This report informs and updates Members on various transport policy and delivery matters of interest and relevance to the work of the Partnership.

1 RECOMMENDATION

1.1 That the Partnership notes the various updates and information provided in this report and accompanying appendices.

2 DISCUSSION

RTP Chairs Forum

2.1 The RTP Chairs Forum met in Edinburgh on 4 June 2015. The Minute of the previous meeting held in Orkney on 4 March 2015 is attached at Appendix A for information.

2.2 On 4 June the Chairs considered reports and updates on various matters, including progress on proposed meetings with the coordinators of the relevant EU TEN-T programmes; Ministerial approval of the joint RTPs/Scottish Government/CoSLA Working Group report on developing effective collaborative working through RTPs; and progress on discussions with the Roads Collaboration Board/Improvement Service regarding the role of RTPs within ongoing work on development of governance models for collaborative working and shared services under the auspices of the National Roads Maintenance Review.

2.3 The Chairs also met with Phil Verster, Managing Director of the ScotRail/Network Rail Alliance and had been due to meet with the Minister for Transport and the Islands.

Meeting with Minister for Transport and the Islands

2.4 As a result of Parliamentary business the Chairs' planned meeting with the Minister on 4 June had to be postponed to 11 June 2015. That meeting will include discussion with the Minister on approval of the joint RTPs/Scottish Government/CoSLA Working Group report on developing the role of RTPs; plans for refresh of the National Transport Strategy (NTS), as announced by the Minister at the Annual Scottish National Transport Conference on 28 April 2015; and relationship of the planned NTS Refresh with ongoing refreshing and approval of Regional Transport Strategies. An oral update on the RTP Chairs meeting with the Minister will be given at the meeting on 16 June 2015.
Meeting with Managing Director of ScotRail/Network Rail Alliance

2.5 Phil Verster outlined the Alliance’s strategy for the ScotRail franchise, which includes the aim of 40% passenger growth over the 10 years of the franchise. Issues related to this and opportunities for further implementation of Tactran’s TERS proposals were highlighted at the meeting and are discussed further in the separate Rail Issues Update report to this meeting.

2.6 It was confirmed that the Alliance’s intention is to develop a single, integrated operational railway business which is highly customer focussed, with safety, passenger comfort, punctuality and control of costs as its core principles. Discussion also touched on the need to align ScotRail plans and priorities with the emerging connectivity needs through Scottish Cities Alliance; the replacement of the former Club 55 discount ticketing scheme; and the need to progress Access for All improvements at a number of stations, including Stirling.

2.7 It was agreed that Mr Verster would meet not less than annually with the RTP Chairs to discuss progress and opportunities for collaborative working during the franchise. It was also agreed that, following on from the regional stakeholder events which the RTPs had hosted for Abellio prior to their taking over responsibility for the franchise on 1 April, Abellio will meet with the RTP Lead Officers to progress early establishment of regional rail fora through the RTPs, as proposed by Abellio at the earlier regional events, including the event held in Perth on 6 March, as reported to the Partnership on 10 March 2015 (Report RTP/15/12 and Appendix A to Rail Issues Update report to this meeting refer).

Meetings with EU TEN-T Coordinators

2.8 Arising from a suggestion by Gavin Roser at an earlier Partnership meeting, the RTP Chairs had agreed to seek meetings with the relevant coordinators of the European TEN-T network to identify and discuss opportunities for the RTPs to engage with and inform the work of the TEN-T Connecting Europe programme moving forward. At the last meeting on 10 March 2015, Gavin Roser offered to assist in facilitating these meetings. With Gavin’s assistance it has been agreed that Peter Balazs, European Coordinator for the North Sea-Mediterranean Corridor covering the north of the UK, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg to the south of France, and his Policy Advisor Andreas Faergemann, will meet with the Chairs at their next meeting on 16 September 2015, which will be hosted by Tactran. The potential for arranging a meeting with Brian Simpson, Motorways of the Sea Coordinator in November is also being explored.

Roads Collaboration Programme

2.9 At its meeting on 10 March 2015 the Partnership was updated on progress with discussions between the RTPs and the Improvement Service regarding work being undertaken under the auspices of the Roads Collaboration Programme Board on the development of governance options for collaborative/shared services arrangements in roads and transport.

2.10 A meeting was held between representatives of RTPs and their legal advisors and the Improvement Service and their legal advisors on 2 April. This discussed a paper which had been prepared by the 7 RTPs’ legal advisors, setting out their opinion on RTPs’ potential role in roads collaboration and other shared services, as underpinned by the Transport (Scotland) Act 2005 and other relevant legislation/guidance. Developments of these papers were subsequently submitted to the Improvement
Service for any further comment and onward reporting to the Roads Collaboration Programme Board. At the time of the Chairs meeting on 4 June, and of writing this report, further comment by the Improvement Service is awaited. At the meeting on 4 June the RTP Chairs agreed to write to all 32 Council Chief Executives, Legal Officers and Directors with responsibility for roads and transport, to make them aware of the RTPs’ legal opinion.

