

<p><b>1. Welcome and Introductions</b></p>	<p>Sarah Boyack, MSP welcomed the group.</p> <p><b>In attendance were:</b></p> <p>Sarah Boyack MSP, Deputy Convener (SB) - CHAIR          Alison Johnstone MSP, Co-Convener (AJ)          Claudia Beamish MSP, Co-Convener (CB)          Suzanne Forup - CTC (SF)          Daisy Narayanan - Sustrans (DN)          John Lauder – Sustrans (JL)          Donald Urquhart - CTC (DU)          Ian Findlay – Paths for All (IF)          Janice Gray – Paths for All (JG)          Dave du Feu – Spokes (DdF)          Karen Furey - Transport Scotland (KF)          Keith Irving – Cycling Scotland (KI)          Maureen Kidd – Cycling Scotland (MK)          Nathan Kaczmarek – Cycling Scotland (NK)          Kim Harding – Pedal on Parliament (KH)          Prof Chris Oliver – PAHRC UofE/NHS Health Scotland/NHS Lothian (CO)          Dr. Mireille Pouget – CTC (MP)          Tricia Fort – GoBike (TF)          Rod Mitchell – Cycle Law Scotland/RoadShare (RM)          Bali Rakhra – CKL Safety Clothing (BR)          John Thorne – Edinburgh to Paris (JT)          Mary Williams – Edinburgh to Paris (MW)          Martyn Edelsten – Edinburgh to Paris (ME)          Tim Fison – Edinburgh to Paris (TF)</p> <p><b>Apologies were received from:</b>          Jim Eadie, MSP, Co-Convener          Greg Chauvet – Glasgow Bike Station          Jim Riach – Scottish Cycling          Helen Todd – Ramblers Scotland          Stuart Hay – Living Streets          Ruairidh MacGlone – Edinburgh Bike Station</p>	
<p><b>2. Minutes of the previous meeting and Matters Arising</b></p>	<p><b>2.1 Previous Minutes</b></p> <p>DdF noted that there had been discussions with JE surrounding domestic bike storage and planning.</p> <p><b>ACTION: JE to update CPG on progress surrounding domestic bike storage and planning (permitted development) at next CPG meeting</b></p> <p>DdF raised an article recently written from Spokes that covered analysis of the funding situation for active travel in 2016/17 (DdF circulated a paper; link here:</p>	<p>JE</p>

	<p><a href="http://www.spokes.org.uk/2015/12/scottish-budget-councils-cycling-hit/">http://www.spokes.org.uk/2015/12/scottish-budget-councils-cycling-hit/</a>) and the proposal to transfer 1% of the trunk roads budget to active travel.</p> <p>The CPG discussed the idea of this. AJ noted that the 1% is substantially less than they will be asking for in manifesto, but supports it as a nudge. JL clarified that this is an additional 1% on top of current budget – key to have ‘additional’ in wording. The CPG suggested that the CPG writes to the Finance Secretary to suggest this 1% approach.</p> <p><b>ACTION: CPG to write to Finance Secretary supporting 1% transfer from Trunk Roads budget to Active Travel</b></p> <p><i>All other actions were accounted for and minutes approved.</i></p> <p><b>2.2 Matters Arising</b></p> <p>There were no further matters arising.</p>	<p><b>CPG (Conveners)</b></p>
<p><b>3. Community Links Plus</b></p>	<p>SB introduced Daisy Narayanan (DN) from Sustrans to present on the Community Links Plus (CL+) programme.</p> <p>DN provided some background of the programme. CL+ Launched in November with aim to deliver game-changing, high modal shift. Focus on road space reallocation – balancing towards people. Stage 1 is complete and was a competition – received 25 applications from 24 local authorities. Assessing 10 that have brought forward – result in 5 of the schemes shortlisted for Stage 3.</p> <p>DN gave some further background to Community Links – noted Bears Way, Meadows to Innocent path and that these are delivered already within Community Links. CL+ is about increasing level of aspiration with partners and bringing in other agendas – e.g., health and how partnership working can be done.</p> <p>DN noted that this was certainly something identified by the Co-Conveners of the CPG and were asked by Co-Conveners to see what a competition might be like for an exemplar project.</p> <p>DN noted that there a range of criteria discussed but must result in road space reallocation as a minimum; cross-portfolio working – need buy in from heads of transport and CEOs, and importantly communities. Needs to have high profile and look at creating segregated, seamless and convenient routes connecting short trip generators</p> <p>DN provided further info on the three stages:</p>	

