

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

Member of Scottish Parliament for South of Scotland

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

Surname

Wheelhouse

Forename

Paul

2. Postal Address

Room M4.17

Scottish Parliament

Edinburgh

Scotland

Postcode
EH99 1SP

Phone
0131 348
6891

Email
paul.wheelhouse.msp@scottish.parliament.uk

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 ☒

Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address ☐

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: No comment

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

Q2 comments: Contracts should be structured to allow sufficient scope to allow franchise holder to invest for the longer term, but should allow scope for modification of services, e.g. provision of additional services to meet emerging demand or addition of new stations.

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: no comment

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: no comment

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 comment

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: no comment

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: no detailed comment other than these should take account of increased pressure on household incomes at this time, should be designed to persuade modal shift from car to rail and should provide options for cost conscious customers.

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: Subsidy should be prioritised and allocated to ensure that Government objectives for cohesion and solidarity (characteristics of growth

sought in delivery of the economic strategy overall purpose and targets) are delivered. Some regions of Scotland, such as the Berwickshire area of the Scottish Borders, have received very little support for development of rail and on equity grounds deserve a fairer deal, when compared with council areas such as Glasgow (60 stations) and Highland (58 stations) – not a call for reductions there, but rather for a levelling up of areas such as the Borders.

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: These should not discourage commuters making the modal shift desired to achieve climate change and economic growth targets.

Scottish stations

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

Q24 comments:

I believe that a review of station locations on the network and a possible reconfiguration may be beneficial.

I agree with Scottish Borders Council and East Lothian Council that in some cases there will be a historical and social dimension to the positioning of existing stations on the network and without being aware of all the relevant details, the number of stations in Scotland that currently serve less than 20 passengers is a concern and the relevance of these stations needs to be tested.

Stations in close proximity to each other, offering similar services also need to be tested.

In the Scottish Borders we have no stopping services at present, although I am strongly supportive of the Borders rail project and strongly welcome this investment and will look to examine how those services may in future be integrated with bus services to communities such as Selkirk and Hawick and, in the longer term, extended to include Hawick on the route.

Another key development in our area is the proposed local rail service between Edinburgh and Berwick-upon-Tweed utilising latent capacity on the ECML.

There have been various studies undertaken in conjunction with East Lothian Council and SEStran and the case for a local service, along with potential new stations at East Linton (East Lothian) and Reston (Eastern Berwickshire) is positive and attracts widespread local and political support from across the SNP, Conservative, Lib Dem and Labour parties.

A stopping service for Reston (for Eyemouth, St Abbs, Ayton, Coldingham, Duns, Burnmouth and Chirnside in Scottish Borders) and the East Linton area of East Lothian would offer substantial socio-economic benefits for this

part of the country and would offer a sustainable alternative for commuters accessing the Edinburgh job market. It would have a potentially significant transformational impact for the East Berwickshire area in particular.

As part of this submission I concur with the two Councils that the following supports the development of this proposal:

Social Aspects

- The population of East Lothian is projected to grow by 33% between 2008 and 2032;
- The population of Scottish Borders is projected to grow by 16% over a similar timescale;
- The social impacts of improving local services to Dunbar and Berwick with new stations at East Linton and Reston improves accessibility to Queen Margaret University, colleges in Edinburgh, and indeed would increase connectivity within the Council areas and beyond;
- The provision of a new local service will help to address elements of industry decline, rurality and the marginalisation of parts of East Lothian and the Eastern Borders, with Eyemouth in particular having been highlighted as being the most vulnerable town, of 44 examined by Scottish Agricultural College, to any downturn in public sector employment. Economic diversification is crucial and a railway would act as a catalyst for this.

Economic Aspects

- Investment in this local rail service would ease pressure on the A1 (improving safety on single carriageway sections) and A720 Trunk Road Network and especially the Old Craighall junction;
- A local service could be introduced to Dunbar and Berwick at relatively little capital cost as the infrastructure is almost all already in place;
- Improved rail services will increase the market for rail-based tourism in the east of Scotland, therefore benefitting local businesses and creating employment opportunities;
- Additional rail services will provide more sustainable transport for the Edinburgh City Region and provide less strain on the capital's road infrastructure and expand the workforce available to Edinburgh employers;
- The proposed developments in SESplan's Strategic Development Plan and existing Local Plan allocations in the area need to be factored into the long-term planning of rail services. Failure to do this may result in having to limit development in the area due to capacity issues on the road network.

I would strongly encourage Transport Scotland to include this proposal as part of any future improvements to the Scottish rail network.

I understand that RAGES supporters sent approximately 400 postcards in support of the project to Stewart Stevenson MSP when he was Transport Minister in which residents called for the opening of East Linton and Reston Stations, although I also understand that Transport Scotland claim they have only recorded having received 48. Anecdotally this latter figure seems way off the mark. However, crucially many community councils claim they were not consulted as part of the recently completed Edinburgh to Berwick feasibility study and, it would appear VisitScotland were not consulted either. Hence passenger estimates appear not to include any assessment of potential visitors to:

St Abbs Head (50,000 visitors per annum); Eyemouth Museum; Eyemouth Maritime Museum; Gunsgreen House; Coldingham Priory; Coldingham Sands (Blue Flag Beach); Jim Clark rally; Eco-tourism; Southern Upland Way and much more.

Community support for the reinstatement of services at Reston is very strong and this support tends to support the view that the MVA feasibility study has underestimated the level of potential demand for the services that would use the station. Some comments from stakeholders are shown below:

Eyemouth Town Council (population of 3,410 with 552 allocated housing units and 90 houses as a potential further allocation) in its own very considered letter of support stated that:

"The benefits of a station in Reston are huge both to the economy and to the wider community as a whole. It would mean that our youngsters, the new generation of voters and workers would be able to remain in the Borders. They could travel for college and University courses. Young people are leaving the area as they cannot afford the travelling costs or the time it takes to commute. This leaves us with an aged retired population which is not ideal.

"A new opened station would encourage visitors to the area. We have the marine reserve at St Abbs which we understand is to be twinned with one in Gozo/Malta. This being the first twinning of this kind in the world. It will bring people to the area. The tourist providers have worked hard and tirelessly over the last few years with the attractions that we can now offer. Eyemouth itself has three museums, coastline, walks and beaches. We have an interesting and varied history in the Borders and we would like more people to come and visit, a station in Reston would assist with this.

"Families maybe more willing to move to the area, helping with the numbers in local schools as well as bringing finances into the communities. Travelling to Edinburgh by train from Reston would encourage such moves, as well as reducing the carbon footprint.

"Businesses' in the area would also benefit with a quick means of travel to the Capital. Reinvestment may then be attracted to the area.....The reopening of a station in Reston makes economic sense. It will bring people to the area. It will give our young people a means of getting to Edinburgh to study. It will

give other residents the ability of visiting the capital without having to drive. It will boost the tourist income into the eastern borders. It will encourage businesses to view the area as one to consider for investment or new opportunities.”

The Eyemouth and District Initiative Group (EDIG) is a newly formed community led regeneration group which is aiming to drive forward the regeneration of the town. At a recent meeting of EDIG, of which I am an ex-officio member, I invited EDIG members to come back to me with comments on what the re-establishment of local rail services via Reston might mean for the community of Eyemouth and surrounding villages. In stressing their “strong support” for the project EDIG stated the following in a letter to me on 31st January:

“re-opening of the station would be beneficial for the following reasons:

- it would provide quicker, easier access to Edinburgh - whilst there exists the, ability to travel by train from Berwick~ this would provide a nearer access point and would be cheaper in terms of parking;
- it would cut down on car use, which is less environmentally friendly, thereby helping the Government to achieve its targets;
- it would provide an alternative to the bus service, which takes much longer;
- it would increase the feasibility of young people travelling to Edinburgh to further their education, thereby opening up much more choice and opportunity to them and enable them to stay in the area after completing their courses;
- it would increase the possibility of more people commuting to and from work in Edinburgh, which would have a beneficial effect on the housing market in our more rural areas;
- it would make the Eastern Borders area more accessible to the vast numbers of tourists who travel to Edinburgh each year, helping to boost the tourist trade in Eyemouth and District; and
- it would economically reinvigorate the area, which has already been designated as an area of deprivation.

“It could have a beneficial knock on effect upon investment in the area. We appeal in the strongest possible terms, to ensure that the station at Reston is reopened in order that the environment, area and the people benefit.”

Reston Community Council (population circa 335 in 2001, with 36 allocated units and 220 potential further allocations of housing) stated in relation to its

own support for the project that:

"A public meeting was held. At this public meeting more than 70% of the voting population attended this meeting with unanimous support for the re-opening of the station.

"At present there is full planning application granted on the building of one hundred and eleven houses in Reston. Land has been allocated on the former Mart Site, for the provision of a car park to serve the station.As mentioned above the station would be greatly received due to the increasing demand for a better public transport in this locality.

"The train services required would ideally be a shuttle type service to Edinburgh..... the re-opening of Reston station would improve the commuter link to Edinburgh and would ease road traffic congestion on the A1 trunk road and city bypass.....Presently people' travelling to Edinburgh travel by car to Dunbar as this is found to be the cheaper option, rather than travelling to Berwick-upon-tweed and this being the more expensive option. A shuttle service running from Reston to Edinburgh is the most desirable option. The rail network at present is accessed predominantly from this area, via Dunbar as mentioned above this is the cheaper option, however accessing via Dunbar and Berwick-Up-On-Tweed does have its parking restrictions, this we feel would not be experienced at Reston as the car parking would be in the region of 200 spaces this is not available at Dunbar Nor Berwick-upon-tweed."

