

**Minutes of the Transport and Travel Statistics Advisory Committee (TTSAC)**  
**Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2006**  
*held at Napier University, Sighthill Court, Edinburgh*

**1 Apologies, minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising**

Present:

Chairman: Mr Frank Dixon	Transport Statistician, Scottish Executive (SE)
Secretary: Ms Mairi MacAskill	Transport Statistics Branch, SE
Ms Lyndsey Avery	Department for Transport
Ms Helen Cameron	Transport Policy, SE
Mrs Sandra Campbell	Tourism Statistician, SE
Mr Hamish Clark	Social Research, SE
Dr David Connolly	MVA
Mr Stewart Dick	Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport
Inspector Murray Dykes	Lothian and Borders Police ( <i>representing</i> ACPOS)
Mr Derek Halden	Derek Halden Consultancy
Mr Tom Hart	Scottish Transport Studies Group
Mr Ron Hunter	SPT, <i>representing</i> COSLA Planning, Economics & Transport R & I Group
Mr Tony Jarvis	Highlands and Islands Transport Partnership (HITRANS)
Mr Hugh Gillies	Transport Scotland
Mr Andrew Knight	Transport Statistics Branch, SE
Mr Clive Marchant	Logistics Research Centre, Heriot-Watt University
Ms Karen Mackay	Highlands and Islands Transport Partnership (HITRANS)
Ms Ellie MacKay	Environment Statistics, SE
Mr Tim Norwood	General Register Office for Scotland ( <i>Census item only</i> )
Dr Robert Raeside	Transport Research Institute, Napier University
Dr Jock Robertson	Robertson Consulting Ltd, <i>representing</i> TSUG
Ms Marjory Rodger	Confederation of Passenger Transport
Mr Alastair Short	SESTRANS, <i>representing</i> SCOTS
Mr Neil Sturrock	Strathclyde Partnership for Transport
Mr Mick Wilson	Head of Transport Analytical Services, SE
<u>Apologies for absence</u>	
Mr Roy Brannen	Traffic Controller, SE
Dr David McGuigan	Colin Buchanan and Partners
Ms Antonia Roberts	Transport Statistics, Department for Transport ( <i>represented</i> by Lyndsey Avery)

1.1 Mr Dixon began by expressing his thanks to Napier University's Transport Research Institute for providing the room free of charge, and to Napier's staff for setting it up.

1.2 Mr Dixon welcomed new members and requested that any changes to, or errors in, the membership list be made known to the Secretary. One change of membership from the list supplied on the 27<sup>th</sup> September was noted: Mick Wilson is the new Head of Transport Analytical Services.

1.3 The minutes of the previous meeting had been distributed in December 2005 and were accepted as an accurate reflection of the meeting.

1.4 A list of the action points from the previous meeting had been sent out with the papers about 3 weeks before the meeting setting out what was (or was not) done in each case. Mr Dixon asked if there were any points that anyone wished to make on these matters, or any other matters arising from the minutes. Dr Connolly said he had failed to complete Action 7.2, and enquired whether this opportunity had now come and gone. Mrs Campbell confirmed that this was the case. Dr Robertson updated the Committee on the progress of Action 5.3; Ms Roberts had asked a colleague in the Ports statistics branch to investigate, and it turned out that the tables were on the Web site but not in an easy to find place.

## **2 Transport Topics in the Census – paper TTSAC (06) 1**

2.1 Mr Dixon introduced Tim Norwood, of the General Register Office for Scotland, who then introduced this paper. He explained that this outlined the transport questions which have been proposed for inclusion in the 2011 Census.

2.2 Mr Norwood informed the Committee that the content for the 2011 Census will have to be finalised by early 2008, when a White Paper will have to be produced and proposals submitted to Parliament. The consultation in 2004 led to a large number of new proposals, creating pressure on the space on the Census form. Consequently, the data need for all questions must be established, and at the moment this is through guidance from groups such as this. There will be a formal consultation in 2007.

