

**Information Access and Compliance Team
Congestion Charging, Transport for London Transport**

Disclosure List (Pt1 CCFOI cases Jan-June 2005)

CCFOI1006

25th January 2005

1. A Copy of the Complaints procedure/policy

A copy of the leaflet outlining the official Congestion Charging complaints procedure is enclosed. Alternatively visit the following link:

<http://www.cclondon.com/complaints-procedure.shtml>

2. Number of complaints since the commencement of congestion charging

Number of complaints by phone, email or post to our customer service centre:
85,662

Number of complaints by phone, email or post to our correspondence department: 10,172

Total received complaints since Congestion Charge inception: 95,834

3. How many of the above complaints have been taken to the second and third stage and how many have been upheld?

We have only been collating details regarding complaints taken to the second and third stage since 20th August 2004. Of 1,529 complaints, 396 have been taken to the second stage and 62 have been taken to the third stage of complaints. We do not hold statistics on upheld complaints.

4. List of the different trends in complaints

The break down by complaint subjects of all calls received, taken from our Customer service centre database up until December 31st 2004, is as follows:

Appeals	594
Bailiff	164
Charge	12160
Court	248
Discount	13907
Data Protection Act	256
Enforce	203
European	
Enforcement	42
Fast Track	3558
Fleet	1374
Image	65

Incident	36
On street enforcement	135
Payments	10342
Penalty Charge Notices	11623
Refunds	4197
Represent	151
Retail	35
Rights	42
Subject Access Rights	165
Scheme	14582
Service	1774
Staff	181
Web	9277
Other	551
Grand Total	85662

Over time the number of total calls for complaints and enquiries to the call centre has reduced. The following table shows the significantly reducing numbers of calls received in on a month by month basis during 2004.

January	2952
February	2545
March	2421
April	1943
May	1847
June	1842
July	1898
August	1397
September	1428
October	1316
November	1342
December	1209

The breakdown for letters and emails received in our correspondence department is split between 3 subject areas according to the subject matter contained within the complaint. These are:

- *Strategy or Policy related* –
 - All correspondence regarding signage
 - Western extension
 - Proposals for future developments for the scheme
 - Legislation queries.

Number of items of correspondence assigned = 2,083

- *Operational: Business related* –

- Resident Accounts
- Blue Badge
- Alternative Fuel vehicles
- Fleets
- Fast Track
- Payment channels

Finance Issues e.g. lost cheques, incorrectly allocated payments.

Number of items of correspondence assigned = 1,765

□ *Operational: Enforcement related –*

- Clamping and Removal
- Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) issues
- Complaints on Statutory Declaration grounds e.g. did not get Penalty Charge Notice (PCN)
- Response to representation or response to appeals
- Potential Clone/Tampers/Ringers
- Complaint about Enforcement Telephone Reps
- Hire
- Complaints about PATAS (Parking And Traffic Appeals Service)
- Complaints about Bailiff actions

Number of items of correspondence assigned = 2,129

- Until August 2004 the above two Operations teams (Enforcement and Business) were operating under one Operations team. This team was separated into two teams in order to better address customer needs. Therefore there were a number of items were assigned to one Operations team.

Number of items of correspondence assigned = 1,024

- Amount of correspondence handled without assignment = 3,171

CCFOI1007

25th January 2005

Request:

“if you could inform me what communication, if any - and when - took place between "TfL" and the various car hire companies regarding the provision of information on the Congestion Charge to their customers”.

TfL has met with the British Vehicle Rental and Leasing Association who are the trade organisation who represent hire companies. During 2004 1 meeting was held in April to discuss issues and the Representation and Appeals manager spoke at a conference in May attended by hire companies to discuss the transfer of liability. TfL also has a service whereby hire companies can at no cost to them request “how to pay the congestion charge” leaflets.

CCFOI1008

25th January 2005

1. Number of letters sent out advising people of the Annual Charge Extension notification.
 - 6,480
2. Number of those letters printed on 2 pages with just the signature on 2 pages.
 - All of them. Transport for London's (TfL's) service provider used third-party printers (SPSL) to print and distribute the letters to customers. When the file was drafted it was a single-page file. The letter, however, was printed using a standard template, which amended the spacing and font size. This then resulted in a two-sheet letter. This was clearly an error and the process is being reviewed to ensure this does not reoccur.
3. What is your environmental policy towards the use of paper?
 - There is no official policy with regards to the use of paper as yet, although an Environmental Policy is being drafted now and should be completed in approximately two months.
 - TfL has recycling bins throughout the business for paper and there is the option to purchase recycled paper from our catalogue.

The largest element of TfL is London Underground (LU). LU guidance with regards to saving paper is as follows:

- Try to reduce the amount of stationary you order - set monthly targets (you can use environmental key performance indicators) whereby the amount ordered is cut down e.g. by 5% every month.
- When printing off work or photocopying print on both sides of the paper. (If your printers / copiers are not capable of the above, when buying new ones make sure that they can do this).
- Use e-mail and the Intranet when passing on information, documents and long pieces of work instead of printing off hard copies to distribute.
- Try not to print off e-mails; if this is necessary just print off ones that are essential.
- Try to limit anything that is printed (i.e. just print off the required pages).
- File and archive documents electronically instead of on paper wherever possible.
- Use notice-boards for information rather than sending out multiple copies or circulars.
- Re-use internal envelopes instead of using new envelopes each time you want to send out something internally

Please find attached TfL's Health, Safety and environmental policy statement.

You can also visit the following URL to read the TfL Environmental report 2004:
<http://www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/downloads/pdf/about-tfl/report-library/Environment-Report-2004.pdf>

CCFOI1010
26th January 2005

All the information is from transactions received from Congestion Charging commencement to date.

- 1. What is the average value of transaction/Sale?**
 - £7.29

- 2. What is the minimum transaction value?**
 - £2.50 is the minimum transaction charge within the scheme which is for a resident's discounted weekly charge.

- 3. What is the Maximum transaction value?**
 - £1260 is the maximum transaction charge within the scheme which is for a non-discounted annual charge.

- 4. Overall percentage of transactions paid for by:**
 - a. Cash**
 - b. Cheque**
 - c. Card**
 - d. Other**

Within the Congestion Charging database cash and cheques are logged in the same field. Here is the data relating to the payment types which outlines volume:

Channel	Payment Types	Volume	Volume (%)
Back Office (Finance)	Cash/Cheque/Postal		
	Orders/Card	69,917	0.15%
		12,855,11	
Call Centre	Card	8	27.67%
Electronic Funds	BACS	46,594	0.10%
Email	N/A	467,090	1.01%
Fax	N/A	6,471	0.01%
IVR - automated call centre	Card	2,134,380	4.60%
	Cash/Cheque/Postal		
On Street Enforcement	Orders/Card	212,378	0.46%
	Cash/Cheque/Postal		
Postal	Orders/Card	3,227,950	6.95%
	Cash/Cheque/Postal	11,259,67	
Retail	Orders/Card	3	24.24%
SMS Text	Card	6,482,291	13.95%
Web	Card	9,693,564	20.87%

- 5. Proportion of transactions in the following categories:**

Transaction Amount Categories	by Value (£)	Value (%)
<£5	799,069.44	0.24%
	154,974,705.3	
£5 - £10	4	46.82%
£10 - £20	0.00	0.00%
£20 - £50	76,665,690.92	23.16%
£50 - £100	33,422,664.66	10.10%
£100 - £250	38,720,131.05	11.70%
>£250	26,441,054.60	7.99%
	£331,023,316.	
Total Value	01	

6. Estimated percentage of payments by each method (cash, cheque, card and other) in each transaction value category:

Channel	Payment Types	Value (£)	Value (%)
Back Office (Finance)	Cash/Cheque/Postal		
	Orders/Card	627,380.00	0.19%
		64,064,106.1	
Call Centre	Card	6	18.91%
Electronic Funds	BACS	5,097,552.14	1.51%
Email	N/A	841.50	0.00003%
			0.0000001
Fax	N/A	45.00	%
IVR - automated call centre		22,558,829.5	
	Card	0	6.66%
	Cash/Cheque/Postal		
On Street Enforcement	Orders/Card	782,396.64	0.23%
	Cash/Cheque/Postal		
Postal	Orders/Card	3,227,950.00	22.36%
	Cash/Cheque/Postal	11,259,673.0	
Retail	Orders/Card	0	18.31%
SMS Text	Card	6,482,291.00	9.58%
Web	Card	9,693,564.00	22.27%

We do not store data by payment method in the database so we are unable to provide this information in the requested format.

CCFOI1011
26th January 2005

- You requested access to enforcement policies and procedures that Transport for London has adopted and relies upon in implementing the congestion charge, along with details of the relevant legislation that supports actions being taken.

The enforcement procedures are set out in the relevant legislation that supports actions being taken as follows:

1)The Road User Charging (Charges and Penalty Charges)(London) Regulations 2001 as amended [Available from HMSO <http://www.hmso.gov.uk>]

2)The Road User Charging (Enforcement and Adjudication) (London) Regulations 2001 as amended [Available from HMSO a copy is enclosed]

3)The Greater London (Central Zone) Congestion Charging Scheme Order 2004 as varied [Available via the www.tfl.gov.uk website at http://www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cclondon/cc_publications-library.shtml]

Customer information on enforcement procedures is available on the Congestion Charging website at www.Cclondon.com.

- You also requested details of any specific measures taken by Transport for London to ensure people residing outside the Greater London area are aware of the payment arrangements and in particular the deadlines for payment.

In order to reach drivers living outside the Greater London area a radio campaign covered a wide geographical area. One of the radio stations used was Invicta, which can be listened to in Canterbury. In addition a petrol pump nozzle campaign ran at petrol stations on main arterial routes in to London as well as nozzles within Greater London. These media carried a number of messages including the hours of operation, where to pay and the payment deadlines.

For drivers planning their routes on Multimap.com a directional route finder indicated if a selected route included roads in the Congestion Charging zone with a click through to the www.cclondon.com home page. This website provides information on the hours of operation, the various payment channel options available, and payment deadlines.

In addition a number of other media campaigns have been running to target drivers once they reach Greater London. Information campaigns on the payment channels and the hours of operation have run on bus shelter posters, in the Metro, and on the backs of pay and display car parking tickets. Additional posters have been running in Tube ticket halls. Literature has also been distributed via the tube stations and to businesses who have requested literature for their customers or visitors. The literature provides detailed information on how and where to pay and payment deadlines.

As drivers approach the Congestion Charging zone roadside warning signs tell the driver how many miles there are to go before they reach the boundary. In addition these road signs clearly indicate the hours of operation.

- You also asked us to advise you whether TfL is subject to the principles of Better Regulation issued by the Government's Better Regulation Task Force. You were keen to explore how TfL is currently delivering the five Principles (Proportionality, Accountability, Consistency, transparency, Targeting of Good Regulation) in your case.

The Task Force comments on the quality of existing or proposed regulation and carries out studies of particular regulatory issues. These reviews are taken forward by sub-groups of Task Force members - supported by a secretariat in the Cabinet Office - who set their own working methods and produce detailed reports. The Prime Minister has asked Ministers to respond to Task Force reports within sixty days.

To date none of the Better Regulation Task Force Reports has been directly concerned with activities that are part of TfL's remit.

- You asked for clarification of how the representations procedure differs from that of the formal appeal procedure. And specifically, whether the criteria allowed for consideration under the representation system duplicated those of the appeal system. If so, what added value does the representation process give, and how does this contribute to achieving the principles of better regulation?

The representation and appeals processes are defined in the regulations (detailed in answer to your first question) that govern Congestion Charging. To understand how they differ in detail, the regulations should be read.

By way of explanation, representations and appeals are in fact part of the same process. When a congestion charging penalty charge is received, the recipient can make a representation to Transport for London against the issue of the Penalty Charge Notice by completing the relevant section of the Penalty Charge Notice and returning it to the address given.

The representation must be made within 28 days of issue of the Penalty Charge Notice. The representation should include any relevant evidence, i.e. receipt or receipt number. If a person disagrees with the decision made when TfL has considered their representation, they are then eligible to make an appeal to an independent adjudicator. They will be provided with an Appeals Form with their Notice of Rejection that gives full details. This should be completed and sent to The Parking and Traffic Appeals Service (PATAS) who will confirm receipt and schedule a hearing date. While an appeal is outstanding Transport for London will suspend further action in respect of the PCN and await the decision of the independent Adjudicator.

The grounds for representation and appeal are the same. However, while TfL is allowed under the regulations to exercise its discretion when considering representations, the adjudicators are not permitted to exercise discretion. The adjudicators can only consider the appeal in the light of the grounds set out on the Penalty Charge Notice. The purpose of the appeals process is to ensure that TfL has followed the due process and to allow an independent party to

review whether the appellant has met the grounds for representation. Sometimes appellants provide additional evidence for their appeal. TfL receives and reviews a copy of this evidence and may decide not to contest the appeal on the basis of the new evidence received.

- You requested details of internal procedures for issuing 'Notices of Rejection' to persons whose representations have been rejected. You asked TfL to advise how these procedures might result in a period of between 8 and 11 days for delivery (hence reducing the time to make a formal appeal). You asked what provision does Transport for London make in recognition of such delays?

A representation is considered and investigated and a suitable response is drafted, this response is created and sent by first class post usually within 24 hours of being completed. (They are sent to a secure printer in an automatic batch process. They are posted out from the secure printer). This is in accordance with the regulations and civil procedure rules. These state that documents sent by first class post will be deemed to have been served on the second day after the date of posting.

TfL is therefore not responsible for any delay in postage but if applicable does allow extra days on the process. The time to make an appeal is determined in the regulations, which also include the provision for late appeals.

CCFOI/1013
27 January 2005

1. What percentage of Appeals on Congestion Penalty charges to the adjudicator are in the appellant's favour?
 - 12.8%
2. What is the cost of funding the Congestion Charge Appeals System?
 - £2,049,000 is the latest forecast for the 2004-5 financial year.
3. What percentage of people pre-pay their Congestion Charge fee more than two months in advance?
 - The total number of people that pre-pay the congestion charge fee for more than 2 months in advance is: 8,672.
 - The total number of people that have paid their congestion charge to date is 32,777,371.
 - This gives the percentage of people who pre-pay more than 2 months in advance as 0.026%.
4. Explanation as to why TfL's letter of 4 March 2004 from Coventry took 12 days to reach you:
 - Customer Services Centre records show that the letter was printed on the 4 March 2004, but may have been sent on the 5 March 2004. The 5 March 2004 was a Friday and the letter was sent 2nd Class.

TfL cannot comment on what happened to the letter after it had left TfL.

CCFOI/1016
7 February 2005

1. Workforce numbers in the helpline?
Call centre staffing levels vary according to the seasonality of call volumes however as of the 21st January the following numbers apply:
 - Total headcount including management, supervisors and administrators - 227 (131 full time & 96 part time)
 - Call handling staff - 192 (102 full time & 90 part time)
2. How many offices?
Two.
3. Location of offices (i.e. postal address).
Both are located in Coventry. The best postal address to contact is: Congestion Charging, PO Box 2985, Coventry, CV7 8ZR
4. Are you a private or public sector organisation?
TfL is a public sector organization. Call centre services have been outsourced to a private sector service provider.
5. If private, what is the name of your organisation?
The name of our service provider for call centre services is Capita Business Services Limited.
6. Educational requirements for the staff?
The minimum education requirement for a Call Centre Customer Service Representative is a GCSE grade C in Maths & English. Education levels are not necessarily an accurate indication of the suitability of a potential candidate for call centre work. Capita focus on the relevant skills of the candidate and the recruitment and selection process requires the candidate to pass a literacy test, a typing test, an assessment of group interaction and communication skills and a competency based interview focusing on team work, communication skills and flexibility.

CCFOI/1017
1 February 2005

In your request you said that there was a public perception that the traffic light phasing in London had been de-synchronised with a view to making congestion worse before the introduction of congestion charging. You also said that it was widely perceived that synchronisation had never been properly restored – and that there remained an element of ‘needless delay and congestion.’

You requested an official statement as to the current position on this matter, together with the relevant minutes of all committees concerned and a view of all the relevant correspondence to support the official position.

Freedom of Information applies to information that is held by a public authority. There has not been an official statement on the current position, and therefore I am unable to supply this. However, I hope that the information that is provided will help to answer your questions.

I enclose copies of a press release, briefing notes and meeting notes about the work that TfL did to traffic signals around the time that the Congestion Charging Scheme was introduced. You will see from these that the works were undertaken for specific reasons but that this was not for the purpose of de-synchronisation with a view to making congestion charging worse before the introduction of congestion charging.

Some of the documents do not have a date on the document itself – instead, this is in the system on which they are stored. The dates provided for these documents are as follows:

<u>Title:</u>	<u>Date:</u>
▪ Q & As for the Mayor – traffic signal changes	10/06/02
▪ Traffic light system -Rephasing of lights	04/12/02
▪ Traffic signals briefing note	19/12/02

Also provided:

- Meeting note – traffic signal timings 12/06/02
- Briefing note on signal changes 18/06/02
- Press release No. 605 (Preparations for Central London Congestion Charging Continue) 6 January 2003

If you are able to specify and identify a number of key bottlenecks where you experience excessive queues and delays, Transport for London will be happy to have a look at these in more detail for you. If you can forward these details to me in the first place, I will make sure that they are passed on.

CCFOI/1018
25 February 2005

1. What are TfL's criteria and methods for assessing the cost-effectiveness of the central London congestion charging scheme as a means of reducing congestion?
2. What are Transport for London's yardsticks for acceptable net income from congestion charging?
3. What is the current net income and are any costs un-recovered?

Here is our response to these questions:

1. Cost-effectiveness

There is no standard criterion. Schemes, and variations to schemes, are generally determined by a legal process that results in a Scheme Order or an Variation Order. These are both subject to confirmation by the Mayor.

For the more significant initiatives TfL provides the Mayor with a social cost-benefit analysis and a financial analysis. In the cost-benefit analysis an economic value is placed on impacts such as traffic delay and accidents. In the financial analysis account is taken, for example, of changes to public transport costs and to fare income.

Section 6.6 of the Second Annual Monitoring Report, which can be seen at http://www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cclondon/cc_monitoring-2nd-report.shtml has details of the estimated resource costs and social benefits of the current central London scheme.

2. Acceptable net income

Neither the Mayor nor Transport for London has a criterion for acceptable net income from a charging scheme. The prime purpose of the central London scheme is to reduce congestion.

3. Current net income and any unrecovered costs

The central London scheme became fully operational in February 2003.

TfL's Annual Report for 2003/04 refers to the net proceeds from congestion charging: in 2002/03 there was net expenditure of £58 million; in 2003/04 there was a net income of £45 million. There is expected to be a larger net income in 2004/05.

CCFOI/1020

28 February 2005

Request:

The signage that was changed by TfL following customer feedback (kindly advise the time period, and how many others were there beside myself) and negotiations with Westminster City Council (similarly all details). Together with the background discussions, extensive negotiations and all documentation relating to points made by TfL departments.

Response:

Your request has been considered under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the information you have requested is enclosed.

Regarding the time period of the sign change:

- Between the period of 24th February 2004 and 11th November 2004, TfL held discussions with Westminster City Council on this matter
- The signage change took place on Friday 5th November 2004
- We did receive other customer feedback on this matter but we have no record of these numbers

You requested all the facts regarding the signage on this matter, together with the background discussions, extensive negotiations and all documents. Enclosed is a collection of emails and files relating to discussions held between Westminster City Council and TfL.

Westminster City Council has given their consent for this information to be provided. Job titles of all people referred to in the correspondence are:

- Brian Lord – Signs and Boundary Manager, TfL Congestion Charging
 - John Clarke – Assistant Signs and Boundary Manager, TfL Congestion Charging
 - Tim Lloyd – Assistant Client Manager (Engineering), Westminster City Council
 - Martin Low – Director of Transportation, Westminster City Council
 - Rick di Paola – Senior Engineer, Hyder Consulting Ltd
 - Geoff Hilling – Principal Engineer, Hyder Consulting Ltd
- [NB: *Hyder Consulting Ltd are the detailed design and supervision consultants on Congestion Charging signing*]

CCFOI/1021
9 March 2005

Q: A copy of the agreement between TfL and Intrum Justitia and a breakdown of the number of foreign registered motorists who have been tracked down and fined since the agreement began.

The number of penalty charges that have resulted in the registered keeper being identified and a Penalty Charge Notice sent, broken down by Country, is shown in the table below. These figures cover contraventions between 17 February 2003 and 23 September 2004 and include British vehicles where liability has been transferred to foreign drivers (hire vehicles).

