

Respondent Information Form and Questions

Please Note this form **must** be returned with your response to ensure that we handle your response appropriately

1. Name/Organisation

Organisation Name

n/a

Title Mr ☒ Ms ☐ Mrs ☐ Miss ☐ Dr ☐ *Please tick as appropriate*

Surname

Bethune

Forename

Nicholas

2. Postal Address

Flat A

37 Dartmouth Park Road

Kentish Town

London

Postcode NW5 1SU

Phone 02074824761

Email

n.bethune@btinternet.com

3. Permissions - I am responding as...

Individual



/

Group/Organisation



Please tick as appropriate

- (a) Do you agree to your response being made available to the public (in Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site)?

Please tick as appropriate ☐ Yes ☐ No

- (b) Where confidentiality is not requested, we will make your responses available to the public on the following basis

Please tick ONE of the following boxes

Yes, make my response, name and address all available ☒

or

Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address ☐

or

Yes, make my response and name available, but not my address ☐

- (c) The name and address of your organisation **will be** made available to the public (in the Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site).

Are you content for your **response** to be made available?

Please tick as appropriate ☐ Yes ☐ No

- (d) We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?
- Please tick as appropriate ☒ Yes ☐ No

Consultation Questions

The answer boxes will expand as you type.

Procuring rail passenger services

1. What are the merits of offering the ScotRail franchise as a dual focus franchise and what services should be covered by the economic rail element, and what by the social rail element?

Q1 comments: No comment.

2. What should be the length of the contract for future franchises, and what factors lead you to this view?

Q2 comments: I would support keeping the contract relatively short so that if the Scottish Parliament receives the power it needs to end the franchising system in Scotland, the service provision can be transferred to some form of state enterprise within a relatively short space of time without having to 'buy out' the incumbent franchisee.

3. What risk support mechanism should be reflected within the franchise?

Q3 No comment.

4. What, if any, profit share mechanism should apply within the franchise?

Q4 comments: Any profits generated from operating services should be re-invested in the railways or used to cross-subsidise loss making but socially desirable services. To this end the franchise should be awarded to a mutual or charitable body set up by but not governed by the state.

5. Under what terms should third parties be involved in the operation of passenger rail services?

Q5 comments: No comment.

6. What is the best way to structure and incentivise the achievement of outcome measures whilst ensuring value for money?

Q6 comments: No comment.

7. What level of performance bond and/or parent company guarantees are appropriate?

Q7 comments: No comment.

8. What sanctions should be used to ensure the franchisee fulfils its franchise commitments?

Q8 comments: No comment.

Achieving reliability, performance and service quality

9. Under the franchise, should we incentivise good performance or only penalise poor performance?

Q9 comments: No comment.

10. Should the performance regime be aligned with actual routes or service groups, or should there be one system for the whole of Scotland?

Q10 comments: No comment.

11. How can we make the performance regime more aligned with passenger issues?

Q11 comments: No comment.

12. What should the balance be between journey times and performance?

Q12 comments: No comment.

13. Is a Service Quality Incentive Regime required? And if so should it cover all aspects of stations and service delivery, or just those being managed through the franchise?

Q13 comments: No comment.

14. What other mechanisms could be used for assessing train and station quality?

Q14 comments: No comment.

Scottish train services

15. Can better use be made of existing train capacity, such as increasing the permitted standing time beyond the limit of 10 minutes or increasing the

capacity limit? What is an acceptable limit for standing times on rail services?

Q15 comments: No comment.

16. Should the number of services making use of interchange stations (both rail to rail and rail to other modes) be increased to reduce the number of direct services? What would be the opportunities and challenges of this?

Q16 comments: No. It is very important to maintain and increase the number of through services wherever possible. Changing trains is a major disincentive to passengers and creates added difficulties for people with mobility problems and those travelling with luggage and children.

17. Should Government direct aspects of service provision such as frequency and journey time, or would these be better determined by the franchisee based on customer demand?

Q17 comments: No comment.

18. What level of contract specification should we use the for the next ScotRail franchise?

Q18 comments: No comment.

19. How should the contract incentivise the franchisee to be innovative in the provision of services?

Q19 comments: No comment.

Scottish rail fares

20. What should be the rationale for, and purpose of, our fares policy?

Q20 comments: To get people out of their cars.

21. What fares should be regulated by government and what should be set on a commercial basis? Do your recommendations change by geographic area (the Strathclyde area example), or by type of journey (for example suburban or intercity)?

Q21 comments: All fares should be regulated based on distance travelled. Airline-style demand management ticketing policies have no place on the railway.

22. How should we achieve a balance between the taxpayer subsidy and passenger revenue contributions in funding the Scottish rail network? At what rate should fares be increased, and how feasible would it be to apply higher increases to Sections of the network which have recently been enhanced?

Q22 comments: Provided fares are set at a fair level to begin with, rises should be kept in line with inflation. Premium fares on routes that have received extra investment should be avoided as they undermine the public service principle of the railway. Rather than concerning itself over the balance between subsidy and revenue, the Government should be concerning itself with the fact that planning and development in the wider economy is too car-orientated. As a result the wider economic and environmental benefit that the railway has the potential to provide is being squandered.

23. What should the difference be between peak and off-peak fares? Will this help encourage people to switch to travelling in the off-peak?

Q23 comments: The difference should be fairly modest. Many low-paid workers can and do use the train to get to work. Commuting by train should not be the preserve of the well-off.

Scottish stations

24. How should we determine what rail stations are required and where, including whether a station should be closed?

Q24 comments: Many stations have poor passenger numbers because they have poor services. Services should be improved (and advertised locally) for a reasonable trial period before any decision is taken. Stations should generally be located as close as possible to the centres of towns and villages and should interchange with local bus services.

25. What are the merits or issues that arise from a third party (such as a local authority or local business) being able to propose, promote and fund a station or service?

Q25 comments: This should be encouraged.

26. Should only one organisation be responsible for the management and maintenance of stations? If this was the franchisee how should that responsibility be structured in terms of leasing, investment, and issues relating to residual capital value?

Q26 comments: I am opposed to greater complexity in terms of the commercial arrangements of operating the railway so generally, stations should be maintained by the train operator as now (with the exception of the big termini, which are NR). However I would be in favour of local, non-profit organisations being able to lease stations and take over the operation and maintenance of them. If the railway was operated on a non-profit basis by the state or community interest mutual/charity body the question of residual capital value would be irrelevant as all value and benefit would accrue to the public benefit.

27. How can local communities be encouraged to support their local station?

Q27 comments: By following the Community Rail Partnerships model adopted successfully in many parts of England.

28. What categories of station should be designated and what facilities should be available at each category of station?

Q28 comments: No comment.

Cross-border services

29. Should cross-border services continue to go north of Edinburgh? In operating alongside ScotRail services, how do cross-border services benefit passengers and taxpayers? And who should specify these services, the Department of Transport or the Scottish Ministers?

Q29 comments: I strongly believe that cross-border services that continue north of Edinburgh should be maintained and indeed enhanced. These services should be specified by the DoT in consultation with TS. It would be perverse to wish to eliminate these services in the because of 'revenue abstraction' issues created by the imperfect franchising system. That would be to penalise passengers for the sake of organisational convenience. It may be beyond the scope of this consultation to affect changes to the UK rail franchising system, but Transport Scotland can at least play its part in resisting the tendency of the franchising system to 'atomise' the railway system into discrete (self contained) operating units.

I am objecting to this as a user of these services. Every year my family and I use the train to travel direct from London to Aviemore and back. My specific objections are as follows:

- Changing trains en-route hurdle which discourages potential passengers – this has been demonstrated by research.
- It is inconvenient and impractical for those with heavy luggage, especially holidaymakers (heavy users of these services in the summer) and those with bicycles.
- For the elderly and those with young children there are added complications in changing trains.
- It is likely that there would be a time penalty involved. Even if it is minimal, the *perception* this creates will discourage potential passengers.
- Through journey opportunities between intermediate stations are equally important but are often overlooked when considering the impact of such a change. E.g. Newcastle to Perth or Berwick to Dundee. The impact of any time penalty on these shorter journeys is disproportionate as compared to longer journeys e.g. London to Aberdeen. There are many such journey options that would be lost as a result of this proposal.
- Having to change trains creates anxiety in the minds of passengers about whether an onward connection will be delayed or whether through a delay to the first leg of the journey, the connection will be missed.
- The benefits and appeal of being able to stay in one's seat on the same train with one's luggage safely stowed right through to the final destination on along journey should not be underestimated.
- The use of 6-car DMUs instead of proper 8/9 coach HST/MK3 stock north of Edinburgh raises questions of capacity and comfort. Under-floor engines, lack of van/luggage/cycle space, loss of buffet and restaurant facilities and loss of overall seating capacity would represent a serious down-grade in quality of service. Anecdotally, the southbound summer Saturday London service from Inverness can have very heavy loadings all the way down the Highland main line.

