

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

Stirling Council

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

Surname

Padmore

Forename

Jonathan

2. Postal Address

Environment Services

Viewforth

Stirling

Postcode FK8 2ET

Phone 01786 443048

Email padmorej@stirling.gov.uk

3. Permissions - I am responding as...

	Individual	/	Group/Organisation	
	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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)?		(c)	
	Please tick as appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>		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).	
(b)	Where confidentiality is not requested, we will make your responses available to the public on the following basis		Are you content for your response to be made available?	
	Please tick ONE of the following boxes		Please tick as appropriate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	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"/>		
(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			

Consultation Questions

General:

The consultation clearly and simply provides background to many of the issues that need to be considered in procuring passenger rail services. Hence the consultation not only provides the opportunity, but also enables, input into Transport Scotland's work in informing both the Scotrail franchise and also future station requirement discussions with the Office of the Rail Regulator. The scope and presentation of the consultation provided by Transport Scotland is therefore appreciated.

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:

Whether a dual focus franchise is preferable, should take account of:

The ability to sub-divide rail services into economic / social elements to enable performance criteria to be defined in a franchise

At the highest level it is easy to assume that services can generally be divided into those which are busy and require the least subsidy, and those which are quieter and require most subsidy (or economic or social elements). It is also appreciated that this is perhaps most marked on services into the Edinburgh and Glasgow during the morning and evening peaks. Any sub-division beyond this level is difficult.

On the Perth/Alloa to Glasgow/Edinburgh lines which serve Dunblane, Bridge of Allan and Stirling, the route has a number of economic and social uses, including:

- Commuter trips into Glasgow and Edinburgh
- Commuter trips from Falkirk, Larbert, Alloa, Bridge of Allan and Dunblane
- Services to Larbert Station (from Dunblane / Bridge of Allan / Alloa / Stirling / Camelon / Falkirk Grahamston) which link to the shuttle bus service to Forth Valley Royal Hospital, are a key element of the access strategy to the hospital.
- Tourist trips to Stirling (and with Stirling being a central and accessible base (to the southern highlands and the Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park, as well as the Central Belt), Stirling Council and Stirling

Community Planning Partnership have an objective of increasing the tourist trips from Stirling)

- Business trips between Stirling and Scotland's other cities during the day
- Daytime and evening social / leisure trips into Stirling and to Edinburgh and Glasgow.
- The use of the route by passengers passing through Stirling / Bridge of Allan / Dunblane to Perth and beyond.

We can assume which trains at which times of day require the most subsidy and those the least. However, it becomes more difficult to sub-divide and define service/ performance priorities along a route or across times of the day when all the above uses are taken into account. Additionally, which of the above uses are for economic purpose, and hence if undermined could result in additional cost to the public purse?

On the Glasgow to Oban / Fort William line which serves Crianlarich, Tyndrum Upper and Tyndrum Lower, the route has perhaps fewer functions:

- Providing an essential lifeline for the communities to services in Oban, Fort William and Glasgow
- Supporting sustainable tourist/visitor access and economic activity in a National Park
- Provides an essential connecting service to onward ferries at Oban or onward rail or coaches at Fort William

Cross subsidy

Would there be much difference between the level of subsidy for a single franchise (where cross subsidy is contained within the franchise) or separate franchises where there would be less subsidy for an 'economic' franchise and more for a 'social' franchise?

The break up of a rail network into franchises which can be categorised by their level of subsidy places, particularly at this time of economic restraint (the end of which is unknown), will raise concerns over how much and how long subsidy will be provided for the 'social' franchise.

There is also a risk that in a 'social' franchise that services will be specified at level that reduces the number of services to a level where they are less attractive and subsequently patronage falls.

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

Q2 comments:

The advantages of longer term franchises are well documented.

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

Q3 comments:

In response to the risks suggested in the response to Q2, the use of break clauses should be considered.

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

Q4 comments:

Given the level of public investment and subsidy in the rail network, it is considered reasonable for a reasonable % of any profit to be re-invested into improving the rail network. Hence a profit share mechanism would be supported – but that this should also consider capping (including profits and/or fares).

