

SPOKES

The Lothian Cycle Campaign

St. Martins Church, 232 Dalry Road, Edinburgh EH11 2JG 0131.313.2114 [answerphone] spokes@spokes.org.uk www.spokes.org.uk

If replying by email, please use... davedufeu@gmail.com

22 October 2009

Submission to Scottish Parliament Transport, Infrastructure and Climate Change Committee

Scottish Draft Budget 2010-11

- 1 The Spokes proposal for a new £20m Cycle Projects Fund - introduction
- 2 How the Spokes proposal would work
- 3 Background and justification
- 4 Developments over the last year
 - 4.1 Cycle Project Funding and the SPICe report
 - 4.2 Cabinet Secretary John Swinney's responses
 - 4.3 Scottish Government cycle use target for 2020
 - 4.4 Carbon emissions and transport

Appendix Examples of possible bids to the Fund

Footnotes Notes, commentaries and references. In the main text '[1]' refers to footnote 1.

“We will step up our promotion of greener transport options, to encourage less fuel dependency”

First Minister **Alex Salmond** [Donald Dewar Memorial Lecture, August 2008].

“With a current modal share for cycling of just 1% we clearly have much more to do if we are to emulate our European neighbours who enjoy between 10% and 30% modal share”

Transport, Infrastructure and Climate Change Minister **Stewart Stevenson** [Herald 14.5.08].

1 THE SPOKES PROPOSAL

Spokes proposes the draft budget be amended to create a new £20m Cycle Projects Fund, to function as outlined in Section 2 below. The fund would be additional to all current initiatives, so raising cycle investment towards a still very small 2% of total transport spend. It should be seen as the first year of continuing increased cycling investment, a step towards the government's very ambitious new target [4.3] to raise cycle use in Scotland to a European-like level of 10% of all journeys by bike in 2020.

Our proposal would operate through existing administrative structures [Section 2 below]. It would contribute to several National Outcomes [footnote 1], to reduced carbon emissions [Section 4.4] and to sustainable economic growth [Section 3].

Last year the TICC Committee in its budget report [para 120] recommended additional funding for cycling and walking, and specifically that the then Spokes proposal be considered in that context. The Committee should challenge Cabinet Secretary John Swinney's argument when he gave evidence at that time, should the same argument be used again [4.2 below]. Unfortunately his remarks were taken at face value by Finance Committee when considering the TICC budget recommendations.

We note that our research showing low and declining cycling investment in Scotland has recently been endorsed in a SPICe report [4.1 below] as *“the most comprehensive analysis of funding for Scottish cycling projects.”*

The money for our proposal could be found by a re-allocation of current priorities - specifically we suggest a £20m reduction in the ever-increasing motorway and trunk road allocation [6]. This rose by £172m in the 2009/10 budget [including accelerated capital spend] and receives a further £51m increase in 2010/11 - i.e. a £223m increase over the 2008/9 figure. A £20m Cycle Projects Fund is very small in transport terms, representing well under 1% of total transport spend – see [5] for European comparators. Yet even £20m would *double* investment in cycle use [7] whilst comprising a minor reduction [under 2%] in trunk road spending – indeed a minor reduction in the *increase* in trunk road spending. Such a transfer from trunk road to cycling investment would also be in line with the thinking of the Sustainable Development Commission [4.4 below].

Our proposal is far more modest than the **10% of transport funding for active travel** proposed by the Association of Directors of Public Health, Institute of Highway Engineers, and many other prestigious and professional bodies [*Take Action on Active Travel* at www.adph.org.uk]. We strongly support such a future ambition, but our proposal is designed to be feasible for year 2010-11 in terms of political and implementable realities.

2. THE SPOKES PROPOSAL – HOW IT WOULD WORK

First – our proposal is realistic and workable. Late last year Spokes was invited to a 2-hour meeting with the Scottish Government's then Head of Transport Strategy [Diane McLafferty] and other officials to discuss the workability of our proposal. The meeting was very constructive and we left feeling the proposal was eminently workable should funding be made available through the budget. Our proposal this year is almost identical.

The fund would be administered by the government's existing Sustainable Transport Team, and would be open to bids over a certain level (perhaps £0.5m) by any relevant body – for example, Sustrans, First ScotRail, BWB, business organisations, local authorities or Transport Partnerships. Bids would normally be match-funded.

The reasons for suggesting this particular approach are...

- **Administration by the Scottish Government Sustainable Transport Team** would ensure public accountability whilst avoiding new administrative structures. Clearly some extra staffing would be required within that team – perhaps similar to the part-time post set up to administer Smarter Choices.
- **Limiting bids to over (say) £0.5m or £1m** would minimise administration by the team, but would not prevent small and innovative projects [see next paragraph].
- Clearly the scheme would support **large projects** – which now have no straightforward funding mechanism, following the transfer of RTP capital to councils and the earlier ending of the Public Transport Fund.

However, our proposal would also enable bodies such as Sustrans, Cycling Scotland or Regional Transport Partnerships to put forward bids comprising **packages of smaller related projects** in particular regional or topic areas. Such an arrangement could also unleash a wide range of innovative ideas and voluntary effort, as is happening under the *Climate Challenge Fund*, as also happened under the 1998/99 *Scottish Cycle Challenge Initiative* [9] and whose possibilities are hinted at by the recent Spokes summer competition [10].

Examples of the types of bids we envisage - to support both large and small projects - are in the Appendix.

- **In subsequent years, cycle expenditure needs to rise further**, to reach European levels. At present the skills and experience to spend such sums effectively may not be widespread across Scotland. Through a new bidding fund, those bodies with existing experience and capabilities will identify themselves and expertise will grow, enabling Scotland to make a rapid start on developing a culture of proper provision for cyclists.
- **Cycling investment should not just be limited to local authorities**. Ambition and innovation are of the essence in our proposal, with all sectors and stakeholders needing the opportunity and incentive to start promoting cycle use in a substantial way – also making a tangible statement of Scotland's over-arching commitment to sustainable development. Because of this wide application and intention of the fund, we do not see it as conflicting with the **Concordat** – the examples in the Appendix show this clearly.
- The expectation of **match-funding**, although it should probably not be an absolute requirement for a successful bid, would increase the effective value of the government investment.

3. BACKGROUND & JUSTIFICATION

The reasons why cycle use should be increased are well known – particularly environment, energy security, public health and congestion. There are many relevant existing government policies and political commitments. Modal shift from car to cycle would contribute to the government's Single National Purpose, Strategic Objectives, and National Outcomes [1], would support sustainable economic growth [below], is essential in meeting the government's new cycle use target [4.3 below], would support manifesto commitments of nearly all parties at the last Holyrood election [2]; would chime well with many of the Single Outcome Agreements with Scottish local authorities; would tie in with the spirit and requirements of the Climate Change Act [4.4 below], and would give real meaning to statements by the First Minister and the Transport Minister [3]. Yet despite these policies, commitments and warm words, real action comparable to nearby European nations is sadly lacking.

European comparator countries show that consistent investment, to create conditions which are not only safe but welcoming for cyclists, results in major shifts to cycle use [5]. For example, Copenhagen, where 36% of commuting is by bike, and investment to raise this further is underway ... *“The city's bike culture was built almost from scratch. There was a political will to make it happen, funds were allocated and are still allocated ... We ride bicycles because of visionary political decisions”* [Guardian, 26.6.08, Wall Street Journal 4.5.07].

Over the years many relevant initiatives have been taken by the Scottish government and its predecessors (some knowingly, some unwitting! [8]) and worthwhile growth in cycle use achieved in limited areas where investment has been made. What has stayed constant, however, is that the proportion of government transport spending allocated to cycling has remained no higher than 1%. The result has been that, whilst Scotland as a whole has seen cycle use remain at miserable levels, around 1% of all journeys, comparator countries have seen it rising to 5%-30% of all journeys – even up to 50% in some towns and cities.

When the government is questioned on cycle project investment we are told of all the initiatives underway – some sustainable travel town experiments, the CWSS fund, a tourist/leisure Inverness-Oban project (over several years), the Cycle Action Plan, and so on. All are welcome, but, adding up total cycling investment, we are now under 1% of transport spending – probably under £20m [4] from a total of now around £2500m [6]. Yet the need for action appears to be recognised by Scottish government ministers, right up to the First Minister [3].

Finally, our proposal contributes in several ways to **Sustainable Economic Growth**, benefiting employment and the economy in a green way. Investment in cycling infrastructure and promotion is labour-intensive compared to major infrastructural projects, so providing more jobs and green jobs. There is also huge scope and enthusiasm for innovative projects, such as Edinburgh's Bike Station, which can bring significant voluntary input, thus increasing the value of the investment. Furthermore, the outputs of cycling investment then further contribute to healthy and sustainable economic growth – for example, reduced city congestion, healthier staff for employers, greater reliability in local journey times, and growing business opportunities such as in sustainable tourism and leisure. As the mayor of Groningen [now one of Europe's top 'cycling cities'] said of their cycle infrastructure programme as long as 15 years ago, *“This is an economic programme – we are boosting jobs and business.”*

4. DEVELOPMENTS IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS

4.1 Cycle Project Funding and the SPICe report

The independent Scottish Parliament Information Centre has published briefing document 09/48, *Cycling in Scotland*. The section dealing with funding calls the Spokes annual cycle project funding survey *“the most comprehensive analysis of funding for Scottish cycling projects”* - this endorsement can give decision-makers added confidence over our conclusions.

Because of the multiple funding sources, and the fact that cycling investment is often an integral part of wider transport or other schemes, it will never be possible to say precisely what is the total of Scottish cycling investment. *Of course, the same could be said of many areas of public spending.* However, the SPICe endorsement, and the fact that our survey is annual, give us confidence that we are providing a reasonable overall perspective (perhaps + or – one or two £1m) – and in particular that we are identifying trends over time.

Our latest survey, for year 08/09, shows total Scottish cycling investment from all main sources falling from £21.7m in 07/08 to £18.3m in 08/09 and a predicted £16.4m in 09/10. That is equivalent to 0.93% of the 07/08 transport budget, 0.81% in 08/09 and a predicted 0.66% in 09/10. More detail in footnote [4].

4.2 Cabinet Secretary John Swinney's responses on cycling investment

In responding to TICC questioning at the time of last year's budget, Mr Swinney relied on the argument that cycling investment comes from a range of sources – thereby implying (though not stating) that investment may well be considerably higher than the Spokes evidence suggested. He used exactly the same argument when questioned at the 15.9.09 Scottish Transport Conference, claiming on that occasion that 1% of total transport spending “*is not an accurate figure*” for cycling investment – again implying, but not stating, that it is over 1% - a very unlikely scenario given that 1% means current cycling investment would be approaching £25m, whilst our survey suggests just £18.3m.

Most importantly, in last year's budget report the Finance Committee appeared to rely on these remarks by Mr Swinney, and perhaps as a result they failed to support the TICC recommendation on funding.

The endorsement of Spokes research by SPICe suggests that our figures are reasonably reliable. Mr Swinney should therefore be asked if he believes the figure to be significantly over 1%. If he does then, having been using this argument for over a year, he should be able to justify his comments.

In any case, arguments around the` 1% figure are something of a red herring. Whether it is 0.8%, 1% or 1.2% is much less significant than the fact that cycle investment in Scotland, whether in total or per head or as a %, is well below those European nations who have achieved and surpassed the levels of cycling to which the Scottish government aspires [5].

4.3 Scottish Government cycle use target for 2020

Speaking at the Scottish Government's *Dreams on Wheels* cycling conference early in 2009, Transport Minister **Stewart Stevenson** announced a target for 10% of all journeys in Scotland to be by bike by 2020. Whilst the target is now being presented as part of the consultation, that is not how it appeared at the time of that announcement. Nonetheless, this is a very impressive target. Unfortunately the subsequent Cycling Action Plan for Scotland [CAPS] consultation on increasing cycle use in Scotland did not contain any assurance of funding to meet the target, or any discussion of possible funding mechanisms. In any case, postponing the start of any new investment until after the next Spending Review (if then, or if at all) makes the 2020 target seem so ambitious as to be virtually unrealisable.

4.4 Carbon emissions and transport

In the last year, Scotland's hugely ambitious Climate Change Act has been passed.

It is widely recognised that transport is a policy area where we are heading fast in the wrong direction in terms of emissions. The Scottish Government *Climate Change Programme 2nd Annual Report, 2007-8*, concluded, “*It is imperative that overall emissions from this sector (transport) are driven down.*”

The Sustainable Development Commission's *Review of Progress by the Scottish Government, November 2008* states “*Transport is the poorest performing area in terms of sustainable development..*” and, even worse, within this badly performing area, “*Active travel is in relative decline...*” According to the Sunday Herald [18.10.09] the SDC is expected in November to issue “*a damning critique of Scottish Government transport priorities.*” A series of forceful comments by SDC chair, Will Day, included... “*Greater alignment between ... sustainable development targets and the many transport project decisions is sorely needed.*”

In an article on reducing transport carbon emissions [Scottish Transport Review Oct 2009], Dr Jillian Anable of Aberdeen University states, “*Increasing the level of cycling in Britain to levels closer to those of our Northern European neighbours could yield emissions savings in the UK of around 2 MtC (7.3Mt CO₂) per year (approximately 6% of total transport emissions by source) if like-for-like mode switching was delivered. The savings could be greater if destination switching was also achieved.*” [the latter point presumably refers to cycling to a local destination rather than driving to a further-away destination].

APPENDIX – EXAMPLES OF POSSIBLE BIDS

- **Local authority large-project bids**, such as upgrading the highly substandard A90 commuter/tourist trunk National Cycleroute from Edinburgh to the Forth Bridge. The government and Edinburgh council have now been in negotiations for over 2 years on a special one-off deal for this possibly £1m-£2m project *because there is no longer any standard funding mechanism under which it can be built.*
- **British Waterways** could bid to surface and light all urban sections of the Edinburgh-Glasgow towpath, these also forming spines for future local town cycle networks.
- **Sustrans** could bid to create safe routes to stations, improving bike/rail integration in a range of towns, and often also forming local spine routes to town centres, where the station is in or near the town centre.
- **ScotRail** could bid for matched funding to improve cycle carriage on the Edinburgh/Glasgow to Inverness routes, a cause of many complaints by tourists and by locals.
- A **Regional Transport Partnership** could bid (on behalf of its constituent local authorities) to create cycle-friendly conditions in one town in each area.
- Cycling Scotland or Sustrans could bid to set up a **Cycle Challenge Fund** to unleash the enthusiasm and expertise of local voluntary groups. Such funding was an explicit recommendation of the Evaluation Report on the 1998/9 Scottish Executive's Cycle Challenge Initiative [9]. The success of that scheme in fostering community involvement and skilled voluntary effort is similar to that of the current Climate Challenge Fund.
- A whole range of **exciting ideas and opportunities** was revealed in the recent Spokes summer competition '*How would you spend £1m to get more people using bikes for everyday journeys.*' Some of these could take off if a fund such as we propose were available. The prizewinning top 8 entries are shown in footnote 10.

FOOTNOTES & REFERENCES

[1] Government aspirations supported by our proposal

One single national purpose: including...

“... opportunities for all of Scotland to flourish, through increasing sustainable economic growth”

Five strategic objectives:

Wealthier and fairer; Smarter; Healthier; Safer and stronger; Greener

Fifteen National Outcomes: including...

“We live longer, healthier lives”

“We live in well-designed sustainable places where we are able to access the amenities and services we need”

“We live in a Scotland that is the most attractive place for doing business in Europe”

“We reduce the local and global environmental impact of our consumption and production”

Forty-five Indicators and Targets: including...

No.4 *“Reduce the proportion of driver journeys delayed due to traffic congestion”*

No.14 *“Reduce rate of increase in proportion of children with body mass index outwith healthy range by 2018”*

No.32 *“Reduce overall ecological footprint”*

No.36 *“Increase the proportion of journeys to work made by public or active transport”*

No.37 *“Increase the proportion of adults making one or more visits to the outdoors per week.”*

[2] Manifesto commitments [Holyrood 2007 elections]

SNP manifesto To “promote walking and cycling.” To make journeys “greener, safer, easier.”

Green manifesto “We want cycle funding to quadruple by 2014 to at least 4% [of Scottish transport spending]”

Labour manifesto “Make cycling a more convenient, attractive and realistic choice for many more short journeys.”

Lib Dem manifesto “Double cycling rates in Scotland by 2012” “Require major towns and cities to develop a core network of routes from residential areas to town centres.”

Conservative manifesto Cycling and walking, regrettably, were totally omitted from the manifesto.

[3] Statements by the First Minister and Transport Minister

“With a current modal share for cycling of just 1% we clearly have much more to do if we are to emulate our European neighbours who enjoy between 10% and 30% modal share” - Transport Minister Stewart Stevenson [Herald 14.5.08].

“We will step up our promotion of greener transport options, to encourage less fuel dependency” - First Minister Alex Salmond [Donald Dewar Memorial Lecture, August 2008].

[4] Cycle project investment in Scotland

For the last 12 years Spokes has conducted an annual survey of cycle project expenditure in Scotland, and has identified main sources and amounts of such expenditure. This is not an easy exercise, as there are a variety of sources, and within some of them the amount which can be considered as cycle investment is impossible fully to disentangle. Therefore our calculations should be seen as providing a ball-park figure, not absolute precision.

The report on our most recent survey and analysis [based on 08/09 government and local authority budgets] can be found in Spokes Bulletin 104 at www.spokes.org.uk – downloads. The top-level summary table is as follows...

	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10
Total cycle spending from all main sources £m	21.2	21.7	18.3	16.4
Total govt transport spending £m	2248	2335	2255	2488*
Cycling investment as % of total transport	0.94%	0.93%	0.81%	0.66%
Cycling investment in pence per head	414p	422p	355p	317p

*the equivalent figure in footnote 6 is very slightly different, as it is based on the current 2010/11 draft budget document.

The above cycle investment totals for 07/08 and 08/09 are made up as follows...

Source	2007/08	2008/09	Comment
Council transport capital budgets, excluding any sums mentioned below	£1.0m	£3.1m	Big increase due to some councils (a minority) using some of the former RTP capital for cycling investment
Regional Transport Partnerships	£4.9m	£0.7m	Big £4.2m decline, due to capital transfer to councils
CWSS ring-fenced funding	£3.3m	£3.7m	Our surveys identify these figures as the elements of the £9m CWSS total that went to cycle investment
Sustrans	£7.8m	£5.0m	Now mainly from Sustainable Transport Budget – big decrease from the allocation under the previous administration
Cycling Scotland	£1.6m	£1.5m	Mainly from the Sustainable Transport Budget
Smarter Choices	-	£0.9m	Assumes 1/3 of Smarter Choices is considered cycle investment – government estimate – our survey suggests slightly less
Trunk Road cycling investment	£2.0m	£2.0m	Letter from Stewart Stevenson to Mike Pringle MSP 18.8.08.
Other local authority – e.g. planning gain, Europe, education	£1.1m	£1.4m	This figure has been around £1m-£1.5m in our survey for a number of years
TOTAL	£21.7m	£18.3m	

In 09/10 the allocations to Sustrans and Cycling Scotland are expected to fall further, and Smarter Choices cycling investment to rise; the combined effect being to reduce the 08/09 £18.3m total to £16.4m in 07/08, as in the top table.

In addition to the above, some funding is going to cycle projects from health authorities, from the Climate Challenge Fund, and possibly from other sources. However, these sums are unlikely to impact significantly on the general picture or on the disparity with comparator countries [5]. In considering any such sums in the context of our survey and of this submission, it is of course important to attempt to separate out the element attributable to cycling – not always easy. As our survey has found, even within the CWSS fund, only some 35%-40% can be considered cycling investment, and there are even examples of CWSS money being used for projects inimicable to cycling, such as one-way streets.

Finally in a Parliamentary written answer [S3O-7409, 18 June 2009] Transport Minister Stewart Stevenson stated, “Scottish Government investment in cycling this year will be in the region of £18 million.” As that is of the same order as our own calculation, it provides further evidence that our ball-park figure is fairly reliable.

[5] Comparisons with other European nations

The relationship between cycle use levels and safe and welcoming cycle infrastructure is widely accepted. For example, “*The key to high levels of cycling appears to be provision of separate cycling facilities* along heavily trafficked roads and at intersections, combined with traffic calming residential neighbourhoods*” Source: Puchler & Buehler, 2008, Making Cycling Irresistible – Lessons from Netherlands, Denmark and Germany.

* [Comment] In practice, in built up towns and cities where there is inadequate space for physically segregated facilities, 'separate cycling facilities' often include clearly defined onroad cycle lanes, e.g. with coloured surfacing.

Similarly, Dr Jillian Anable of Aberdeen University states, “*Inter-country comparisons suggest that effective policies to make cycling safe and more convenient, for example through segregation or prioritisation, correlate closely with levels of cycling*” [Scottish Transport Review, October 2009].

Precise funding comparisons between countries are very difficult, as funding may come from local, regional or national level; and cycle investment may be substantially sourced from other more general transport or other budgets. In particular, to calculate for other countries a figure comparable to the Spokes national % calculation for Scotland would be a major task completely beyond our resources. Nonetheless the following examples clearly illustrate the extent of the disparity between Scotland and comparator European countries.

Cycle spending per head in **Amsterdam** is estimated at 27euro (approx £20) p.a. in 2006-10; compared to our 2006/7 Spokes estimates of £3.70 for Scotland and £3.60 for Edinburgh [Spokes 96]. In historical terms, **Groningen** invested 13euro (approx £8) per head p.a. in 1989-99, as compared to our 1997 estimate of £0.55 for Scotland and £1.30 for Edinburgh [Spokes 67]. **Copenhagen** currently invests around DKK165 (£17.50) per resident in cycle provision, and this in a city with an already extensive cycle infrastructure. Sources: Cycling in Netherlands, Dutch Ministry of Transport, 2007; Copenhagen Bicycle Account 2006, City of Copenhagen.

Norway has a slightly smaller population (4.7m) than Scotland (5.1m) and climate/topography which might be considered less cycle-friendly. The government aims to raise cycle use from 5% of all journeys to 8%, and has allocated 1500m Krone (approx £150m) over 4 years 2006/09 (i.e. nearly £40m p.a.) as part of a longer-term strategy. Note that this special budget is additional to regular ongoing cycle investment [total unknown] from other sources such as toll-road income and through local authorities. Thus in total Norway is certainly investing in cycle use at very much more than double Scotland's rate. Source: Norwegian Cycling Strategy, Hege Tassell, Velo City Conference, Munich 2007.

Germany has a 2000m euro p.a. urban transport fund providing 75%-80% match funding for cycle facilities built by state and local government [the proportion of this fund going to cycle facilities is unknown]. This is in addition to several other regular forms of cycle funding, such as a 100m euro annual fund for cycle routes beside national highways, national cycling research, etc. Source: Puchler & Buehler [above].

