



### Rail Consultations – SPT responses

**Committee** Strategy and Programmes

**Date of meeting** 9 September 2016

**Date of report** 16 August 2016

#### Report by Assistant Chief Executive (Operations)

#### 1. Object of report

The object of this report is to recommend approval of SPT's responses to two rail consultations:

- The consultation by the Department for Transport (DfT) on the future of the InterCity West Coast (ICWC) (draft response enclosed as Appendix 1); and
- The Office of Rail and Road (ORR) initial consultation on the 2018 periodic review of Network Rail (draft response enclosed as Appendix 2).

Both responses have been submitted as draft within deadline subject to Committee approval.

#### 2. Background

##### 2.1 The DfT Consultation on the ICWC Rail Franchise

The ICWC franchise covers the Glasgow-Motherwell-Carlisle-North West England-Birmingham-London route. This consultation, which ran between 10 May and 2 August 2016, sought views from all interested parties on the planning of future rail services within the new franchise which will commence in May 2018. Views were sought on facilities at stations and on train, parking at stations, fare levels, overall journey times, stopping patterns, as well as community, heritage and sustainability considerations for services within the ICWC rail franchise. The DfT state that the opportunity is being taken to undertake a widespread, early, initial consultation, in order to ensure the new services specified within the new franchise will meet the needs of users and the wider communities it serves. The implications of future rail developments, such as HS2, are also considered as part of this initial consultation.

The key points of SPT's draft response are as follows:

- The new franchise should ensure that the customer experience is improved as much as possible, from availability of car parking/pick-up drop-off facilities, through to time standing on train being kept to a minimum.

# Agenda 9

- Service levels for those stations within the SPT area – Glasgow Central and Motherwell – should, as a minimum, be preserved at current levels, and improved in line with investments, particularly Motherwell as a regional hub.
- A simplified ticketing system utilising smartcard technology should be a pre-requisite of any future franchise.
- Regarding future development, it is vital that the new franchise integrates with any proposed high speed network, but in a way which does not disproportionately penalise existing catchments which may not be on the new high speed network.

## 2.2 Office of Rail and Road (ORR) PR18 Periodic Review Consultation

Periodic Reviews are one of the principal mechanisms by which the ORR holds Network Rail to account, and secures value for money for users and funders of the railway. The 2018 Periodic Review (PR18) will determine Network Rail's 'outputs' (what it is expected to deliver) and funding for control period 6 (CP6, which is programmed to run from 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2024). These outputs will feed through into the service that customers can expect rail infrastructure operators and rail service operators to provide.

The key points of SPT's response are as follows:

- The response highlights the positive step forward that is the 'alliance' between ScotRail and Network Rail, but that NR still need to work in a more collaborative way with other transport agencies / providers to ensure a co-ordinated and joined-up approach for serving public transport users.
- SPT welcome references to the impact of such major initiatives as City Deals and the need for NR to take account of these.
- The response emphasises the importance of NR being more reflective of the devolution agenda.
- SPT note that it is important that NR give greater certainty over costs for future developments on rail infrastructure.

## 3. Conclusion

At a strategic level, SPT continues to actively engage with rail industry partners, this engagement includes project development and delivery, and responding to relevant consultations, as well as liaison via the West of Scotland Rail Forum. SPT will continue to engage with the DfT and ORR on these consultations and report on any outcomes to the Committee in due course.

## 4. Committee action

The Committee is recommended to:

- Note the contents of this report; and
- Approve SPT's draft responses to the DfT ICWC Rail Franchise and the ORR PR18 Consultation.

## 5. Consequences

Policy consequences	<i>In line with the RTS.</i>
Legal consequences	<i>None.</i>
Financial consequences	<i>None.</i>
Personnel consequences	<i>None.</i>
Social inclusion consequences	<i>The rail network in the west of Scotland and beyond contributes to social inclusion.</i>
Risk consequences	<i>None.</i>

**Name** Eric Stewart  
**Title** Assistant Chief Executive

**Name** Gordon MacLennan  
**Title** Chief Executive

For further information, please contact *Bruce Kiloh, Head of Policy and Planning* on 0141 333 3740.

# InterCity West Coast rail franchise consultation

25 July 2016 – 2<sup>nd</sup> August Response

# InterCity West Coast rail franchise consultation

The Department for Transport is seeking the views of the public and stakeholders on the future of rail services, stations and other supporting services provided in the InterCity West Coast rail franchise.

This comprises of all rail services currently operated by Virgin Train West Coast, which includes long distance inter-city high speed services and stations. The current InterCity West Coast Franchise operates long distance high-speed services, primarily on the West coast Main Line between London, Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, North Wales, Glasgow and Edinburgh.

We are now starting the process to select a rail company to operate and develop these services and stations from April 2018.

This gives us the opportunity to look again at the rail services provided by the InterCity West Coast franchise, and ensure they meet the needs and aspirations of the people and areas they serve.

***Our vision for the new franchise is to enable economic growth, support investment and make journeys better for passengers.***

We welcome your views on all aspects of the rail service so we can ensure the new franchise delivers the best possible railway for passengers, communities and business.

## Your details

<b>Please indicate whether you are:</b>	
<b>Responding as an individual</b>	
<b>Representing the views of an organisation</b>	<b>Strathclyde Partnership for Transport (SPT)</b>

<b>If responding as an individual, to make sure we can make best use of the information you provide and make focused changes where necessary, it would be helpful if you could please provide the following details:</b>	
<b>First name</b>	n/a
<b>Surname</b>	n/a
<b>First half of your postcode</b>	n/a
<b>Your nearest station (not necessarily the one you use)</b>	n/a
<b>Where you normally travel from and to on the train</b>	n/a
<b>The times you most regularly travel on the train i.e. between 0600 and 0700 on a weekday</b>	n/a
<b>How frequently you travel on the train i.e. every weekday; several times a week, weekly; several times a month; monthly; several times a year</b>	n/a
<b>The purpose of your most regular rail journey i.e. commuting, leisure or business</b>	n/a
<b>Any specific accessibility needs you have which could include, but is not limited to, wheelchair access, pushchair access, English is not your first language, you are blind or partially sighted, capability</b>	n/a

impairments	
-------------	--

**If responding on behalf of a larger organisation, please make it clear who the organisation represents and, where applicable, how the views of members were gathered.**

**Name of Organisation: Strathclyde Partnership for Transport**

**Who does this represent:**

SPT is the Regional Transport Partnership for the west of Scotland, covering 11 local authority areas and part of one other. This response is being submitted as draft subject to comment and approval by SPT's Strategy and Programmes Committee on 9 September 2016.

**Contact details:** Allan Comrie – [allan.comrie@spt.co.uk](mailto:allan.comrie@spt.co.uk) or 0141 333 3241.

**Do these views relate to a particular part or region of the InterCity West Coast route? Please give details.**

SPT's views are focused on that part of the ICWC which is within our area – from the south west of Scotland to Glasgow – and also considers access to/from all of Scotland to/from the north of England, the Midlands, London and the south of England.

# 1. Question Areas

1.1. The following sections contain a series of themes, aligned to our vision for the ICWC franchise (see below) with questions on which we would like your views. The responses will either help provide detail to the specification we issue to bidders or be provided as information to bidders in the Stakeholder Briefing Document to help inform and improve their bid. For more information on these areas please refer to the ICWC consultation document [add link]

The question themes are:

- A - Passengers:
  - Customer experience and satisfaction
  - Information
  
- B – Train services:
  - Ensuring train services meet the needs of the areas and passengers they serve
  - Capacity
  
- C – Communities, heritage and a sustainable railway
  - Supporting the community
  - Stations for passengers and communities
  
- D - The whole journey:
  - Make the railway more accessible for all
  - Fares, ticketing and paying for your journey
  
- Other areas not addressed

1.2. We would be grateful if, wherever possible, you could explain why you have given the answer you have and provide any evidence that supports your response. We look forward to receiving your views.