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

Q5 comments:

It is difficult to envisage any third party involvement, however there may be scope to allow the franchise operator to sub-franchise if a third party could operate (an element of) a service at a lower cost.

As an example, there are numerous examples of successful enthusiast / community rail services across Britain. Opportunities for such services to be provided along with conventional services, particularly when they provide both a functional service as well as a tourist draw, should be supported.

Any third party involvement should not result in additional complexity for the rail user. So, for example, introducing additional complexity to users with regard to ticketing and timetables should be avoided.

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

Q6 comments:

Unable to offer any comment.

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

Q7 comments:

Unable to offer any comment.

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

Q8 comments:

The ultimate sanction is the ability to terminate a contract. However, given the cost and time involved in securing a franchise a range of sanctions or penalties should be able to be employed before this stage. Any sanctions / penalties should be measures which contribute either to continual improvement of the rail network and/or improvements for the rail user.

Achieving reliability, performance and service quality

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

Q9 comments:

While Transport Scotland are seeking views on whether greater flexibility be applied to a franchise(s), it is assumed that any franchise must still, in part, be defined by a set of minimum criteria. It is essential that there are sanctions / penalties to discourage poor performance below this minimum criteria.

However, if a franchise(s) is to provide greater flexibility with regard to service / performance criteria, there are presumably benefits accruing from this which the operator is expected to provide. Hence there needs to be consideration as to how to incentivise the operator to achieve these benefits, rather than providing a minimum level of service. (see also response to Q4)

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 performance regime should be aligned to what is important to passengers. What is important to passengers may vary across routes, times of the day and across Scotland according to what uses the route is put to. Hence, due to the complexity of uses on many routes (see response to Q1), it may be difficult to vary the performance regime much across Scotland.

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

Q11 comments:

The following passenger issues / priorities are assumed:

- **Commuters** are most heavily influenced by reliability, cost, frequency of services at peak times (to reduce door to door time) and the ability to get a seat (the later two factors are closely related)
- Passengers requiring **access to Forth Valley Hospital** require regular services throughout the day and evening (for staff and visiting)
- Trips between Stirling and other cities will be influenced by the perceived directness of the service. **Business trips** will require reliability. **Social / leisure / tourist trips** will be sensitive to cost and frequency of services into the evening.
- Passengers **travelling through** Stirling / Bridge of Allan / Dunblane to **Perth and beyond** will see some or all of the above as priorities subject to the regularity of their trip. However, due to their longer journey they can also be expected to place a slightly higher premium on journey time than passengers travelling shorter distances.

Any regime should not focus solely on existing passengers who may be satisfied with the service offered, but also take into account people who could make a journey by train but use the car instead. Consideration needs to be given to total journey times. In paragraph 4.7 it is commented that “relative journey times matter and therefore shorter journey times will increase patronage”. The journey time that should be considered needs to include waiting time at stations. If a train service is to substitute for a car journey, a more frequent service with consequently shorter waiting times will do more to reduce total journey times than having shorter on-train journey times.

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

Q12 comments:

Marginal improvements in journey time are unlikely to be important to passengers, particularly if this is at the expense of requiring a transfer between services.

An emphasis on performance which results in improved reliability is of utmost importance to trips within the Central Belt.

A similar argument applies to any definition of lateness. Except when passengers are told that their train is a couple of minutes late, they are unlikely to notice. They will however notice (and be significantly inconvenienced) if the lateness results in a cancellation or missing of a connecting service. Cancellations and missed connections matter – not being

a couple of minutes later than scheduled.

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:

Unable to offer comment.

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

Q14 comments:

Unable to offer 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:

The acceptable standing time on a rail service is likely to be determined by how often you have to experience such.

Network Rail's Scotland Route Utilisation Strategy Generation Two suggests a scenario post 2019 (and hence post EGIP improvements) of peak morning services from Stirling to Glasgow having a passenger to seat ratio between Stirling and Croy of 100% -130%. The journey time between these two stations is approximately 20mins. Equally, a standing time of well beyond 10minutes is likely on the routes out of Edinburgh or Glasgow towards Stirling when the trains are full (with the first stops post 2016 likely to be, respectively, Linlithgow and Croy). Regularly putting up with this degree of discomfort at the end of a day – and an ability to use their travel time productively - will quickly encourage the commuter to seek alternatives at the expense of rail.

