I refer to the above and the content of the associated web site. The Bill Committee is seeking views on:

A. whether the accompanying documents to the Bill are adequate to allow for proper scrutiny of the Bill, and

B. the ‘general principles’ of the Glasgow Airport Rail Link Bill, that is to say, is a new railway service between Glasgow Airport and Glasgow Central Station a sensible policy to pursue?

Regarding A

The documents that accompany the Bill give only a general description of the project. It is my view that these documents lack the detailed content identified in the following, thus are inadequate to allow for proper scrutiny of the Bill, vis:

A 1) omission of comparative fares and journey times for other forms of transport – public and private – for bus, taxi journeys from Glasgow City and the Conurbation that presently serve the Airport,

2) omission of comparative rail fares and times for passenger journeys between rail stations in Glasgow, the Conurbation and Paisley Gilmore Street, including from Glasgow Queen Street Station High and Low Levels to GARL,

3) no confirmation that the proposed GARL fares will apply,

4) no statement on passenger facilities that will be included in the new Link Structure between the Airport Terminal Building and the new Airport Station, (linked to (5),

5) no decision on the location of taxi and bus ranks at the Airport, if these are to change,

6) omission of any GARL Works at Network Rail Paisley Gilmore Street Station,

7) no content on the movement of GARL trains and passengers including access to trains at Platform 11A to provide the proposed 15 minute rail service to the Airport,

8) omission of GARL passenger barrier controls, ticket facilities at Network Rail Platform 11A,

9) omission of any GARL Works in the interlink between Network Rail Glasgow Low Level Platforms 14 / 15 and Platform 11A,

10) no content on GARL coach capacity - seating, luggage facilities, toilets - and whether the level of floor of rail coaches (re disabled) relative to Platform 11A, PGS and at the Airport station requires the ‘normal’ coach entry step-up / down,

11) omission of the benefits to road travel to / from the Airport with the completion of the proposed M74 Extension, south side of Glasgow,

12) omission of consideration of rail delivery of Aviation Fuel to the proposed relocation or to an alternative location of the Aviation Fuel Depot,

13) omission of consideration of the fuel capacity of the proposed Aviation Fuel Depot in view of the projected air passenger estimates from 2009 to 2030, vis-à-vis road / rail transport delivery requirements,

14) transfer of PGS non-airport trips to GARL patronage appears to significantly increase GARL ‘revenue figures’,

15) source of operational funding for GARL, eg Scottish Executive rail subsidy to GARL / First ScotRail, (or other), contribution from BAA, et al.
Detail on point (2)
2.1 Researching (see sheet attached) the standard Single Fares charged by First ScotRail from several stations in the Conurbation, each as a through journey to Paisley Gilmore Street, shows that many are via Glasgow Central. eg Dalry, Ayrshire at £3.35 Single journey of 30 miles for 12 p per mile, Motherwell £3.65, 23 miles for 16p per mile, et al.
2.2 Glasgow Central to PGS £2.30, 8 miles for 29 p per mile, and extending the railway from PGS to the Airport for 1.87 miles at 29 p per mile would add 54 pence taking the fare to £2.84. Further add-on to what is easily the present highest rail fare in the Conurbation. Not a fare that would encourage ‘social engineering’ or locals.
2.3 Further, for the Return Ticket to Glasgow Platform 11A at £4.50 as proposed in the Bill, First ScotRail would require to amend their ticket policy for the Conurbation or the proposed GARL Return Fares structure would have to change.
2.4 Re ticket types, First ScotRail issue Single tickets and Day Return tickets but not Standard Return tickets, eg 28 day. Other types of tickets are issued, eg pensioner, weekly, weekend, children, etc, which have been not considered here.

Detail on point (14)
14.1 On reviewing the SPT rail Timetables – booklet West and Clyde Coast, p24 states that there are presently 150 trains Mondays to Saturdays to and from PGS to Glasgow Central. At the proposed GARL timetable of 4 trains per hour in a period of 18 hours increases by 72 trains bringing the total to 212 per day. Similar Glasgow / PGS.
14.2 The forecast (ES Table 12.3) of GARL annual patronage 2009 at 1,388,000 includes non-airport related trips of 838,000, trips that have already been accounted for in PGS present passenger figures. Deleting the non-airport trips would reduce GARL patronage to airport figures only, ie 550,000 annual including employees
14.3 Is there not double counting here? To change regular PGS / Central users to GARL users seems inappropriate. This passenger change affects GARL revenue calculations and presumably subsidy.
14.4 How many are employed at the Airport today? How many use the employees car park and is there a charge for this use?
14.4 What are the Airports opening hours? Train times early and late, Saturdays and Sundays is unlikely to provide the transport required by employees to suit Airport traffic and services.

Summary of A
Detailed information is required to allow proper scrutiny of the Bill.

Regarding B
The Promoter’s Memorandum includes several Policy Objectives, as listed in the Committee’s ‘Call for written evidence’.

For Bullet points 1, 2 and 3 my view is that GARL will assist in a limited way in achieving these Policy Objectives.

For Bullet Points 4, 5 and 6 my views on GARL are:
**Bullet Point 4**

To improve social inclusion and accessibility by connecting areas of low car ownership and high deprivation within west Scotland to economic opportunities at Glasgow and Glasgow Airport.

B 4.1 The 'less-well-off', low car ownership areas of Glasgow City and Conurbation, pre and post 1939 – 45 out-of-centre districts such as Drumchapel, Easterhouse, Castlemilk, Toryglen, Sighthill, Pollock, Clydebank, also the old districts of Anderson, Springburn, Calton, Parkhead, Shettleston, Tollcross, Barlanark, Govan, Ibrox, Cardonald, then similarly for towns in Ayrshire, Inverclyde, a population in the region of possibly over 800,000 are not well served by rail stations. Making use of GARL requires (with luggage) individuals, families, elderly to use a combination of public transport – buses, taxies, friends, walking, either to reach stations or directly to the Airport. Individual or group opportunities may be at the Airport but would / could the 'less-well-off' be able to afford the cost of rail transport, and accept the time taken to leave such areas and reach the Airport.

B 4.2 GARL proposed fares do not fit the Promoter’s Policy Objective.

**Bullet Point 5**

To provide a high quality, high capacity public transport service between Glasgow Airport, Paisley and Glasgow that will attract car and other users through offering a high quality, high reliability, safe, frequent service, and competitive journey times.

B 5.1 GARL may offer a high quality, high capacity, high reliability, safe, frequent service and competitive journey times transport service - but so do the others operating to and from the Airport.

B 5.2 Consider the ‘high quality’ provision. GARL by relying on the use of the existing station facilities for interchange at Paisley Gilmore Street, Glasgow Central Low / High Level would not get ‘half marks’ in any survey.

B 5.3 Take Paisley. Passengers interchanging at Paisley require to change platforms for two of the four trains arriving / departing to connect with GARL. This requires (with luggage) individuals, families, elderly to use two way stairs to the under platform passageway to reach their next train. For the disabled, the lifts that operate from each platform do not stop at the under platform passageway, next stop is street level.

B 5.4 Take Glasgow Low Level. Passengers on the Low Level trains (with luggage) have to use stairs – some narrow two way - and a labyrinth of passageways to rise two levels then escalators to near Platform 11A, while for the less able and disabled, the lift system is on a level – to - level basis with walking or wheel chair (and luggage) between lifts.

B 5.5 GARL Works, as described in the Bill, do not include for any upgrade of Network Rail Station facilities.

B 5.6 GARL proposed Works do not fit the Promoter’s Policy Objective.

**Bullet Point 6**

To provide public transport services to Glasgow Airport and in the M8 and the Ayrshire corridors that integrate with the existing transport network and allow for the future development of enhanced interchange opportunities with bus, car, rail, cycling and walking.
B 6.1 Integrating local transport with rail is worthy but to do so requires a modernisation of many Rail Station facilities throughout SPT area. For example, take Rutherglen Station - here the Station is nearby Main Street with most daily passengers walking to it from local housing or bus stop. However, access to the platform is via a steep 42 step stairway with one landing. Then for GARL, with the train calling at Central Low Level there is the effort to reach Platform 11A.

