Scottish rail fares

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

Q20 comments: Fares structure should seek to maximise train usage, which is currently frustrated by excessively high level of 'walk-on' fares and off-putting complexity of current structure.   Need to end the policy of disproportionately high single fares and the heavy price discrimination against those who return the next or subsequent day. Offering last minute reduced rate 'turn up and fill up' fares (for otherwise empty seats) should be examined.

fare structure too complex

Extension of National Concessionary Travel Scheme benefits should be extended to rail travel. Reimbursing the passenger with substantially lower ticket prices can be achieved <u>without</u> additional cost to the Scottish Government.

agree

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: Train fares should not rise by more than annual inflation. The rail fare cost for two persons should generally be related to the equivalent car / motoring cost for an equivalent journey over the same distance.

agree

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: Political pressure to reduce current level of taxpayers' subsidy to Britain / Scotland's rail system should be set not just as some arbitrary level taking account of improved efficiency gains and passenger fares income.   But also related to the totality of economic / social / environmental / energy sustainability and land-use benefits resulting from for a widely accessible and affordable and well used national rail network. Lessons can be learnt from European railway systems with higher levels of usage (and reduced car dependency) resulting from high levels of Government subsidy.
Passengers on recently enhanced rail routes should <u>not</u> be 'punished' by selectively higher fares (which would seem counter-productive to attracting more patronage).

Social + environmental aspects must be taken into account.

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: Off peak fares should be significantly cheaper to encourage a shift to less busy times, often with spare capacity where there is an element of personal choice available.   But this 'pricing mechanism, to unilaterally change national and obligatory travel to work patterns should not be used in isolation from wider consensual support from national government and employers/employees organisations etc.

12 week advance booking to be maintained off peak fares should be cheaper.

Morning off-peak restrictions should be standardised at 9 am and generally <u>without</u> application of any pm restrictions (including concessionary travel) given the more diffuse travel pattern in the late afternoon / early evening 'peak'.

Scottish stations

Concessionary rail travel to supplement bus Concessionary Journeys

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

Q24 comments: There is broad evidence to suggest desirability of retaining the current number of Scottish rail stations, with more innovative ways of encouraging greater use of those which are considered 'lightly used'. A 'think positive' approach requires a programme of new / re-opened stations (and lines) throughout Scotland which would support economic / employment opportunity and serve a distinct social need and environment or road traffic congestion relief benefit. The current Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidelines (STAG) evaluation of desirable new stations / new lines is too narrowly restrictive and needs improving to more fully recognise the wider accessibility environmental / energy benefits of more rail travel. Experience of new / reopened stations / lines has invariably demonstrated far <u>higher</u> levels of usage than the original 'estimates'

You might like to identify a range of additional rail stations / lines you feel are desirable across Scotland. The 'menu' of desirable additional stations listed on the Attachment is only for your reference - naming even a few of those (or others you desire) would suffice!

re-opened stations have proved very successful

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: Evidence suggests that third parties e.g. local authorities / land-use developers / employers <u>are</u> already interested to invest in new rail stations / lines and other passenger facilities. But are often frustrated and discouraged by contrived operating 'difficulties' raised and unreasonably high capital cost of additions /improvements. Those current 'barriers to progress' should be mutually resolved to encourage opportunities for third parties inputting their contribution to a bigger / better used Scottish rail system.

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

more co-operation between rail franchisee + network rail stations

Q26 comments: Some merging or unified responsibility between ScotRail as the franchisee (and responsibility for stations (and Network Rail as the track infrastructure provider) might be desirable in certain situations regarding station provision and reduced cost of maintenance etc.

