



Rail Freight Meeting: 28th September 2011

Armstrong Room, Civic Centre, Newcastle

In Attendance:

Mark Wilson (Chair)	Newcastle City Council
John Bourn*	LTP Team
Councillor Ed Hodson	North Tyneside Council
James Firth	FTA
Gareth Richards	Network Rail
Terry Bye	Wilton Transport
Marin Marinov	Newrail, University of Newcastle
David Morgan	Network Rail
Andy Jameson	Sunderland City Council
Gordon Carr	CILT
Kieron Bridges	Newcastle City Council
Alan Todd	Port of Blyth
Tony Walker	Railfuture NE
Lee Davies	Railfuture NE
Peter Hayes	Aecom
Stuart Corker	Gateshead Council
Stephen Psallidas	Nexus
Mark Stephenson	NECC

Apologies:

Alasdair Kerr	Port of Tyne
John Holwell	Malcolm Group
Margaret Robinson	Northumberland County Council
Mike Page	Aecom
Matthew Hunt	Port of Sunderland
Philip Robson	Co-Op
Steve Brown	DB Schenker
Shruti Jain	Sustaine
Martin Murphy	Nectar
Tim Jackson	Freightliner
Steve Mulvey	Marks & Spencer
Tom Zunder	Newrail, University of Newcastle
Bob Donaldson	Sunderland City Council
Gordon Harrison	Nexus

* Author of note

Item	Action
<p>1 Introductions</p> <p>MW chaired the meeting, thanking everyone for attending the Tyne and Wear Rail Freight Partner Group meeting. He asked everyone to briefly introduce themselves for the benefit of the rest of the group. He announced the apologies for the non-attendance at the meeting.</p>	
<p>2 Minutes of last meeting</p> <p>The minutes of the last meeting were agreed. All outstanding actions were in the current agenda with the exception of TZ's suggestion that he could explore rail freight brokerage potential – this would be followed up with TZ.</p>	<p>TZ</p>
<p>3 Rail Freight Opportunities Questionnaire</p> <p>PH provided an update on the Rail Freight Questionnaire. The Questionnaire was to be circulated via various organisations including the FTA, RHA, CILT and through the Chamber of Commerce to maximise response rates. However no responses have yet been received. CLr Hodson stated that the LTP consultation suffered the same difficulties and it was important to try to understand how industry can be targeted more effectively.</p> <p>JF said that he had been expecting an online version of the questionnaire to be made available so they could provide a link to the questionnaire to ease dissemination and access to it.</p> <p>PH to work with Mike Page to get an electronic version of the questionnaire up and running</p> <p>GC said that he will investigate what happened with the questionnaire within the CILT and suggested publicity through the FOCUS magazine once an online version was available.</p> <p>MS confirmed that it was given out to members but also said that he would investigate what happened with the questionnaire.</p> <p>TW suggested a more direct approach, calling some of the larger retailers directly, may reap some rewards. PH to gather contact details from the group for those most likely to respond.</p>	<p>PH/MP</p> <p>GC</p> <p>MS</p> <p>PH</p>

<p>Cllr Hodson suggested that the ITA could help in dissemination of the questionnaire as well. One idea would be to send the questionnaire out with a covering letter from the ITA Chair. JB/MW to liaise with Cllr Hodson to find a way forward.</p> <p>MS, GC (as above) and JF all agreed to assist in ensuring their members are aware of the questionnaire.</p> <p>MW said in many respects this is a re-launch of the questionnaire and it should be treated as such.</p>	<p>JB/MW/Cllr Hodson</p> <p>MS/GC/JF</p>
<p>4 Development of Multi-Modal Map for strategic rail freight facilities</p> <p>PH presented a quick run through of the current Multi-Modal Map – available at www.multimodalmap.org.uk . Awareness of this map was low amongst the meeting attendees.</p> <p>The Map provides a facility for operators to view open access multimodal terminals across the UK to aid them in decisions regarding and viability of modal shift. It currently provides details of handling capabilities of terminals (Ports, Wharves, intermodal terminals) and contact details of the facilities. The map will locate the nearest terminals based on origin and destination criteria and provide an estimate of the emissions from the road, rail or sea options available.</p> <p>The Partnership is considering updating the map (operational details and contact details) and improving its current functionality to allow for more effective selection of facilities for the user. It is also proposed that a login facility is added to the site to allow capture of details of the users (interested parties), some brief fleet information and commodity types that they carry.</p> <p>The map will also contain some check boxes for operators to fill in to detail the goods they carry to further improve and ease the selection of appropriate facilities for their goods.</p> <p>It was suggested that we should ascertain current usage of the site – however, as the map is no longer maintained by the DfT and is not promoted it is expected that current usage will be low.</p> <p>The Partnership plan to host the map on its website in the new Rail Freight section to ensure that the Tyne and Wear version is the definitive version of the map.</p>	

