

Meeting Title:	Silvertown Tunnel Implementation Group
Date & Time:	24 th September 2020, 0930 -1100
Location:	Virtual meeting hosted on MS Teams

1. Introductions and welcome

Andrew Lunt welcomed all attendees to the first meeting of the Silvertown Tunnel Implementation Group (STIG), held virtually using Microsoft Teams. It represents a key milestone in the delivery of the project and the group will have an important role to play in ensuring the project meets its obligations under the Development Consent Order (DCO).

Attendees (28 total) – representatives from:

Organisation	Attendee	Organisation	Attendee
TfL	Andrew Lunt	Greenwich	Ryan Bunce
TfL	Matthew Yates	Hackney	Andy Cunningham
TfL	Billy Parr	Hackney	Tyler Linton
TfL	Chris Frost	Hackney	Sam Kirk
TfL	Seyram Kumapley	Hackney	Eleanor Winning
TfL	Chris Hemmingsley	Lewisham	Louise McBride
TfL	Seren Dussuyer	Newham	Murray Woodburn
TfL	Jasmit Jabbal	Newham	Marina Lai
Aecom	Anna Savage	Newham	Nick Marks
GLA	Tim Aldham	Redbridge	Rogan Keown
GLA	Stephen Inch	Southwark	Sally Crew
Barking & Dagenham	Mohammad Chibou	Tower Hamlets	Jack Ettinger
Bexley	David Freestone	Highways England	Amelia Yeodal
City of London	Bruce McVean	Highways England	John Nicholas
Apologies			
Barking & Dagenham	Nick Davies	Hackney	Stuart Dunlop
Bromley	Angus Culverwell	Lewisham	Alexandra Crush
City of London	Amy Chapman	Waltham Forest	Neil Bullen

2. Review of actions from introductory briefing 5 March 2020

All actions from the introductory briefing session on 5 March 2020 were noted as completed, namely:

- a) Presentation slides and agenda circulated (17 July 2020)
- b) Monitoring & Mitigation Strategy (MMS) scope of services circulated (17 July 2020)
- c) Arranged first STIG meeting (24 September 2020)
- d) Draft Terms of Reference circulated (17 July 2020)
- e) All bodies to confirm nominated representatives and substitutes.

All bodies are requested to confirm the list of STIG representatives (attached as Appendix A to these notes).

ACTION: All bodies to confirm the list of STIG representatives set out in Appendix A and nominate a substitute (each body can nominate one member and one substitute).

3. Terms of Reference

A draft Terms of Reference for the group was circulated ahead of the meeting for review and comment. The draft Terms of Reference takes account of Article 66 of the Silvertown Tunnel Order 2018, which sets out STIG's role as a consultative body on matters relating to the delivery of the scheme's MMS, User Charging Policy and Bus Strategy.

It was noted that the Terms of Reference would be kept under review and updated from time to time as necessary.

a. Election of chairperson

TfL put forward Andrew Lunt as the proposed chairperson but is open for the group to nominate an alternative chair, which can be chosen by a vote if necessary. If the chair is not a TfL representative, TfL will remain responsible for the meeting's administration and would agree the agenda with the chair in advance of each meeting.

LB Newham more comfortable for a Local Authority representative to chair STIG to ensure impartiality, but not necessarily a representative from a host borough. LB Newham considered this was probably more important later in the programme when key decisions on the MMS are made, and this view was shared by RB Greenwich. No alternative chairpersons were proposed at the meeting it was agreed that Andrew Lunt would chair the meetings until an alternative chairperson was elected. All bodies were invited to give further consideration to this for discussion and election of a chairperson at the next meeting.

ACTION: All bodies to consider potential chairpersons for discussion and agreement at the next meeting.

b. Recording of decisions

TfL proposed that a proforma is used to record both the representations made by STIG members and TfL's decisions in relation to consultation undertaken on key matters in accordance with Article 66 (sub-section 6). A draft 'record of decision' template for this purpose was circulated ahead of the meeting for review. It was noted that LB Southwark was not included on the draft template and TfL apologised for this omission. A question was raised about how STIG members could be confident that their representations were adequately summarized on the proforma and it was agreed that TfL's summation of members' representations would be circulated for review before the document was finalized and decisions made. The proformas would include reasoning for TfL's decision where appropriate.