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

Q27 comments: Some more innovative and collaborative discussion between the train

our station at Dunkeld/Birnam has a disgracefully low platform *not usable by anyone with disability*

operator (franchisee) and local community interests (local authority /commercial / voluntary) might involve sub-leasing of station premises, including new-build structures on station land to create 'transport and community hubs' Those could jointly share many common costs and help retain a 'human presence' in stations which might otherwise face downgrading to unstaffed status. Lessons could be learned from airports who have succeed in extending their retail, commercial, leisure, restaurant /cafe / bars activity as a significant supplementary income source to planes. There is father considerable opportunity for developing a similar approach at certain station locations in Scotland

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

Q28 comments: Creating arbitrary categories for 'level of facilities' at each station is a futile exercise, since each station must be assessed on the level of passenger throughflow and particularly those with longer waiting times e.g. interchange stations. Rail passengers expect, and are prepared to pay for, the use of toilets at main stations. It is shameful (for example) that the new Partick Station, as a major 'flagship' rail / bus / underground interchange station, is still lacking toilet facilities for its users: a situation which must be remedied within the context of the 2014 ScotRail franchise specification, if not much sooner

more luggage space required on Scotrail trains

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: It is an integral part any 'fit for purpose' ScotRail franchise that a through / direct (no-change of train) service is maintained from London to Dundee - Aberdeen / Inverness. As in response to Q16, any requirement to change at Edinburgh would probably be followed by a 25-30% loss of existing customers. A more responsive way to accommodate the lower volume of cross-border rail traffic to the major centres in northern Scotland, would be to design / operate trains which are capable of being split (reduced in length) for onward travel north without imposing a passenger 'change of train' at Edinburgh. The Scottish Government is the major franchise specification partner with negotiated support from the Department of Transport.

maintain direct services from London to Dundee Aberdeen & Inverness

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: Edinburgh already serves as a 'hub' interchange for many internal Scottish services, including connectional interchanges for communities in the north of Scotland. Those deliver a supplementary range of services and does not conflict with the basic minimum franchise specification' to retain some direct / no change services from Aberdeen - Dundee / Inverness to London. Ideally two direct daytime services each way should be part of the 2014 ScotRail Franchise specification.

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: Passengers' expectation of a seat within 10 minutes is reasonable and this time should not be increased. Passenger Focus should take a more active monitoring role over instances of persistent /gross overcrowding with ScotRail having a mandatory duty to investigate ways in which this can be resolved.

agree

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: Interchange stations and coordination with other rail/bus/subway/tram routes has a value, but direct (no change needed) trains are a much valued factor encouraging rail travel with freedom from hassle /insecurity /inconvenience imposed by a journey interruption change of train (which rail management have confirmed can lose 25-30% of existing passengers). Direct trains from Aberdeen/Inverness to London must be maintained. Offering a direct / no change needed rail travel from Ayrshire / Inverclyde / Renfrewshire to Edinburgh /Cumbernauld-Stirling via the planned Crossrail route would significantly boost rail travel usage, which is currently handicapped by need to change stations/ trains across Glasgow.

Strongly agree

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: A minimum service specification (frequency and first / last trains of the day) must be retained, particularly for social reasons.

agree

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

Q18 comments: A high level of specification is needed, but supplemented by incentive opportunities for the franchisee to improve on the minimum service requirement.

agree

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

Q19 comments: Some mechanism for increased rewards on the basis of every additional passenger carried (by route) could form a basis for usefully encouraging innovation by the franchisee.

agree

Achieving reliability, performance and service quality

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

> Q9 comments: Good performance, coupled with imaginative and well thought out proposals to carry more passengers at lower and radically simplified fare structure should be rewarded, with penalties for failure to adhere to franchise specification

agree

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: The 'threshold' of on-time train punctuality (arriving no more than 5 minutes late for regional services, and 10 minutes for long distance services) seems reasonable. But the numbers (or average) of passengers on the late running train and the daily frequency of trains on any particular route (important in rural areas of low frequency) should also be factored in for different situations.

agree

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

> Q11 comments: There needs to be a more visible way of indicating how customers can make known their concerns. With some guarantee that they will at least receive a detailed explanation of why this deficiency has arisen and measures to reassure customers it will (hopefully) not happen again.

agree

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

> Q12 comments: Published timetables showing attractively short / competitive journey times should be capable of reliable /consistent delivery. But should not seek to imply that the actual train running was longer than actually needed as a franchisee's 'safeguard' against being penalised for late running.

agree

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: The SQUIRE regime seems a reasonable framework covering trains / stations and other aspects of the rail operating regime. It must be capable of adaptation / extension / modification to meet changing issues and passenger expectations etc.