2.3 Mr Norwood went on to describe the proposals contained in the paper for the transport questions in the next Census. The number of cars or vans available to the household is in the household part of the form. There was some suggestion before the 2004 consultation that this could be replaced by DVLA data, but the consultation showed this was not possible, as the DVLA data do not cover all vehicles and may count company cars on the basis of the location of the head office. Travel to work/study is collected using two questions: the address of the respondent's place of work or study; and the method of travel. Mr Norwood asked the committee whether they considered the combined work and study question to yield poor quality data, and if there is a need for both "study" and "work" information. He pointed out that ONS will only be collecting travel to work, and that there are efforts to harmonise the Census across the UK.

2.4 Mr Norwood stressed that responses to the proposals outlined in this paper should ideally reach GROS in the next month or so, and that organisational responses may be considered to have greater weight than individual responses.

2.5 Dr Connolly stated that there was a strong data need for the "car ownership" question, as it is a fundamental transport indicator and links heavily to Travel to Work behaviour: both were needed at the household level. Mr Norwood reassured him that these questions were very strong contenders for inclusion, but that nothing is certain until the plans are approved by Parliament.

2.6 Mr Sturrock agreed that "car ownership" was needed, and asked whether it would be possible to split the work and study question, as there may be confusion over which to answer if a respondent is both in work and study. Mr Norwood said that the problem was the extra space that would be required. Dr Connolly was content with the combined question –

although it is not perfect, it is important to have travel to study information. Mr Halden reinforced later the importance of the travel to study information (e.g.) for work on planning bus services in remote areas. Mr Wilson proposed that the confusion could be resolved by putting in a sentence for clarification (e.g. "If full-time student with a part-time job, answer this for travel to study"). Mr Norwood replied that this would be possible but that GROS would need guidance on the wording to be used and on whether users would want the "work" or "study" location to be entered in various situations.

2.7 Mr Hunter asked whether GROS had considered the effect that the order of the modes given would have on respondents – e.g. does "Underground" coming first lead more people to choose this than would be expected? He added that the lack of a "Ferry" option caused problems. Dr Connolly recommended that "car driver" and "car passenger" appear side by side, so that the distinction between them is clear for respondents. Mr Norwood conceded that ONS testing had showed that there are order effects.

2.8 Mr Halden suggested that there may be an increasing need to include a 'mixed-mode' option (e.g. car and public transport - "park and ride"), and Dr Connolly mentioned that asking for only one mode could lead to the appearance of "impossible" journeys (e.g. when a person who lived miles from a station was shown as travelling to work by train). However, Mr Marchant replied that this question asked for the main mode (i.e. the longest part of the trip to work), and that seeking journey stages would be too detailed for the Census. Dr Robertson concurred, saying that mixed-mode options could lead to confusion, as there were many possibilities – whereas, in theory, everyone can answer the current question in only one way.

2.9 Mr Dick enquired whether GROS had considered asking only for the work postcode, to save space on the form. However, Dr Connolly pointed out that a considerable percentage of people do not know their work postcode, and Mr Sturrock added that GROS would not know if a postcode that had been given was incorrect. Mr Norwood believed this to be the case from GROS' experience. The collection of the address and postcode allows for cross-checking. Mr Dick replied that he realised the data would be of poorer quality, but the question was whether the quality would be unacceptably low.

2.10 Mr Hunter asked whether GROS would be releasing any outputs from the test that was carried out this year, and why it had not included the "car ownership" question. Mr Norwood said that GROS was reluctant to release any data as the test was voluntary and the data are not great quality. The "car ownership" question had not been included because the purpose was to test changes to questions (e.g. the addition of a box for "work/study at home") and there was no doubt about how the "car ownership" question should be asked.

