

## 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

Newtonhill, Muchalls & Cammachmore Community Council

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

#### Surname

Morgan

#### Forename

Michael

### 2. Postal Address

64 St. Michael's Road

Newtonhill

Stonehaven

Kincardineshire

Postcode AB39 3RW

Phone 01569730789

#### Email

warrensoftware@aol.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)?
	<b>Please tick as appropriate</b> <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 <b>Please tick ONE of the following boxes</b>
	Yes, make my response, name and address all available <input type="checkbox"/>
	or <input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address <input type="checkbox"/>
	or <input type="checkbox"/>
	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?
	<b>Please tick as appropriate</b> <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
------------	--	--	-----------------------------

## 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: **no comment**

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

Q3 comments: **no comment**

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

Q4 comments: **no comment**

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: **Providing a service and trains that run on time is far more important than journey times.**

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: **Open more stations on commuter routes and have more trains stopping at stations that are already open.**

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**

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: **Government policy of shorter inter-city journey times should be relaxed in favour of more commuter trains.**

18. What level of contract specification should we use 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: **Fares must be set at a level that encourages greater use of the railway; they must not be used as a form of taxation.**

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: **no comment**

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: **Fares are too high.**

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: **It should be cheaper for two people to take the train rather than drive one car and pay to park.**

### **Scottish stations**

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

Q24 comments: **Public demand.**

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: **You will never know how many people will use the train if it doesn't actually stop to let them on.**

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: **no comment**

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

Q27 comments: **Engage with local community and civic pride groups.**

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: **YES, we have already seen a cut in cross-border services and we view this as a penalty imposed on us for not living in Edinburgh.**

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: **We believe that Edinburgh Waverley could not cope with hundreds of extra passengers standing around in the cold waiting for connections.**

### **Rolling stock**

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

Q31 comments: **no comment**

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

Q32 comments: **no comment**

### **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: **no comment**

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: **Sleeper services must be continued.**

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: **no comment**

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: **We have heard only praise about the sleeper services for both services and staff. The sleeper, to and from Aberdeen, provides an essential link for many people that is not available from plane or coach services.**

### **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: **no comment**

### **Any additional comments**

**The Newtonhill, Muchalls & Cammachmore Community Council recognises the importance of this consultation and welcomes the opportunity to add our comments to the debate on Rail 2014. The Community Council held a Planning for Real exercise in May 2009 and a Making it Real exercise in June 2011. Our response to this consultation is based on the information gathered during those community engagement exercises.**

**The current policy of giving priority to cutting inter-city journey times has run its course and should now be scrapped. Aberdeen has two strategic growth corridors that run along the existing rail links, Aberdeen-Inverness and Aberdeen-Dundee. The opening of a new station at Laurencekirk demonstrated a higher than expected demand for commuter services to Aberdeen. The way ahead is to improve**

commuter services; initially this would entail more of the existing services stopping at stations like Portlethen. Then more commuter trains and longer commuter trains need to be added to the schedule. Eventually the station at Newtonhill needs to be reopened. Newtonhill, with a population of over 3000, is physically divided by the railway line. Many residents commute to Aberdeen, but there is no station.

We see that the increased commuter service may impact slightly upon inter-city services at peak times, but otherwise these inter-city services should continue at their existing service level. Similarly, freight services must not be affected.

The argument given in the consultation is that opening more stations will lead to potential overcrowding as a consequence of increased patronage. We anticipate that solutions will be found and do not see this problem as a good reason to prevent the network from meeting demand.