

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

Newburgh Train Station Campaign

Title Mr Ms Mrs Miss Dr Please tick as appropriate

Surname

Forename

2. Postal Address

c/o 151A High Street

Newburgh

Cupar

Fife

Postcode KY14 6DY

Phone 01337 840415

Email

ntsc@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:

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:

Newburgh Train Station Campaign (NTSC) would like to respond to this question by turning it on its head, answering the question in terms of reopening stations that formerly served their catchment area communities well enough in their day and to address this as both an important economic, environmental and social issue that Scottish ministers should urgently consider.

This serves the purposes of many small towns and their catchment areas within Scotland not merely Newburgh, which with well over 2000 folk is the largest town in Fife on a busy railway line with no station and entirely dependent on road transport. At one time Newburgh had two halts. Salmon, potatoes and other produce was all loaded onto the train. That was when there was a more varied rural and town economy. Newburgh had a linoleum works as well as a farming and river economy. This locally sustained economy has largely gone now and Newburgh is but one example that can be multiplied across the land.

The historic reasons for station closures in past times can be broadly understood as just one part of the overall widespread pattern of managed economic decline, which in so many ways is much bleaker than it sounds. Subsequent efforts to regenerate local economies and particularly present day efforts to do this sustainably by local communities themselves, examples of which are likely to increase in future, require from government and the rail authority transparent and accessible procedures established to examine and process cases for station reopenings. Basically, local efforts to establish their communities once again need support at a national level and within a fair national framework. Mutuality and equality are key ingredients.

This is especially important when attempts to reopen stations are made as an integral part of a local regeneration strategy by communities themselves, often effectively and nearly always with little resources of their own.

Before costly, formal submissions are made, the rail authority should be placed in a position that obliges it to meet and work with local communities on plans to reopen stations, initially on an informal basis and as far as possible in a way that is mutual and cooperative.

Attempts to reopen stations in areas that lie between, or indeed those beyond the main urban conurbations should not by default be deemed as intrusive on time schedules or as a burden on timetabling and planning. If anything the onus of proof against reopening a station should be on the authority and open to examination and adjustment accordingly.

Sacrificing train services of the intermediary communities along main routes to avoid impacts on long-distance inter-urban journey times and going hell for leather to reduce inter-city travel times could soon enough be seen as being just as bad as kow-towing to greedy bankers. However with good will and enough good political will there will always be wriggle room in plenty to negotiate and find room for new stops.

The case for retaining and extending the number of Scottish stations should always be understood and made as an economic and social reckoning. To quote a recent policy document:

A well designed, maintained and operated station supports and enhances the passenger experience of rail services, including the interchange with other modes, encouraging additional trips and supporting shifts from other modes of transport. Many stations also provide a broader contribution to the communities in which they reside, supporting economic activity in the station catchment and accessibility to jobs, and cultural and community facilities and activities.

(p99, 7.1.3 Stations, Network Strategies for Scotland, *Initial Industry Plan – Scotland - Proposals for Control Period 5 and beyond* - Network Rail, Association of Train Operating Companies, Rail Freight Operating Association and the Rail Industry Association, September 2011).

National planning and provision of rail services and networks should then be flexible and in an evolving way be involved with and cognisant of local scale community regeneration initiatives and not presume in favour of the major urban hub. Local stations between the urban centres represent local communities and local economies, in many ways a vital glue that sticks the whole together, the stuff of cohesion, a principle that should be better minded in policy making and planning.

If the many smaller towns and communities in the rural areas of Scotland are to regenerate and thrive properly again in a sustainable and meaningful way they should be considered as a vital part of an overall integrated national rail and transport network, they should be considered and planned for as an integral, active part of the whole economic development of Scotland. If they are presumed against, the disastrous managed economic and social decline of the latter half of the 20th century will continue into the 21st. Is that a political and economic legacy to be proud of? Is that what Scotland wants?

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:

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:

Taking questions 25 and 27 together as well as continuing from the response given in the comments above for question 24, Newburgh Train Station Campaign would argue that the merits of a partnership approach to a local station reopening are as clear enough as they are necessary.

Community initiatives, channeled for example through community trusts as part of a local strategy of sustainable economic and social regeneration, are by their very nature characteristically adaptive and responsive, well able to work in partnership with local government and agencies as well as the rail authority and the Scottish Government, able to take advice as much as to take the initiative and the responsibility for reopening and ensuring support for a local station since in large part they arise from and maintain their strength through local community, grass root networks.

A station like any well used public space becomes a source of local pride and more so if it has resulted from an array of community initiatives all working together. Local communities easily enough accommodate issues such as the care for the fabric of a station and its immediate environment. Examples of communities involving themselves in the maintenance of stations and their landscape and garden areas are well enough attested. Businesses can thrive within station buildings and on land adjacent, after all they did so well enough in the past.

So it is that the ownership and responsibility of a public space is arguably increased by the seriously functioning public space represented by a station and railway line services, whether this is expressed through voluntary involvement efforts or through the community managed provision of jobs as well as an input from business.

The social and economic dynamics set in motion by the reopening of a station through the direct involvement of a local community readily follow, especially if they have jointly invested in this with local and national authorities as a result of income streams from other community regeneration initiatives and fund raising drives.

Stations are also vital when linked to regeneration strategies involving tourism and the culture industries as crucial components, a not unusual occurrence in recent years especially in Scotland and not always arising from urban centres or elites. Festivals and Feisean have grown dramatically in number and scale and this is reflective of the deep currents that have surfaced or resurfaced in

contemporary Scotland.

The empowerment of communities by the reopening of a local station is more than just about arrivals and departures, it signals new promise for an area and a sustainable and meaningful investment both in the short and the long term.

Local stations for local communities means where the train stops so too does the buck. Local communities will keep their stations alive with as much effort as they do to keep themselves going. Scotland needs them both for a better, determined future.

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:

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: