

## Appendix 2: Consultation Questionnaire



**The Scottish Government**  
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

# Scottish Ferries Review: Public Consultation 2010 Questionnaire

This questionnaire should be read in conjunction with the Scottish Ferries Review Consultation Document. Copies of the Consultation Document will be available at consultation events throughout Scotland in summer 2010. The Consultation Document, its appendices and this questionnaire can be downloaded from the Scottish Government website at:

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Consultations/Current>.

Consultation responses may be emailed to:

[scottishferriesreview@scotland.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:scottishferriesreview@scotland.gsi.gov.uk)

or posted to:

*Scottish Ferries Review Consultation*

*Ferries Division*

*Transport Directorate*

*Scottish Government*

*Area 2F Dockside*

*Victoria Quay*

*Edinburgh EH6 6QQ*

If you have any questions about this form or would like to speak to a member of the consultation team, please telephone 0131-244-1539.

Some of the questions are aimed at ferry operators. **You do not have to answer every question. If you do not wish to express a view please move on to the next question.** Your time in completing the questionnaire is very much appreciated. Your opinion will help us design your future ferry services.

# Scottish Ferries Review Public Consultation 2010 Questionnaire

Preliminary Question: We know that different communities across Scotland often view their ferry services very differently, sometimes for reasons which are specific to the local area. If you would like to enter your postcode in the box below, that will help us to make the best use of the information you provide to us in this questionnaire.

Postcode:	All
-----------	-----

Consultation Question 1: Do you agree that a change is required, to improve consistency in provision and secure funding for the future?

**Yes**  No

## Comments:

If this question is taken to refer specifically to whether alternative sources of finance should be sought for ferry services (e.g. from the private sector) then we have no objection to this in principle. What will be important is to what extent this proposal is compatible with maintaining the high quality of ferry services that we currently enjoy (and we can find little in the consultation document which specifically supports this proposal).

Consultation Question 2: Do you think that harbours should be self funded through harbour dues or do you think the current system of funding improvements through grants should continue?

**self-funded yes**  funded through grants  **No view expressed.**

## Comments:

We have no specific position on this topic – although we note that, of our members, the Scottish Association for Public Transport has supported "self-funded" and that this view was also supported by David MacBrayne Ltd (DML).

Consultation Question 3: How much of the funding should come from the users of the service?

**Comments:**

We support the principle that the user should pay for the full costs of their travel (including cost externalities imposed on the environment and society). However, due to market failure, and for wider societal objectives, we recognise that there are situations where it is appropriate for the state to intervene to support fares. We would not have a functioning national railway without state intervention, and we would have little in the way of ferry services.

We can see that there may be a case for fare increases on certain routes and/or for certain groups where existing prices are demonstrably too low. Unfortunately, the consultation paper presents no detailed information that would allow us to make specific comment on this topic. (We note that Table 2 suggests the targeting of visitor cars for higher fares and, while we find this attractive in principle, we have no information on the likely impact of such a policy.)

It is also difficult to answer this question in the absence of full information about the costs and impacts of the RET trial.

Furthermore, the consultation is partial in as much as it makes no reference to the levels of subsidy provided to Highlands and Islands Airports Ltd. Figure 9 of the consultation does indeed show a large rise (perhaps a doubling) in subsidy to ferry services over the decade from 1998/99, but a similar analysis of subsidies for HIAL would show a fourfold (400%) increase over the same period (see 'Scottish Transport Statistics 2009 Edition', Table 11.1). Given that CalMac and HIAL serve broadly similar routes, and both provide 'lifeline services', it would be helpful to know to what degree the additional expenditure on air services has abstracted patronage from ferry services.

Finally, we note the view expressed in the DML response that a "reduction of just 1% in the funding levels for both road and rail and a re-allocation of the funds to ferry services would have a significant impact on the ferries budget allowing much needed investment to take place." While we would not support the transfer of funds from the rail budget to the ferries budget, there are large opportunities for cutting expenditure from the roads budget, principally through the deletion of unsustainable and unnecessary projects such as the proposed Aberdeen western bypass and the proposed Second Forth Road Bridge. While we accept that public finances are constrained, it is evident to us that public expenditure should be prioritised on the support of existing public transport services (such as ferries) ahead of projects (such as new road schemes) which will further undermine the prospects of the Scottish Government meeting its legal responsibilities under the Climate Change (Scotland) Act. While there remains a vast maintenance backlog across all modes (and not least in ferries and ports), it is a poor allocation of scarce public funds to seek to further expand the road network ahead of maintaining lifeline services such as ferries.

Consultation Question 4: Do you agree that we should test the market by tendering some routes on a single basis with the option for the operator to bring their own vessel(s)?

Yes

No

**Comments:**

The consultation paper presents no evidence that this approach would be more successful in reducing costs than that currently in place.

We note the range of arguments presented by DML in its response, are persuaded by them, and see no reason to expand upon these.

Consultation Question 5:.....Do you agree that the following routes are the correct routes to consider tendering as single routes?

Ardrossan - Brodick Yes

No

Wemyss Bay - Rothesay Yes

No

Oban - Craignure Yes

No

Largs - Cumbrae Yes

No

Pentland Firth Yes

No

**Comments:**

See answer to question 4.

Consultation Question 6:...Should we allow single routes to be tendered as a bundle or should we stagger the tenders?

allow a bundle yes

stagger the tenders no

**Comments:**

Routes should be tendered as a bundle.

Consultation Question 7: Should the remaining routes stay within 2 bundles?

Yes

No

**Comments:**

We note that DML have proposed that the bundles be combined into one, and we see this as a more attractive proposal than splitting them further.

Consultation Question 8: Should we consider the implications of a looser tender, where a minimum level of service is required but where the operator has flexibility to innovate and reduce costs where they see fit?

Yes

No

No view expressed

**Comments:**

We have no specific position on this topic – although we note that, of our members, the Scottish Association for Public Transport has supported this and that this view was also supported by DML.

Consultation Question 9: Should we specify climate change objectives within the tender and require the operator to specify how he intends to meet them? Do operators agree and have views on how emission reductions should be defined? How would they measure and monitor performance, and demonstrate delivery?

**Comments:**

Yes

See questions 31-33 for our detailed views on this topic.

Consultation Question 10: What else do you think should be specified in a tender document? E.g. accessibility requirements, integration requirements etc.

**Comments:**

Integration with other sustainable transport modes (walking, cycling, bus/coach, rail) should be a key consideration. We are happy to support the views of the Scottish Association for Public Transport in their response, which called for (in summary):

- Integration with public transport, including the national rail network through railheads, and island bus services.
- Retention of the network-wide enquiry and booking system.
- High standards of passenger accommodation and facilities to attract tourists and to give incentives for more active travel.
- Network-wide marketing and timetable information, covering all main ferry routes.
- Full integration with train services for ferry routes serving railheads.
- Integration with island bus services, and mainland buses where there the ferry terminal is not rail linked.

Consultation Question 11: What should be the rationale for, and purpose of, the fares policy?

**PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY** No view expressed

- (a) Fairness of fares across Scotland
- (b) Community sustainability
- (c) Supporting economic development
- (d) Supporting tourism
- (e) Supporting the particular need of the particular community
- (f) Reduce the cost to government
- (g) To manage demand on ferries i.e. a policy that encourages people to travel at different times
- (h) To support “low carbon” travel
- (i) Other

**Comments:**

**All** of these objectives should be addressed by the fares structure so ticking only one box is over-simplistic.

Consultation Question 12:..... To what extent should fares differentiate between islanders/residents of peninsular communities and other ferry users? No view expressed

**Comments:**

We have no specific position on this topic.

Consultation Question 13: Should there be one fares policy across all of the supported Scottish ferry routes or should there be a different fares policy dependant on the need(s) of the community?

one fares policy  different fares policies  **No view expressed**

**Comments:**

We have no specific position on this topic.

Consultation Question 14: Do you agree that there should be a consistent and fair way of deciding what ferry services should be funded?

Yes  No

**Comments:**

Consultation Question 15: Do you agree that the ferry service should be designed to meet the most important needs of the community?

Yes  No  **Unsure**

**Comments:**

While meeting the desires of communities is an attractive proposition, other factors that require consideration will include public finance cost, environmental implications, and so forth.

Consultation Question 16: Is our assessment correct for your community? Please tell us what your community needs are and whether our assessment is right.

**Comments:**

We are not a 'community' so will not answer this question.



Consultation Question 17: Do you agree that investment should be prioritised to those areas that have the most potential to contribute to Scotland's growth?

Yes  No  **Unsure**

**Comments:**

**We are unclear as to the methodology being proposed.**

Consultation Question 18: Do you think that the responsibility for ferries provision should be more consistent across Scotland?

**Yes**  No

**Comments:**

Consultation Question 19: Do you agree that it would be wrong for all ferry services to be the responsibility of the Scottish Government?

**Yes**  No

**Comments:**

Consultation Question 20: Do you agree that the Scottish Government should become responsible for all ferry services providing necessary transport links for island communities to access the mainland and Local Authorities or Regional Transport Partnerships should be responsible for the provision of all others?.

Yes  **No**

**Comments:**

Consultation Question 21:.. Question 20 assumes that where an island is attached to the mainland via a bridge, it is treated as the mainland. Do you agree this is the correct way forward?

Yes  **No**

**Comments:**

Consultation Question 22: Do you agree that the provision of ferry services would be better placed within the remit of Local Government?

Yes

No

**Comments:**

Consultation Question 23: Do you agree that Regional Transport Partnerships could play a key role in the procurement of ferry services?

Yes

No

**Comments:**

Consultation Question 24: How should the responsibility be split between Local Authorities and Regional Transport Partnerships? **No view expressed**

**Comments:**

**We do not have a detailed position on this topic.**

Consultation Question 25: Do you agree that the provision of ferry services should continue to be split between central and local government?

Yes

No

**Comments:**

Consultation Question 26: If a continuation of a mixed responsibility role is preferable going forward (i.e. responsibility continues to be split between Central and Local Government), how should the split be determined?

**Comments:**

We support the views of the Scottish Association for Public Transport, viz:

- The main "sea" routes should continue to be funded through central government, preferably Transport Scotland to ensure good public transport integration.
- Inter-island routes, and routes of predominantly local use (eg Corran ferry), should continue to be specified by Local Government to suit local needs.
- But timetable publication and marketing, and "Rover" and "Hopscotch" tickets, should continue to be available for all ferry services on a national basis.

With regards to SAPT's first two points (above), the first should be seen as analagous to the separation of responsibilities for maintenance of roads between central government for 'trunk' routes and local government for 'local' routes.

Consultation Question 27: Should there be a central provision of procurement expertise? For example, Local Authorities/RTPS could determine what services/vessels they wanted to provide and specify those services/vessels, with a central procurement team purchasing them on their behalf.

Yes

No

**Comments:**

Consultation Question 28:

(a) Do you think that recommendations A – G (see below) should be implemented now?

Yes

No

No view expressed

**Comments:**

We have no detailed position on this or the following two questions.

We would however suggest that views are sought from the Scottish Accessible Transport Alliance (SATA) on this topic.

(b) When tendering do you think these recommendations should be included in any future tender requirements?

Yes

No

**Comments:**

(c) Are there any of these recommendations that you consider to be of particular importance?

A. The design of new ferries and harbour/ shore infrastructure should take full account of the DPTAC guidance, for example the provision of handrails, ramps and assistance telephones. Consideration where possible should also be given to their use in smaller ferries and ports.

B. The need for regular, recognised disability awareness training is viewed as a relatively cheap and quick solution in helping to reduce many of the barriers faced Good customer care and assistance by staff is often viewed as the key factor when deciding if ferry travel is possible, practicable or comfortable.

C. Port and ship operators need to plan their communication and information dissemination to take full recognition of PRMs. Audio, visual or other disabilities need to be considered, especially when considering passenger safety.

D. Accessibility information should be readily accessible to PRMs in order to aid journey planning. Where possible websites should be improved to take recognition of the needs of PRMs and make it easier to access this information.

E. Disabled Persons Assistance policies should be developed by all ferry and port operators as a matter of best practice.

F. A policy for those passengers which may require additional assistance which fall outside the general categorisation of PRM, for example people travelling with small children, or heavy / awkward luggage or baggage should be encouraged.

G. Provision where appropriate of some form of left luggage facility which would aid those passengers that are waiting onward travel connections.

**Comments:**

(d) Are there other issues that should be addressed?

**Comments:**

Consultation Question 29:

(a) Do you think that an Accessibility Improvement Fund should be set up?

Yes

No

**Comments:**

See answer to question 28.

(b) How would this be funded?

**Comments:**

(c) Who would administer this fund?

**Comments:**

Consultation Question 30:

(a) Do you think that an information system indicating the degree of accessibility would be useful?

Yes

No

**Comments:**

See answer to question 28.

(b) Are there any particular aspects you would like to see considered?

**Comments:**

Consultation Question 31: How could the reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from ferries be delivered to assist in meeting the potential emissions reductions set out in the Climate Change Delivery Plan?

**Comments:**

The consultation paper sets out a clear way in which GHG emission reduction can be achieved: the reduction in vessel speeds. The example provided is very impressive (a 20% emission reduction resulting from a 4% increase in journey times) and it would be interesting to see wider research done on the potential GHG emission reductions across the vessel fleet.

We note the measures set out in the DML response (a younger vessel fleet, differing fuel types, better capacity utilisation) can consider these also all important factors.

We note that SAPT in their response have, inter alia, raised the question of whether shorter routes should be pursued where possible, and we can see the potential merit in this approach but only insofar as good public transport links are maintained (something e.g. that is not present with the Western Ferries service vis-à-vis the CalMac service on the same route).

There should also be a greater concentration on promoting passenger access to ports by sustainable transport (public transport and active travel) rather than by car. This will not only reduce vessel loadings, but may (as and when the fleet is replaced) allow a concentration on the procurement of smaller vessels with less requirement for the carrying of vehicles rather than the procurement of ever-larger vehicles designed to accommodate greater volumes of vehicles.

Consultation Question 32: Operators would be likely to appreciate the fuel-efficiency benefits of such a measure. Would operators be willing to implement such a measure on a voluntary basis? If not, can they provide suggestions for alternate methods of delivering emissions reductions?

**Comments:**

We are not an operator and as such will refrain from attempting to answer this question.

Consultation Question 33: Would passengers support longer journey times as part of a CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction programme? If not, can they provide suggestions for alternate methods of delivering CO<sub>2</sub> reductions from ferries?

Yes

No

**Comments:**

Increases in public transport journey times are, on the whole, not welcome. As road transport is the main sector for emissions from transport, we would suggest that this is where most effort should be placed to drive emission reduction within the transport sector. However, all modes of transport should be striving to reduce their emissions where practicable and, as such, we can see no reason to exclude ferries from this consideration.

We expect that there would be some passenger resistance to an increase in journey times should measures be taken to reduce vessel speeds. However, this cannot on its own be used as a justification to reject such an approach. There is ample evidence that better enforcement of existing road traffic speeds (and possible reduction in speed limits) could significantly reduce emissions from the road transport sector. If such an approach is being actively considered for surface transport (and we know that it has been considered by the Scottish Government as part of the drafting of its climate change act RPP document) then we cannot see a good reason why it should not be considered for sea transport.

We are also not persuaded by the argument that longer ferry journey times would necessarily cause passengers to miss public transport connections. As long as timetables are established and kept to, we are not clear why public transport connections to ports could not be amended to fit with the new journey times. (Indeed, a counterfactual could be posed whereby shortened ferry journey times could lead to more inconvenience in terms of 'seamless travel' connections on to public transport.)

•