While it is accepted that First Class seating brings in significant finances, should First Class seating be sacrificed at peak times? (see also response to Q34)

Existing off-peak travel promotions should be developed further to fill spare capacity at these periods and promote peak spreading where possible.

The best that can be achieved is more and longer trains at peak hours, although it is accepted that this resource is unlikely to be utilised during the rest of the day.

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:

It is difficult to support an increase in the use of interchange station at the expense of direct services. Paragraph 5.16 fails to consider the “penalty” for interchange in terms of cost, longer journey times due to having to change trains and the inconvenience for all passengers. A major attraction of train travel for business people is the ability to work on board the train, this ability would be negated by having to change trains frequently. Passengers with accompanying luggage and those with disabilities would be similarly inconvenienced

Would the proposals offer guaranteed connections for all trains? This would have obvious implications for overall network reliability. If connections were not guaranteed then this would increase public concerns on unreliability of rail travel.

Greater opportunities for interchange with other modes (including bus, coach and ferry) would be supported. However, current lead-in times for even minor rail timetable changes are lengthy and excessive. Where connections are made with local bus services, which can be varied with 56 days notice, some mechanism is needed to allow consequent train service changes.

Also, greater recognition is required within both the rail and bus industries of opportunities for rail-bus interchange, through-ticketing, etc.

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:

As the Scottish Government ‘heavily subsidises’ the franchise then Transport Scotland should ensure that the franchise operator satisfies Government objectives and therefore should directly determine aspects such as frequency and journey time.

As stated in response to Q9 while Transport Scotland are seeking views on whether greater flexibility be applied to a franchise(s), it is assumed that any franchise must still, in part, be defined by a set of minimum criteria.

This service criteria set by the Government should also pay regard not only to the potential improvements that EGIP will bring, but also to the promised improvements upon which EGIP is being sold to the public. It is difficult to

comprehend the promise of EGIP of a certain level of provision following 2016, but then permitting the operating companies the opportunity to determine whether or not this will be case post 2014.

Presumably the operators should be committed to providing at least what EGIP promises, particularly at peak times.

Additionally, assuming the evolving EGIP timetables are maximising service opportunities with existing/proposed stock, are we being led to believe that different operators, or a different way of running services, could bring more stock, or opportunities for more services, over and above the EGIP improvements?

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

Q18 comments:

To ensure that services meet social, economic and environmental aims rather than narrow financial targets and following on from the response to the questions above (in particular Q1, Q11 and Q12), we believe that the contract specification which applies on:

(A) the Edinburgh / Glasgow to Alloa/ Perth lines via Stirling – whether this be a minimum, full, or targeted specification - should:

- Provide a level of service at least equal to that promised via EGIP.
- Provide frequent, reliable, direct and competitively priced commuter services at peak times (Monday to Friday)
 - To Glasgow and Edinburgh (and Perth?) from Dunblane, Bridge of Allan and Stirling
 - To Stirling from Dunblane, Bridge of Allan, Alloa, Larbert, Camelon and Falkirk (and Perth?).
- Provide regular and direct services between Dunblane, Bridge of Allan, Alloa and Stirling to Larbert (for Forth Valley Royal Hospital) throughout the day (Monday to Sunday)
- Provide a choice of fast or semi-fast services to connect Stirling to Edinburgh and Glasgow during the day for business, tourist and leisure/social purposes (Monday to Sunday)
- Ensure that the last trains in the evening to / from Stirling / Glasgow / Edinburgh enable reasonable advantage to be made of the night-time economy in these cities. This is equally important for residents as well as enabling visitors to use Stirling as a base for both city and rural activities.

(B) the Glasgow to Oban/Fort William line – whether this be a full, or targeted specification – should:

- Provide services to enable users to get from Crianlarich or Tyndrum to and from Oban / Fort William / Glasgow to enable them to spend the majority of the day in these locations if desired. (Monday to Sunday)
- Similarly services should allow visitors to get to Crianlarich or Tyndrum to enable them to either chose to arrive the night before or early the next day.

