



REPORT TO: Stakeholder Relations & Communications Strategy Committee
DATE: 20 January 2009
SUBJECT: 2008 BTP RAIL STAFF SURVEY
SPONSOR: Michael Furness
AUTHORS: Valdeep Gill, Stephanie Weller

1. PURPOSE OF PAPER

- 1.1. This paper provides the headline findings from the 2008 British Transport Police (BTP) Rail Staff Survey.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. As part of BTP's commitment to consult with its stakeholders, BTP aims to conduct a Rail Staff Survey (RSS) every two years. The 2008 RSS solicited feedback on a variety of topics including contact with BTP, incident reporting, police visibility and safety, fatalities, football policing, station environment, and priorities. To improve the utility of the survey, BTP departments and Train Operating Company (TOC) representatives were invited to review suitability of questions and contribute additional questions where appropriate.
- 2.2. Two versions of the survey were designed; one for Station Staff and one for Train Crew. Twenty two TOCs were invited to participate: Nineteen agreed, with a return of 944 for station staff and 1,148 for train crew surveys from an original sample of 20,000.
- 2.3. The Strategic Development Department are currently working on recommendations which will be provided to Chief Officers Group and Area Commanders. Where appropriate, data will be provided at a local level to ensure the greatest impact. Data will continue to be analysed to help monitor the impact of Neighbourhood Policing and any relevant findings will be provided



to ACC Operations. An update on progress with regard to these recommendations will be provided at the next Stakeholder Relations & Communications Strategy Committee meeting.

- 2.4. Findings for station staff and train crew are presented separately. Demographic data can be found at Appendix A.

3. SUMMARY

- 3.1. More staff reported feeling safe whilst at work in comparison to 2005 rail staff survey data, with particular improvement within the train crew sample. This is strongly linked to staff reports of increased police visibility since 2005, both at stations and on trains.
- 3.2. Station staff identified CCTV and station lighting as the key elements of station environment that have the greatest impact on their feelings of personal safety.
- 3.3. Four questions explored staff satisfaction with service on four aspects of BTP service. Across all comparable aspects, a greater percentage of station staff were satisfied than train crew. Almost half of all staff reported they were satisfied with the service they currently receive from BTP; an increase of 5 percentage points from 44% in 2005.
- 3.4. Staff identified staff assaults and police visibility as key priorities for BTP.

4. INCIDENT REPORTING

- 4.1. Almost half of all respondents (48%) have reported a crime or incident to BTP in the last 12 months, with an almost equal percentage of station staff and train crew. Of those, the most commonly reported incident by far was ASB (41% all staff; when broken down 38% of train crew and 26.2% of station staff). Assaults on staff were the second most commonly reported crime (17% all staff; 17% of train crew and 16% of station staff) followed by 'Other Offences' (14% all staff; 19% of train crew and 9% of station staff). This category is mainly made up of



Ticket offences and Fare evasion for train crew and Trespass (including suspected suicide attempts), Fare evasion/ticket offences, Reporting vulnerable people and Counterfeit money for station staff.

4.2. Over half of all staff (58%) who had reported a crime or incident to BTP in the 12 months prior to the survey, were satisfied with the service provided. This breaks down to 61% of train crew and 54% of station staff. There is no comparable data for 2005.

4.3. When overall satisfaction is compared across incident type, although non-satisfaction can be seen across most incidents, it is concentrated within those incidents that are likely to have had a direct impact on the member of rail staff. For train crew, non-satisfaction lies with Staff assaults, ASB and Hate crime; for station staff, non-satisfaction is mostly with ASB, Staff assaults and Vehicle crime. Reassuringly, of the train crew respondents who had reported fatalities, 100% were satisfied with the overall BTP service provided, whilst station staff reported high levels of satisfaction with response to reports of Vandalism and Assaults on passengers.

5. FATALITIES

5.1. A question on BTP fatality management was not included on the station staff version of the survey as it was considered relevant primarily to train crew. The question identifies all respondents who have been involved in dealing with a fatality in the 12 months prior to the survey, not just those who have reported a fatality, as discussed at 4.3. Of all respondents identified as dealing with a fatality on the network, 70% were satisfied with the assistance and support provided by BTP. This score is slightly down from 73% in 2005; percentages may not be directly comparable as in the 2005 survey this question was directed to both train crew and station staff, whereas in the current survey it is only directed to train crew.



BRITISH
TRANSPORT
POLICE

Agenda Item 11

5.2. Train crew suggested the following improvements to service:

- Better communication between officers and train crew, particularly the train manager at the scene
- Providing information about progress at the scene (e.g. approximate length of time the train will be held, etc.)
- Assisting with relaying incident information to passengers.