agree

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

> Q14 comments: Passenger Focus needs to have a higher profile on trains/ in stations with more prominent notices over how passenger concerns/complains can be more easily registered at the time e.g. greater use of e-mail, Twitter, as well postal contact details.

agree

Rolling stock

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

> Q31 comments: As electric rolling stock is cheaper to build, operate and maintain further extension of electrification beyond the central belt Edinburgh Glasgow Improvement Programme (EGIP) should be pursued north of Edinburgh / Glasgow to Aberdeen, together with logical infill electrification for diesel operated suburban lines in the greater Glasgow / Edinburgh areas.

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

> Q32 comments: Whilst many of the shorter distance suburban diesel and electric trains are acceptable, longer distance intercity Glasgow/Edinburgh to Aberdeen/Inverness routes, and longer distance rural lines serving the far north of Scotland and south west need radical upgrading with more quality assured new-build stock. A basic list of passenger pre-requisite improvements would include:
> at least one toilet per coach (with greater degree of reliable functionality than on many of the current semi-life expired trains) : adequate and responsive heating : corridor connection throughout the whole train (to ease localised overcrowding/ individual toilet malfunction and achieving more efficient on-train trolley catering service) : more generous seating / legroom, all seats properly aligned with all windows : lower height of windowsill allowing young children to see out without recourse to standing on seats : more adequate luggage / prams / cycle space : Wi-Fi connection / charging facility and 'quiet coaches'.

a separate luggage van on Scotrail long distance trains.

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: Probably best to prioritise Wi-Fi installation / charging facilities on longer distance routes and busy Glasgow-Edinburgh commuter service.

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: Design of new stock should facilitate some greater technical adaptability to alter the balance between first and standard class accommodation in response to varying level of demand. Greater flexibility to allow staff to responsively 'declassify' first class accommodation to mitigate periods of gross overcrowding in standard class (without spatial or ambient prejudice to those having already paid first class fares!).

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

Q35 comments: Any 'blanket ban' on alcohol consumption on trains is undesirable, would be resented and hugely difficult for staff to meaningfully enforce. Maintaining the 'status quo' with selective ban on particular trains with back-up from British Transport Police would be more appropriate and acceptable.

[handwritten: no blanket Ban on Alcohol.]

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

Q36 comments: Possibly the simplest and most effective way of improving the dense amount of complex timetable detail on 'Train Times' notice boards displayed at station and adjoining public places, would be highlighting the 'home station to which each board refers. Simply horizontally underlining the train departure time with a strong/non-fade colour at each home station would be the easiest help to the passenger. This helpful practice has sporadically been done at some stations over many years but should a mandatory application for all 'Train Times' notice boards in all the relevant Scottish locations. And included an integral part of the SQUIRE requirement. Although previously done manually (by the goodwill of individual station staff) modern printing processes now allow this to be done 'at source' in appropriate batches for ready distribution to the current locations.

Train and station staff should be better supplied with information on any timetable changes (departures / arrivals) and the need to better relay this information to passengers on the train and at stations.

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: Since publication of this 'Rail 2014' Consultation the continuing future of this service now seems more assured, given a financial agreement between the Scottish and UK Government to jointly fund major upgrading / refurbishment of the existing fleet of sleeper trains.

[handwritten: Sleeper services from London to Aberdeen, Inverness + Fort William must be maintained]

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: Provision of the Highland and Lowland Sleeper trains must be integrally included within a [single] 2014 ScotRail Franchise.

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

1 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?

2 What is the value of sleeper services to Fort William, Inverness and Aberdeen and are

beneficial (which has been done with the current ScotRail franchise) would seem best.

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

Q3 comments: Relatively low risk level to potential franchisees is acceptable, providing their revenue income stream (profit) is primarily geared to increased passenger carryings. Rather than punitively high bids being submitted by franchisees, whose initial outlay could only be recouped by maximising fare revenue at the expense of passenger numbers, with a readiness to 'hand back' the franchise to Government in times of financial stringency.

