permit system for the pilot trials, but with a discussion on the option of making the permit free, and charging for use, except where the cycle is used by a person with a disability who, may though cycling be able to access mainstream public transport*.

For an initial public acceptance study the detail illustrated in the Pedalpushers report – placing a full size cardboard 'bike' on a tram and inviting comment from other passengers may be a useful initial exercise which can be carried out in cooperation with the cycling groups. The design of cardboard bikes is now something well developed!

*Through gaining access to mainstream public transport the cost of the disabled person to state and local agencies can be dramatically reduced – in an example from Sheffield we

calculate a reduction from £19,000/year to £4,000/year for the specific case, with further intangible gains in fitness and wellbeing. GMITA may see this in reduced demand for/costs of paratransit bus and taxi provision



"Carl Williams"
<CarlWilliams@metrolink.co.uk>
17/05/2010 16:30

To <s.warburton@manchester.gov.uk>
cc
bcc
Subject CYCLES ON TRAMS

Dear Mr Warburton

In response to your request for evidence I submit the following.

In September of last year Stagecoach Metrolink Limited were requested by GMPTE to comment on a study into the carriage of bicycles on trams. Our response highlighted the increased levels of risks associated with the carriage of bicycle insides the confines of a tram, also, the policing of such a proposal and the impact this would have on timetable reliability, even with racking we feel the potential for passenger injury remains high.

Aside from the deleterious effect that carriage of cycles will have on the interior of the vehicles we believe that other aspects such as restricting passenger accommodation on trams and cycles being ridden on/off platforms drastically reduces the safety, comfort and general appeal of the Metrolink system.

In summary SML vehemently believe that, due to the significant increase in the risk to passenger safety and a lowering of the customer service standards resulting from the relaxation of the current restrictions, Metrolink is not capable of accommodating bicycles on trams, other than those already provided for under the Metrolink bylaws.

If, however, you feel our involvement would be of benefit Stagecoach Metrolink would be happy to partake in a working group to discuss the issues surrounding this topic.

Carl Williams

Stagecoach Metrolink

Metrolink House

Queens Road

Manchester

M8 0RY

T 0161 205 8665

F 0161 205 8699