2.11 Dr Raeside enquired whether thought had been given to picking up commuters who fly to (e.g.) London and work there for, say, 3-4 days per week. He felt this was a growing proportion of the workforce. Mr Dixon replied that the long-distance commuters report may be of some use, although it might not show "air" as a separate mode. Mr Wilson pointed out that such people might not be identified by the 'main mode of travel to work/study' question, as they might well give the modes of transport used to travel to work within London. Dr Connolly felt that such cases could be identified using the information about the "home" and "work" locations, and suggested a question about the frequency of travel (e.g. "How many days per week do you travel to work by...?"). However he conceded that this may be too detailed for the Census, and there may be difficulties in developing an unambiguous question. Mr Jarvis wondered how the Census could reflect flexible, changing patterns, referring to

people who spent a mixture of days at home and at work, and (e.g.) Stornoway residents who used the train to get to Aberdeen, and worked off-shore. Mr Norwood said that if a new question were felt to be worthwhile it would be considered, but that the opportunities for testing at a large scale are running out.

2.12 Mr Dixon thanked Mr Norwood for consulting the Committee, and thanked members for their comments, which he was sure GROS would consider carefully. He asked members to get in touch with Mr Norwood if they wanted to take any matters further.

**Action: GROS to consider the points made in the discussion.**

**Action: Committee members to get in touch with Mr Norwood within a month or so if they wish discuss matters further.**

### **3 Users' experience of recent developments in SE Transport Statistics, and suggestions for further improvements – paper TTSAC (06) 2**

3.1 Mr Dixon explained that this paper was designed to seek the views of committee members on recent developments in SE Transport Statistics, and to gather their suggestions for further improvements to our outputs.

#### "Scottish Transport Statistics Update" tables

3.2 Mr Dixon asked committee members whether they had used the "*Scottish Transport Statistics*" (STS) Update tables, and what improvements could be made. Dr Connolly said that he personally had not used them, but that colleagues had. He added that more figures for Regional Transport Partnership (RTP) areas would be useful. Mr Dixon said that Transport Statistics bulletins of SHS results contain figures broken down by RTP area, but that (because SE received much of its data from other providers, such as DfT) it will have to explore with them what other "RTP" figures would be possible. Mr Short echoed the need for disaggregated results, which will only increase as Regional Transport Strategies are developed.

3.3 Mr Dixon asked for which particular topics the RTP representatives would find it useful to have figures at RTP level. Mr Short replied that travel trends, sustainable travel, changes in travel patterns, home working, interchange, park-and-ride and travel to work are important from his perspective. Mr Jarvis felt that it was difficult to know at this stage, as the strategies were still being developed, and would not be finalised until April: a lot would depend on what they needed to measure and monitor. Mr Dixon said that the SHS data could be broken down easily by RTP area (subject to there being sufficient sample size), but reinforced that for other statistics it will be necessary to liaise with SE's data providers, so the earlier SE could start what might be long discussions with them the better.

3.4 Mr Marchant said he felt that there was not much freight data broken down by RTP area. Mr Dixon replied that the DfT survey's samples were small (about 50 Scottish lorries per week), but DfT might be able to change the current freight table which gives figures cross-classified by the old regions to give figures for RTP areas. Mr Marchant expected that demand for RTP data will grow as the freight strategies are developed.

**Action: Mr Dixon to liaise with data providers to find out which statistics can be broken down by RTP area**

3.5 Mr Jarvis said that, following discussions while developing their "Freight Action Plan", he felt that there were data gaps – e.g. origin and destination information for users of the ferry services. HITRANS was undertaking surveys with SPT. Could the DfT road freight survey be improved or the sample expanded? He also felt that there was a lack of good quality Trunk Road traffic and road conditions data for some roads in his area. Mr Dixon expressed his surprise at this, as he believed that there were over 1,000 automatic traffic counters across the trunk road network, although coverage might not be as good in rural areas. Mr Hart said that he had had difficulty getting information about traffic trends due to problems with the counters, and Mr Halden referred to a study which had found that some of the counters were not working some of the time. Mr Gillies informed committee members that the next version of the Transport Model for Scotland will have national coverage, and work was underway to see if this would require better data sources.