[handwritten: I agree]

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

Q4 comments:
A mechanism should be devised for allocating part of the train operator's profit (above a certain level) into better services, to encourage more use of the railway e.g. more trains and stations.

[handwritten: agree]

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

Q5 comments: Investment and innovative proposals to run new train services, provide or operate stations, should be encouraged to supplement and enhance the service and facilities provided by the train operating company.

[handwritten: agree.]

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

Q6 comments: A system of penalties related to failure to deliver agreed franchise specification, should also be matched by rewards to the train operating company for improving on the specification e.g. punctuality and genuine commitment to resolving on persistent areas of passenger dissatisfaction.

[handwritten: agree]

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

Q7 comments: Too high a performance bond may discourage franchise bidders.

[handwritten: correct]

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

Q8 comments: The existing Service Quality Inspection Regime (SQUIRE) with its penalties and sanctions would seem adequate with power to terminate the franchise being applied in cases of major failure.

[handwritten: agree]

Attachment 1 - Transport Scotland - Rail 2014 Consultation

Respondent Information Form and Questions

This is a sample guide only - please do <u>not</u> use for your own response

The <u>blank</u> response form can be obtained from 'Annexe D' and by

clicking on the 'Consultation Response Form' *米 FORM INCLUDED*

Your response, when completed, should be sent to:

Rail2014@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk

by Monday 20th February 2014

When filling in your Response form:

1. Put only your name (no organisation)

2 Your residential Postal address

3. Permissions - Tick 'I am responding as an Individual'

The responses below are for your private <u>reference</u> use only - please do not use as an identical response

----

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 comment: A single ScotRail train franchise will best serve all Scotland's rail needs. *Agree.*

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

> Q2 comments: A 7 year franchise with the option of a further 3 year extension if felt

these the correct destinations, for example would Oban provide better connectivity?

3 What facilities should the sleeper services provide and would you pay more for better facilities?

> Q39 comments: Better advance information and understanding / responsiveness to the needs and changing expectations of existing passengers would maximise the wider awareness and appeal of the sleeper train to <u>potential</u> sleeper passengers -- perhaps through a more specialised marketing division. A specific case in point is the Fort William-London Sleeper train, also conveying seated coaches for non-sleeper patrons, which stops at Westerton (Bearsden). There is believed, to be a considerable level of travel business / leisure travel from the Bearsden / Milngavie communities to London. Yet the availability of this conveniently local accessed service <u>direct</u> from the Bearsden / Milngavie areas to London (obviating the need for 5 - 8 mile journey into central Glasgow Central Station) is not fully appreciated locally, yet is capable of being more fully exploited.

Environmental issues *Seated Sleeper to be maintained at same price Level as day time trains.*

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

> Q40 comments: A key criteria would be monitor the amount of modal shift on to rail, achieved on a year by year basis from other more environmentally damaging forms of transport car or plane. And the extent to which this was achieved by improved and more competitive fares and marketing policy, allied to investment in modern electric and more efficient diesel stock replacements

Attachment 2 - SCOTTISH RAIL STATIONS: DESIRABLE / POTENTIAL NETWORK ADDITIONS

Some examples of additional desirable stations (many identified in Local Authority Plans) to boost economic and employment opportunity, meet social need, give environmental relief of road traffic congestion, improve regional accessibility etc. Not in any ranked order of priority. Some desirable stations involving network extensions (requiring new / restored lines) are also shown.

Aberdeen City:
Bucksburn, Cove

Aberdeenshire:
Kintore, Newtonhill

Angus:

Argyll and Bute:

Clackmannanshire:
Cambus

Dumfries and Galloway:
Beattock, East Riggs, Thornhill

Dundee:

East Ayrshire:
Cumnock, Hurlford, Mauchline, New Farm Loch, Riccarton + Altonhill and Queens Drive (short freight links, Kilmarnock)

East Dunbartonshire:
Allander, Westerhill, Woodilee

East Lothian:
Blindwells, East Linton + Haddington(restored line)

East Renfrewshire:
Mansewood, Netherlee, Springfield

Edinburgh: ✓
Abbeyhill, Kirkliston, Morningside, Portobello, The Jewel, Gogar West Interchange, Ingliston/Newbridge Interchange

Falkirk:
Bonnybridge, + Grangemouth (freight line)

Fife:
Abernethy, Dysart, Halbeath, Windygates, Sinclairtown, Wormit, Levenmouth (restored line), + St Andrews (new line). Extending the re-opened Alloa line eastward through Longannet to Dunfermline.