Austria	2825
Belgium	1143
Denmark	1492
Finland	952
Iceland	1143
Netherlands	6476
Norway	434
Portugal	2836
Sweden	593
Total In Scheme	17894

During this period, a total of 65,534 penalty charges have been incurred by foreign vehicles or British vehicles where liability has been transferred to a foreign driver. The balance of 47,640 penalty charges are either outside the European Union or are where keeper details are not available, as shown in the table below.

Australia	21
Cyprus	53
Czech Republic	222
Eire	751
Estonia	138
France	10910
Germany	19751
Hungary	1206
Italy	2000
Malaysia	11
Malta	21
Netherlands Antillies	540
Poland	57
Senegal	42
Singapore	11
Slovenia	85
Spain	10624
Switzerland	466
Turkey	720
USA	11
Total Out of Scheme	47640

Of the 65,534 penalty charges incurred by foreign vehicles or British vehicles where liability has been transferred, a total of 1,993 have been paid through Intrum Justitia or as a result of on-street enforcement action having been undertaken. The breakdown of these payments by Country is not available.

Also attached is the 'Agreement for the provision of European Debt Collection Services' with Intrum Justitia, dated 24 September 2002, and the termination letter, dated 18 November 2004, serving notice of the cancellation of the agreement.

Intrum Justitia were awarded the provision of these services following a procurement process in 2002, in which two bids were received. Regrettably the services provided have failed to meet the expectations of TfL and as a result the agreement was terminated. TfL are currently working with the second bidder, who provides these services for several local authorities, with a view to entering an agreement for the provision of these services.

TfL are also working closely with the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) with a view to implementing the findings of the VERA 2 project

recently completed that was commissioned by the European Union. Attached is an extract from an e-mail explaining the objectives of the project.

CCFOI/1022

16 March 2005

Q: congestion levels in the area of the proposed western extension of the congestion charging scheme.

I enclose for your information a document produced in December 2004 by TfL's contractor, MVA, which sets out the results of speed surveys carried out for TfL comparing levels and patterns of congestion across central and inner London.

Please note that this document was delivered to TfL as a work in progress. As a result it may contain rounding errors, and we are also aware that MVA have used more than one night-time travel rate within the document (which reflects alternative approaches to defining the most appropriate night-time travel rate). However this does not substantially affect the findings set out in the document.

In addition, I would bring to your attention an error in the legends for figures 5.1 and 5.2. In line with the preceding text, the legends should actually show the excess delay bands as 'up to 1.5 mins/km', '1.5 to 3 mins/km' and 'greater than 3 mins/km'.

CCFOI/1023

7 March 2005

b) *"Further I now request as a member of the public all statistics pertaining to similar incidents / complaints/ cases so that the public may know whether this is a situation that you should have addressed & taken steps to remedy but have deliberately chosen not to. This is a matter of public interest, as it relates to the morality of charging, & its purpose".*

Part B

Part (b) has been considered under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, and is provided below.

Regarding the statistics pertaining to similar incidents to your case, there have been since scheme start to date:

- A total of 10,809 representations rejected due to 'Wrong VRM'.
- A total of 3,281,640 PCNs issued to date.

This indicates that 0.33% of all PCNs issued have been rejected due to incidents similar to your own case.

CCFOI/1024

7 March 2005

Request:

“the number of cars that paid the congestion charge in the last calendar year, and also the number of residents that live inside the congestion zone that paid the charge at the reduce rate”.

Charge payments from the 1Jan 2004 to 31st December 2004 are as follows:

- Resident Discount payments = 211,384
- Total Charge Payments = 17,024,390
- % At resident discount rate = 1.24%

CCFOI/1025

1 April 2005

CCFOI/1026

19 April 2005

Request:

“Q: Information about the amount of people who enter the zone and how many people are issued fines. Also the revenue it generates.”

Response:

TfL has so far published a number of reports with details of the congestion charging scheme, and the reports are all available from our website www.tfl.gov.uk/cclondon. There are two main areas of interest and can be found by selecting options from the blue left-hand menu on the webpage. They are ‘Monitoring’ and ‘Publications Library’.

TfL have published the Second Annual Monitoring Report in April 2004, which set out the results of the congestion charging impacts monitoring programme. The Third Impacts report will be available on TfL’s website from April 2005 and later in the spring it will also be available in a printed version. Monitoring reports are available to download from TfL’s website on the following link www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cclondon/cc_monitoring.shtml.

Some other links that may prove useful are:

- A listing of all congestion charging publications available on TfL website
www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cclondon/cc_publications-library.shtml
- Congestion Charging facts
www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cclondon/cc_fact_sheet.shtml
- The official Congestion Charging website, inc operational information for customers
www.cclondon.com
- The Combined Services Agreement – Capita Contract
www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cclondon/cc_csa.shtml
- The Legal Framework: Congestion Charging Scheme Order
www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cclondon/cc_consolidated_scheme_order.shtml

CCFOI/1027
11 April 2005

Request:

What happens to the credit card numbers after taking payment?

Response:

I am pleased to confirm that TfL employ strict control measures to ensure that customer card details are not retained following payment. There is therefore no risk of potential fraud within this process.

TfL will receive written card details either on an original discount application form or on a Penalty Charge Notice payment slip. Having processed the transaction, the paperwork is securely packaged, stored in-house for a period of two weeks and then delivered to an archiving storage unit. It is retained there for a further two weeks prior to shredding and destruction.

An electronic image of the payment is kept indefinitely against the customer account, as legally TfL must retain such records for 7 years. Access to TfL systems is strictly limited to its employees and agents.

I trust that you will appreciate TfL has taken the necessary precautions to safeguard all customer details to minimise the opportunity for fraud and fulfilled the requirements stipulated by law. I also hope that my response will meet with your approval.

CCFOI/1029
22 April 2005

Request:

A copy of the result of the individual studies, covering the WEZ. The names of the roads on which the measurement were taken, the duration and time and date of each study.

Response:

TfL does not as such have a spreadsheet showing the names of roads surveyed together with the speeds recorded. The dataset produced by TfL's congestion surveys is essentially a second-by-second record of the distance covered along a numbered set of road links, by time period and survey run. The database holds nearly 200,000 rows of data. Rather than road names, the spreadsheet gives location co-ordinates.

Therefore the data is unfortunately not available in the format that you have requested. We are of course happy to send the full dataset if you prefer, but you indicated that this was unlikely to be helpful. However as discussed, I have attached four documents which I hope will be of assistance: a map showing the roads that were included in the survey, a paper setting out the

methodology of the MVA speed surveys, a paper explaining how results are derived from the speed survey dataset, and a document showing the column headings that are available in the database. If these documents prompt any further questions, please put your request in writing and we will seek to assist you.

I have enclosed the map showing the survey network on disc as well as hard copy, as it has proved difficult to generate a sufficiently clear paper map. Viewing the file on screen would enable you to 'zoom in' on individual roads if required. The speed survey network diagram (marked in blue) unfortunately does not always match precisely with the road map on which it has been overlaid. However I trust it is sufficiently clear for you to see which roads were surveyed.

I also mentioned that the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea commissioned a review of TfL's congestion data, which essentially audited the conclusions reported in our consultation documents. You may wish to contact them directly.

In respect of the other points you raised about the proposal for a western extension of the congestion charging scheme, I explained that TfL may be carrying out a public consultation on the proposal later this year. I would recommend that you take that opportunity to make a formal representation setting out your views on the scheme, for consideration by the Mayor of London. You may also find it helpful to review Annex B of the Report to the Mayor following consultation on the Transport Strategy Revision last year, which sets out TfL's consideration of these issues. That report is available at www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cc-ex/reports.shtml

CCFOI/1033
14 April 2005

Q: Who was the second bidder for the original tender for collecting on the congestion charges and other road traffic fines? (Foreign Registered Vehicles)

A: (by email) Further to our recent discussions about congestion charging enforcement, and your subsequent request under the Freedom of Information Act, I can confirm that a new contract was signed yesterday with Euro Parking Collection to recover debts incurred by foreign registered vehicles.

CCFOI/1034
27 April 2005

Q: Can you please let me know if there are ANY plans to increase the daily charge, and if so, to how much and when.

A: You will find information about planned increases to the daily charge on our website. The following link will take you directly to the Congestion Charging Legal Framework section:

http://www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cclondon/cc_consolidated_scheme_order.shtml

In particular you may wish to view information on:

- * Variation No. 4 Order 2004 – Confirmed by Mayor on 31st March 2005 (regarding Fleets & Residents)
- * Variation No. 5 Order 2004 – Confirmed by Mayor on 31st March 2005 (regarding an increase in charge)

CCFOI/1035
24 April 2005

A) What influence do you have over bailiffs and how do we recover bailiff charges?

Response provided by Enforcement Validation & Verification Manager:

“We have a contract with each of the Bailiffs we utilise which sets down what is required of them when enforcing Warrants of Execution. With regard to Warrants of Execution, however, these are enforceable unless revoked by the issuing Court. The Bailiffs have a responsibility to identify the respondent and enforce the Warrant of Execution.

Where obvious errors are identified TfL will withdraw the Warrants of Execution from the Bailiffs and cancel the penalty charges. A total of 25,635 have been withdrawn because of this reason. This equates to 6.5% of the total number of Warrants issued.

Transport for London do not pay the Bailiffs any money. The Bailiffs charges are recovered direct from the debtor, and are governed by legislation and the contracts in place with the Bailiffs.”

B) What is your policy for recovery of debt from foreigners and what is your success rate in recovering money from them?

Intrum Justitia were awarded the provision of these services following a procurement process in September 2002, in which two bids were received. Regrettably the services provided have failed to meet the expectations of TfL and as a result the agreement was terminated on 18 November 2004. TfL have been working with the second bidder Euro Parking Collections, who provides these services for several local authorities, and have now entered into an agreement for the provision of these services (as of April 2005).

TfL are also working closely with the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) with a view to implementing the findings of the VERA 2 (Video Enforcement for Road Authorities [2]) project recently completed that was commissioned by the European Union. Attached is an extract from an e-mail explaining the objectives of the project.

We only hold information on the recovery rate with Intrum Justitia. These figures cover contraventions between 17 February 2003 and 23 September 2004 and include British vehicles where liability has been transferred to foreign drivers (hire vehicles). The number of penalty charges that have resulted in the registered keeper being identified and a Penalty Charge Notice sent, broken down by Country, is shown in the table below.