	<p>Stage 1 – Expressions of Interest; Stage 2 – Ongoing, development of concept – viability report and delivery plan; Stage 3 – Presentation – June 2016. Delivery is 2-3 years depending on the scheme. DN noted there would be post implementation monitoring</p> <p>DN added that all taken through to Stage 2 have received 10k from SG, with those going to Stage 3 to 35k from SG (both not needing to be matched). The final award amount depends on level set by SG, scheme details.</p> <p>DN noted that due to technological issues with presentation, proposals from Stage 1 could be circulated with the minutes from the meeting as a presentation. In the meantime, these can be seen on the website.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Circulate DN’s presentation with proposals to CPG with minutes</b></p> <p>DN noted the next steps. Recruitment process on for CLplus manager; 2 Feb interviews. Stage 2 meets on 29 January; stage 3 meets in July; announcement in August. Exhibition in August to celebrate aspirations as well as winners. Projects that don’t win, will go through to Community Links process.</p> <p>DN added that Dutch Cycling Embassy noted news has made it there – interested in finding out results and also gathering interest on social media.</p> <p>SB noted that it was good to hear background – good that commitment spreading around country. CB added that delighted that it has come to fruition. Connections and inspirations are great.</p> <p>AJ agreed that it shows that there is an interest, some projects sound fantastic and hope in time can see them delivered even if not progressing through competition.</p> <p>SB: Interesting pressure point if there is underspend – some clever things to do off the back of this.</p> <p>DdF noted that it is a great project; really positive response. But that funding is the issue. Not new money, coming out of existing community links – one or two will get more money, but others may have smaller pot to bid into for all the others. Spokes proposal addresses this – e.g., if moving 1% from trunk road budget, then all can go ahead, plus no dip in CL funding.</p>	<p>NK</p>
--	---	-----------

<p><b>4. We Walk, We Cycle, We Vote</b></p>	<p>SB introduced Suzanne Forup to speak on We Walk, We Cycle, We Vote (WCV).</p> <p>SF introduced WCV as the campaign to provide a voice for walking and cycling in run up to elections to Scottish Parliament in May. SF noted that most present know about it as part of steering group supporting it, and that it has come out of the National Cycling Interests Group (NCIG) as a way for all stakeholders and partners to come up with key asks that all could get behind and push for inclusion in party manifestoes. It is a collaboration of 21 organisations, from Sustrans and Cycling Scotland to EDFOC, GoBike, PoP. All passionate to deliver cycling – as it’s something that is important to all of us.</p> <p>SF noted the main asks. Investment and Infrastructure are first two and are intrinsically linked; looking for 10% of transport budget. The third is safety – all partners have a different angle; e.g., CTC looking at criminal justice, etc.</p> <p>Some activities have included attending party conferences and taking attendees on led rides – showing infrastructure in various towns and cities where the conferences were held. WCV also supports volunteers – for example, there is a training day on 5 March training day in Glasgow with 50-60 places – learn, share, network and talk about what’s important and the actions.</p> <p>SF noted the website: <a href="http://walkcyclevote.scot">walkcyclevote.scot</a> – lots of info and evidence. There will also be publicly available info on each candidate and their support of the three asks.</p> <p>SF is hoping people do active campaigning – e.g., going to non-cycling events, hustings, etc.</p> <p>SF also noted that they will be running a photo campaign – selfie campaign – people on bikes to support the campaign in every day clothing hopefully showing a diverse face of those who cycle.</p> <p>SB noted that it would be a good strategy to show up to hustings other than transport and cycling related ones - the challenge is to get out in the rest of the country – constituency plus list, will be able to lobby all of them – adding that to party discussions.</p> <p>JT asked what was behind the 10% budget figure? Is there a business plan to look at what this would be spent on?</p> <p>AJ noted that this was a figure that was used by the Association of Directors of Public Health – also other groups who call on this investment. DdF noted that 10 years ago, signed up to by over 100</p>	
---	---	--