Glasgow:
Drumchapel West, Blochairn/Garngad, Germiston, Ibrox, Jordanhill West, Parkhead Forge, Robroyston + Glasgow Cross + Gorbals + West Street with Subway Interchange (stations on Crossrail freight line)

Highland:
Balloch, Beechwood (UHI University/Inverness College), Conon Bridge, Culloden, Dalcross (Inverness Airport) Evanton, Kildary, Halkirk, + Dornoch (new line)

Inverclyde:

Midlothian:

Moray :
Balbair, Balmakeith, Kinloss

North Ayrshire :
Ardrossan North.

North Lanarkshire:
Abronhill, Mossend, Plains

Perth and Kinross: ✓ _Long overdue_ .
Blackford

Renfrewshire:
Arkleston/Gallowhill + Glasgow Airport (new line)

Scottish Borders:
Reston, + Melrose and Hawick (restored line)

South Ayrshire:
Ayr South

South Lanarkshire:
Kirktonholme, Law, Symington

Stirling:
Bannockburn

West Lothian: ✓
Winchburgh

AN URGENT MESSAGE TO ALL RAILFUTURE SCOTLAND MEMBERS

As you are probably already aware, Transport Scotland's 'Rail 2014' Consultation is currently seeking views on the terms and conditions of the new 2014 ScotRail Franchise.

The details of this are contained in 'Rail 2014 - Public Consultation' document which gives a huge amount of information on Scotland's rail system and also how you can register comments and suggestions.

For computer users see: www.transportscotland.gov.uk/rail2014
Without computer access: phone for copy of document to: **0141-272-7588**

An explanation of how to respond, to 40 specific questions, is explained in Annexe D - Respondent Information Form and Questions.
For computer users: Click on the 'Consultation Response Form', fill in the boxes and when complete send to Rail2014@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk by Monday 20th February 2012.

Without computer access: Write your numbered responses (you don't need to write out the questions) and post to:
Rail 2014 Transport Scotland Buchanan House 58 Port Dundas Road Glasgow G4 0HF to be received by Monday 20th February 2012.

Some simple suggestions on how to offer your responses:

* **No need to attempt an answer to all 40 questions asked !**

* **Only do as many or as few you understand/and feel competent to make comment on.**

* **Short forceful responses can often make a very powerful point**

* **Simply write 'no comment' or take a line through through those you don't wish to answer.**

* **Some helpful outline response suggestions are given in ATTACHMENT 1. These embrace much of our policy as discussed by our Committee, and will form an input to our final Railfuture Scotland response. Those are only an outline guide which you are free to alter or discard as you wish! But please don't send in this 'sample response'!**

* **Scottish Stations (Questions 24, 25 and 27) may be of particular significance, in urging Transport Scotland to adopt a more positive approach to providing more stations on the Scottish rail network. The examples in ATTACHMENT 2 are only intended as possible examples of the range of possible new/additional stations (and lines) which you could selectively incorporate if you wish - or suggest different ideas of your own.**

* **Scottish Rail fares (Questions 20 - 23) are a crucial issue of concern**

* **Retaining direct / no change) rail services (Questions 29-30) is another area of concern**

* **Please send in your response as an individual : not as a member of Railfuture Scotland**

* **Need any further assistance or clarification? Please contact me, as below (phoning is often quicker, simpler, and easier to explain/ clarify complex issues than by e-mail).**

Kind regards
Ken Sutherland
(0141-942-0194)

ATTACHMENT 1 - Rail 2014 Consultation Sample Responses from Railfuture Scotland (for your private reference only)
ATTACHMENT 2 - Examples of additional rail stations potentially desirable throughout Scotland (reference samples only)

Remember Monday 20th February 2012 is the closing date for all responses