## A – Passengers: Customer experience and satisfaction

<p><b>Q1: We have listed below examples of areas identified that customers would most like improved on their ICWC journey and would ask you to rank your top five.</b></p> <p><b>It would help us analyse this information if you could explain why you think this area warrants/needs improvement, if it relates to a particular station or train service, and what you think the new train operator could do to help.</b></p>		
<b>Description</b>	<b>Your priority for improvement (1 = highest to 5 = lowest)</b>	<b>Reason why you think this warrants/needs improvement, location if appropriate and example of what you would like to see done.</b>
<b>Availability of seating at train stations</b>	3	There is generally sufficient seating capacity at most stations but improvements could be made at main terminal stations – for the west of Scotland, this would be Glasgow Central – and at Motherwell.
<b>Getting a seat on trains</b>	1	Capacity - there should always be available seats. Booked capacity should be exceeded by an agreed percentage in order to accommodate “turn-up and go” passengers. This is particularly relevant for the journey section between Carlisle and Warrington and should be considered in order to prevent over-crowding on this section of the route. On very busy services a tolerance of perhaps 20-30 mins standing between e.g. Preston and Lancaster could be considered but this would have to be highlighted as an exceptional circumstance – although

		<p>some commuting passengers might consider this more tolerable. The de-classifying of First Class seats in cases of extreme over-crowding (particularly when that over-crowding is caused by disruption) should be a preferred option. Perhaps the split between First and Standard class carriages should be re-assessed in light of experience – a greater percentage of standard class seats per train could be considered.</p>
<p><b><i>Car parking facilities at train stations</i></b></p>	3	<p>Fundamentally, the focus should be on better planning and co-ordination of public transport for improved service connections thereby discouraging over-reliance on the car.</p> <p>However, notwithstanding the above, parking can be problematic at some city centre locations but drop off facilities and short stay/pick-up should be provided and closely monitored for abuse. More rural or regional locations – for example, Motherwell which is being developed as a regional hub - could have dedicated long-distance (perhaps overnight) facilities although land, land ownership and security issues would require to be resolved in some instances.</p>
<p><b><i>Customer recognition and reward (e.g. loyalty schemes)</i></b></p>	4	<p>Whilst theoretically this would appear to be a priority, in reality it could lead to a further classification of</p>

		passengers – First Class, Standard Class and “Frequent User” Class. The challenge would obviously be in cases of peak demand. Again it might be worth considering an “up-grade every 5 <sup>th</sup> or 10 <sup>th</sup> journey” approach or some such scheme – this could be stored on a SmartCard or other such accountable system for verification.
<b>Increased staff visibility (at train stations or on trains)</b>	2	Information and passive surveillance should already give a high level of security, however, the presence of staff on trains and at stations should be seen as highly desirable as part of the “customer experience”
<b>A more proactive approach to customer service at train stations</b>	4	Passengers might prefer a more “passive yet approachable” customer experience
<b>Luggage space on trains</b>	2	Adequate space and safe storage should be prioritised. The potential for blocking aisles, or occupying seats with baggage should be minimised /precluded.
<b>Overall satisfaction with the station and their cleanliness</b>	2	Stations are generally well presented – albeit the security aspect of no litter bins can lead to indiscriminate littering.
<b>Getting between the train and station concourse</b>	2	Compliance with all aspects of accessibility legislation should be the priority and assistance should be available on demand.
<b>Toilet facilities on train</b>	2	Toilets must work and be kept clean – indeed, a standard for the number of

		available toilets per potential passenger per train should be considered.
<b><i>Being kept informed about delays</i></b>	2	High priority – use of technology should assist. The opportunity exists to do this through the Traveline Scotland website/app and through Regional Transport Partnerships websites.
<b><i>Access to catering and refreshments on board</i></b>	3	Access is generally good although cost and quality can sometimes be less so.
<b><i>If there are other areas for improvement not included in the above table, please explain what these areas are and why you think this area could be improved.</i></b>		
<p>Interchange and connections with other train services/other modes should be facilitated by greater information – particularly in instances of trains being delayed and running late. It is accepted that the provision of “guaranteed connections” is probably unworkable but the provision of relevant and current information as well as suggested alternatives should be considered.</p> <p>Similarly the use of tickets on other operators’ services in instances of delay and cancellation should be better facilitated by greater information provision as well as by the use of ticketing technologies.</p>		

## A – Passengers: Information

<b>Q2: What type/method of communication do you find most effective to:</b>	
<b>a) <i>Enable you to plan your end to end train journey?</i></b>	It is important to differentiate between end-to-end and station-to-station journeys. The former will rely on other modes and so again, a co-ordinated and integrated approach is required and any online or face to face interaction should also be prepared to handle multi-modal enquiries. Again, the Traveline Scotland website / app are ideal for doing this.
<b>b) <i>Be informed in advance about known disruptions such as planned engineering works?</i></b>	On-line (Traveline Scotland, RTP websites), customer information systems (where appropriate) and station posters, mass-media and social media, announcements at stations.
<b>c) <i>Be informed during unplanned disruptions both before you travel and during the journey?</i></b>	On-line, social media, announcements as per above as regards disruptions to connecting or onward journeys.
<p><b><i>This could include, but is not limited to, talking to customer services, notices at stations, leaflets, voice announcements, information on websites or social media.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Where possible please provide reasons for your answers.</i></b></p>	

## B – Train services: Ensuring train services meet the needs of the areas and passengers they serve

**Q3: Are there any direct journeys currently provided by ICWC that you would want to see protected at a minimum level (e.g. 1 train every 2 hours)?**

**Please say where would this be and your reasons why where possible.**

**Comments:**

SPT would expect that all current journeys provided to and from stations in the west of Scotland – Glasgow and Motherwell - on the ICWC are protected to at least their current level, and, where possible, improved. For information, and complementary to any future service improvements, SPT is in the process of working with the rail industry and other partners including Glasgow City Region City Deal representatives from North Lanarkshire Council to deliver improvements at Motherwell.

**Q4: Please rank the options below to indicate your priority for potential changes you would like to see to ICWC train services. Please say where would this be and your reasons why where possible.**

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Please rank these options (1 = highest priority to 5 = lowest priority)</i>	<i>Please say where would this be and where possible your reasons why</i>
<b><i>Speed up service for long-distance passengers for example by changing stops at low-use stations.</i></b>	3	
<b><i>Introduce new stops to provide services to destinations not currently directly served by the ICWC franchise.</i></b>	3	Widening the market leads to patronage growth – the most obvious destination would appear to be Scotland-Liverpool as well as potentially direct services to/from Wales
<b><i>Swap an existing stop for another to increase destinations not currently directly served by the ICWC franchise.</i></b>	3	Such a move could be challenging as regards established travel patterns as well as interchange opportunities. If, for

		example, a stop is dropped the growth in patronage for a new destination would require to be rapid given the loss of the established stop and its replacement by a potentially more speculative patronage source.
<b><i>Adjust the level of service (e.g. evening, weekend) to better match demand.</i></b>	4	SPT would be concerned regarding any changes to services in Scotland in this regard.
<b><i>Better support the economic development of the towns and cities served by the franchise for example by increasing/reducing services for seasonal travel (e.g. tourism, holidays) or for a major event (e.g. concert or sporting event).</i></b>	3	Where resources permit this is already undertaken – e.g. holiday destinations as well as increased capacity for sporting / entertainment events. Consideration of this type of demand should form part of the tender process.
<b><i>Improve/connections with other trains services as part of longer–distance journeys.</i></b>	2	This should be a priority for the new franchise. Motherwell, Carlisle, Preston, Wolverhampton, Birmingham New Street and Warrington are already natural interchange locations.
<b><i>Holding trains at stations for connecting trains</i></b>	2	In an ideal world this would be possible but different TOCs and different franchises will all have operational standards which will have to be met and wider network issues could, in many instances, preclude delaying services for connectional purposes.

## B – Train services: Capacity

<p><b>Q5: Based on your journey, please could you state whether you consider any priority should be placed on either:</b></p>	
<p><b><i>Protecting long distance capacity on trains; or</i></b></p>	<p>This is a high priority given that the franchise is primarily a long distance one. However, some journeys, notably between Warrington and Carlisle could be considered to be more regional in nature and some capacity issues can occur. This should be considered in any fleet allocation as well as in any standing standards being set.</p>
<p><b><i>Providing maximum choice of operator over short distance journeys.</i></b></p>	<p>Interoperability of tickets should be applied such that loads can be spread over the total number of trains on any one section of the route (TransPennine, Northern Rail, Cross-Country for example).</p>
<p><i>Where possible, please provide reasons for your answer.</i></p>	

<p><b>Q6: What methods do you think could enable more people to travel and improve the railway's ability to cater for passenger growth?</b></p>
<p><b>Where possible, please provide reasons for your answer.</b></p>
<p>More services and longer trains.</p>



## C – Communities, heritage and a sustainable railway: Supporting the community

<b>Q7: Based on your knowledge of your local area/station, how could the new ICWC train operator:</b>	
a) <b><i>Improve rail services (including all the support functions it needs) in a way that respects and helps to maintain the environment?</i></b>	Increased use of electric trains with the phasing out of diesel Voyager units wherever and whenever possible. Dual power units should be considered for greater flexibility and specifically if other cities in Scotland are to benefit from better services on the WCML.
b) <b><i>Better support the economic growth of the areas it serves?</i></b>	Increase in capacity on services either via longer trains or via more services. Furthermore, and as mentioned earlier, SPT is working with the rail industry and other partners including Glasgow City Region City Deal representatives from North Lanarkshire Council to deliver improvements at Motherwell, making it a regional hub.
c) <b><i>Improve its support and development of its workforce?</i></b>	A pre-requisite is to encourage greater staff “ownership” of the rail services they are operating – this could be achieved by widening the skills base and opportunities for staff to follow a career path not dictated by the level or skills they have when they entered the industry.
d) <b><i>Play a greater role in supporting and improving the community it serves, the heritage of the railway and help develop their stations into hubs for the community?</i></b>	Involvement of communities along the railway to see the benefits brought by the rail services locally – this need not necessarily require the formal adoption of a Community Rail Group for sections of the railway but could mean that Communities and existing Community Groups are advised of rail issues by the operator on a rolling basis and that they have a conduit by which they can contribute to the operation of services, and the potential growth of patronage for all journey purposes.
e) <b><i>Improve the services offered to reduce discrimination and advance equality of</i></b>	Legislation against discrimination covers a considerable number of groups within Equalities legislation, however, the exclusion of less obvious discriminated against groups still exists (persons with

<b>opportunity for people from protected groups<sup>1</sup>?</b>	mental health or behavioural issues do not generally present as the same stereotypical “disabled” person), and these groups should be brought more closely into the equalities fold such that their “hidden” or less obvious needs can be properly addressed.
--	---

## C – Communities, heritage and a sustainable railway: Stations for passengers and communities

<b>Q8: Please list, in priority order, the top five facilities you would like to see either improved or introduced at the station(s) served by the ICWC Franchise</b>	
<b>Please provide the name of the station(s) and why you think these improvements are needed:</b>	
<b>a) you use; or</b>	<p><u>Glasgow Central</u> – Dedicated concourse area or waiting area for passengers with luggage for long distance journeys.</p> <p><u>Motherwell</u> – Additional services – better integration with other rail and public transport operators – park-and-ride facilities – improved platform waiting areas – new pedestrian link bridge.</p>
<b>b) as a non-user would encourage you to use the rail network.</b>	n/a

## D – The whole journey: Make the railway more accessible for all

<b>Q9: Thinking of the journeys you make or have made on the ICWC, or a journey you could make by the ICWC but where you decide to use an alternative transport mode instead.</b>	
<b>What specific changes could be made to make the railway easier to</b>	Higher capacity trains, where appropriate (similarly more frequent but shorter trains could be an option but there will be additional

<sup>1</sup> A list of the protected groups can be viewed using this link <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/guidance-all/protected-characteristics>