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

Q19 comments:

Unable to offer additional comment other than the response to Q4

Scottish rail fares

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

Q20 comments:

Rather than considering rail in isolation, fares should be set to achieve wider social, economic and environmental objectives. Rail should play a full role in alleviating urban road congestion, and so be set to be competitive with car travel, as well as enabling affordable access to services and opportunities for those without access to a car.

In terms of encouraging the maximum number of regular users (especially commuter) to relieve road congestion and its economic and environmental consequences (addressing the consequences of which come at a cost to Government), it is suggested much more could be done with regard to incentivising the purchase of season tickets, for both peak and off-peak travel.

As important as setting the right fares, is keeping the fare structure simple for the public, enabling them to easily identify the cheapest fares which will then inform decisions with regard to time of travel.

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:

Fares should be regulated to achieve the broader objectives such as those outlined in response to Q20 i.e. ensuring that fares make rail travel an attractive option compared to car travel.

In addition, fare structures should also be as simple as possible.

Given these two factors, it is difficult to assume much scope for fares to be set on a commercial basis. However operators should be given the opportunity to maximise customers, so some form of capping which recognises the price sensitivity of routes could be considered. The type and regularity of the journey will determine its price sensitivity. It is therefore worthwhile emphasising that commuter services between Stirling and Glasgow / Edinburgh will display a price sensitivity similar to suburban trips rather than inter-city trips.

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:

When considering the balance between subsidy and passenger revenue contributions, regard should in the first instance, be paid to the potential cost to the public purse of a rail network which, because high fares discourage passengers, will not contribute to:

- Reducing traffic congestion for economic and environmental reasons
- Reducing access to services and opportunities for those without access to a car

A variety of Government sources support the greater use of rail including the National Transport Strategy, The Climate Change Act (Scotland), Scotland's Cities etc.

The cost to the rail user, whatever the subsidy, must remain competitive with alternatives if the wider economic, social and environmental objectives are to be achieved.

With regard to applying higher increases to sections of the network which have recently been enhanced, this principle assumes that the rail user is the person who receives all the benefit of the investment. Investment in the rail network does bring advantages to those who chose to use it. But by these people choosing to use the network, the whole of society not only benefits from less car trips, less pollution and less congestion, but also increased movement and (economic) activity. The rail network is a resource for all, as is the road network. Asking the rail user to pay an additional charge for improvements is not an equitable approach when tolls are not sought on improved sections of the road network.

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:

Peak fares need to be set at a level which encourages use of rail rather than driving (taking account for example of car parking charges at a destination), and off peak fares should be set at a level which is sufficient to encourage people to travel in the off peak if they can.

It should also be remembered that approximately a quarter of households do not have access to a car. These people use public transport because they have no choice. Some sensitivity must be applied when setting fares for people who have no choice but to use rail.

See also response to Q20

Scottish stations

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

Q24 comments:

As noted in response to Q11, the key factors to encourage / retain rail users, place reliability and direct services over journey time, at least for journeys to and from Stirling, hence:

New stations

If a new station can be added which generates new rail users because it provides a direct service, and if measures can be undertaken to ensure that the negative impact on services are only a couple of minutes, then the case for the station should be considered further.

In addition, if a significant new travel generator is being introduced into an area, and there is scope and a sufficiently strong economic case, to encourage some of its travel demand to be met by rail, then a new station should be considered.

There is obviously a limit to how many new stops can be added before the cumulative impact results in a significant increase in journey time. Therefore any consideration of a new station should reflect on how many new stations could be added to that route without a significant impact on journey time, and where these stations are best placed.

Closing Stations

Given that the long term objective is to grow rail passengers closing of a station should only be considered if:

- all options to grow demand have been considered and exhausted, and there are no long term prospects of increasing demand AND it is important to services on that route that time savings are made
- there is significantly more potential to generate additional rail passengers at new location AND there is no capacity for additional

stations on that route. Obviously closing one station in preference for another could be a very tricky politically.