6. VISIBILITY AND SAFETY

6.1. There were higher rates of police visibility at stations than on trains both during the day and the evenings. The majority of railway staff (55%) reported seeing BTP officers/PCSOs at their station or on their train at least once a month or more during the daylight hours (68% station staff; 44% train crew). This is an improvement on 2005 percentages for visibility (65% visibility at stations; 24% visibility on trains). However daily sightings of officers appear to have dropped since 2005 at stations (from 36% in 2005 to 23% in 2008) though remains the same on trains (5%); data may not be directly comparable as the 2005 respondents were drawn from a targeted sample from busy stations, whereas the 2008 survey includes staff from a wider range of stations.

6.2. There is less visible police presence during the night time hours, though data shows an improvement on figures obtained in 2005. Over a third of all railway staff (35%) reported seeing BTP officers/PCSOs at least once a month or more at their station or on their train during night time hours (52% station staff and 24% train crew). This compares to 47% visibility at stations and 15% visibility on trains in 2005.



	Train Crew (%)	Station Staff (%)
Daylight hours		
Daily	5.0	22.3
Once/twice a week	19.5	29.4
Once a month	19.7	15.8
Less than once a month	37.5	23.3
Never	18.2	9.2
Night time hours		
Daily	1.9	14.2
Once/twice a week	12.2	24.6
Once a month	9.8	12.7
Less than once a month	32.8	25.0
Never	43.3	23.5

Table 1 Police Visibility

- 6.3. These steep increases from 2005 data may to some extent be attributed to the increase of PCSOs, the introduction of Neighbourhood Policing Teams, and the deployment of high visibility Operations such as Operation Alert all of which have occurred since 2005.
- 6.4. Both train crew and station staff felt safer during daylight hours. Roughly two thirds of train crew (65%) and station staff (62%) reported feeling safe during the day, whereas less than one third of staff for each survey reported feeling safe during the evenings (see Table 2).
- 6.5. These results are not particularly surprising, and mirror findings from 2005, where staff also reported feeling safer during the day than in the evenings. However, a higher percentage of the 2008 sample reported feeling safe during both daylight and evening hours. In 2005, 56% of staff reported feeling safe during the day; this figure has increased to 63% in 2008. Similarly, 21% of staff reported feeling safe during the evenings in 2005; 31% of the 2008 sample feel safe.
- 6.6. A slightly higher percentage of train crew than station staff reported feeling safe during the day, whereas the reverse was true for feelings of safety during the evenings. Interestingly, twice



the percentage of station staff than train crew felt unsafe during the day, whilst at night these proportions were roughly equal.

	Train Crew (%)	Station Staff (%)
Daylight hours		
Safe	65.0	61.5
Neither safe nor unsafe	28.5	24.9
Unsafe	6.5	13.4
Night time hours		
Safe	29.2	33.7
Neither safe nor unsafe	34.7	29.6
Unsafe	35.9	33.7

Table 2 Personal Safety

- 6.7. Upon discussion with the Crime Reduction Unit (CRU), a question about personal panic alarms was included. This was to assist the CRU in obtaining feedback regarding the impact of wearing a personal panic alarm would have on staff safety. The majority of staff (78%) did not believe the alarm would make them feel safer whilst on duty; however more station staff (30%) than train crew (16%) were positive about its impact on safety. These results will be fed back to the CRU to help in the development of the associated project.

7. FOOTBALL POLICING

- 7.1. Over a third of all staff (39%) were satisfied with current football policing, this score is down from 2005 (44%). A greater proportion of station staff (49%) were satisfied compared to train crew (32%) with the support they receive from BTP in relation to the management of football fans.
- 7.2. Staff suggestions for improving to football policing mostly related to alcohol control, visible policing and improved planning and management:
- 7.3. Alcohol control:
- Running 'dry' trains



- Enforcing an alcohol ban on stations and trains
- Refusing access to drunken fans.

7.4. Visible policing:

- More officers on platforms and trains (particularly those with a large number of fans on them), not just on the concourse
- Train crew suggested the use of police dogs on stations.

7.5. Improved planning and management:

- Communicate better with rail staff about potential football-related problems and issue advance warnings of any problems
- Support late departures not just those departing immediately after the match
- Be aware of displacement of the problem from platform to train
- Help ensure that fans have valid tickets before allowing them to board trains
- Liaise with TOCs over the possibility of reintroducing special football trains to separate fans from other passengers.

