

## 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

Cycling Scotland

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

#### Surname

Marshall

#### Forename

Alasdair

### 2. Postal Address

Policy Officer

Cycling Scotland

24 Blythswood Square

Glasgow

Postcode G31 2TB

Phone 0141 229 5350

Email  
info@cyclingscotland.org

### 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 <b>will be</b> made available to the public (in the Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site).
	Are you content for your <b>response</b> to be made available?
	Please tick as appropriate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>(d)</b>	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? <i>Please tick as appropriate</i> <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
------------	--

## 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:

Profit share should be aligned with the goal of achieving modal shift from carbon intensive modes to sustainable alternatives.

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:

Both types of incentive should be used under the new franchise agreement. Poor performance should result in consequence and improvements in performance should be rewarded through clearly defined, transparent and structured mechanisms

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:

The focus of the performance regime should be passenger experience rather than a strict focus on the performance of the rolling stock.

Further research and consideration of views of current passengers and potential passengers should be included within any future performance regime.

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

Q12 comments:

Journey times are of importance to passengers; however, reliability, consistency and quality of journeys should be placed higher than overall journey times when measuring performance.

One area we would like to ensure journey time is included in performance measurement is in multi-stage journeys. We believe that there should be minimum interchange penalty if services are structured with less direct services and more interconnecting shuttle services.

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:

SQUIRE has proved useful to us and our members regarding the reporting on and maintenance of station standards. We would like to see SQUIRE maintained or at least its role and functions incorporated into the future franchise

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

Q14 comments:

Additional station quality measures that should be included in assessing station and train quality should include (but not be restricted to) accessibility for people with mobility issues, amenities for wheel chair users, prams buggies and cyclists. Stations should also consider perceived safety of access for all users.

### **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:

Cycling Scotland believes there is a case for improved use of existing rolling stock. This should include better use of existing space and providing more multi-use utility space. It is important however to re-state that any reduction in the level or perceived level on onboard service must not reduce the attractiveness of the network for existing or potential service users. At all times the focus must remain on ensuring that rail is a more attractive proposition than private car use otherwise the chances of driving modal share to rail will be compromised

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:

Direct services are the more favoured solution, but where this is not appropriate increasing the number of services making use of interchange stations could be utilised. This presents significant timetabling challenges and if this option is taken safeguards must be put in place to reduce any interchange penalty and interchange stations will need redesign to provide passengers with a significantly more simple experience of changing trains. Accommodation will have to be made for people with mobility issues, amenities for wheel chair users, prams buggies and cyclists.

The facilities at interchange stations should be improved to make them safer and more attractive, for example accessible public toilets, attractive waiting areas with shops, kiosks, and facilities for storage of bicycles.

Performance measurement could include missed connections (although there is potential for significant under-reporting here). Safeguards to popularise use could include specification of alternative provision in case of missed connections. High quality information, including risk of missed connections when the first train is announced late must be made available to passengers in real-time to allow accurate decision-making. This would require a significantly improved level of information relative to what is available at present. Developing IT solutions may provide opportunities in this area.

In the case of cyclists it must also be the case that the ability to book their cycle across all trains on a multi-stage journey exists and that if connections are missed that they are able to take their cycle with them on the next subsequent train.

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:

The Government should set a level of minimum frequency and maximum journey time and then agree with franchisee on particulars based on customer demand.

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:

The contract should incentivise modal shift towards rail transport. Government must recognise the impact of other transport decisions on the likely success of the franchisee in providing successful outcomes. For example where improved or upgraded road facilities are put in place that directly compete with the use of the rail network Transport Scotland should not penalise the franchisee for to changes in the operating environment that the Government has control over.

### **Scottish rail fares**

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

Q20 comments:

Fares policy should work towards the proposed outcome of encouraging more people to use trains and therefore working towards the proposed outcome of a enabling a modal shift towards rail travel in Scotland. To achieve this fares should be kept to a minimum and not increased in peak times compared to non peak times; i.e. rail pricing should be structured that it does not become relatively more expensive than use of the private car, particularly at peak times where the bulk of private car use occurs.

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:

Government has the ability to structure its regulatory regime towards achieving high-level goals. Given the degree of subsidy within the network, it is only logical that the priorities of the greatest investor (the Scottish Government) should be met first. Where it can be determined that this can be affected by regulatory price control it should remain possible for Government to do so. Whether the Government of the day chooses to exercise this right or not should be a decision for the relevant Minister and Parliament at the time. However, the ability to do so, or not, should not be ruled out due to contractual reasons. Following the logic of this argument, these powers should not be restricted by geography or journey type.

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:

The McNulty report clearly identifies the opportunity for significant savings in

over the rail network. Transport Scotland should look to ensure that all potential opportunities for savings across the franchise and infrastructure network are made before increasing either the passenger or Government contribution. In particular, any increase in passenger revenue contribution, that would only serve to disincentivise use of the network, should be avoided without clear evidence that operators have made substantial savings before increasing passenger costs.

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:

Unless other structural arrangements, over which the franchisee, has no control (working patterns, patterns of land-use and development) also alter the vast majority of service users will have no control over when they choose to travel. Therefore, using increased fares as a demand management measure is regressive and only provides advantage to those with the ability to set their own working patterns. The franchisee must work to provide the timetabling, rolling stock and therefore capacity to meet the demand on its busiest services before looking to price its users off the network. Particularly whilst maintaining operating viability through high levels of government subsidy.