Austria	2825
Belgium	1143
Denmark	1492
Finland	952
Iceland	1143
Netherlands	6476
Norway	434
Portugal	2836
Sweden	593
Total In Scheme	17894

During this period, a total of 65,534 penalty charges have been incurred by foreign vehicles or British vehicles where liability has been transferred to a foreign driver. The balance of 47,640 penalty charges are either outside the European Union or are where keeper details are not available, as shown in the table below.

CCFOI/1036
26 April 2005

Request:

How successful the 'Congestion Charge for London' has been since the scheme's introduction.

Response:

TfL has so far published a number of reports with details of the congestion charging scheme and it's success, and the reports are all available from our website www.tfl.gov.uk/cclondon. There are two main areas of interest and can be found by selecting options from the blue left-hand menu on the webpage. They are 'Monitoring' and 'Publications Library'.

First try viewing the reports in the Monitoring section. TfL have published the Second Annual Monitoring Report in April 2004, which set out the results of the congestion charging impacts monitoring programme. The Third Impacts report will be available on TfL's website by the end of April 2005 and later in the spring it will also be available in a printed version. Monitoring reports are available to download from TfL's website on the following link www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cclondon/cc_monitoring.shtml.

Some other links that may prove useful are:

- A listing of all congestion charging publications available on TfL website
www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cclondon/cc_publications-library.shtml
- Congestion Charging facts
www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cclondon/cc_fact_sheet.shtml
- The official Congestion Charging website, inc operational information for customers
www.cclondon.com
- The Combined Services Agreement – Capita Contract
www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cclondon/cc_csa.shtml
- The Legal Framework: Congestion Charging Scheme Order
www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cclondon/cc_consolidated_scheme_order.shtml

CCFOI/1037
7 May 2005

Request:

Please supply the names of the top 20 organisations or businesses with the highest number of fines against their name, including the number of fines and the total amount outstanding. Please indicate the amount of time for which the fines have been outstanding, and the number of vehicles involved in each case. Please exclude from the list of companies or organisations any vehicle hire or leasing firms. In addition, please state the total amount owed in unpaid congestion charges and relates fines by each company.

Response:

I regret to inform you that despite extensive research it is not possible to provide you with the information you have requested. There are a number of reasons for this:

1. In the first instance I must advise that Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) are issued to the registered keeper of the vehicle as provided by the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA). This information is heavily reliant on the accuracy and consistency of information provided by the keeper of the vehicle at initial registration or following sale / purchase. Therefore, in order to ascertain the volume and details of outstanding PCNs issued to companies TfL would need to take the following steps:
 - i. Obtain a listing of all company names and addresses in electronic format from Companies House;
 - ii. Raise a change with our Core Service Provider, Capita to match this information against the name and address of all registered keeper names and addresses of outstanding PCNs on the PCN database.

The estimated cost of undertaking such a task would is estimated to be in excess of £10,000 and would take many weeks to complete.

3. In the event that the availability of the company details and the matching exercise was much simpler and cost effective to perform it is still unlikely to provide a clear and accurate response to your request. The key reasons for this are due to the fact that a high percentage of companies will not be the registered keeper of the vehicle with the vehicle being registered to a leasing or finance company rather than the company itself. Also, even if the address of the registered keeper were to match that of a registered company, experience has shown that there will be both significant and slight differences in the keeper details provided by the DVLA and used for enforcement which would make the provision of an accurate response to your request impossible. An example would include Lloyds TSB who sometimes register their vehicles as Lloyds TSB, TSB, Lloyds Leasing, Lloyds Finance or, for that matter, the name of an individual fleet manager such as Mr Smith. Matching the data and providing an accurate response would, as I have said, be virtually impossible and, in such cases where there are named individuals, the issue of disclosing personal rather than Company details would also need to be considered in light of the Data Protection Act.

CCFOI/1038
22 April 2005

1. *Do you hold information in relation to Complaints Received in respect of 'ignorance' of how to pay the congestion charge?*

No. We do not hold statistics in the category of 'ignorance' of how to pay the charged. Enclosed is a list showing all the categories of complaint enquiry types we do use.

2. *Request for information in relation to:*

- a) *Numbers of complaints received between the scheme's implementation and 31 December 2004*

From 16th February 2003 to 31st December 2004 there were 75,558 complaints received.

- b) *Percentage of those complaints that were related to 'Ignorance of the methods of payment'*

We do not hold any information about 'ignorance of payment methods'.

- c) *Numbers of complaints received between 1st January 2005 and 17th March 2005. The number of complaints received is 3,622*

3. *Request further:*

- a) *A copy of the 'communication strategy' that supported implementation of the scheme*

- b) *Quantifiable and authentic evidence to support the claim beyond reasonable doubt that 'Transport for London' has indeed made every reasonable effort to communicate in an appropriate matter, to anyone who may be driving into London, how to pay the charge*

The information on these points is still being collated. It will be emailed to you by the 29th April 2005.

Enquiry Code	Description	When Used
E01	Appeals	A call relating to a appeal where PATAS are involved
E02	Bailiff	A call relating to a bailiffs case
E03	Bomb Alert	Caller contacts us with a bomb warning
E05	Charge	A call where a charge has been purchased
E06	Court	Call made relating to possible court action
E07	Discount	Relating to discount registrations Where advice is given in relation to making a written request for info under the
E08	DPA	Data Protection Act
E09	Enforce	Call relating to Enforcement
E10	Euro Enf	Call relating to EDRA
E11	Fast Track	Used when registering a customer
E12	Fleet	Fleet call information sent out
E13	Image	A call is made where an image has been requested A call is made regarding an incident or diversion into the zone
E14	Incident	Call relating to on street enforcement i.e. a vehicle
E16	On street	has been clamped
E17	Other TfL	Selected Partner queries
E18	Payments	A call where a PCN payment has been made
E19	PCN	Enquiry regarding PCN
E20	Refunds	Refund query or request. A call received where caller has queried
E22	Represent	representation process
E23	Retail	Enquiry in relation to retail outlets Where advice is given in relation to making a written request for info under the Freedom of
E24	Rights	Information Act
E25	SAR	Caller is requesting information regarding themselves
E26	Scheme	Enquiry about scheme or info pack
E27	Service	Enquiry relating to service
E28	Staff	Where a complaint is made about staff
E30	Web	Enquiry regarding cclondon website

CCFOI1039
6 April 2005

Q: The name and contact details for the company who supply the camera system for the Congestion Charge Zone.

A: CRS (Computer Recognition systems).

Fishponds close
Wokingham
Berks
RG41 2QA
Tel: 0118 979 2077
www.crs-vision.com

CCFOI/1040
7 May 2005

1. *How many instances have there been of undisputed (by TFL) failure on the part of TFL to correctly register the registration mark or other details of vehicles.*
 - a. *Entitled to a discount on or total exemption from payment of the congestion charge.*
 - b. *Where the charge has been correctly and timeously paid.*

2. *In such instances under 1a and 1b above state the number of :*
 - a. *Refunds made of penalties demanded and paid.*
 - b. *Penalties demanded but not paid then waived by TFL.*
 - c. *Instances where additional compensatory payments have been made by TFL.*
 - d. *The highest and lowest amounts respectively of such compensation.*

Your request has been considered under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the information below covers the period of congestion charging (CC) from the **1 December 2003 to 31 March 2005**. *Information has not been captured prior to 1 December 2003 for the types of data that you have requested.*

Question 1.

There have been 13,578 cases of failure of TFL to correctly register vehicles details. These cases can be broken down by the following reasons.

1a – Entitled to a discount on or total exemption from payment of congestion charge

Non-discounted and discounted vehicles - Reasons	Number
VRM MISMATCH - Account Registration Error	1911
VRM MISMATCH – Call Centre Charge Error	1954
VRM MISMATCH - Post Charge Error	187

Discounted vehicles only - Reasons	Number
BLUE BADGE - Account Registration Error	4101
BLUE BADGE – Call Centre Nomination Error	2321
DISC VRM MISMATCH – Account Registration Error	1387

1b - Where charge has been correctly and timeously paid

Charge paid - Reasons	Number
------------------------------	---------------

VALID RECEIPT NOT ON SYSTEM	1494
SMS UNAVAILABLE	223

Question 2.

You also requested details on refunds, penalties waived by TFL (2a) and compensatory payments (2c and 2d).

2a – Refunds made on penalties paid

TFL does not hold information on refunds of penalties broken down by the categories that you have specified.

2b - Penalties demanded but not paid then waived by TFL.

There have been 6,491 PCNs cancelled by TFL from 1 December 2003 to 31 March 2005. These cancellations can be broken down by the following reasons.

Non-discounted and discounted vehicles - reasons	Number
VRM MISMATCH - Account Registration Error	1907
VRM MISMATCH – Call Centre Charge Error	1274
VRM MISMATCH - Post Charge Error	184

Penalties waved by TFL - discounted vehicles only	
BLUE BADGE - Account Registration Error	962
BLUE BADGE – Call Centre Nomination Error	357
DISC VRM MISMATCH - Account Registration Error	1143

Penalties waved by TFL – charges paid	Number
VALID RECEIPT NOT ON SYSTEM	536
SMS UNAVAILABLE	128

2c – Instances where additional compensatory payments have been made by TFL.

TfL does not hold information on this matter in the format you have requested. TFL tracks the volumes and values of compensatory or goodwill payments, but such analysis is at a high level and not directly tied to specific discounts or charge payments.

2d - The highest and lowest amounts respectively of such compensation.

Again, TfL does not hold information in the format you have requested, please refer to our response for 2c.

**CCFOI/1041
16 May 2005**

Q: I would like all the correspondence between yourself (Susan Milnes - Congestion Charging Data Protection & FOI Mgr) and the FOI Team regarding the advice sought on the use of blanket exemptions for requests on congestion charging. I have reason to believe that you have sought advice from the FOI team on the possible use of exemptions on test cases even before Jan 2005.

A: We have conducted a search of our files and there is no correspondence which falls within the scope of your request.

TfL's policy on the use of exemptions is outlined in the TfL FOI Handbook. I understand that you have already been supplied with a copy of this in a separate request to TfL. Please see Guidance Paper F 'Exemptions' in the handbook. TfL treats each individual request on its merits. It is a case by case application, rather than a 'blanket approach'. This means that in any request for information, an individual assessment is made about whether an exemption applies. The circumstances prevailing at the time of the request will be taken into account

**TfL/1042
6 May 2005**

*Q: (a.) the number of cars with foreign number plates whose owners have failed to pay the congestion charge
(b.) the number of owners of cars with foreign number plates who have been fined for failing to pay the congestion charge
(c.) the number of owners of cars with foreign number plates who have been prosecuted for failing to pay the congestion charge*

A: The number of penalty charges that have resulted in the registered keeper being identified and a Penalty Charge Notice sent, broken down by Country, is shown in the table on the next page. These figures cover contraventions between 17 February 2003 and 23 September 2004 and include British vehicles where liability has been transferred to foreign drivers (hire vehicles).

Austria	2825
Belgium	1143
Denmark	1492
Finland	952
Iceland	1143
Netherlands	6476
Norway	434
Portugal	2836
Sweden	593
Total In Scheme	17894

During this period, a total of 65,534 penalty charges have been incurred by foreign vehicles or British vehicles where liability has been transferred to a foreign driver. The balance of 47,640 penalty charges are either outside the European Union or are where keeper details are not available, as shown in the table below.

Australia	21
Cyprus	53
Czech Republic	222
Eire	751
Estonia	138
France	10910
Germany	19751
Hungary	1206
Italy	2000
Malaysia	11
Malta	21
Netherlands Antillies	540
Poland	57
Senegal	42
Singapore	11
Slovenia	85
Spain	10624
Switzerland	466
Turkey	720
USA	11
Total Out of Scheme	47640

Of the 65,534 penalty charges incurred by foreign vehicles or British vehicles where liability has been transferred, a total of 1,993 have been paid through Intrum Justitia or as a result of on-street enforcement action having been undertaken. The breakdown of these payments by Country is not available.

CCFOI/1043
16 May 2005

Q: A request for Congestion Charge camera footage. In particular, from the cameras at the junction of Shoreditch High Street, Bishopsgate and Commercial Street between the hours of 0100 and 0400 on Saturday 23 April 2005.

A: Unfortunately TfL does not hold any footage that falls within the scope of your request. Please follow this link to a copy of our camera system leaflet which explains more about how our cameras are operated; <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/downloads/pdf/congestion-charging/cam-system.pdf> .

The Congestion Charging Cameras capture still images of vehicles during the hours between 7am and 6:30pm, Monday to Friday. Of the images captured only those that have not paid the daily charge are retained; the remainder are deleted the following day.

CFFOI/1044
25 May 2005

Q: I totally refute your statement about a period of time for payment adding unnecessary expenses to the project. Not only is this a necessary feature, it is inexcusable for you to have omitted it.

I have over 20 years working in delivering complex IT systems and I would be frankly ashamed to have built a system with the limitations you describe, unless they had been specifically requested by the customer (TfL in this case).

Please explain to me how, under the facilities of the "Freedom of Information Act", I may gain access to the requirements documentation and specifications from TfL towards the contractor covering this feature. I am most interested to get to the bottom of whether such a feature would have added significant cost to the project or whether TfL specifically requested such an aggressive deadline for payment to extract fines from honest citizens.

I have spoken with one of your customer service representatives, who told me, "many, many people are fined because they forget to pay when they get home and try to pay the next day". Clearly, you are more interested in extorting maximum revenue than making a fair levy.

A: Your e-mail to Anne Williamson of 24 April has been passed to me, as Customer Services Manager, for reply. I would first like to apologize for the delay in my response. Although you have mentioned the Freedom of Information Act, I'm happy to respond to your query without reference to that process.

You are correct, the IT systems requiring motorists to pay on the day of travel was a requirement of Transport for London (TfL). Although the letter you received from Mr Sporton is accurate, in that there would be additional costs and complexities involved in allowing drivers to pay the following day, that is not the only reason payment is required by midnight on the day of travel.

The Central London Scheme Order, the legal framework which under which TfL operates Congestion Charging, is clear that motorists must pay the Congestion Charge on the day of travel. The scheme order is published on TfL's website, www.tfl.gov.uk should you wish to review it. Therefore, TfL's requirements for system development were designed in line with the Scheme Order.

As Mr Sporton mentions, Congestion Charging operations are subject to review. Should a variation to the Scheme Order be made such that payment of the charge the following day is allowed, we will, of course, modify our IT systems to allow such payments.

I hope my response answers your query, and explains why our systems are designed as they are.

CCFOI/1045
26 May 2005

Q: Would like to know when our consultative documents were sent out regarding the increase in CC and who/where they were sent to.

A: As you are aware, following public consultation, the Mayor of London Ken Livingstone, has confirmed an increase in the congestion charge from £5 to £8. The charge increase will be effective from 4 July 2005.

The consultation on the variation orders to the scheme commenced on 7 December 2004 and concluded on 28 February 2005. An additional 2 weeks was allowed for representations and objections as the period ran over the Christmas holiday period. Representations and objections could be made via e-mail or in writing.

To publicise the consultations, full consultation information on the proposed Variation Orders were posted on the TfL website, and deposited at TfL's Faith Lawson House for public inspection. The notice announcing the making of the Variation Order was published in the London Gazette and the Evening Standard. Further notices were published in the Evening Standard on 13 December, 12 & 24 January and 7 & 14th February. An editorial was published on the TfL page of the Metro on 6 December (circulation 500,000 approx.).

Moreover, in order to enhance participation in the consultation for Variation Order No. 5, additional advertisements were placed in the Evening Standard, Evening Standard Lite (circulation 55,000 approx.) on 12 & 24 January 2005 and 7 & 14 February 2005 and Metro on 12 & 25 January 2005 and 8 & 15 February 2005.

Furthermore, a consultation pack was sent to over 750 stakeholders for Variation Order No. 5 (Charge Increase) including each of the 33 London

Boroughs, London Assembly Members (25), TfL Board members (16), London MPs (73) and London MEPs (10). Consultation packs were also sent to the following stakeholder organisations under the categories of:

- Bus & Coach Operators (23)
- Business Representative Groups (36)
- Central Government Departments (23)
- Cycling/Pedestrian Organisations (5)
- Disability/Mobility Groups (40)
- Economic/Regeneration Partnerships (28)
- Embassies/Diplomatic Missions (84)
- Emergency Services (9)
- Local Authorities Surrounding Greater London (14)
- Organisations Representing the Interests of Ethnic Minorities (64)
- European Government (1)
- Organisations Representing the Interests of Faith Groups (17)
- Freight/Haulage Representative Organisations (2),
- GLA Functional Bodies & Mayoral Commissions (8),
- Organisations Representing the Interests of Gay/Lesbian Groups (5)
- Health Organisations (3)
- Local Government Associations (2)
- Organisations Representing the Interests of the Low Paid/Job Seekers (2)
- Motoring Organisations (11)
- NHS Trusts/Health Authorities in Greater London (80)
- Non Departmental Government Bodies/Executive Agencies (8)
- Organisations Representing the Interests of Older People (14)
- Professional Organisations (11)
- Taxi/Minicab Organisations (8)
- Trade Associations (7)
- Trade Unions (21)
- Train Operators (26)
- Transport & Environment Campaign/Pressure groups (21)
- Transport Partnerships (2)
- Utilities (7)
- Organisations Representing the Interests of the Voluntary/Community Sector (14)
- Organisations Representing the Interests of Women (15).

Some 1700 companies and organisations that are registered with TfL's Congestion Charging Fleet Schemes were also sent a consultation pack.

The consultation pack consisted of a covering letter advising recipients of the Variation Orders and how to respond to the consultation, a copy of the Variation Order itself, a schedule of proposed variations that explains TfL's reasons for the variation, and the consolidated Scheme Order. TfL also produced and enclosed a Supplementary Information note that set out in

some detail the projected impacts, benefits and operational issues associated with the proposed increase to the congestion charge.

For further information on the decision, including TfL's report on the public consultation, please visit www.tfl.gov.uk/congestioncharging.

CCFOI/1046
18 May 2005

Q: Provide the dates and meeting at which comments were mentioned to increase the CC. Also provide any documents held within the GLA from the period 1 March 2004 to 10 June 2004 which detail any mention of increasing the charge to £8.

A: I can confirm that there are no documents held within TfL from the period of 1 March 2004 to 10 June 2004 regarding information about an increase to the Congestion Charge to £8.

CCFOI/1047
16 May 2005

Q: Request to obtain a list of all restaurants/bars and convenience stores within the Congestion Charge

A: The sample for the TfL congestion charging business survey conducted in 2004 was drawn from the Dun and Bradstreet database of businesses. This is a commercial database containing individual records for most businesses and workplaces in the UK.

The database is generated from Companies House and Thomson Directories and is subject to continuous updating through telephone contact. The database includes business addresses and this is how businesses located inside or outside the charging zone were identified. The Dun and Bradstreet database contains 65,000 records for businesses in the zone.

Our Third Annual Impacts Monitoring report (April 2005) has recently been published on our website. Section 6, page 68 onwards contains information on business and economic impact. Please follow this link to view the report online: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cclondon/pdfs/ThirdAnnualReportFinal.pdf>.

CCFOI/1049
31 May 2005

Q: 1) full documentation to support the assertion that TfL is legally prevented from paying compensation for maladministration (2) Full details of internal correspondence, emails, discussions, and any other information/records etc relating to this case [SIC] (4) Full details of other cases where payments have been lost in your system

A: 1) Full documentation to support your assertion that TfL is legally prevented from paying compensation for mal-administration

TfL is not legally prevented from paying compensation, however TfL's position on making such payments is as follows: The Central London Congestion Charging Consolidated Scheme Order is the legal framework that establishes Transport for London's (TfL's) powers to operate a Congestion Charging scheme in London and to levy charges. The document is able to be viewed on TfL's website www.tfl.gov.uk at the following URL: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/downloads/pdf/congestion-charging/tfl-consolidated-scheme-order-01112004.pdf>.

The Scheme Order states that all the net revenues generated from the scheme will be invested in transport in London for at least ten years. You will appreciate that any detraction from the net revenues will impact upon the transport investments that the Scheme can deliver.

Paragraph 16 of Schedule 23 to the Greater London Authority Act 1999 provides that the net proceeds of such a scheme as congestion charging shall only be available for application to relevant transport purposes; details of which can be found in Annex 4 to the Greater London (Central Zone) Congestion Charging Scheme Order 2004.

Congestion charging has a published complaints procedure in place, with customers' having the opportunity to raise their complaint ultimately with the Local Government Ombudsman.

Only in exceptional circumstances do TfL grant discretionary good-will payments, for example to customers who have experienced undue distress in resolving an issue or where an issue has taken an undue length of time to resolve. A goodwill gesture does not entail liability or fault. The decision to do so and the amounts granted always take into account the fact that net revenues from the Scheme are legally bound to be reinvested in Transport in London.

Any proceedings issued against TfL in relation to congestion charging will be passed to TfL's Legal Affairs Department and are dealt with appropriately through the County Courts.

2) Full details of internal correspondence, emails, discussions and any other information/records etc relating to this case.

Copies of correspondence and CSR notes will be provided shortly. If you've not received anything by Tuesday 7 June 2005, please contact me on the details at the foot of this letter.

4) Full details of other cases where payments have been lost in your system

Unfortunately we can not provide you with this information because we do not hold it.

CCFOI/1050
24 May 2005

***Question 2.** The document you refer to in your reply does not contain any data to show that traffic levels are rising. It estimates the impact that TfL perceive will happen as a result of the increase to £8. I therefore ask again for you to provide evidence that traffic levels are rising since the charge was introduced in 2003.*

Your original request was for information to support the statement that "TfL estimate that with a proposed charge of £8, the number of vehicle movements coming into the charging zone during charging hours by vehicles with four or more wheels would decline by an additional 3% to 7%". The link to this information was supplied with our previous reply (ref: CRU42500).

You now ask to provide evidence that traffic levels are rising. TfL has made no such claim. The latest details on traffic levels can be obtained from TfL's Third Annual Monitoring Report (dated April 2005), which is available from http://www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cclondon/cc_monitoring.shtml.

***Question 6.** 'The value of the congestion charge is eroded over time by inflation and incomes growth.' You are proposing a 60% increase. I am not aware that the vast majority of users have seen their incomes grow by 60% over the past two years nor is the rate of inflation running at 60%.*

Again, we note your opinion. The increase to the congestion charge was not solely based on inflation. The proposed increase would exceed the expected rate of inflation, and other external economic factors, however, the proposals are intended:

- to maintain and build upon the benefits of the congestion charging scheme
- to support new investment on measures to further reduce traffic congestion
- to support new investment on the wider objectives of the Mayor's Transport Strategy

This point is covered in more detail in Appendix 1 of the Report to the Mayor available from the following link:

http://www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/downloads/pdf/congestion-charging/v05/VO5_RTM_Appendix1.pdf

CCFOI/1051

3 June 2005

1) *The number of complaints made against TfL/ Capita for incorrect PCN and other charges being made?*

The number of complaints from 17/02/03 (scheme start) until 28/04/05 are as follows:

<u>Complaint Reason</u>	<u>Total</u>
Payments:	11,216

A daily breakdown is attached.

Please note that this figure includes all complaints marked as 'payment related' by the Customer Service Representative (CSR) dealing with the query. We do not have information as to whether the complaint was about a PCN or other type of payment, or the specific nature of the complaint.

2) *The Number of Cases that were settled and in whose favour at*

a) stage 1 of the TfL complaints process

Unfortunately we cannot provide you with this information because we do not hold it.

b) stage 2 and c) stage 3

Correspondence Reason	Amount
Boundary Didn't Enter Zone	4
Boundary Entered Outside Charging Hours	1
Boundary Forced/Diverted Into Zone	9
Not the Keeper Clone/Tamper/Ringer	4
Not the Keeper Never the Keeper	8
Not the Keeper Sold the Vehicle	6
Paid/Attempted to Pay Call Centre	20
Paid/Attempted to Pay Metric	11
Paid/Attempted to Pay Paypoint	10
Paid/Attempted to Pay Postal	4
Paid/Attempted to Pay SMS	13

Paid/Attempted to Pay Web	20
Total	110

d) *As a result of any other form of arbitration:*

Local Government Ombudsman

Since November 2004 to date, a total of 57 cases have been referred to the Local Government Ombudsman. To date, 52 cases are closed and the remaining five that are live were received in May 2005.

PATAS

As at 22/05/05 the amount of allowed and refused appeals stands, 11630 appeals have been allowed (found in the appellant's favour) and 26910 have been refused (found in TfL's favour).

Legal action (small claims):

As at 19/05/05 the total number of legal challenges against TfL in relation to congestion charging is 78. 73 of these relate to small claims litigation, 1 to High Court Litigation and 4 to injunctions against TfL.

3) *Number of cases in which compensation was paid to complainants and total amount paid for each of the above (a-d)*

The refund tracking currently undertaken does not capture the stage of the complaints process when the payment was made. The volume and value of ad hoc PCN refunds (including bailiff fees) made as a result of a complaint or enquiry responded to by TfL is set out in the table below. These figures represent the total refund made, including any PCN charge, bailiff fees and any additional goodwill payment.

Month	Total Refunds (£)	Refunds (Volume)
Jun-04	2194.12	6
Jul-04	998.15	3
Aug-04	1430.17	6
Sep-04	697.17	5
Oct-04	4108.97	9
Nov-04	3899.39	13
Dec-04	1622.79	3
Jan-05	5671.78	13
Feb-05	903.16	3
Mar-05	1725.29	4
TOTAL	23250.99	65

4) *If or where no compensation was paid where a complaint was upheld, what other form of redress was made?*

- TfL will acknowledge where a mistake has occurred and will issue an apology to customers where a complaint is substantiated and a customer has been inconvenienced as a consequence.
- TfL will issue refunds to customers where appropriate where the claim is both substantiated and qualified. A refund is intended to reimburse a customer for an actual financial loss suffered and to return to the customer

something that is theirs by right and set out within the Congestion Charging Scheme Order.

- In extreme cases, TfL will at our discretion offer gestures of goodwill, where the claim is substantiated and where the complainant has clearly suffered undue distress or inconvenience. In some cases, a goodwill gesture will be made where it has not been possible to substantiate the complaint but where it is judged that the complainant has suffered distress or inconvenience. A gesture of goodwill does not imply liability or fault.

5) *The Total Amount paid to capita for administering the Congestion Charge.* Capita have been paid the following amounts for administering the Congestion Charging scheme to 31 March 2005.

2002/03	£12,413,791
2003/04	£71,805,350
2004/05	£67,231,408
Total	£151,450,549

6) *The total amount levied in fines and other penalties levied against Capita for poor performance/ failure to meet targets/ etc. Also to whom such fines, charges were paid and for what these funds were used?*

We are unable to supply this information at present; however we will supply it to you as soon as possible and in any event by 17 June 2005. Please accept my apologies for this delay.

CCFOI/1052
7 June 2005

1. *How much of the congestion charge is taken in payments to the operator of the system and if anyone audits and independently publishes such a figure?*

There are many service providers who provide different aspects of operating the scheme. These include, but are not limited to, the operational activities such as the core services (call centre, data processing and finance and so forth), enforcement services, appeals services, maintenance services and communications services. In addition costs for the scheme include TfL staff and TfL lead activities, such as monitoring, which are carried out for the scheme. The provisional scheme revenues for the financial year 2004 to 2005 were approximately £190 million and costs for operating the scheme of approximately £92 million. All TfL accounts are subject to audit in accordance with standard financial procedures. There is no other independent presentation of this information.

2. *What legal rights the mayor has to raise the congestion charge by two thirds?*

The legal documentation regarding the Central London Congestion Charging Scheme can be found on the TfL website on the 'Congestion Charging Legal Framework' page;

http://www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/cclondon/cc_consolidated_scheme_order.shtml#order_four. The Greater London (Central Zone) Congestion Charging Order 2004 ('the consolidated Scheme Order') provides the legal framework for the congestion charging scheme. Variation Order No. 5 contains all the information relating to the increase in the daily charge.

CCFOI/1053

25 May 2005

Q: Follow up Request from CRU/42907: I feel it is disgracefull to charge people to drive on British roads that we have paid road tax for to the DVLA, is there any way (asking under Freedom of Information) so that we can expect any foreigners who hire a car to pay the same, at hertz etc, how do they pay?

A: Foreigners pay the charge in exactly the same way as other charge payers via any of the payment channels available. If they are hiring the car then unless the Hire Company has advised that the cost of the hire includes payment of the congestion charge then it is the individuals responsibility to pay the charge.

We hold very little information regarding hire vehicles as this is dealt with in the agreement between the hire company and hirer.

In terms of awareness, TfL have undertaken a very comprehensive traffic management and signage strategy. This strategy seeks to ensure that all drivers will be aware of the Congestion Charging Zone as they drive towards and around central London. Over 1,000 traffic signs have been installed on the main radial approach roads, around the zone boundary, and within the zone itself. In addition, over 300 very visible road markings showing the charging zone symbol were laid at the zone boundary. All major roads into central London have signs informing drivers of the operational times and rate of charge (£5) for driving in the charging zone and this signage strategy was agreed with the Department for Transport.

Additionally, the scheme has been extensively publicised, and as far as how to pay is concerned the very extensive multi - media pre - launch public campaign and media interest has been enhanced by further public information campaigns aimed at infrequent drivers via the radio, petrol pump adverts, posters, leaflets at tube stations, Eurotunnel, hotels etc. In addition, full information is available via our website <http://www.cclondon.com> or call centre (08459001234), both of which are easy to find via directory enquiries or web searches.

Our only obligation is to erect traffic signs at the points where vehicles enter or leave the Congestion Charging Zone. These signs are regulatory signs, authorised by the Department for Transport, and support the Scheme Order: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/downloads/pdf/congestion-charging/tfl-consolidated->

[scheme-order-01112004.pdf](#). All other traffic signs and road markings in Authorisation are non-regulatory and have been provided by TfL to inform motorists that they are approaching or driving within the Congestion Charging Zone.

The type, size, layout and information content of the signs were agreed with the Department of Transport. The regulations covering this issue are the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002.

It remains the responsibility of any motorist to familiarise themselves with the regulatory road signs and this includes Congestion Charging and signs, which indicate the entrance to, and exits from the Congestion Zone and all motorists must comply with the regulations as with any traffic violation.

Info on the web: Our website outlines that certain vehicles are exempt or entitled to a 100% discount, visit <http://www.cclondon.com/exemptions.shtml>. These include:

- Motorbikes (and sidecars), mopeds and bicycles
- London licensed Black cabs
- London licensed mini-cabs
- Emergency services vehicles
- NHS vehicles that are exempt from vehicle excise duty
- Vehicles used by disabled persons that are exempt from vehicle excise duty
- Disabled passenger carrying vehicles (e.g. Dial-A-Ride) exempt from vehicle excise duty
- Public Service Vehicles with 9 or more seats licensed as a buses

Our website is also specific that if your vehicle is not eligible for exemption or a 100% discount the relevant daily charge should be purchased. If in any doubt individuals are also advised to contact us through our call centre (Tel: 0845 900 1234) or via email via the "Contact Us" section of the website. In addition our website points out that if you are a tourist or visitor to London on a tourist or educational trip and are using a private vehicle (including a hire car) in the charging zone during the hours of operation (and are not eligible for a specific exemption or 100% discount) you will have to pay. Furthermore there is information on the website about how TfL enforces against foreign vehicles that haven't paid the Congestion Charge. Please view our question and answer section, searching 'all' topics and using 'foreign' as the keyword; http://www.cclondon.com/infosearch/dynamicPages/WF_Questionsanswers_w.aspx

CCFOI/1054
9 June 2005

- 1. If the traffic has been diverted by the police into the congestion charging zone due to a road traffic accident, how do you coordinate with the police to get the details?**

Transport for London (TfL) has a department called the London Traffic Control Centre (LTCC). This department forms the central operations hub of TfL's Traffic Management, and constantly monitors traffic and co-ordinates responses to traffic congestion, 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

The process of managing disruption has four main stages:

- The Information Desk collates intelligence on actual or potential congestion from many sources, including bus drivers, police and the Transport for London call centre.
- Area Monitors combine this intelligence with their monitoring of some 1,000 CCTV inputs to decide upon and initiate appropriate action, such as signal re-timing.
- Where intervention is appropriate, police Area Traffic Control (ATC) assigns traffic wardens and police officers to provide on-scene traffic management and where necessary alerts emergency services.
- The Traffic Update Desk provides information to the public, media and motoring organisations, for example on the Internet and through Variable Message Signs on the roadside.

2. Do police inform you of the diversion caused by an accident?

See above, however this depends on the scale of the incident/accident. The Police and emergency services are aware of the need to feed information through to the LTCC however it has been known for the police and or other emergency services to deal with the incident without notifying the LTCC of it.

3. If the police or any member of the public informs you about the diversion of the traffic caused by a road accident how do you confirm whether or not information provided is correct?

With regards to the Police see response to question 2.

Enquiries/issues raised by the general public with Transport for London, are referred to the LTCC who use its contact network system through the Police/emergency services to identify any diversions that have not already been reported by them to the LTCC. Generally speaking this requires either an incident or CAD number (Computer Aided Dispatch number, basically a police reference) to be provided and the relevant Police station details to be provided to assist in verification. However the information recorded for any incident may vary from each station and therefore can limit the verification of any or the exact details of any incident.

4. If information is correct how do you ensure that the information is available for the representation officers to deal with any representation?

When an enquiry is raised with TfL it is passed through to the LTCC for investigation and response (see question 3). When the result is known the information is distributed throughout the TfL network for use by relevant departments who would require verification of the incident, this can then be utilised and considered in the processing of representations where this may be stated as a reason the relevant contravention.

5. The diversion is caused by a road accident do you still issue the PCN to the vehicles entering the Congestion Charge Zone from that particular street?

This depends upon whether the diversion is reported to the LTCC during the course of the day. If the LTCC receive notification of the diversion during the relevant day, they notify the relevant departments in TfL of the diversion so that the information can be utilised accordingly. This may mean that cameras along any diversionary route can be turned off to prevent any image capture or if notified by 8.00pm on the day any images captured by affected cameras during the diversionary period can be deleted to prevent any unnecessary PCNs being issued. This information is then stored and used in the consideration of any representations.

If the diversion is not notified to the LTCC then PCNs will be issued as normal. However, TfL monitors representations and those which state that there has been a diversion that may have caused the contravention. TfL uses the information presented and seeks to verify any diversions which have not been notified and need to be considered. See further the response to question 4.

6. If you still issue the PCN to such vehicles entering the Congestion Charge Zone due to an emergency diversion imposed by the police do you take this as an opportunity to make some extra revenue?

No. It is TfL policy to validate any diversions, and dependent on a number of factors such as the circumstances of the diversion and the route that drivers were required to take, (for instance drivers who deviate from a signed diversionary route are unlikely to have PCNs cancelled), and then consideration is given to the validity of all PCNs issued. These may be cancelled immediately, or not at all or accepted when representations are made against the PCN.

7. If the traffic is diverted into the Congestion Charge Zone by the police, why do you issue the PCN to the vehicle entering into the zone from effected entry point?

See answers to questions 3,4,5 and 6. The issue of a PCN may not always be governed by the entry point to the zone particularly where a driver deviates from a signed diversion and exits the zone at another location see response to question 5.

8. How many PCNs were issued to the traffic that entered into Victoria Street from Victoria Station end on April 14th 2005 between 0700 and 0730?

There were 45 PCNs issued to traffic entering Victoria Street from the Victoria Station end between on April 14 between 0700 and 0730.

The LTCC were not informed of this diversion until 19 May 2005 after further investigations were undertaken by them. Accordingly any vehicles that were diverted as a result of this incident would have received a PCN and should have challenged the PCN through the Representation and Appeal process.

9. Did you contact the Belgravia Police Station to confirm whether or not there was any diversion

We did not contact Belgravia Police. The reasons are explained in previous and following answers.

10.If it was confirmed that there was a diversion due to an accident, did you cancel all the PCNs?

Whilst TfL does have a policy and process to consider the cancellation of PCNs this needs to be considered in relation to the answers to questions 2,3,4,5, and 6. The cancellation of PCN incurred as a result of a diversion needs careful consideration and may depend on the specific details of the diversion, whether vehicles were actually diverted into the zone, the route taken by drivers, i.e. did they stick to signed diversion routes, when the diversion was notified to TfL for consideration in representation processing and could also require considering the specific times of the incident, for example motorists may have already passed an incident or used alternative routes before the diversion was in place therefore they may still get a PCN.

11.If not why not?

See question 10.

12.How many of these PCNs have already been paid?

Unfortunately we cannot provide you with this information because we do not hold it.

13. If you have not refunded the money, why not?

TfL's process and systems that are in place mean that where any PCN is cancelled any monies paid against that PCN are automatically refunded. Where a PCN is not automatically cancelled the motorist does have the right to challenge the PCN through the representation and appeals process and again any representation or appeal that is accepted after a PCN has been paid again automatically generates a refund.

CCFOI/1057
9 June 2005

Q: Concerns Press Centre Press Release on 6th May 05: (1) It is stated in the above that there would be 10-14% less traffic within the zone during charging hours and that a vehicle making a journey into and back out of the extended zone would typically save 5 minutes. May we have the detailed calculations on which both the 10-14% and 5 minute figures are based. (2) It is stated that congestion in the extended zone would be reduced by 15-20%. May we have the detailed calculations on which this reduction is based. (3) It is stated in the last bullet point that 'Businesses would benefit from deliveries being more reliable and that most customers in the extension come by public transport. May we see the evidence that you have that shows that businesses would benefit by deliveries being more reliable and how your estimate of the value of this benefit compares with the extra costs that they would have to bear due to their own and their suppliers costs associated with the charge. May we see the evidence that leads you to conclude that most customers come by public transport. (4) May we see the calculated evidence on which you base the prediction that the net revenues from the scheme would be £30-50M pa. (5) What assessment have you made, if any, of the increase in the Cost of Living for the average resident living inside the proposed Extension as shopkeepers and service people seek to recover, in higher prices to residents, the extra costs in connection with the congestion charge that shopkeepers and service people would incur should the extension go ahead. May we see your calculations on this matter.

A: Subsequently I have sent you a copy of the full range of information published by TfL to support the current public consultation.

You will see that document 7 (Supplementary Information on Traffic and Transport Effects) includes more detail on many of the issues you have queried.

Turning to the specifics of your letter, I have set out the information you requested below, with references to relevant paragraphs in the Supplementary Information document.

1a) 10-14% traffic reduction

TfL's assessment that the proposed western extension would lead to a 10-14% reduction in traffic within the zone is based on outputs from the London Transportation Studies (LTS) transport computer model (as noted in *Supplementary Information*, paragraphs 5.1-5.3).

The LTS is a computer model of travel on the road and public transport networks of Greater London. In broad terms the model is used in congestion charging to characterise the effects on vehicle movement of charges, the consequent influence on routing patterns on main roads and hence the changes to traffic flows and public transport passenger demands. To produce an estimate of the traffic impacts of a western extension the model performs several million calculations.

The model is used to provide estimates of traffic changes assuming either low or high driver sensitivities to the charge (see *Supplementary Information*, paragraph 5.3). The press release quoted a range based on the LTS model outputs for low and high sensitivity scenarios.

May I direct you to two sections of *Supplementary Information* that provide detailed outputs generated by the LTS model:

- Figures 8a and 8b show the pattern of traffic changes on individual roads
- Annex 2 shows the percentage traffic change in each borough by 'sector' of London.
If you refer to the 'total' row on Table 5 under the column 'inside proposed zone', you will see the 10% traffic reduction referred to in the press release – this is the LTS low sensitivity projection. The corresponding figure in Table 6 is the high sensitivity projection of 14%

1b) 5 minute time saving

This figure was based on the experience of time savings from the central zone scheme, where monitoring showed that drivers were accumulating a ten minute saving on a typical 80 minute round trip. Enclosed at tab A is an extract from the Second Annual Monitoring Report.

TfL judged that the corresponding saving in the proposed western extension would be about 5 minutes. This estimate is supported by outputs from the LTS model and from the SALT model, used to look in more detail at conditions on the road system in and around the extended charging zone. Enclosed at tabs B and C are extracts from the supporting model analyses. Note that the projected journey times for the routes in these extracts assume an £8 charge is being applied to the existing central zone – as will apply from July.

2) 15-20% congestion reduction

TfL estimates the reduction in congestion (which is broadly equivalent to the time spent in traffic queues) by applying flow / speed elasticities to the changes in traffic flow projected by the traffic models. Inside the western extension changes in average traffic speeds are related to changes in average traffic flows with an elasticity of -1.0: that is, for every 1% reduction in traffic, speeds will increase by 1%.