ACTION: TfL to add LB Southwark to the template and provide further details of the proposed process for recording consultation and decisions.

c. Meeting frequency

Article 66 (sub-section 7) requires that meetings of STIG are held at least twice a year. It was questioned whether this frequency was appropriate and agreed that more frequent meetings could be arranged depending on the items to be discussed. TfL confirmed the intention to engage with STIG members when necessary and not just at meetings. Given the level of activity across the MMS over the early phase of the programme, TfL proposed the next meeting should be held in January 2021 to discuss progress. Attendees agreed with using Microsoft Teams to hold information on the project and disseminate information, supplemented by email as necessary.

ACTION: TfL to arrange next meeting for January 2021 and set-up and invite boroughs to MS Teams STIG channel.

d. Attendance at STIG meetings

Each body is requested to nominate a designated STIG representative and a substitute if desired. It was accepted that different experts will be engaged on different topics, however for the purposes of administration each representative (or substitute) is requested to collate views from their organization as necessary and provide a single, consolidated view on behalf of the organization. Whilst meetings are held virtually it is acceptable for multiple attendees from the same body to attend meetings however when future face-to-face meetings are held it may be necessary to limit numbers due to logistics.

ACTION: To ensure STIG representatives are able to effectively engage with others in their organisation, TfL to maintain a forward meeting planner and confirm proposed agenda items no less than 10 working days in advance of each meeting. In addition, TfL will endeavor to circulate papers, reports etc. no less than 5 working days in advance of each meeting.

4. Project update

a. General progress update

TfL outlined Riverlinx and TfL responsibilities and current scheme progress. Since Riverlinx were appointed in November 2019 further design work has been undertaken and construction activities are expected to start later in 2020.

b. Monitoring & Mitigation Strategy update

Delivery of the MMS will comprise two main aspects. The first is an updated assessment of the scheme's operational impacts closer to the opening of the tunnel to confirm the requirements for mitigation, the opening year user charges and the cross-river bus network (herein referred to as the 'refreshed assessment'). The second is to monitor the actual traffic, environmental and socio-economic impacts for of the scheme for a minimum of three years post-opening. In order to provide a baseline pre-opening monitoring data is also required.

TfL outlined key contacts involved in this work. It was noted that David Rowe remains as sponsor with overall responsibility for the project and Helen Wright is managing the implementation of the project in conjunction with Riverlinx. It was agreed that Helen Wright would be invited to attend a future meeting.

Delivery of the MMS has been split into a number of workstreams or 'lots', with suppliers now appointed for three of the lots to provide technical expertise and support. These suppliers are:

- Lot A – traffic and transport modelling – Jacobs / SWECO
- Lot B – environmental services – Aecom
- Lot C – socio-economic monitoring – Arcadis / Steer

LB Hackney enquired how Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) will impact on the updated traffic modelling, and RB Greenwich also noted that emerging LTN proposals might affect the updated baseline. TfL explained that the traffic modelling focuses on the strategic highway network and changes to the highway network will be considered when the new base model is developed.

ACTION: Helen Wright to be invited to attend the next meeting. MMS organogram to be updated to include David Rowe.

5. Other relevant updates

The opportunity was provided for attendees to provide updates on other projects, initiatives or ideas that may be relevant to the project / STIG. The following updates were provided:

LB Southwark – work is continuing on the development of Cycleway 4. LB Southwark has a new leader and has a number of new cabinet members.

TfL – work into options for improving public transport connectivity to Thamesmead is continuing, including a potential DLR extension from Gallions Reach to Barking Riverside. TfL is aiming to have a single preferred option around mid-2021, with further work beyond this point subject to funding.

LB Newham – updates to the Royal Docks OAPF including revised development forecasts are underway. LB Newham is further developing the North Woolwich Road scheme (interface with Tidal Basin Road and Dock Road), and this has been put forward to DfT as a strategic cycling scheme. LB Newham has a Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) programme which could include an LTN in the Custom House area.