Station Opportunities in Stirling

Within Stirling we would request that Transport Scotland and Network Rail work with the Council to investigate the benefits of:

- relocating Bridge of Allan Station. The current station is on the edge of the residential area. The emerging Local Development Plan is considering a major housing development between Bridge of Allan and Causewayhead. The relocation of Bridge of Allan station approximately 1.8km to the south would place the station within walking distance of a much wider population of bridge of Allan, Cornton, Causewayhead, and any new development between Bridge of Allan and Causewayhead and Stirling University (if the said development goes ahead).
- A station to serve the proposed major residential proposals in the merging Local Development Plan of Durieshill (2500houses), South Stirling Gateway (800), Plean (500) and Cowie(500), as well as the existing population to the south of Stirling. We are conscious of Transport Scotland's stated opposition to the idea, however the only evidence that Transport Scotland has been able to provide regarding it's consideration and rejection following the commitment by the then Scottish Executive to investigate the feasibility of the proposal is the following statement in the EGIP Timetable Review of Infrastructure Improvements:

"There is growing talk of a proposal to build a new station at Bannockburn; and this is likely to lead to the requirement for further re-signalling between Larbert and Stirling to reduce the headways to 3 minutes to maintain the capacity of this section of route."

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:

Provided there is capacity for an additional stop on a route, a third party could bring in additional finance to help fund a new station. Examples could be existing large businesses (whether retail / commercial or leisure) or major new developments – where the addressing of the existing or potential travel demands would significantly benefit from facilities to reduce the car modal share of the development.

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:

Any customer is likely to use a variety of stations. Some consistency in the facilities and service they can expect from stations would minimise frustrations arising from receiving a lower level of service / facilities than they may normally expect. Hence minimising the number of different organisations responsible for the management and maintenance of stations on any route or in any geographic area would be preferable.

The response to Q5 suggested that there may be opportunities for third parties such as groups of rail enthusiasts to run services in certain areas. Where this is the case, then permitting such groups to manage and maintain stations on route should be given consideration.

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

Q27 comments:

There should be a requirement on the franchisee to work with communities to identify opportunities to support their local stations.

It should be noted that encouraging and enabling mixed uses at stations will help improve security.

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

Q28 comments:

Any station is likely to perform as one or more of the different station types identified, as well as there being individual circumstances at all stations (for example, being connected to the national cycle network).

The staffing of stations, and perceived security, remain a crucial issue for passengers. The examples given do not give any indication of which types of stations should be staffed.

It is suggested that the 'interchange' station should not be restricted to merely interchange with other rail services. Where the station provides an interchange with coach or bus services, the same level of passenger waiting / information facilities are required.

Cycle parking: all stations should have cycle stands, but additionally those stations which are used by commuters should also have lockers or secure cycle compounds.

Rationalising, in the franchise, who is responsible for cycle parking at the

stations would be appreciated. There is a variety of stands and lockers at Stirling's stations, provided by and managed by both Scotrail and Stirling Council. As the other facilities that are provided at a station are usually managed by the operator, it would both clearer and better promoted if the cycle parking facilities are managed by the operator.

An aspect which is not reflected in the proposed description of 'Tourist' stations are the roles of certain stations as gateways / arrival points into Scotland or a tourist destination. Stirling Station for example is not on a rural line (like the examples given) but does provide an important tourist function. Accordingly, the following are important:

- First impressions (i.e. standard to which the station is maintained – this reflects on the rail operator, Stirling and Scotland)
- Staffing
- Local information

The franchisee should also be required to develop station travel plans to work with RTPs and local authorities to ensure that travel to and from stations by various modes are considered.

Within Stirling suggest:

Stirling Station: serves as a commuter, interchange, tourist and also (currently) hourly inter-city services. Tactran Rail Passenger Survey 2009, identified the following trip purpose destinations for passengers boarding at Stirling between 0600 - 1000

NORMAL WORKPLACE (49.6%)
EDUCATION/TRAINING (15.8%)
EMPLOYERS BUSINESS (10.8%)
PERSONAL BUSINESS (10.4%)
SHOPPING (5%)
SOCIAL/RECREATION (4.2%)
HOME (3.5%)
NOT GIVEN (0.8%)

As such, at least staffing, car and cycle parking, waiting and toilet facilities, real-time information, taxi provision, ticket office should be provided. It should be noted that Stirling Station is also a gateway for tourists. Disabled access is an issue from platforms 9/10, and we believe this is an issue that is currently being addressed by Scotrail. We would also request that the franchise enables the forecourt area of the station be adopted by Stirling Council to enable ourselves to better accommodate the Station Forecourt into the redesign of the Station Rd / Goosecroft Rd area to provide an enhanced gateway into the City Centre from the station (NB we would ideally time this work with the maintenance of the A9 tunnel deck which runs beneath the station forecourt).