<p><b>access and therefore more attractive to use; and</b></p>	<p>costs and network capacity issues associated with such a strategy) and closer attention to proper connectivity at strategic stations along the route</p>
<p><b>Why do you think these changes would help?</b></p>	<p>Passengers would have better choices about when they travel as well as potentially benefitting from greater capacities on trains.</p>

## D – The whole journey Fares, ticketing and paying for your journey

**Q10 – What do you think the future ICWC train operator could do to modernise and improve the ticketing experience for customers? Please include your views on the elements or parts of service the train operator should consider when developing their ticketing and ticket retailing plans.**

**Comments:**

A pre-requisite of any modern transport system is an easy to use smartcard system. SPT has the most commercially successful smartcard system in Scotland operating on the Subway and we would welcome dialogue with the DfT regarding potential future integration with the ICWC operators ticketing.

The disparity in ticket pricing is very often a discouraging issue specifically in “Standard Class”– higher cheaper fares and lower premium fares might actually encourage more use and generate greater revenue for the operator. “First Class” tickets should remain priced at the top end (albeit with elements of existing pre-booking reduced fares made available) – frequently the “first class” passenger is not actually paying the fare for the journey undertaken as it is considered a business expense.

The de-classification of carriages on busy services should also be a far more organic process and a presumption in favour of de-classification in specified cases of over-crowding and delay should form part of the franchise bidding process, even if this results in existing “first class” passengers either being re-located into the fewer remaining “non-de-classified” carriages or financially compensated for the “non-first class” journey undertaken.

More staff on trains, particularly revenue protection staff and additional

staff available at stations carrying out ticket checks would enhance the travelling experience. The provision of highly visible staff during disruptions should also be seen as a priority – particularly as regards bus replacement and other alterations which might involve passengers having to change train or mode of transport in unfamiliar surroundings.

## Other areas not addressed

**Q11: If there are any additional areas that you think it is important for us to consider that have not already been addressed in this consultation please explain them here.**

**Comments:**

Route availability is critical – particularly after years of disruption and potential issues that might arise due to HS2 construction and capital fund availability for on-going maintenance of the network within finite public spending budgets. The issue of the Lamington Viaduct during the severe weather in winter/spring 2015/16 highlights the importance of constant scrutiny of the infrastructure as well as issues regarding alternative routings – the electrification (and in places re-doubling) of the GSW route via Kilmarnock and Dumfries should not be seen in isolation from the WCML franchise – although this is an issue for Network Rail rather than a specific Franchise consideration, but the consequences for the Franchise should there be critical failures of infrastructure will be considerable.

A robust infrastructure regime will help to prevent potential loss of patronage if services are disrupted over a longer period of time and passengers are lost to other long distance travel modes and choices. It is, of course, acknowledged that there is a considerable volume of major pre-planned engineering work to be undertaken on the WCML over the current Control Period (to 2019).

## 2. What happens next

Following the close of this consultation, we will publish a report summarising stakeholder views on the franchise and our conclusions on them. This will be provided to potential bidders to consider when submitting their proposals to operate the ICWC rail franchise. We plan to publish this report on our website in November 2016, at the same time that the Invitation to Tender (ITT) is planned to be issued. We will not reply individually to each consultation response.

### Freedom of Information and Data Protection

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

If you want information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the FOIA, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence.

In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information, we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the DfT.

DfT will process your personal data in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) and in the majority of circumstances this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties. Individual consultation responses may be shared with bidders in an anonymised format as part of the franchise competition.

By providing personal data in response to this consultation, you consent to the DfT, or third parties contracted to the DfT, processing your personal data for the purpose of analysing responses to this consultation.

It would be very helpful to DfT if, as part of its analysis of responses to this consultation, it was able to take into account certain sensitive personal data that you may wish to provide in response to this consultation.

Please indicate if you consent to the DfT or third parties contracted to the DfT, processing your sensitive personal data for this purpose and to your consultation response being shared with bidders in an anonymised format as part of the franchise competition.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I consent</li></ul>	SPT is content that the contents of this response can be shared
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I do not consent</li></ul>	