Accordingly, it is expected that if traffic in the proposed western extension decreases by 10-14%, then speeds would increase by 10-14%. After separating the delay component of traffic speeds this converts to a decrease in congestion of 15% - 20%.

The detail of the calculation is as follows: the existing daytime speed in the area of the proposed western extension is 14kph, a travel rate of 4.286 mins/km (quoted to three decimal places for the purpose of calculation). An increase in speed of 10-14% would therefore reduce the travel rate to between 3.890 and 3.760 mins/km.

Congestion is defined as the travel rate minus the night-time travel rate of 1.6 mins/km. Therefore the change in congestion is projected to be from 2.686 mins/km to between 2.290 and 2.160 mins/km. This is a decrease in congestion of between 15% and 20%.

3a) Business deliveries and reliability

The surveys of travel times (tab A) into the central zone showed that the reductions in journey times were accompanied by significant improvements in the reliability of journeys – journey times were both quicker and more dependable. Again TfL expects this effect to apply to vehicle journeys into and within the extension zone. Delivery journeys within the extension would be prime beneficiaries.

You may also by now have seen the *Economic and Business Impact Assessment* of the proposed western extension on TfL's website. A copy is enclosed for ease of reference.

Section 5 of this assessment sets out an analysis of the business-related journeys that are likely to be affected by the proposed scheme. It uses TfL's projections of the impacts of a western extension on levels of congestion to assess the benefits to business from improved journey times, and notes that around 60% of the traffic and transport benefits arising from a western extension would accrue to vehicles on business-related travel –section 5.8.

Section 5.12 acknowledges that for many vehicle occupants, the cost of the congestion charge is likely to be considered greater than the value of time savings gained. However, for inner London journeys wholly outside the western extension area, as well as those already using the existing congestion charging zone, the additional journey time and reliability benefits of reduced congestion resulting from an extension would be 'free'.

3b) Customers travelling in the proposed western extension by public transport

This is referred to in sections 6.7 and 6.8 of the *Economic and Business Impact Assessment*. It is derived from a survey carried out for TfL with over 2000 shoppers in Summer 2004 on weekdays at key shopping locations in the proposed area of the western extension.

The survey found that 8% had arrived as a car driver or passenger. The majority, 92%, arrived by public transport, walking or other modes: 24% used a bus, 30% used the Underground and 22% walked.

Of the car users: 13% said they could have walked all the way to the location instead of using their car; 39% said a bus would have been a feasible alternative; and 46% said they could have used the Underground.

4) Net revenues

Table 5 of *Supplementary Information* shows that if a western extension were introduced, there would be 44,000-52,000 'new' potentially chargeable vehicles. Revenues would be derived from these vehicles, though there are various factors to be included such as discounted payments and reduced revenues in the central zone.

As a result the calculation of potential revenue requires a separate computer model incorporating a variety of factors. The main factors are set out below, and I hope that this meets your request for information on the calculation:

- The number of vehicle movements entering the proposed extended congestion charging zone during charging hours – derived from vehicle count surveys taken in June 2004.
- The average number of entries per day for each vehicle type to obtain the number of 'unique' vehicles entering each day – values of 1.2-1.4 are used, for example, for cars
- The number of vehicles already inside the charging zone at 7.00am, the start of charging hours – taken as 10,000
- The number of residents' vehicles, discounted vehicles, fleet vehicles, exempt vehicles
- Rates of evasion and payment of penalty charges
- Vehicles deterred by the charge; for example based on stated preference surveys and experience from the existing scheme, it is estimated that 35-45% of car drivers making through-trips will continue to do so and pay the proposed charge; for drivers making trips that terminate in the proposed western extension some 61-74% are expected to pay (of those not already paying a charge for driving in the central zone).

The gross revenue from the proposed western extension, as stated in paragraph 5.40 of *Supplementary Information*, is projected to be £60-80 million.

Annual operating costs are estimated at £27-33 million (paragraph 5.41) based on the current status of commercial negotiations with service providers for the scheme.

The annual net revenues are therefore estimated at £30-50 million.

5) Cost of living consequences from charges being passed on to customers

TfL has not carried out a cost of living assessment along the lines you suggest; however, the issue of increased business costs is included as a 'supply side' effect in the *Economic and Business Impact Assessment* (copy enclosed).

CCFOI/1058 23 June 2005

Q; I have had lengthy and very unhelpful correspondence regarding the misprocessing by TfL of my credit card details, leading to me being overcharged for a fine. I therefore request the following information under the Fol Act. Internal quality control reports for the last 6 months available that estimate the number of errors made by TfL in processing credit card details of fines being paid.

A: Unfortunately, after conducting extensive searches we can confirm we do not hold the information you have requested on errors made by TfL in processing credit card details nor on the number of complaints received of incorrect processing.

Congestion Charging do collate statistics on complaints received but we don't have a category for complaints on the subject of 'incorrect processing of PCN credit card payments'. These for example would be categorised at a high level such as 'PCN complaint' and therefore not broken down into groupings of such detail.

CCFOI/1059 15 June 2005

(a) Can you tell me the proportion and amount of Congestion Charging Revenue that is generated by PCN's as opposed to the charge itself?

	Amount	Proportion of Total
Charge Revenue	£237,797,854	57%
PCN	£132,360,144	32%

(b) Can you tell me the proportion and amount of Congestion Charging Revenue that is generated by late payment charge (ie £10) as opposed to the charge itself?

1.67% since scheme started (scheme start date February 2003). This equates to £3,971,224

(c) Can you tell me the proportion and amount of Congestion Charging PCN's that are as a result of 'forgetful' individuals as opposed to wilful violations?

The only available data is the percentage and volume of valid representations made against issued PCNs that have been rejected on the basis of "no charge paid / insufficient evidence". Since charging began this equates to 36,918 (20% of all representation rejected and 1% of all PCNs issued). It should be noted that such representations do not, of course, include PCNs issued to people who "forget" and who just pay PCNs. There is currently no data of the reasons why paid PCNs were issued.

(d) Can you tell me the proportion and amount of Congestion Charging PCN's that are as a result of wilful violations?

The only available data is the percentage and volume of PCNs that are paid without representation. This is 70% of all PCNs issued and is currently running at around 73-75% of all PCNs issued.

(e) Can you tell me the proportion and amount of Congestion Charging PCN's that are as a result of individuals making mistakes in their 'attempts' to pay the congestion charge?

The only available data is the percentage and volume of representations that are accepted through TfL applying discretion when such grounds are cited in representations. The onus in the Scheme Order is for the customer to make correct payment for the correct date of travel and the correct, specific, vehicle registration number.

To date 69,046 representations have been accepted because of a customer error in paying for the correct VRM. This equates to 34% of all representations accepted and around 1.8% of all PCNs issued.

(f) Can you tell me the proportion and amount of Congestion Charging revenue (either for Capita as operator or TFL) which is generated by the chargeable text messaging number 81099?

To date 20% of all sales transactions are made using the SMS facility. This equates to £47,559,570. Neither TFL or Capita collect revenue from the text itself.

(g) Can you tell me the proportion of TfL's (or Capita's) congestion charging operating costs which is taken up dealing with customer complaints and disputes in relation to PCN's?

Capita have been paid the following amounts for administering the Congestion Charging scheme from February 2003 to 31 March 2005. Capita are not paid on the basis of resources or effort required in processing representations or complaints against PCNs.

2002/03	£12,413,791
2003/04	£71,805,350
2004/05	£67,231,408
Total	£151,450,549

(h) Can you tell me the proportion of PCN's which are disputed? And of those disputed PCN's how many do not require payment?

PCNS issued	3,645,398
Proportion Disputed to date =	18%
Reps Accepted: 203,075 / 334,924	60.63% (Do not require payment)

(i) Can you tell me the cost of issuing and processing a PCN, broken down into the differing stages of issue (ie £ 50, £ 100, £ 150 and County Court)?

Data is not available. Capita are not paid on the basis of resources or effort required in issuing or processing PCNs, registering debts etc. It does, however, cost TfL £5 to register each debt at Court. Bailiffs are not paid and add on their own charges in accordance with specific bailiff powers and regulations.

(j) Can you tell me the cost of processing a congestion charging payment? In addition can you highlight the differing costs for each type of payment option?

Data is not available. Capita are not paid on the basis of resources or effort required in processing payments.

(k) Can you tell me the number and proportion of daily payments which are made for which there is no photographic record showing the vehicle to be in the congestion zone?

TfL estimates that this is less than 5% but it is impossible to ascertain whether this is as a result of the cameras not detecting (our evidence has always suggested that over 90% of all vehicles are captured) or if the daily charge payer did not drive in the zone for the date paid or if the charge payer paid for the incorrect date of travel.

(I) Can you tell me the proportion and amount of Congestion Charging revenue (either for Capita as operator or TfL) which is generated by the chargeable 0845 telephone number which one has to telephone to discuss a PCN?

Neither Capita nor TfL make any money through use of the 0845 number.

**CCFOI/1060
16 May 2005**

Q: This is a freedom of information request. I would like to know how many people have contacted TfL or the Mayor to ask that the period for paying the cc should be extended beyond the day of the visit. I would also like to know how many people have asked for a credit system to be introduced so that we can the cc in advance and then use that credit at any time in the future

A: The Congestion Charging Division within TfL manages all correspondence to either TfL or the Mayor relating to the Congestion Charge. The computer system in place to manage this correspondence until March 2005 does not include a search facility that can provide accurate results for the information you have requested. We have conducted a review of files held however using the word 'payment' and found that in the two years to March 2005 there were 91 pieces of correspondence with this title. While not all these pieces of correspondence necessarily request a longer payment period or an advance or credit form of payment, many of them highlight problems with the payment mechanism for the Congestion Charge. This includes in many cases requesting an easier payment method such as using a credit system or allowing a longer time to pay the charge.

Since March 2005 correspondence relating to the Congestion Charge has been managed by a new computer system where those responding to letters and emails code the issue raised by the writer against a set of available classifications. Some correspondence raises multiple issues but can only be coded against one classification and in such circumstances the main issue raised by the writer is the one coded. A number of codes relate to your query and the number of pieces of correspondence recorded since March 2005 against each code is shown.

Requested an automated/pre-pay system	9
General issues with paying the Congestion Charge	18
Requesting extra time to pay the Congestion Charge	12