B 6.2 GARL proposed Works do not fit Promoter’s Policy Objective.

Summary of B

S.1 The Bill, based on the Promoter’s Memorandum and other documents, misses what I consider to be a vital point in the GARL promotion, namely, that of the provision of ‘high quality services’.
S.2 Coming to Glasgow and Scotland to be given (yet unspecified) modern ‘high quality services’ at the Airport, to be followed by ‘Victorian’ services will not do for what the First Minister calls the ‘Best Small Country in the World’. I am quite sure that Melbourne and Bejing will have promoted and provided these ‘high quality services’, but I am afraid that this has been omitted in GARL where the passengers / parents have to move children, elderly parents, perhaps disabled, (with luggage) in very poor transit facilities which will create disappointment, stress and hassle. The alternatives of taxies and buses provide near door to door, perhaps more expensive for some journeys, but without stress and hassle, and quite possibly be quicker and cheaper, thus more attractive.
S.3 These ‘high quality services’ will need additional monies, but without them the travelling public will not create the ‘Image of Scotland’ and will not meet the Promoter’s Memorandum.

Policy Objectives

P.1 To make a success of GARL, I would ask that the Committee take my comments seriously and make new detailed proposals for inclusion in the Bill.
P.2 On their inclusion, I would ask for copy of the revised version to allow me to reassess the Bill and give my opinion on whether these allow the proper scrutiny that the Committee desire and whether the GARL project should be pursued.

I thank the Committee for this opportunity to give my views.

APPENDIX

Rail fares, distance and cost per mile for several Stations in Glasgow and Conurbation.

**Single Rail Fares (through ticket) from Origin Station to Paisley Gilmore Street (PGS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin Station</th>
<th>Fare</th>
<th>Distance to PGS</th>
<th>Cost per mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Largs</td>
<td>£ 4.80</td>
<td>41 miles</td>
<td>14.5 pence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Fare</td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilmarnock</td>
<td>£ 4.50</td>
<td>30 miles</td>
<td>20.5 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherwell</td>
<td>£ 3.65</td>
<td>23 miles</td>
<td>16.0 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coatbridge</td>
<td>£ 3.10</td>
<td>18 miles</td>
<td>17.0 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkhall</td>
<td>£ 4.10</td>
<td>26 miles</td>
<td>16.0 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milngavie</td>
<td>£ 2.80</td>
<td>18 miles</td>
<td>15.5 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutherglen</td>
<td>£ 2.55</td>
<td>12 miles</td>
<td>20.0 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muirend</td>
<td>£ 2.50</td>
<td>13 miles</td>
<td>19.0 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larbert</td>
<td>£ 5.90</td>
<td>28 miles</td>
<td>21.0 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kilbride</td>
<td>£ 3.10</td>
<td>28 miles</td>
<td>12.0 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalry, Ayrshire</td>
<td>£ 3.35</td>
<td>30 miles</td>
<td>12.0 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestwick (town)</td>
<td>£ 5.00</td>
<td>30 miles</td>
<td>17.0 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestwick (Airport)</td>
<td>£ 5.00</td>
<td>29 miles</td>
<td>17.2 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weymoss Bay</td>
<td>£ 4.15</td>
<td>36 miles</td>
<td>12.0 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Glasgow</td>
<td>£ 2.90</td>
<td>21 miles</td>
<td>14.0 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Central to PGS</td>
<td>£ 2.30</td>
<td>8 miles</td>
<td>29.0 p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PGS to Airport £ 0.90 1.9 miles 48.0 p Very expensive

In theory, the PGS to Airport fare should be added to all fares shown to give Rail Fare to / from any station to Airport.
APPENDIX

I refer to my letter to the committee of 31st March and the Appendix thereto.

I have recalculated the distance from Central Station to Paisley Gilmore Street at 7.1 miles, not 8 miles as the Appendix. With this reduction the cost for this rail journey increases from 29.0 p / mile to 32.4 p / mile, thus putting the use of rail further out of the reach of those in less well off areas.

Please add this letter to my submission of 31st March.