<p>PH to send out some more details and the link for the map (see above) to the meeting attendees to get feedback on initial ideas for the map and to gather some further ideas as to its potential and possible functionality.</p> <p>AT suggested it would be good to have details on potential costs of different modes and time related information. The map currently focuses on emissions.</p> <p>MW said that the map needs to be marketed and promoted correctly in order to get the recognition it deserves. AT said he would be happy to help out.</p>	<p>PH</p>
<p>5 Development of Rail Freight Webpage</p> <p>PH provided a brief overview of the new Rail Freight web pages. For the benefit of those unfamiliar with the website, PH also provided an overview of the other resources available.</p> <p>The new Rail Freight section will contain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An introduction explaining the purpose of the Rail Freight Partner Group • Minutes of the meetings • Links to the Multi-Modal Map • Contact details for Rail Freight companies and other pertinent organisations. <p>PH highlighted that there was a knowledge network (online discussion forum) on the site that is currently poorly used. The members of the group were asked to sign-up and, where possible, post some interesting questions or comments to assist in adding interesting content to the forum that will hopefully encourage others to join.</p> <p>MW suggested that we can make it a forum to house some of the topics covered in today's meeting, including the suggestion for the group to post their ideas for the Multi-Modal Map. MW to start new thread on the forum.</p>	<p>MW</p>

<p>GR advised that Network Rail had a list of strategic rail freight sites that they keep up to date, which they could share via the website.</p> <p>There was wider discussion of the efficacy and layout of the website, and whether it should be more clearly directed at operators. JB agreed to take these views into account as the website is further developed.</p>	<p>GR</p> <p>JB</p>
<p>6 Overcoming Barriers</p> <p>MW introduced this item to discuss participation and engagement role of the ITA and LEPs.</p> <p>SP felt there was an opportunity for brokerage to build up full train loads from smaller loads. Freight train becomes viable at 10,000 tonnes.</p> <p>GR said the North East lacks feeder hubs compared to West Coast.</p> <p>AT advised they are looking at adding freight boxes to alumina trains.</p> <p>GC said there are 2 problems with brokerage options – trust and payment.</p> <p>LD added there needs to be co-operation between rail freight companies.</p> <p>AT said need to find out from operators what trains and number of paths which are not full.</p> <p>MW suggested role for this group might be to engage with various ports and operators. He suggested talking separately with Newrail to see if there is an existing operational model or something new to try.</p> <p>MM advised EC is willing to support simple wagonload operations in Europe and want to promote brokerage idea.</p> <p>ACTION – set up meeting with Newrail – explore EU funding bid.</p>	<p>JB/MM</p>

<p>MW asked if there were ways we could work more closely with the ITA and LEPs. EH said this group needs to make representations so that voice is heard. EH to take back to ITA.</p> <p>MW advised group of the constitution of the NE LEP. There had been aspirations to widen the Freight Partnership to include Northumberland and Durham, and the LEP could help with this.</p> <p>“Transport and Connectivity” is one of the LEP’s four key priorities. There is an opportunity over time to raise freight issues via the briefing papers that the LEP receives on transport.</p> <p>EH said there is potential for some overlap between NE and TV LEPs e.g. North Bank of the Tyne EZ development.</p>	
<p>7 Sources of traffic flows</p> <p>Network Rail to provide map of Strategic Freight Facilities (<i>see under Item 5 above</i>). FTA has also done work on this.</p> <p>MW said aim of Freight Partnership is to extend ‘footprint’ of freight movements to cover Teesside etc.</p> <p>DM advised recent Freight Route Utilisation Strategy documents should provide traffic information. Network Specification documents and route specification documents are next to be produced (new form of route planning) There will be 10 network specifications fitting with the devolved route MD areas as Network Rail evolves towards a more devolved organisation.</p> <p>DM said there are positive indications from Port of Tyne about growth in biomass traffic.</p> <p>DM confirmed that, as part of plan for improving ECML, Network Rail is looking to reopen the Leamside route.</p> <p>AJ said Sunderland CC are supportive of any move to reopen the Leamside line.</p>	

8 Freight Modal Choice review

GR commented biomass and waste are seen as growth areas for energy production. No funding to assist operators to establish rail connections (Freight Facilities Grants abolished), customer pays, although cheaper to refurbish existing connections. Also need to establish whether rail paths exist to serve new rail traffic.

Network Rail are looking to speed up process involved in establishing a new terminal (currently takes 1½ - 2 years). Current review of planning policy may make such procedures quicker.

9 Lorry length

There is a proposal to increase trailer length of lorries (not load length) from 16.5m to 18.25m. Weight will not increase. JF explained that operators are full to capacity and looking for more space in the trailer.

Rail Freight Group had expressed alarm about the impact on rail freight. TW was concerned about bigger lorries trying to deliver into smaller towns.

JB felt it was a relevant issue that the group should be aware of.

NOTE – the consultation closed on 21st June. Details can be found at <http://www.dft.gov.uk/consultations/dft-2011-06>.

10 AOB

AT asked about involvement of Port of Blyth in the T&WFP. MW stressed they welcomed involvement from Northumberland and Durham especially as issues like rail freight went beyond county boundaries.

Date and Venue of Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held in March 2012. Venue and exact date to be confirmed later.