### **Scottish stations**

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

Q24 comments:

In determining what rail stations are required and which should be closed a full assessment should be made of the transport alternatives, future demand, approaches to and potential of improving station use and a full health and inequalities impact assessment should be undertaken. Much more consultation and research needs to be undertaken with both existing and potential new passengers.

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:

In theory, the merits of a third party such as a local authority or local business or local community being able to propose, promote and fund a local station or service appear good. It could be beneficial for the community by providing a level of ownership, autonomy and engagement to the local community and adheres to an asset based management approach for local communities.

There are, however, issues that would require to be addressed such the variable degree to which communities and Local Authorities across Scotland have the willingness, ability and capacity to undertake such a responsibility. In addition, some communities would have relevant experience and knowledge in managing a station, customer service and of health and safety etc, but some other communities would not have the same experience. How would the significant disparities between stations and services operated be addressed and how would consistency in terms of quality and health and safety across the network be managed?

In particular how would minority interests across the network be supported and how would the franchisee maintain a minimum quality of service at all stations?

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:

There are concerns that having multiple organisations managing and maintaining stations could lead to confusion and would lead to increased complexity in the system. This would make ensuring quality and health and safety systems are consistently in place and are appropriately maintained more difficult. Only where it is demonstrably the case that the quality and minimum levels of service can be ensured should this be permitted.

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

Q27 comments:

From our own work we have seen examples of local community groups becoming engaged in supporting local stations through the provision of their own expert knowledge, such as with SPOKES, the Lothian Cycle Campaign, and their information boards at stations. Additionally, local users groups could provide a useful insight into many aspects of the operations of local stations and the needs of the local community.

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

Q28 comments:

### **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:

The focus of stopping cross-border services at Edinburgh seems economic, (by increasing the revenues available to the Scottish franchisee) rather than for the benefit of service users. If the Scottish Government aim to deliver modal shift to use rail transport it must avoid the situation where it more inconvenient for people, i.e. having to change trains, waiting for connections, having to buy new tickets, then less likely to use trains. Therefore, only where interchange penalties can be reduced significantly should this cessation at Edinburgh be the case. Also, passengers should expect a consistent level of service across rolling stock if required to change. In the case of cyclists it must also be the case that the ability to book their cycle across all trains on a multi-stage journey exists and that if connections are missed that they are able to take their cycle with them on the next subsequent train.

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 are potential concerns that if cross-border services terminate at Edinburgh Waverley and passengers wanted to go to other places in Scotland they would have the inconvenience of changing trains and perhaps waiting at Edinburgh for a connection with other Scottish trains. There would need to be good co-ordination between cross-border services and Scottish services and perhaps increasing the number of trains provided in Scotland to meet the cross-border services. Passengers should expect a consistent level of service across rolling stock if required to change. In the case of cyclists it must also be the case that the ability to book their cycle across all trains on a multi-stage journey exists and that if connections are missed that they are able to take their cycle with them on the next subsequent train.

## **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:

All trains should have amenities to allow the carriage of bicycles and the number of bicycles which can be carried should be greater for those routes which go to major trip generators as well as significant tourist destinations.

All trains should have facilities to allow accessibility for wheel chairs, prams and buggies. The franchisee should consider the use of utility spaces that could be adapted to suit multiple purposes.

### **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:

Enabling the fleet of rolling stock to suit mobile patterns of working is important to confer advantage over the use of the private car. Whilst this should be considered, it should be balanced by the need to improve the general accessibility of rail transport and encouraging more people to use the rail network. Targeted reductions in train ticket prices, increasing the capacity of the rail system, increasing punctuality and reliability and improving connections between trains should be prioritised above investment of the above.

Also, implementation of any programme to improve mobile connectivity of rolling stock should be focussed on key business commuter routes.

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:

First class should only be offered if commercially viable and this should be indicated by the usage of first-class. However, the need for additional seating capacity and utility spaces should be prioritised above the provision of first-class services.

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:

Operators should strive to provide up to date travel information. This must be in a format that is easily accessible and easy to understand. The format of

the information should always be considered from the point of view of passengers rather than train companies. The information should continue to be provided by different methods such as the internet, twitter etc.

Operators should continuously review the train fare or train ticket system as although recently simplified, it could be considered to still be confusing from a user perspective

### **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:

The use of a train is considerably more environmentally sustainable than flying or driving to London and we would suggest that the sleeper services could be subsidised and marketed as a viable alternative to an early morning flight to London.

There is the possibility that if more early and late trains were provided then the appeal of the sleeper services may change, but further research would have to be undertaken to see if this is the case.

Appeal of the Sleeper service to passengers includes: the ability of a full day's work either side of the journey; avoidance of hotel bookings (and expense); and arrival early enough to get to work (though not always the case in Scotland if a connection from Glasgow or Edinburgh is required).

Further research would have to be undertaken to investigate if Fort William, Inverness and Aberdeen are the correct destinations for sleeper services rather than Oban.

The possibility of dropping the West Coast sleeper service was mentioned. In addition to the justification of train services offered throughout this response, there may be an additional issue of equity and social cohesion in this particular issue. Decisions where one section of the country may feel itself marginalised by decision makers should be avoided. Particularly given the option of establishing a 'social rail' element of the network is being considered.

Some of the sleeper facilities should be updated and modernised. It may be optimistic/doubtful if people would pay more for better facilities on sleeper services because the prices are fairly high already unless tickets are purchased well in advance of travelling.

## **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:

The franchise agreement could consider adopting the average carbon intensity per trip as an environmental performance indicator. This would promote the use of non-diesel rolling stock and incentivise the operator to have more trains running at a higher occupancy.