[6] Scottish Draft Budget 2010/11 proposals [Figures in £m]

Budget area	2008-09 budget#	2009-10 draft budget##	2010-11 plans##
Sustainable and active travel*	11.0	11.5	11.2
Cycling, Walking, Safer Streets*	9.0	9.1	9.1
Motorways and trunk roads	929.6	1102.2 [up £172m]	1153.0 [up £223m from 08/09]
Total government transport**	2254.6	2502.4	2457.6

* The bulk of cycle project investment comes from these two budget lines [which also cover several other areas]

** This row is calculated by totalling the 8 transport-related budget lines under Finance and Sustainable Growth.

Column figures from 2009/10 draft budget report

Column figures from 2010/11 draft budget report

Note: Some capital was transferred from 2010/11 to 2009/10 as 'accelerated capital spending', but that still leaves a significant further rise in trunk road spending in 2010/11, as shown in the table.

[7] The impact on the 2010/11 budget of our proposal

Cycle investment would roughly *double* from under £20m [4] to approaching £40m.

Motorway/trunk road spending would reduce *by less than 2%*, from £1153m to £1133m.

[8] The erratic, semi-random, nature of government decisions on cycle project expenditure

No Scottish administration has yet made a really serious attempt to increase cycle use, through the necessary adequate and *continuing* investment. Indeed, many of the *most significant* decisions affecting cycle project expenditure are taken without a considered awareness of (and without concern for?) their cycle project consequences.

For example, for several years (until 05/06, when it provided £3.4m cycle project spend) the biggest single source of cycle investment was not a cycling allocation at all, but the Public Transport Fund. The main element of cycle spending from this huge fund comprised cycle facilities integrated into big public transport schemes. When PTF was abolished the government was quite uninterested in the fact that this would seriously damage Scottish cycle spending. Spokes many times over a 2-year period highlighted this looming major cut; and the then Scottish Executive was eventually compelled in writing to accept our argument - but did nothing about it.

Similarly, when RTP capital funding was introduced a few years ago there was little expectation or intention that this would bring the major boost to cycle investment which did in fact happen. Then, funding rules were again changed, by the new SNP government, and again with absolutely no thought to whether or how this would impact on investment in cycling infrastructure – and we expect the outcome to be severely negative. Already, for example, the £4.3m SESTRAN budget (over several years) for high quality cyclistroute connections between Edinburgh and surrounding local authority areas has been replaced by an Edinburgh Council budget for the same purpose of £0.5m in total to cover the 3 years 2008-2010.

[9] 1998/99 Scottish Cycle Challenge Initiative

This was Scottish Executive scheme with a one-off lump sum of £2m, to which any organisation in Scotland could bid, for funding to raise cycle use. The Evaluation Report was published by the Scottish Executive Central Research Unit in 2001, and pointed particularly to the huge level of community initiative and input which was released and prompted by the fund.

[10] Prizewinning entries from Spokes Summer 2009 competition

Entrants were asked to state how £1m should be spent to get more people cycling for everyday journeys such as commuting, shopping, or family leisure. The prizewinning entries, judged with the assistance of transport professor Tom Rye, showed the range of ideas and enthusiasm waiting to be unleashed!...

1= **Nick Brotchie** Red cycle lanes and parking restrictions on every Edinburgh A & B road, 20mph elsewhere.

1= **Euan Renton** Match-funded small-employer grants to promote workplace bike use/ commuting Scotland-wide.

3 **Mike Lewis** *Rack 'n' Roll* – equip buses on 200 Scottish routes with US-style 2-bike racks, for leisure, commuter backup, etc. 12m extra US journeys resulted in 2008!!

4 **Pippa Coutts** Multi-pronged child-centred programme to promote cycling - from pregnant women through to teenage groups and parental involvement via employers.

5 **James Ryder** Route from Edinburgh to the 4000-person Bush Estate, avoiding 'A' roads [costly underpass needed].

6 **Tom Morris** Dutch-style 'FietsPoint' staffed park/hire/workshop centres at main rail stations [we understand that the first such UK scheme will open at Leeds station in 2010].

7 **David Wardrop-White** Towns/cities to install extensive visible onstreet bike parking - well used in Edinburgh.

8 **Katharine Wake** Cycling to be a compulsory part of the driving test [some exemptions] – to increase awareness of cyclists and of the driver's own option to get about by bike.