3.6 There was then some discussion about potential data sources. Dr Connolly referred to the growing amount of data available from (e.g.) traffic camera systems. Mr Halden was working with ITIS data for DfT, which would give 88 of 113 transport authorities in England data for their areas. Such data were important, as they gave real-time information about movement. The ratio of peak : off-peak journey times was important. Dr Connolly added that such data also provided measures of journey time reliability / variability, and that public transport timetable data also showed peak / off-peak differences in journey times. Mr Dixon mentioned that discussions with DfT had indicated that such data sources might need considerable resources devoted to them (to buy and clean the Scottish data, as well as for analysis). This could require a significant commitment on the SE's part, and might depend on the priorities identified in the National Transport Strategy. The SE Trunk Road Congestion Monitoring system collected the data needed to monitor progress towards the Spending Review target. Mr Gillies said that Journey Planner information produced from ITIS data had been available on the Transport Scotland website, and might cover the whole trunk road network, but that he would check with Roy Brannen whether this was the case.

**Action: SE to review its need for data from ITIS/GPS/camera/etc systems, if appropriate following the publication of the National Transport Strategy**

**Action: Mr Gillies to ask Roy Brannen about the ITIS data used to produce the Journey Planner information**

3.7 Mr Dixon asked for any other views on the "STS Update" tables on the Web site. Dr Robertson said that he had used them, but that he had problems downloading some of the larger files, as his village did not have broadband. He felt that DfT was good at breaking its material down into individual tables. Mr Dixon said that SE would look at the bigger workbooks, to see how they might be split up. Mr Jarvis and Dr Robertson suggested finding out from the SE Web team how much each section of the Web site is used, in order to assess priorities, and adding a "comments" form asking (e.g.) what other information users would like to see on the site.

**Action: Miss MacAskill to investigate size of "STS Update" workbooks, and to consider splitting some of the larger ones**

**Action: Miss MacAskill to get in touch with SE Web team to assess use of site and enquire about adding a "comments" form**

3.8 Mr Dick felt that the more detailed/specialised tables need not appear in the publications, as long as there were clear references to their availability on the Web site, as users could download them to their laptops. Mr Wilson said he was looking to see whether

there was scope to release any of the resources used to produce Transport Statistics publications – e.g. perhaps making some more specialised analysis web-based.

### "Main Transport Trends"

3.9 Mr Dixon asked the committee for their views on the new publication, "*Main Transport Trends*". Generally, members were happy with it. Mr Hart welcomed it. It was helpful to have the main figures sooner. He felt that where there are series of road traffic counts at "strategic" points on the road network (he appreciated that there would have to be agreement on which locations these were), the change over 5 or 10 years would be interesting. He would also like the toll bridge traffic counts to continue after tolls have been removed, to see what the difference was. Dr Connolly too was interested in this. Mr Sturrock wondered whether this might require the installation of extra automatic traffic counters, as might have been done at the Erskine Bridge. Mr Dixon said he would investigate these points with Transport Scotland colleagues.

3.10 Dr Connolly requested Travel to Work and Travel to School broken down by RTP area to be included in "*Main Transport Trends*". Mr Dixon replied that this would be feasible for the bigger RTP areas. Dr Connolly also emphasised the importance of always keeping car driver and passenger separate.

**Action: Mr Dixon to investigate the feasibility of Mr Hart's and Dr Connolly's requests**

3.11 On the "audience" for a publication like "*Main Transport Trends*", Dr Robertson said that different types of users looked for different types of statistics - e.g. consultants and RTPs were more interested in detailed figures. However, Dr Connolly said that they were also interested in overall trends: having seen what was rising or falling for Scotland as a whole, they could look at more detailed figures for their areas of interest. Mrs Rodgers added that businesses used the figures (e.g.) to identify opportunities, threats and "what works": the user base was wider than might be thought. The general feeling was that "*MTT*" was a lighter publication, and so may be more attractive to a wider audience than "*STS*".