Bridge of Allan Station: Principally commuter and local transport connections. Tactran Rail Passenger Survey 2009, identified the following trip

purpose destinations for passengers boarding at Bridge of Allan between 0600 - 1000

NORMAL WORKPLACE (75.8%)
HOME (9.5%)
EMPLOYERS BUSINESS (8.4%)
PERSONAL BUSINESS (4.2%)
SOCIAL/RECREATION (2.1%)
EDUCATION/TRAINING (0%)
SHOPPING (0%)

The survey also noted that approximately 74% of the passengers arrive by car (NB only 52% travel to Dunblane by car) , reflecting the distance from the majority of residences in Bridge of Allan. Hence, if the station remains in its current position, and additional rail patronage is desired, a minimum of the existing level of facilities should be provided plus:

- Additional car parking should be required. Car parking is at or near capacity and the rail industry have already previously been in discussion with Stirling Council with regard to extending the parking provision for this station.
- More should be done to encourage accessing the station by alternative modes – for example cycle parking facilities, bus shelters etc.

Dunblane station: Principally commuter and local transport connections, but there is also currently also an hourly intercity service (including the sleeper service). Tactran Rail Passenger Survey 2009, identified the following trip purpose destinations for passengers boarding at Dunblane between 0600 - 1000

NORMAL WORKPLACE (70%)
SOCIAL/RECREATION (7.5%)
EDUCATION/TRAINING (6.7%)
SHOPPING (5.8%)
PERSONAL BUSINESS (4.2%)
EMPLOYERS BUSINESS (3.3%)
NOT GIVEN (1.7%)
HOME (0.8%)

The car parking provided by the station can not meet demand, with the consequence that there is significant on-street parking demand in the vicinity. Existing parking associated with the franchise should be at least maintained, and it is recommended that discussions are held with Stirling Council to better understand how the franchise can best continue to manage demand in the context of a Dunblane parking strategy.

The greater trip variety at the time surveyed indicates the greater variety of users across the day, over and above regular peak hour commuters. These users are more likely to be both infrequent users and hence rely on the manned booking office.

Given the volume of passengers waiting for southbound services in the morning peak, the demand for shelter in inclement weather can only be met by the station waiting room being open at this time of day.

Given the two issues above, it is strongly recommended that a minimum of the existing facilities are retained, including station building/waiting room (and toilet) and booking office are retained in any franchise.

Crianlarich Station; Principally local and tourist, but also sleeper services. At least the existing level of provision is considered essential to meet the aspirations for the role the station plays in the local community i.e. retain a minimum of facilities such as long stay parking, payphones, help points and waiting facilities, including toilets.

Tyndrum Upper Station: Principally local and tourist, but also sleeper services. As a minimum, waiting facilities, parking, payphones, help points and train and local information require to be retained.

Tyndrum Lower Station: Principally local and tourist. A minimum of waiting facilities, parking, payphones, help points and train and local information required.

All stations should include local area information which promotes both local facilities as well as how to access the stations.

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:

Passengers, particularly new passengers, are always more likely to use a direct service. If the rail industry is to play its part in encouraging long-distance travel within Britain to be made by rail rather than air, then the number of direct long distance services to those cities beyond the Central Belt should not be reduced. This is particularly important given:

- The Scottish Government's carbon reduction targets
- The reduction in Scotland to London air services

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:

Other than sleeper services and 1x am and 1x pm East Coast service, no other cross-border services call at stations within Stirling Council area.

However: The numbers of people disembarking the cross country service at

Stirling Station is a good indicator of the value the passenger places in a direct cross border service.

Hence we recognise the value of direct cross border services to the cities and destinations north of the Central Belt.

Rolling stock

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

Q31 comments:

Unable to offer comment.