Ayton Community Council (population circa 540, with allocated housing capacity of 44 units) support the project and stated in its response: *"it would have a large positive impact on the economy of Eastern Berwickshire; it would enable people resident in our area to commute more efficiently to Edinburgh and possibly beyond; it would make socialising in Edinburgh much easier; it would encourage commuters and others to leave their cars locally thus avoiding parking problems in Edinburgh which are likely worsen in the future as the number of cars increases; there is the likelihood of a large car park with easy access; students from both Eyemouth High and Berwickshire High Schools would have easier access to universities and colleges for the next stage of their education. The rail travel option would be much cheaper than finding accommodation in Edinburgh; and properly marketed it could help develop tourism in our area."*

Coldingham Community Council (population 620, with 46 allocated units of housing) have stated that:

"We often feel we are overlooked in the grand scheme of transport planning.....We have a large population who choose to live in this delightful area, and commute to either Edinburgh or Newcastle for work or study. Currently their only transport options are a protracted series of bus journeys, travel to Berwick or Dunbar to connect with existing train stops, or use their cars. In these days of eco-friendly travel, this hardly seems the best option.

"In a population of just over 340 homes, where about half have 1 or more regular commuters, ALL expressed their enthusiasm for using such a service

if it were available, albeit not every day for some. I would urge you to give this more consideration.....To us the local population, it seems 'a no brainer'”

“Chirnside Community Council (popn circa 1,360, with 181 allocated units of housing) support reopening of the station and state *“we feel it would be a benefit to Chirnside and district. It’s a shorter drive than to get to Berwick, parking at Berwick is a major issue. A number of local commuters from here already drive to Dunbar to catch the train to Edinburgh (cheaper fares between Scottish stations) and parking. It would also benefit students studying in Edinburgh...they would be able to stay at home and commute.”*

St Abbs Community Council (popn 100) stated to RAGES their *“full support of St Abbs Community Council for any campaign for the reopening of Reston Station, we would all use a station in Reston, as at this present time 80% of residents within St Abbs commute to Dunbar for a train North as it is half the price of a ticket from Berwick.”*

In October 2010, **Burnmouth Community Council** stated *“At this month's meeting of Burnmouth Community Council, it was unanimously agreed to strongly commend the re-instatement of Reston Station. It is felt that this would be greatly to the advantage of residents/communities in the Eastern Borders.”*

Duns Community Council (population 2,790, with 327 allocated units of housing and potential further allocations of up to 545 houses) stated to RAGES that *“On the understanding that other public transport services would co-ordinate their timetables with that of trains and that bus services to and from Reston would be improved, the Duns Community Council are happy to give you their support.”*

A Parliamentary motion lodged by John Lamont MSP on behalf of himself, myself, Iain Gray MSP and Jim Hume MSP has attracted support from across the political spectrum and is worded as follows:

Motion S4M-01799: John Lamont, Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire, Scottish Conservative and Unionist Party, Date Lodged: 23/01/2012

That the Parliament commends the Rail Action Group, East of Scotland and what it considers to be its hard-working volunteers on campaigning for many years for improved rail services for Berwickshire and East Lothian; understands that there is strong cross-party support for the reintroduction of local services from Edinburgh to Berwick-upon-Tweed and the reopening of stations at Reston and East Linton; notes the September 2011 feasibility study commissioned by Transport Scotland, which concluded that there is a positive economic case for local services and the reopening of the proposed stations; notes that the study also highlighted the latest East Coast Main Line Route Utilisation Strategy, which said that there is no capacity constraint to reinstating local services on the existing line; understands that there is strong support from residents in all of the communities that would benefit from the reintroduction of local rail services and the improved access that this would confer on employment, education and leisure opportunities; welcomes the

support and collaborative, proactive approach from East Lothian Council, Scottish Borders Council and partners SEStran to move this project to the next stage in completing the final elements of the Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance Part (STAG) 2 appraisal, and would welcome consideration of such a service should the STAG appraisal conclude that this would have positive economic, regeneration and environmental impacts for East Lothian and Berwickshire.

Supported by: Paul Wheelhouse, Jim Hume, Iain Gray, Annabel Goldie, Gil Paterson, Nanette Milne, Aileen McLeod, Jamie McGrigor, Patricia Ferguson, Claudia Beamish, Margaret Mitchell, Roderick Campbell, Jackson Carlaw, Hanzala Malik, Colin Beattie, Liz Smith, Richard Lyle, Alison Johnstone, , Joan McAlpine, Graeme Pearson, Mark McDonald, Kevin Stewart.

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: welcome further information on this

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: Develop a network of Community Rail Partnerships with local rail development officers in place to promote the use of the station locally. I understand that for a relatively modest investment, in the region of £30k per FTE post, rail partnerships have been able to boost passenger numbers by 25% by actively promoting the use of local rail lines in ways .

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: no comment

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: no comment

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: free to use Wi-Fi and mobile phone coverage is a key issue for rail users, especially business users and should be improved as a priority within the new franchise.

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: not yet formed a view on this.

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

Q36 comments: no detailed comment, but improved, real time information would be helpful to giving passengers confidence to use rail.

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: no comment

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: I support Scottish Borders Council's view that the tourist market should be a higher priority for the sleeper service, especially in relation to London airport connections, to encourage tourists to travel to Scotland from international hub airports in SE England..

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: Rail has tremendous potential to help address climate change. Greater weight to rail investment would be desirable and especially in areas that are car dependent and in need of investment to raise economic growth, such as the Eastern Borders.