### "One page" / "high level" summaries of statistics

3.12 Mr Dixon asked for the committee's views on the "one-page" / "high level" summaries on the website. Dr Robertson thought that they were well put together and provided a useful "taster". He again made the point that the use in general could be assessed by counting "hits" on the pages, and perhaps identifying which were used the most. Mrs Rodger said she had found them useful, and would use many of the figures at a conference on the following day. Mr Wilson indicated that this sort of product can fulfil the general "public service" information needs of those with a passing interest in a topic.

**Action: Miss MacAskill to get in touch with SE Web team to assess use of "one-page" summaries**

### "Scottish Transport Statistics"

3.13 Mr Dixon then asked the committee to suggest any improvements they would like made to "*Scottish Transport Statistics*", reminding them that the request for Regional Transport Partnership figures had already been noted. Dr Connolly supported the suggestions

made in the paper, but asked whether the emissions shown in "STS" would count bio-fuels. Mr Jarvis asked about the sources of data and assumptions made to produce the estimates of emissions per passenger-kilometre. Ms Avery replied that the figures were estimated by DEFRA's contractors, using a lot of different data for each mode, and she was not sure of the details in each case. This was discussed again later in the meeting. Mr Jarvis asked whether emissions would be available at local authority level, and Ms Avery indicated that these would be coming out at the end of this month. Dr Connolly felt that such figures for RTP areas would be more important, to inform Regional Transport Strategies.

### Content of Transport Statistics publications - general points

3.14 Section 4.2 of the paper asked whether Transport Statistics publications should have more "background/context". Mr Hart felt that they should, in order to open up a debate on the reasons for trends and for changes in trends (e.g. why had there been a dramatic reduction in the growth in average trip lengths since 1999?). Mr Marchant thought that the more "qualitative" material was interesting, but required more resources to produce. Dr Connolly wanted as little interpretation as possible, because such material was resource-intensive, requiring expert input, and because there might be other causes of trends/changes besides those referred to in a commentary. However, the publications should explain any "process" issues which may have affected the figures. Mr Wilson felt that there was a need to distinguish between the presentation of the data and more analytical pieces, which might be produced for policy colleagues: the latter presented more risks. Dr Raeside commented that with limited resources, the main tasks were to ensure that the data were reliable and comprehensive. SE could commission separate studies to interpret the results. Mr Marchant suggested that the SE might consider producing publications like DfT's "Focus" ones, and Mr Wilson added that publications of this sort were valuable, and could open up the debate and improve understanding of the figures. Mr Halden thought that understanding what was happening was linked to the choice of statistics that would be needed and should be collected and presented in future: did they enable analysis of big issues in Transport policy, such as the effect of Ryanair and similar companies?

3.15 Mr Dixon asked the committee about the related issue of the balance between commentary, tables and charts in the publications, and whether they felt this should change. Mr Hart favoured more charts and less text. Mr Dick favoured limiting the amount of commentary/interpretation, but emphasised that the publications must mention anything that affected the figures, such as methodological or question changes. Mr Marchant said that the balance depended upon the audience for the publications. He was content with the balance as it stood at present: the bigger issue was the level of disaggregation of the figures that was possible. Dr Robertson added that the commentary must help the reader find his/her way into the statistics, to look at the tables and to understand them. However, SE must be very careful when commenting on the reasons for changes, as this could be dangerous ground - given the general distrust of government statistics, the commentary should be very cautious. Mr Sturrock felt that the commentaries gave new users a good guide to the figures, but were not needed by experienced users. Mr Wilson added that it had been good for him, as a newcomer to Transport, to have the commentaries to read. Mr Dixon asked whether members were content with the current balance: Mr Halden, Mrs Rodger and others indicated that they were; no-one disagreed.

Conclusion: the Committee felt that the commentary in Transport Statistics publications should focus primarily on data quality and reliability, rather than on interpretation of the figures (as speculation about possible reasons for change could be misleading or

misunderstood). However, they should continue to provide information about methodological changes etc. and highlight new figures or significant changes (e.g. in a trend). Some description was valuable for new or infrequent users: the commentaries help them to find their way into the statistics.