Joint RTP Responses to Consultations

2.11 As reported on 10 March 2015, the Scottish Government issued a consultation on a draft Low Emissions Strategy for Scotland on 16 January 2015. Responses to the consultation required to be submitted by 10 April 2015. The Scottish Government also issued a consultation on a Proposed Draft Climate Change (Reporting on Climate Change Duties) (Scotland) Order 2015, which will require specified public bodies, including RTPs, to prepare annual reports on compliance with climate change duties under the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009. Responses to this consultation required to be submitted by 29 May 2015.

2.12 On 10 March 2015 the Partnership noted that the RTP Chairs had remitted officers to prepare and submit joint RTP responses to both consultations. The response to the Low Emissions Strategy consultation is included at Appendix B and the response to the Reporting on Climate Change Duties consultation is included at Appendix C, for the Partnership’s information.

Hydrogen Bus Joint Undertaking

2.13 At its meeting on 9 December 2014 the Partnership noted progress on the development of a project and planned bid for EU funding to support a project which aims to commercialise the supply of hydrogen fuel cell electric buses across Europe (Report RTP/14/39 refers). Tactran had previously agreed to support the work of a Scottish consortium, which is being led by Aberdeen City Council and also includes Dundee City Council, Perth & Kinross Council, Nestrans and Hitrans. In agreeing to support the consortium it was noted that no financial support by Tactran was required.

2.14 During April partners in the Scottish consortium were invited to sign a joint Letter of Understanding which contained indications of commitment and readiness to take part of the operational risk and financial burden of introducing the new technology and to allocating resources to manage overall deployment of the project, including construction of hydrogen refuelling infrastructure etc. In consultation with the Treasurer and Legal Officer it was agreed that it would not be appropriate for the Partnership to sign the Letter of Understanding and the lead partner was advised of this position. The Director has confirmed that the Partnership remains supportive of the aims of the project and will offer continuing officer support for its development.

A90/Laurencekirk Junction Study

2.15 In December 2013 Nestrans, in partnership with Transport Scotland and Aberdeenshire Council, commissioned consultants to undertake a study investigating options for improving the A90 and improving access at Laurencekirk. Given that the study and its findings included consideration of, and will impact on, connectivity to/from north Angus, Tactran officers have been involved as part of the project Steering Group.
2.16 The study, which has been undertaken in accordance with Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG) and the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 1, has recently been completed and is to be reported to the Nestrans Partnership meeting on 17 June 2015. Ahead of that meeting Press Releases have been issued confirming that the provision of a grade-separated junction at the A90/A937 junction to the south of Laurencekirk is the preferred option for improving the A90 at Laurencekirk.

2.17 An oral update on any further developments will be given at this meeting, with a detailed report on the study being submitted to the next Partnership meeting following consideration of the study findings by the Nestrans Board on 17 June 2015.

3 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

3.1 This report has no additional financial or other resource implications.

4 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

4.1 This report has no direct equalities implications.

Eric Guthrie
Director

For further information email ericguthrie@tactran.gov.uk or tel. 01738 475771

NOTE

The following papers, as defined by Section 50D of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 (and not containing confidential or exempt information) were relied on to a material extent in preparing this Report :-

Report to Partnership, RTP/14/46 Director’s Report, 9 December 2014

Reports to Forum of RTP Chairs on 4 March 2015 : Various

Reports to Forum of RTP Chairs on 4 June 2015 : Various
Regional Transport Partnerships Joint Chairs Meeting
Held in the Ayre Hotel, Kirkwall on 4th March 2015 at 9.30am

Minute of Meeting

Present:  Cllr Michael Stout, Chair, ZetTrans (Chair)
          Cllr James Stockan, Chair HITRANS
          Cllr Peter Argyle, Chair Nestrans
          Cllr Russell Imrie, Chair SEStran
          Cllr Will Dawson, Chair Tactran

In attendance:  Michael Craigie, ZetTrans (MC)
                Ranald Robertson, HITRANS (RR)
                Derick Murray, Nestrans (DM)
                Alex Macaulay, SEStran (AM)
                Eric Guthrie, Tactran (EG)
                Fiona McInally, HITRANS (Minutes)

Apologies:  Ewen Milligan, Transport Scotland (EM)
            Tom Davy, Transport Scotland (TD)
            George Eckton, CoSLA (GE)
            Kieran Jackson, CoSLA (KJ)
            Cllr Tom McAughtrie, SWestrans
            Harry Thompson, SWestrans
            Cllr James Coleman, SPT
            Bruce Kiloh, SPT
            Cllr Ramsay Milne, Nestrans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Welcome and Apologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr Stout welcomed everyone to Orkney and noted the apologies received above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Presentation by ZetTrans and Orkney Islands Council on Ferry Service Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A presentation was provided by Michael Craigie and Gavin Barr on the work of the Ferry Service Working Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Minutes of the meeting held on 3rd December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The minutes were approved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matters Arising

(i) Roads Collaboration Board

EG raised RCP letter from Colin Mair and the circulated response from RTP chairs. There was general concern regarding mission creep from Improvement Service. RTP secretariat has been liaising with RCB and RTP’s. Discussion at Lead Officers meeting with legal advisers was very useful.