8. STATION ENVIRONMENT

8.1. Station environment questions were developed with the assistance of the Crime Reduction Unit the aim of which was to identify any relationships between station environment and personal safety. Questions related to station staff work location and were therefore not included on the train crew version of the survey. There is no comparable data for 2005.

8.2. Just over half (53%) of all station staff respondents had heard of the Secure Stations Scheme, 60% of which felt they had a good understanding of the scheme. Almost two thirds of staff believed their station of work was part of the scheme at the point of survey (62%), however there was no strong statement about whether the scheme had made the station safer (36%



Yes, 36% No, 29% Don't know). The majority of respondents (72%) that work at a Secure Station were aware of the accreditation; however 28% were unaware of the accredited status.

- 8.3. Roughly two thirds of station staff (64%) rated the general standard of their station environment as 'very/fairly good'; almost half (49%) recognised that this had a 'very/fairly high' impact on their feelings personal of safety whilst at work.
- 8.4. When considering individual elements of station environment, station staff identified CCTV (59%) and lighting (57%) as having the highest impact on their feelings of personal safety (See Table 4). Reassuringly, over 60% of station staff rated the general station standard of CCTV and lighting as 'very/fairly good'; however 23% of respondents rated CCTV at their station as being 'fairly/very poor'. Considering the impact CCTV is indicated to have on feelings of personal safety, there are clear benefits to maintaining CCTV which go beyond that of crime detection.

	General station standard			Impact on personal safety		
	Very/fairly good (%)	Neither good nor poor (%)	Fairly/very poor (%)	Very/fairly high (%)	Neither high nor low (%)	Fairly/very low (%)
Station layout	63.5	20.5	16.0	43.4	38.0	18.6
Upkeep & repair of station premises (including graffiti)	66.0	17.1	17.0	41.8	40.0	18.2
Lighting	74.9	11.9	13.2	56.9	27.8	15.3
CCTV	63.4	13.9	22.7	58.6	21.4	20.0
Access to emergency contact points	61.7	21.9	16.4	47.2	36.3	16.5
Location & upkeep of toilets	56.7	19.6	23.7	38.1	38.2	23.7
Overall station environment	66.4	21.0	12.6	48.5	35.0	16.5

Table 3 Station Environment



9. CRIME AND DISORDER PROBLEMS AND POLICING PRIORITIES

- 9.1. To explore the dissemination of BTP priorities, all respondents were asked if they were aware of BTP priorities in relation to rail staff. Thirteen percent of all rail staff reported to be aware of current priorities, of which a greater proportion of station staff (16%) reported awareness than train crew (10%). There is no comparable data from 2005 survey.
- 9.2. Managerial staff for both station staff and train crew were most likely to report awareness of priorities. Amongst station staff there is a similar spread of awareness across job roles (approximately 20% of staff within each job role). Job roles with the highest levels of awareness about priorities were security (26%) and gateline staff (25%); sales point/ticket sales staff had the lowest awareness (14%). There was greater variation of awareness across job roles for the train crew sample, which is arguably related to their remote nature of work. Managerial staff aside, ticket inspection/ticket sale staff and revenue protection had the greatest proportion of awareness (23% and 22% respectively); cleaning and catering staff reported little or no awareness. This suggests that those in job roles more directly impacted by policing priorities are more likely to be aware of these; however there still exists a knowledge gap that needs addressing.
- 9.3. The top priorities for both station staff and train crew were staff assaults and increased visibility, presence and availability of officers (at stations and on trains respectively). Station staff also referenced faster response times and train crew gave particular reference to officers patrolling late night services. The ongoing role out of Neighbourhood Policing Teams seeks to address these to issues.
- 9.4. Staff were also asked to identify the major crime and disorder problems at their sites. There is a slight distinction in severity of rating provided by the two groups. Station staff were more likely to rate things as a slight problem or not a problem at all. Train crew on the other hand more often rated items as a major or moderate problem; approximately 15% of the problems



identified by the train crew respondents were major problems. This compares to only 9% for station staff. In total, 67% of the train crew respondents identified a problem; this compares to 48% of station staff.