LB Lewisham – LTNs are also in development.

LB Redbridge – noted that lessons could be learned from other major infrastructure schemes and that Crossrail had appointed a complaints commissioner which could be worth considering. Minimum safety standards for construction vehicles were also set. Annual borough leads on-site meetings were also held to raise the profile.

City of London Corporation – noted that consideration is being given to potential changes to the A13, and that the potential relocation of Billingsgate Market could have an impact on the operation of the A13.

RB Greenwich – noted that the borough road network had changed significantly since the previous scheme assessments were undertaken, with changes including LTN schemes, Cycleways and Growth Areas. With Covid-19 and emerging LTNs, the forward plans are less clear and this makes forecasting the future do minimum (without scheme) modelling scenario more difficult.

It was agreed that the opportunity for all attendees to provide relevant updates was useful and would be repeated at future meetings.

6. Air quality monitoring proposals

Seren Dussuyer (TfL) and Anna Savage (Aecom, Lot B supplier) provided an overview of air quality monitoring proposals, with reference to the briefing note that had been circulated ahead of the meeting. Baseline air quality monitoring (NOx) is planned to commence by the end of 2020, with the monitoring locations largely as per those identified in the MMS. TfL has met with five boroughs where it is proposed to install air quality monitoring, where the scheme is expected to have the biggest impacts on traffic, and have agreed the locations for three continuous monitoring sites with LB Newham and RB Greenwich. It is intended that the monitoring will be supplemented by data (which is publicly available) from existing monitoring sites across a wider area.

LB Hackney raised a concern that no air quality monitoring is proposed within Hackney, despite traffic monitoring being proposed. TfL explained that air quality monitoring is planned to cover the area most likely to experience changing traffic patterns as a result of the scheme based on the previous scheme assessments completed to inform the DCO application. Existing air quality monitoring data in Hackney and other boroughs could also be considered. The monitoring programme will be reviewed as part of the refreshed assessment and if necessary additional monitoring can be installed if the assessment indicates this is necessary.

ACTION: TfL to arrange a meeting with LB Hackney to discuss monitoring proposals.

LB Newham explained that their view was that the continuous monitoring sites should also monitor PM2.5 in addition to NOx, and that a third continuous monitor should be installed in Newham in the Canning Town area. It was noted that a separate meeting between LB Newham and TfL had been arranged for w/c 28 September 2020 to discuss this.

GLA expressed support for enhanced air quality monitoring generally, but noted that this is a collective responsibility and it should be recognized that that future changes to air quality in east and south-east London will be a result of many factors of which the Silvertown Tunnel project is just one.

Several questions were raised on how the currently atypical traffic conditions (as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic) would affect the MMS work. TfL explained that the majority of the traffic counts required to update the strategic traffic model were undertaken in November 2019, when conditions were typical. In terms of monitoring, the intention is to undertake three years' worth of traffic and air quality monitoring pre-opening of the scheme to ensure a representative baseline. LB Newham suggested that pre-lockdown SCOOT logs could be used to validate the traffic count data if necessary, as had been done for modelling completed for North Woolwich Road.

ACTION: As some attendees had not seen the air quality monitoring briefing note prior to the meeting, TfL agreed to re-send the briefing note.

7. DCO obligations and forward meeting planner

TfL explained that an 'obligations tracker' was in the process of being developed to ensure requirements in respect of STIG and the matters on which TfL would be engaging with STIG were clearly set out and available to all STIG representatives to help keep track of progress. This will be maintained and updated as necessary, and it is proposed it will be shared with STIG at each meeting. It will also be used to inform a forward meeting planner to give representatives an indication of the topics to be discussed at future meetings.

ACTION: TfL to maintain obligations tracker and forward meeting planner for discussion at each meeting.

8. Next steps / AOB

TfL provided an overview of key MMS activities planned over the next six months. It was agreed that the next meeting should be held in January 2021 rather than March 2021 given the programme of work planned.

ACTION: TfL to arrange next STIG meeting in January 2021 and propose Thursday 28 January. Meeting invitations to follow meeting minute distribution.