#### Other possible outputs

3.16 The committee was then asked if there was a need for any new publications or outputs on the website. Mr Sturrock felt that greater disaggregation of freight data by sector would be useful (a meeting within SPT on Freight Quality Partnerships had identified the limited breakdown of freight data as a weakness). Mr Marchant said that this issue was often raised, but to obtain more detailed data would increase the burden on haulage companies. Mr Dixon replied that the availability of data on freight had been discussed with Policy colleagues in the context of SE's forthcoming Freight Action Plan, and a balance had to be struck between the cost and the detail of the data. Mr Dixon asked which members of the committee would like to be involved in a sub-group to discuss this issue, should the Action Plan identify a need for more data. Mr Halden, Mr Marchant, Mr Sturrock, Mr Jarvis, Dr Connolly and Mr Short all volunteered. The different interests of some members were mentioned: Mr Marchant was interested in interconnectivity; Mr Sturrock in international traffic, the trend to the greater use of regional distribution centres, and the different behaviours in different sectors; Mr Jarvis in the growth in the small goods van sector; and Dr Connolly in the choice of routes (e.g. to avoid congestion and low bridges). Mr Marchant suggested that a representative from Scottish Enterprise be invited to join any "freight" sub-group.

**Action: Mr Dixon to arrange meeting of the "freight" sub-group, if appropriate in the light of the Freight Action Plan**

3.17 Dr Connolly expressed an interest in gathering information about the use and supply of community transport. Mr Dixon said that there had been community transport questions in the Scottish Household Survey in the first 6 months of 2005, but very few interviewees had said that they used it. Mr Halden pointed out that it was a difficult topic to measure using a household survey, as the definition was very complicated and open to interpretation, and people would not know what should be counted. A forthcoming report to DfT would make some recommendations - e.g. that the Traffic Commissioners could make more data available. Mr Dixon said he would consult community transport policy colleagues about what might be done. Ms Rodger added she would also like more information about non-emergency health transport, and Mr Dixon wondered whether colleagues in NHS ISD may have some information on this.

**Action: Mr Dixon to consult community transport and NHS ISD colleagues**

3.18 Mr Jarvis said he would find a publication devoted to aviation useful. HITRANS has produced a collation of Civil Aviation Authority data and assessments of the environmental and economic effects of aviation. These were major topics for debate, and there was a need to look at changes in travel patterns and at international connectivity with key hubs. A more analytical "one-off" report would inform the ongoing debate. Mr Hart added that a more fundamental issue was whether the National Travel Survey would be changed to include overseas travel. Mr Dixon said that there were many "aviation" figures in *STS*, but a more focussed publication could perhaps be produced as a one-off.

**Action: Mr Dixon to consider an "aviation" publication**

#### **4 The Transport Part of the Scottish Executive Statistics Plan - paper TTSAC (06) 3**

4.1 Mr Dixon introduced the paper and invited comments on points in the Transport part of the SE Statistics plan, bearing in mind that some had been covered in earlier discussions.

4.2 Mr Wilson felt that the format and use of the material that was currently produced should be reviewed, to see if time could be released for other work. Mr Halden thought that there was a need to collect basic information on some issues (e.g. patient transport as a passenger in a car [whose? - a relative? a friend?], as the number of such trips had risen substantially). Mr Jarvis mentioned that statistics would be required to meet the information needs of the National Transport Strategy and the Regional Transport Strategies, and Mrs Rodger added that there would be also requirements from the "daughter" documents. Mr Hunter said that there would be a need to monitor whatever indicators were specified by the National Transport Strategy, and hoped that there would be consistency between the indicators used for national, regional and local strategies. Mr Dixon replied that the Committee's Progress Indicators sub-group could discuss these matters, once it was clear what indicators were being proposed.

**Action: Mr Dixon to consult the Progress Indicators sub-group, if appropriate, after the publication of the National Transport Strategy**

4.3 Mr Dixon asked the Committee if they were content with the draft plan, subject to it being revised in the light of the discussions. Committee members indicated that they were.

**Action: Mr Dixon to revise the draft plan in the light of the discussion**

#### **5 Recent and forthcoming developments in Department for Transport (DfT) Transport Statistics – paper TTSAC (06) 4**

5.1 Ms Avery introduced Ms Robert's paper, summarising the main points and major developments. For road accidents, the main developments were the publication of contributory factor results in "*Road Casualties Great Britain*", and the continued investigation into "under-reporting". The road traffic Quality Review is complete and will be published by the end of the year, as will results from the National Rail Travel Survey. The National Travel Survey data have been weighted for 2005 and previous years and there will be a review of the Travel Diary in 2007. Ms Avery invited questions about recent and forthcoming developments in DfT Transport Statistics.

5.2 Mr Dick enquired how hospital staff were able to categorise the causes of accidents accurately. Ms Avery replied that it was part of the admittance procedure. Mr Dixon said an article in "*Road Accidents Scotland 2005*" would compare Police "STATS 19" figures with those from other sources, including hospital admissions and GROS death figures.

5.3 Dr Connolly asked whether the "emissions" estimates assume that all vehicles use fossil fuels, or whether bio-fuel is counted differently. Ms Avery replied that the estimates are constrained to DTI's figures for the sales of petrol and diesel, and that she would ask DEFRA's contractors about the treatment of bio-fuels. Mr Halden thought that a large percentage of the vehicle fleet would be using fuel cells five years hence, and there was a need to start collecting data on this now, and Dr Connolly reinforced the need to be able to

calculate the carbon needed for fuel cells, and the savings/contributions to emissions from bio-fuel and electric cars. Ms Cameron said that a number of issues with calculating emissions had come to her attention through developing the National Transport Strategy, and that (through the Strategy) SE was looking for this to be done in a more systematic way.

**Action: Ms Avery to enquire how bio-fuels are treated in the preparation of the "emissions" estimates**

5.4 Dr Robertson asked about the production of results from the National Rail Travel Survey. Mr Dixon mentioned that he had asked DfT to include some "regional" figures in the bulletin which it was intending to publish in the Spring.

5.5 Mr Dixon thanked Ms Avery for attending on Ms Roberts' behalf, and asked committee members to get in touch with DfT directly if they had any further questions.

## **6 Developments in Tourism Statistics in Scotland – paper TTSAC (06) 5**

6.1 Mrs Campbell introduced her paper and indicated that it was mostly for information, but highlighted the developments in the two main surveys: the UK Tourism Survey and the International Passenger Survey. Mr Sturrock asked whether these surveys covered tourists who travelled to Scotland after entering the UK elsewhere (e.g. through English ports or airports) - Mrs Campbell confirmed that this was the case for the International Passenger Survey. The UK Tourism Survey is based on tourism trips taken by residents of the UK.

6.2 Mrs Rodger asked when the report of the research into the travel behaviour of visitors to Scotland would be published. Mr Clark replied that it would be available soon. Mrs Rodger thought that there would be points from the research which should be followed up, and Mr Halden said that there were a number of recommendations on data collection.

## **7 Scottish Household Survey developments – paper TTSAC (06) 6**

7.1 Mr Dixon introduced this paper, explaining it was primarily for information. Miss MacAskill mentioned that the redesign of the Travel Diary was taking longer than had been expected, but the contractors' current assessment was that it should not result in "interview length" problems. Mr Dixon asked if anyone would like to be consulted should SE have to review the balance between sample size and detail in the Travel Diary, in the light of the outcome of the "pilot" surveys. Dr Connolly and Mr Halden expressed a wish to be involved, Mr Halden emphasising how useful the Travel Diary was. He added that many (local) surveys in England were following the lead of the SHS by covering Transport and some other topics in the same survey.