- 9.5. The majority of all train crew respondents (92%) identified alcohol-related crime and incidents as a problem; 43% identified it as a major problem. This compares with 74% of station staff, 26% of which identified it as a major problem (see Table 3). Overall, the top five problems are the same for both groups, although in a different order. A main group difference can be found for football-related crime/incidents, which are identified as a major problem by 17% of train crew, but by only 6% of station staff.
- 9.6. Under the 'Other' category, train crew identified Fare evasion and ASB (including smoking on trains, youth groups, feet on seats, loud music, etc) as additional problems they encounter. For station staff, youth groups and associated ASB were identified as additional problems.
- 9.7. The concerns of train crew and station staff do to a large degree reflect the priorities in the 2008-09 Policing Plan. Of the top five problems identified by the majority of train crew and station staff, four are currently directly covered by the 2008-09 Policing Plan targets. Alcohol-related crime/incidents are addressed through local ASB targets, held by all Areas. Two Areas (London South and London Underground) have Trespass targets. Graffiti is a local target on London South, London Underground and Scotland. Staff assaults are addressed through local targets across all Areas.



Train crew problems	Problem as % of total respondents	Major problem as % of total respondents	Station staff problems	Problem as % of total respondents	Major problem as % of total respondents
Alcohol-related crime/incidents	91.6	42.5	Alcohol-related crime/incidents	74.1	26.5
Vandalism	90.1	28.7	Graffiti	71.4	13.2
Trespassing	89.4	26.4	Trespassing	71.1	13.3
Graffiti	87.1	29.5	Vandalism	69.4	12.5
Staff assaults	82.8	23.1	Staff assaults	65.7	14.1
Passenger assaults	80.8	11.6	Drug misuse	62.2	16.0
Obstructions on the line	80.7	12.5	Passenger assaults	61.3	8.4
Drug misuse	73.3	14.5	Begging/vagrancy	57.6	16.2
Theft of public property	70.5	8.4	Theft of public property	49.2	6.2
Football-related crime/incidents	67.9	16.9	Racial abuse	48.6	6.6
Theft of rail property	67.2	11.4	Obstructions on the line	44.9	5.6
Begging/vagrancy	65.8	10.6	Vehicle Crime	43.3	3.9
Racial abuse	59.1	4.5	Theft of rail property	40.2	5.6
Fear of terrorism	58.0	8.4	Fear of terrorism	37.8	7.3
Robbery	57.8	6.5	Football-related crime/incidents	34.1	5.8
Sexual assaults	42.9	2.4	Robbery	32.7	2.6
Ticket touts	34.7	8.5	Ticket touts	29.4	7.6
Other	8.7	6.8	Sexual assaults	20.4	1.2
Vehicle Crime	N/A	N/A	Other	5.1	3.3

Table 4 Priority problems

10. SATISFACTION WITH BTP

- 10.1. Almost half of all staff (49%) reported they were satisfied with the service they currently receive from BTP; a higher percentage of station staff (54%) reported satisfaction with overall service provision than train crew (44%). Although satisfaction for individual elements of BTP service



may be lower than 2005 scores (as discussed in previous sections), satisfaction with overall service has increased 5 percentage points from 44% in 2005.

- 10.2. The overriding suggestion put forward by station staff and train crew to improve current BTP service was to provide a higher visible presence; staff linked this to deterring crime/incidents, quicker response times and increasing staff and passenger reassurance.
- 10.3. More specifically, station staff suggested a need for more officers covering smaller areas of responsibility, more regular station visits and patrols (including outstations), particularly at evenings and weekends. Staff also suggested officers speak to staff whilst making station visits.
- 10.4. Train crew also suggested greater patrols on trains, particularly during the evenings and on known trouble routes. Unlike station staff, train crew suggested this presence could be provided by PCSOs. They also called for increased formal opportunities for BTP and train crew to share information (e.g. Officers to attend training days, etc.) as well as greater deployment of Operation Shield and the use of sniffer dogs at stations.

11. CONCLUSIONS

- 11.1. There are clear improvements since the 2005 survey, particularly officer visibility and increased feelings of staff safety whilst at work. Increased visibility was the top priority from the 2005 survey; BTP has worked to address through the introduction of NPTs. These, combined with ongoing high profile Operations have arguably contributed to the improvement in visibility and safety. It is hoped that through the continued NP programme, the ongoing demands for an increased presence will be addressed.



- 11.2. The introduction of NPTs and PCSOs appear to have improved BTP service provision and staff satisfaction; however, the impact of station environment remains a key factor in feelings of safety.
- 11.3. Suggestions for football policing mainly concern late management of drunken fans, and better staff involvement in planning.
- 11.4. Fatality management in general is good. The main suggestion for improvement regards better communication with the train manager, to enable better sharing of information with other staff and with passengers.
- 11.5. Train crew appear detached from current BTP service provision; survey findings suggest there is a need for improved communication and contact between BTP and train crew.
- 11.6. The current Policing Plan objectives appear to be accurate and reflect the concerns of rail staff.

12. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 12.1. That members note the contents of this paper.