However, we are concerned about proposals in the Initial Industry Plan consultation to scrap “a significant number” of diesel powered units that will be freed up following EGIP electrification. The availability of surplus rolling stock may allow the implementation of initiatives across Scotland.

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

Q32 comments:

The services on a train should reflect the purpose the route is put to. However, as has been noted, many routes are put to a variety of purposes during each day.

Whilst stating that sufficient toilets should not be necessary – unfortunately because of the frequency with which they are abused and/or out of order – this does need to be stated.

Cycle storage on trains is tricky. The highest demands for cycle storage are also likely to be when there is highest demand for seats. Nonetheless there is often insufficient carrying capacity for cycles. Initiatives that could reduce the demand for cycles on commuter services, such as cycle hire facilities, could assist.

Catering facilities on intercity services are vital to passenger comfort.

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:

It is suggested that the advantages of rail over other competing modes are maximised – and this includes enabling people to work on the train. However

inconsiderate behaviour by passengers (use of phones / not using headphones whilst using laptops for films, games, watching items on the internet etc) continues to need to be discouraged.

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:

Priority needs to be given to moving people. Appreciate that first class brings an important revenue stream, however if the provision of first class seating means that passenger numbers are lower than they could be, consideration needs to be given to what the priorities of the rail network should be.

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

Q35 comments:

It should be considered which of the following scenarios will have the greatest adverse impact on rail patronage:

- (a) The responsible passenger not having the opportunity to relax with an alcoholic drink for a couple of hours; or
- (b) The intimidating atmosphere and/or disturbance (which does not have to result in actual violence) created by rowdy groups who are drinking on the train (who do not necessarily have to be 'drunk'). At the least, this is annoying, but it can often be scary for other passengers.

Obviously, if (b) can be dealt with in other ways, there is perhaps no need to ban the consumption of alcohol by all.

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

Q36 comments:

Good information is generally provided:

- Before travel via National Rail enquiries, Scotrail website, and timetable information which is available
- During travel via real-time information and announcements

However

- Destination information on board trains is often wrong, which does provide confusion for passengers who don't know the route (such as tourists) or for people who are visually impaired

- Real-time information at stations is confusing when an expected train disappears off the screen, and the next train appears on the screen, despite the first train not having passed through the station yet.
- During times of disruption, the actual level of service is often different to the 'current information' displayed on the websites. Equally websites must have sufficient capacity to cope with demands when services are disrupted.

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:

Consideration should again be paid to the wider objectives for the rail network:

If we are to encourage rail over air for long distance trips within Britain, this can only be achieved from most destinations in Scotland if sleeper services are provided. The Sleeper service therefore assists the carbon reduction objective by providing a realistic alternative to air travel between Scotland and London. And with the reduction in flights between the Central Belt of Scotland and London, the sleeper service becomes even more important.

The sleeper services calling at Crianlarich, Tyndrum and beyond are an essential element of the tourism industry along this line. In this sense, it has a social benefit which is worth supporting to help sustain communities on the West Highland line.

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:

If the Caledonian Sleeper is a separate franchise, its role as an early morning service for remote communities would need to be ensured.

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:

(a). From Stirling it is assumed that more earlier or later trains would be unlikely to alter the demand for sleeper services. The time when these would either leave the Central Belt in the morning, or arrive in London in the evening would still make the use of the sleeper the more attractive option.

(b) Both Oban and Fort William provide essential interchange locations for passengers travelling further north/west. Even if the number of people arriving at these locations for interchange can be identified, choosing between one or the other remains difficult – assuming that the passenger travelling to whichever destination is not served will have to wait at either Glasgow or Crianlarich for a connecting service.

(c) The concept of sharing a sleeping space with a stranger is presumably a concept many people these days find 'out-dated'. However, it is recognised that more individual compartments would presumably come at a cost.

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 rail network is a public asset, and it is the responsibility of who-ever is managing this asset does so in a way which complements the wider objectives of the Scottish Government, and this includes setting environmental performance indicators.

Indicators should be included for aspects including carbon consumption, waste and biodiversity. However, the primary indicator should relate to modal split between rail and road. The franchise agreement should include indicators and targets to achieve modal shift from car to train.