**Action: Mr Dixon to consult Dr Connolly and Mr Halden, if the need arises**

7.2 Mr Hart suggested that the SHS should ask about travel beyond Scotland. Mr Dixon said all bids for new questions in the next consultation round (likely to be in 2008) would be considered, but this kind of information may already be collected by the National Travel Survey and International Passenger Survey. Dr Connolly asked about the extent of clustering in the survey from 2007. Mr Dixon informed him that some of the sample would be clustered, but that it would be a much smaller proportion than previously. Mr Hunter emphasised the need for data at RTP level, and Mr Dixon said that this could be provided on an annual basis for the larger RTP areas.

## **8 Recent and forthcoming developments in Scottish Executive Statistics about Transport – paper TTSAC (06) 7**

8.1 Mr Dixon introduced this primarily “for information” paper, and said that if any member of the committee wished to raise any issues, they could get in touch with the relevant people. He asked if anyone had any comments at this time.

8.2 Dr Connolly drew attention to the publication of the 2006 Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation, which now has better accessibility measures than before. Mr Halden added that further development might be required, as (e.g.) access to primary/secondary schools had not been included - unlike in England, where secondary schools and further education colleges had been found to be surprisingly "inaccessible". Mr Dixon assumed that the Office of the Chief Statistician will consult interested parties before developing the next version of the index, and Dr Connolly added that he is on the Measuring Deprivation Advisory Group, and would be happy to feed in any suggestions. Mr Jarvis asked whether it was possible to look at just the accessibility strand on its own, and Dr Connolly replied that it was. Mr Halden said that, now that "accessibility" data were available, there were opportunities to make better use of them, in other areas of analysis. Mr Jarvis said that the "accessibility" data would be useful, but a big issue was the lack of Global Positioning System information: Mr Halden replied that such data did exist.

## **9 TTSAC-related ScotStat news – paper TTSAC (06) 8**

9.1 Dr Connolly said that the ScotStat Board meeting which was due to be held in the Autumn had been cancelled. He informed the committee about the business of the Board meeting in February. The main item was the ScotStat committee structure and whether it was working. Dr Connolly had told the Board that, from a TTSAC point of view, the structure was functioning well. He asked the committee if it agreed, and for suggestions for improvements to the way that TTSAC and its sub-groups worked. Several members said that they were content with the way in which TTSAC worked. There were no suggestions for improvements.

9.2 Dr Connolly asked if there were any statistical matters that members would like the ScotStat Board to discuss. The main point raised was about the links between transport and health (e.g. the health benefits of walking; access and travel to health services). Mr Short said that there was a growing need for such information, and Mr Halden referred to work done in England on travel to hospital - was similar information available for Scotland? Mrs Rodger suggested that Traveline information should be supplied with all hospital appointments, as the Traveline batch journey planner could be used to produce details of possible public transport journeys for each patient. Dr Connolly said that the key links between Transport and Health would be on the design and operation of transport links to/from hospitals, and making better use of the data to provide integrated transport. Mr Dixon confirmed that he would consult community transport policy colleagues.

**Action: Dr Connolly to raise at the ScotStat Board issues identified by members**

9.3 The Committee thanked Dr Connolly for representing it on the ScotStat Board.

## **10 Any Other Business**

10.1 Dr Connolly felt that the membership should be reviewed, in particular to try to ensure there are representatives from all the RTPs. Mr Dixon said that they had all been invited earlier in the year, but some had shown no interest; nevertheless, SE would invite them again. Mr Marchant also suggested that someone from Scottish Enterprise, such as Mary McLaughlin, should be invited to join.

**Action: Miss MacAskill to contact Scottish Enterprise and those RTPs which have not yet taken up their invitation to be represented on TTSAC**

10.2 It was agreed that the next meeting should be in about a year (Autumn 2007) and on the same day as the next TRi/TSUG seminar. In the meantime, the Committee's subgroups would meet as and when required.