	<p>other organisations. On the association website. Came up with figure on basis of other European countries.</p> <p>JL noted this equivalent to £200m a year; at the moment £40m. Idea is to go incrementally – allow to grow staff and skills. Would reflect the ambition that the Scottish government has – All policies are there, just would help deliver the policies.</p> <p>SB noted changes beginning to take place in Edinburgh. 25 bids in CL+ means that there are 24 that think about what they could do if they had the money. Ambitious route – won't phase them to think larger. Maybe gain support in LA to make things happen. Prospect of money does make it more real.</p> <p>KI asked on MSPs advice on how the WCV could make biggest impact in March and April in terms of candidates taking issues seriously and what they say is then factored into future plans post-election.</p> <p>SB suggested to cover all parties. Find people who emerge as enthusiastic – geography is significant. Clearly Glasgow and Edinburgh competing is good. Fife looking rurally – looking at each local authority area and thinking about hustings other than solely transport or cycling. Should be able to spread word to other candidates. Lobby in Scottish parliament, but build up networks in places that aren't built up for 2017 – some candidates may end up as local councillors or are active members of the party.</p> <p>AJ noted that when lobbying, the more you can share that investment in active travel is very small. E.g., Asking "1.8% spent on cycling, what are you going to do about it.?" Bringing knowledge to those who are attending the hustings.</p> <p>CB added that in thinking about hustings and public meetings – perhaps joint hustings with other groups such as health or air pollution that would draw in a wide range of people. E.g., smaller or rural locations can combine.</p> <p>IF noted that trying to move beyond cyclists for cycling, about people cycling or walking for every day journeys. People who cycle in cities/towns where cycling is high, they use it because it is best way to get around, not an image.</p> <p>SB noted that the idea of widening out is great; people and place; air pollution, etc. On one hand it is cheap, some people can do quite long journeys, also aspirational for others. Trying to keep it open for as many people as possible – health issue. Lots of opportunities in the future.</p>	
--	---	--

<p><b>5. CAPS Progress Report</b></p>	<p>SB introduced Keith Irving to speak on the CAPS Progress Report.</p> <p>KI provided some background noting that the idea is to review progress on CAPS with a report and recommendations in June 2016.</p> <p>KI noted that this will not involve writing a whole new way forward, and will take advantage of existing information and knowledge and bringing this together for three key elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultation on actions – where progress is being made, where it is slower</li> </ol> <p>Key conclusions through consultation thus far (CS Conference, CAPS Delivery Forum) include demand for further action – focus on links with public transport, for example Scotrail. Progress within LAs, some progressing, some lagging behind and need for further investment. There will be further consultation with stakeholders in February/March covering progress, barriers, priorities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Comparator study – on CS website (<a href="http://www.cyclingscotland.org/policy/monitoring">http://www.cyclingscotland.org/policy/monitoring</a>)</li> </ol> <p>KI noted the research conducted by Urban Movement and the European Cyclists’ Federation and this showed evidence of change and evidence of action. The research raised questions about data and assumptions; cannot categorically say x miles of network will produce y number cycling; but clear connections, commitment + investment coming with infrastructure, there will be a shift. KI noted that no matter what country looked at, sequence was seen and that infrastructure is essential and training is required as well.</p> <p>KI added that there were some lessons for Scotland. It appears right to focus on mode share; can look at length of infrastructure and journeys, but mode focus on everyday journeys is the right focus. In addition, if looking for progress from a low base, focus on short urban journeys up to 5-8km. KI also noted the link between national implementation and delivery locally.</p> <p>KI noted that it is important to be careful about assumptions and direct comparisons – depending on city, region, country, walking may or may not be included – so not necessarily possible to link money and mode share.</p> <p>In short, KI noted that Scotland is doing the right things, but to see the shift as seen in other countries, need to go faster and further; fair to say that this will be a strong element on how we report using evidence.</p>	
---------------------------------------	--	--

