

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

CLEAR Fife

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

Surname

Armstrong

Forename

Allen

2. Postal Address

28 Viewforth

Buckhaven

Fife

Postcode KY8

Phone 01592-713078

Email

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 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input type="checkbox"/>
	or
	Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address <input type="checkbox"/>
	or
	Yes, make my response and name available, but not my address <input type="checkbox"/>

(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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Response from CLEAR Fife

Overall: the consultation avoids virtually any reference to potential future re-instatement of rail links, even where they are clearly justified. Thus we feel completely and unnecessarily excluded from such exercises. Where the basic link is not provided, all other questions about how the system should operate are irrelevant. This goes against the claim in the Consultation cover note that “We believe that an efficient railway, attuned to Scotland’s needs, plays a key role in enabling delivery of the Scottish Government’s Purpose of creating a more successful country, **with opportunities for all of Scotland to flourish**, through increasing sustainable economic growth.

The 33,000+ residents of the Levenmouth conurbation (Leven/Methil/Buckhaven etc) live in the largest urban centre in Scotland NOT connected by rail, not to mention another 15-20,000 in the adjoining East Neuk of Fife.. Although a disused but operational track exists connecting Leven to Thornton – a stretch of 5 miles - there is no firm plan to reinstate this, despite consultant studies confirming its viability and Fife Council prioritisation and commitment of investment funding. Freight traffic to Diageo’s major Cameron Bridge distillery (one of Europe’s largest which has just completed a major programme to make it carbon-neutral) and nearby Leven bottling plants as well as to the Fife Energy Park in Buckhaven (a flagship for the post-carbon era), must ironically still travel by road .

Exclusion of such a large population from the national transport grid may well be a contributory factor as to why Levenmouth remains the deprivation hotspot of Fife. So forgive us if we feel that quality improvements and even airport links are relatively esoteric and distant concerns - we believe a connection here is a justified priority over these other schemes.

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:

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

Q2 comments:

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

Q3 comments:

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

Q4 comments:

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

Q5 comments:

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

Q6 comments:

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

Q7 comments:

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

Q8 comments:

Achieving reliability, performance and service quality

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

Q9 comments:

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:

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

Q11 comments:

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

Q12 comments:

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:

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

Q14 comments:

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:

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:

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:

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

Q18 comments:

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

Q19 comments:

Scottish rail fares

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

Q20 comments:

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:

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:

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:

Scottish stations

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

Q24 comments: "We are therefore considering how our railway should develop and what services passengers will need". Here in east Fife, living in a conurbation of 33,000+ residents (Levenmouth – ie Leven/Methil/Buckhaven etc), we have no active rail link despite the presence of a fully intact but disused railway line linking Leven with Thornton (and the full network). How dare this consultation claim to serve the wider public when this basic link is not reinstated?. The failure to complete these basic links in the system leave large swathes of population unserved. We are not even second-class citizens – while you focus on further provision and improvement for those communities, many smaller, already served

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: Fife Council has lobbied and set aside some investment funds for reinstating this link but the Scottish Govt has not included this in its

priorities.

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:

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

Q27 comments: provide a rail link to larger urban communities – eg Levenmouth (Leven, Methil, Buckhaven) with a population of 33,000+ is unserved, despite a disused line being in place

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

Q28 comments: provide a rail-link to all major urban populations such as Levenmouth

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:

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:

Rolling stock

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

Q31 comments:

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

Q32 comments:

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:

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:

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

Q35 comments:

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

Q36 comments:

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:

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:

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:

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: