

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

Contact for this paper: davedufeu@gmail.com

file: spk\events\1211

CYCLING SCOTLAND CONFERENCE 13.11.12 'LOVE CYCLING GO DUTCH'

WORKSHOP F – FUNDING AND CAMPAIGNING Notes from Dave du Feu, Spokes

Contents

1. What should the Scottish Government be investing in cycling?
2. What is it investing now, and through what funding mechanisms?
3. If funds were raised substantially, how should they be invested (initially)?
4. How has funding information been used in campaigning?

Note: For more info and web links see the Spokes Bulletins referred to in this paper [particularly Bulletins no. 112 & 114]. They can be found at www.spokes.org.uk/bulletin.

The Scottish Government in 2009 set a target for 10% of journeys to be by bike in 2020 – they have frequently repeated this target in Parliament, including in the debate on cycling on 29 March 2012, but have never invested at a level anywhere near capable of reaching it.

1. What should the Scottish Government invest in cycling per annum?

1.1 What various sources say [Spokes Bulletin 112, page 7]

How much?	Who says?	Rationale/Comments
£200m [for active travel, AT]	Assn of Directors of Public Health + 110 other organisations	ADPH report <i>Action on Active Travel</i> calls for 10% of transport budgets [no reason given why 10% is the appropriate figure]. Scottish transport budget is £2015m for 2013/14, so 10% would be £200m.
£120m [AT]	Scottish Parliament + government	<i>Low Carbon Scotland</i> , the Scottish Government RPP document [Report on Policies & Proposals for meeting CO2 targets] includes the 2020 cycle use target as a 'milestone' and 'proposes' £1320m over 11 years for active travel [i.e. £120m p.a. average] – a proposal not yet implemented! Evidence from Europe is referred to in the RPP technical appendix. A new RPP is expected soon – will this proposal remain? - we have our doubts!
£100m [cycling]	Spokes	Spokes calculation of investment needed to meet the 2020 cycle use target - see 1.2 below.
£50m [cycling]	Calculation based on existing work travel equity	Roughly 2.5% of Scottish work journeys were by bike in 2009. One might argue, for equity, particularly as the government wishes to boost cycling rapidly, that 2.5% of transport spend should go to cycling i.e. ~£50m.
£15-£18m [cycling]	Scottish Government actual investment	See section 2 below. Government cycle investment seems to be based on "what we usually spend" +/- something; not on any objective assessment of what is needed, for example to meet the 2020 cycle use target.

1.2 Spokes calculation of investment needed to give hope of meeting the 2020 target

Although the Scottish government set the ambitious 2020 cycle-use target, they have never provided a researched and costed path to meet it [let alone a funded path!] Spokes, however, has attempted to calculate what is needed to meet the target, on the basis of evidence.

Our calculation uses Cycling England* research, based on the English Cycle Demonstration Towns and European experience. This research suggests that £10 per person per annum, invested consistently over the years, could hope to double cycle use every 3-4 years in typical British towns and cities.

At present roughly 1% of all trips are by bike [table 11.1, Scottish Transport Statistics no.30, 2011 edition]. Therefore if investment of £10 per head began in 2013, cycle use might reach 10% of all trips by between 2023-2026. To reach the target by 2020 rather than 2023-2026, much more rapid growth is required – particularly given the lag from funding allocation to actual investment, then to its (incremental) impact on users, and also because cycle planning expertise would need to be ramped up across Scotland. **It therefore seems likely that £20 per head per year is now necessary to give any realistic hope of reaching the target by 2020.** With a Scottish population over 5 million, £20 a head represents roughly £100m (annually).

*Cycling England, its research programme and its funding for Cycle Demonstration Towns and other cycling initiatives, were scrapped after the last UK General Election by the new Coalition government. NB - the replacement Sustainable Transport Fund meant less money for cycling in England & Wales.

2. What is the Scottish government currently investing, and how?

Cycling in the Scottish budget is very difficult to disentangle, being buried in several different budget 'lines' [particularly CWSS, FTF, SAT, and trunk roads]* - none of which clearly state how much goes to cycling. Spokes attempts to identify the total going to cycling and how it is used [table on page 6 of Spokes Bulletin 114].

* CWSS = Cycling, Walking, Safer Streets; FTF = Future Transport Fund; SAT = Sustainable and Active Travel.

For 2012/13 we calculate total Scottish government cycling investment as £17.8m, i.e. less than 1% of the total £1893m transport budget. The main components of how the £17.8m is allocated/administered are...