	<p>DdF noted that 20 years ago the Scottish Administration introduced Trunk Road cycling initiative; Spokes would like renewal of this, got a letter from TS saying it would be done and in parallel with the CAPS renewal process. Not long distance routes, but within or near towns/cities. Can KF note the process for the next edition of CAPS?</p> <p>KF noted desire to conduct a public consultation – could go to public consultation as part of trunk road cycling initiative.</p> <p>SB noted thinking of key stretches where improvements open up opportunities. Eg. Queensferry crossing, small improvements over time crucial to unlocking journeys. Ranking priority is important. Should be able to feed into this.</p> <p>KF added that the intention that this has money behind it; would like active travel to put into fund – think it should come out of trunk road budget. Need to fill gaps in NCN so it is truly joined up.</p> <p>JL noted meeting with trunk roads group, strategic road safety group; looking at accidents to pedestrians and cyclists on trunk roads, to reference this with need for better infrastructure which could then be reviewed via trunk roads initiative. Positive meeting.</p> <p>SB noted National Transport Strategy is being looked at.</p> <p>IF noted links also with the National Walking Strategy; now have strategy, delivery forum set up, plan to be launched in March hopefully. Noting cycling summit is now an Active Travel Summit. May wish to cover where it can collaborate.</p>	
<p><b>6. Presumed Liability</b></p>	<p>SB introduced RM to provide an overview of Presumed Liability (standing item).</p> <p>RM noted a few amends for the previous minute. <i>[These have been incorporated into current minute from 22 Sept meeting]</i>.</p> <p>RM highlighted the need to educate and communicate surrounding presumed liability. Brought on Brake to actively support. Speaking to British Horse Society in Scotland – presenting at their road safety conference. Support from London Cycling Campaign – voted at AGM to support presumed liability. Road Danger Reduction Forum – support. Stop Killing Cyclists, Roadpeace and EU Fed of Traffic Victims (2013 study), suggest going to European Minister Fundamental Rights and Citizenship, so looking at EU level as well.</p> <p>RM also noted comment from Sir Kier Starmer QC on presumed liability. RM also noted international support from Dublin Cycling Campaign and Irish campaign.</p>	

	<p>RM added that the Isle of Man Minister of Infrastructure, putting forward a bill that will allow presumed liability in IOM.</p> <p>RM also noted insurance discussions with ABI, Yellow Jersey broker, QuickFit insurance promoting campaign.</p> <p>RM noted that STUC at their annual conference in 2014 proposed presumed liability, gone back through and will be presented back on 20 April. RM noted some PR as well in a Holyrood Magazine article from Kim Harding.</p>	
<p><b>7. AOCB</b></p>	<p>SB asked for AOCB.</p> <p>CO raised awareness of Edinburgh University’s Sit Less, Get Active Massive Open Online Course to run in May for three weeks online. Very popular, already 4,500 signed up. Involves Andrew Murray, JL and SF also involved.</p> <p>ME from Edinburgh to Paris noted their cycle to Paris for COP21 to raise awareness of climate change issues. ME asked how best to make use of high profile rides to keep up pressure after the ride, perhaps through a website.</p> <p>SB noted that saw them off with AJ as well. SB noted the large amount of coverage the group’s blog received, and that if anyone has any ideas then to pass along to ME.</p> <p>CB noted how inspiring their journey was. Also noted addressing concerns around risks for employees in terms of organisations supporting attending the ride.</p> <p>SB also noted that perhaps to spread the word schools may be interested in getting them along to speak on this. Also perhaps any other opportunities where interesting speakers are sought.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Circulate ME’s email address to CPG members so that CPG members can forward on any ideas</b></p> <p>TF raised issue of mandatory cycle lights on bicycles that was raised at a previous CPG meeting. The CPG agreed that this, along with other safety items, could be a topic at a future meeting.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Add mandatory cycle lights onto list of potential topics for discussion at future CPG surrounding safety topics</b></p>	<p>NK</p> <p>NK</p>

<b>8. Date of Next Meeting</b>	SB thanked all for attendance. SB also noted that there is no date for the next meeting due to dissolution of Scottish Parliament. Following the results of the election, up for Parliamentarians to move to re-establish the CPG on Cycling. SB thanked all for contributions and effort in putting pressure on Scottish Parliament to support cycling. The CPG also thanked the Co-Conveners and Deputy Convener for their contributions within and as a result of involvement in the CPG on Cycling and for their commitment to establishing it and attending.	
--------------------------------	---	--