In conclusion, existing through services should not be withdrawn and TS should be looking to enhance these services and, where possible, introduce

new ones in partnership with the DoT and other English operators.

30. Or should the cross-border services terminate at Edinburgh Waverley, allowing opportunities for Scottish connections? And if so, what additional benefits would accrue from having an Edinburgh Hub?

Q30 comments: There would be no benefits. This would be a disaster. This should not be allowed to happen.

Rolling stock

31. What alternative strategies or mechanisms could be used to reduce the cost of the provision of rolling stock?

Q31 comments: The government should buy it outright and lease it to the operator. Huge sums of money are wasted in financing the purchase of new trains by ROSCOs.

32. What facilities should be present on a train and to what extent should these facilities vary according to the route served?

Q32 comments: All trains should have a luggage van with space for plenty of bikes and bags. Before locomotive-hauled trains were withdrawn in the late 1980s/early 1990s most trains had half a coach dedicated to van space. People could take their bikes on the train without having to book or worry that they might be turned away through lack of space. By not providing such a space the railways are turning away a large potential market since the bike/train combination is a very effective alternative to the car. For all the operational convenience of DMUs, the inability to simply lengthen a train by adding an extra van or coach means that they are in many ways much less flexible. It's much cheaper to buy a simple locomotive-hauled coach than it is to buy a new DMU vehicle.

Passengers – information, security and services

33. How should we prioritise investment for mobile phone provision and / or Wi-Fi type high-bandwidth services?

Q33 comments: No comment.

34. How should we balance the need for additional seating capacity and retain the flexibility of a franchisee to offer first-class services if commercially viable?

Q34 comments: No comment.

35. What issues and evidence should be considered prior to determining whether or not to ban the consumption of alcohol on trains?

Q35 comments: I do not support an alcohol ban on trains, but if one were to be introduced there should be an exemption for intercity services with restaurant cars and buffets. This is an important source of revenue for operators and an advantage that the train has over motoring!

36. How can the provision of travel information for passengers be further improved?

Q36 comments: No comment.

Caledonian Sleeper

37. Should we continue to specify sleeper services, or should this be a purely commercial matter for a train operating company?

Q37 comments: TS should continue to specify the sleeper service.

38. Should the Caledonian Sleeper services be contracted for separately from the main ScotRail franchise? Or should it be an option for within the main ScotRail franchise?

Q38 comments: The present arrangement has worked well and I see no reason to change it.

39. We would be interested in your views in the level and type of service that the Caledonian Sleeper Services should provide. Including:

- What is the appeal of the Caledonian Sleeper Service, and if there were more early and late trains would the appeal of the sleeper services change?
- What is the value of sleeper services to Fort William, Inverness and Aberdeen and are these the correct destinations, for example would Oban provide better connectivity?
- What facilities should the sleeper services provide and would you pay more for better facilities?

Q39 comments: As an intermittent user of the sleeper service, I strongly support its retention to the existing range of destinations. TS should not cave-in to the so-called threat from road coach sleeper services – these can never match the comfort of rail travel. By all means modernise the sleeper and provide a greater range of accommodation and facilities, including showers. I would pay more for better facilities but thing that cheaper classes of accommodation should be maintained to cater for all budgets. I would support the re-introduction of a sleeper service from Scotland (Edinburgh or Glasgow) to the south-west of England (Bristol, Plymouth or Penzance), at least in the summer. This is a major long-distance journey option in the UK with no overnight rail services. Many travellers who currently go by air because the idea of a 10-hour daytime train journey is too off putting would welcome this option. If this service was routed via Newcastle and Leeds it would give the north-east of England a sleeper service which, for many years, it has lacked.

Environmental issues

40. What environmental key performance indicators should we consider for inclusion in the franchise agreement or the High Level Output Specification?

Q40 comments: Getting people out of their cars and away from the airlines is the main benefit that can be achieved. Forget about tinkering with CO2 emissions from trains etc – this is small beer compared to achieving modal shift.