How money invested	Amount	Comment
CWSS	£3.2m	Our estimate of the amount of the £6.1m 2012/13 CWSS total being used by local authorities for cycling or shared cycle/walk investment
Sustrans	£9.7m	Mainly invested in joint projects with local authority and other partners. For infrastructure projects, Sustrans requires match-funding from partners.
Cycling Scotland	£2.0m	A variety of projects, the biggest being Bikeability.
Trunk Road facilities	£2.0m	Transport Scotland often now provides associated cycle facilities when it builds or upgrades trunk roads.

On top of the £17.8m government funding, much of which is invested through councils [via CWSS and Sustrans] we estimate that *councils themselves* are investing an additional £8.8m in cycling from other sources, including their own capital budgets and outside money raised from developers, Europe, etc.

There are big differences between councils [table on page 7 of Spokes 114]. **Edinburgh leads the way by allocating a fixed % of its transport budget to cycling – 5% increasing by 1% a year over the next 4 years [Spokes 112 p1].** Spokes urges other councils also to allocate a fixed %. Given that current cycling levels elsewhere are well below Edinburgh, it may be politically most realistic for them to allocate an initial % comparable with their current cycling-to-work modal share rather than following Edinburgh's 5% lead. For example, if 3% of trips to work are by bike, the council could allocate 3% of its transport budget (again increasing annually).

3. How should substantial new funding be administered?

If government were to take their cycle use target seriously and allocate substantial funding, how should this be administered? Initially there would be insufficient experience and expertise in cycle planning in many parts of Scotland. We therefore suggest that for the first two years...

- **Funding via existing methods** – notably CWSS, Sustrans, Cycling Scotland - would be raised substantially.
- **A large new cycling investment fund** would be created to which councils and other relevant bodies [e.g. ScotRail, British Waterways] could bid for large-scale cycling investment projects. This would enable those councils and others who already have expertise, experience and plans to move ahead rapidly. At present there is no realistic source of funding for large-scale cycling projects, other than cobbling money together from various sources and over several years.

This investment pattern might continue after the first 2 years, or might be modified in the light of experience.

4. How has the above info [1 & 2] been used in campaigning?

In our long experience **it is political pressure, not reasoned argument**, which changes policies. Admittedly, political pressure is more likely to succeed if accompanied by reasoned argument, but reasoned argument without political pressure has little hope.

The funding information collated by Spokes over the years has not of itself persuaded government to change policies. But it has helped inspire many individuals and organisations to protest and lobby MSPs and councillors. It has motivated them to feel [to know!] that they have a strong objective case which politicians are neglecting.

Issues which have motivated individuals strongly in recent years include...

- **Less than 1% of the government's transport budget is invested in cycling.** This figure was first identified by Spokes some years ago. *It is now widely known and accepted and remains a potent motivational factor.* Given the transport, health and environmental benefits of cycling, and the government's own 2020 cycle-use target, 1% sounds absurd to many members of the public. It is often mentioned by individuals when writing to MSPs, is quoted by other organisations such as **Pedal on Parliament** in motivating individuals to protest, and is often now quoted in Parliament.
- **The government cut cycling investment in last year's draft budget.** Because of the obscurity of the budget on cycling [2 above] it was not immediately obvious, even to most MSPs, how deep was this planned cut, or even that a cut was happening. However, once detailed research and enquiry revealed what was happening, the planned cut became a major motivating factor, leading to the demonstration outside St Andrews House, literally 100s of emails and letters to MSPs, and reversal of most [though not all] the planned cut [Spokes 112, p1 and p6]. This year's Scottish budget, with no cut [and, indeed, a modest rise] has not yet motivated a response from individuals on a similar scale, although organisations are again lobbying hard.
- **The SNP 2011 Holyrood manifesto.** The manifesto promised “*to increase the proportion of transport spending on low-carbon, active and sustainable travel.*” This, like many other promises, was buried deep in the manifesto, but once it became clear that the government's first draft budget included big cuts to cycling the manifesto promise became a very powerful motivational tool [Spokes 111, p1]. Many of the letters to MSPs from individuals talked of a broken manifesto promise.
The government tried to wriggle around this by pointing out that the manifesto promise would be satisfied if the *total* of low-carbon, active and sustainable funding rose - but such technical arguments carry no weight if one of the elements in the manifesto promise [active travel] is being drastically cut but compensated by others [e.g. bus projects] rising. The active-travel increase in this year's budget, although small, allows the government to just about defend its manifesto promise in the court of public opinion at the next election!