RTP Legal advisers are continuing to liaise with each other. The Improvement Service have invited the legal advisers to a meeting in SPT offices on 11th March. Both the RTP lead officers and legal advisers
agree that a consensus is required before meeting with Improvement Service. Additionally, a RTP representative has been invited to attend the RCB/Improvement Service meeting on 22nd April.

It was agreed that the meeting on 11th March should not go ahead, as the timescale is too tight to enable a consensus being reached. Additionally the RTP lead officers wished to pursue their request from 11th Feb that 3 RTP leads attend the meeting on 22nd April.

MS asked if RTPs could ask RCB legal representatives Burness Paul to provide legal reasons why the RTP model couldn’t work?

Additionally questions were asked regarding the Improvement Services end date for this work?

**Action: Secretariat to liaise with RCB to ask questions.**

Moving forward AM has volunteered the SEStran legal representative to lead the discussion between the legal advisers to help reach a consensus between them, while liaising with RTP lead officers.

**Action: AM to liaise with SEStran legal representative**

**Items for Discussion/Decision**

4. RTPs/Scottish Government/CoSLA Working Group Paper – Update on Actions (BK/EG)

EG provided an update to the paper provided to chairs. No update from SG has been provided following the RTP chairs meeting on 11th Feb.

EG raised concerns that RTPs need to be recognised as an asset within all teams within Transport Scotland, for example improving links with the Sustainable and Active Travel team to ensure a key role going forward.

RR updated chairs that the Minister for Transport and the Islands, Derek Mackay has been sent the dates of 2015 meetings, and that he could not attend today.

It was agreed that if the minister cannot attend June meeting, a separate meeting date should be requested for RTP Chairs and Leads to meet with the minister to discuss the working group paper, and also to discuss key RTP engagement going forward. Key issues for discussion:

- Funding
- RCP
- Role of RTPs as statutory bodies

**Action: RTP secretariat to liaise with SG to define meeting dates.**

Note: It was highlighted in news that several LA’s including Glasgow, Aberdeen, Renfrew and South Lanarkshire have left CoSLA and are setting up their own group. RTPs need to engage with this group going forward, to discuss our role as statutory bodies.

5. Active Travel/Behaviour Change Issues

(i) Smarter Choices Smarter Places (AM)

AM circulated a paper on the outcomes of the SCSP applications. Each LA was provided a nominal sum of money, which required match funding,
and was administered via applications to Paths for All. The 31 LA’s who applied were successful in receiving funds, subject to the agreement of an action plan and recommended monitoring and evaluation techniques.

Additionally, it is worth noting that not all LA’s applied for their full entitlement due to match funding/ budget restrictions, while others indicated that additional monies could be spent for further work. Details of LA’s gaining additional funds are still being finalised, dependant on strength of further projects.

As work progressed during 2015, objective is that there will be regional seminars where LA’s can provide progress on their work, and the organisation and co-ordination of these events would be through RTP’s. To expect this request from PFA.

(ii) RTP/Cycling Scotland Update (EG)
EG provided a verbal update following attendance at CS board on 24th Feb:
- **Pedal for Scotland.** Looking to extend outside Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen. More likely to be future events in 2016.
- **Give me cycle space.** CS looking to engage with secondary schools as well as primary schools. This will result in a different focus on campaign this year.
- **Bikeability level 3.** This will be targeted towards secondary schools.
- **£60k for HGV training.** CS have set up a steering group to take this forward. Essential for training LA HGV staff in the first place. BK invited to attend.
- **Cycle Friendly Communities Fund** has been launched.
- CS conference likely to be around 12th November.
- **Action:** EG to meet with Keith Irving to discuss CAPS, with specific focus on KPIs and RTP involvement.

6. Rail Issues
(i) High Speed Rail Report (AM)
AM circulated an update on the current situation on HSR following recent meetings. Currently two outstanding reports. One is with Scottish Govt regarding Edinburgh/Glasgow opportunities, and the other with Westminster Govt. It is worth noting:

Key messages from meeting with SCDI /SG/ Sir David Higgins:
- 3 hr journey time to Scotland would we welcomed.
- Sir David provided a lengthy case for a HS2 line to Scotland, taking into account the delays for any improvement to lines.
- Likely that HS2 Phase 3 would go to Scottish Govt, as a devolved matter. Not likely to be seen as a priority to National Govt.
- HS3 over the Pennines may possibly ‘jump the queue’ due to the political support for this south of border.

(ii) ECMA Report (AM)
AM provided a verbal update following meeting ECMA meeting:

ECMA has been in a state of flux for several months. Chair of ECMA changed, due to political changes within York City Council, and dependant on May elections this may change again. Suggestions of people who could chair ECMA have been suggested, subject to LG elections.

York City Council have overspent in consultation, due to others’ not paying funds into the consultation process. Going forward there are 3 proposals for ECMA budget. All 33 LA have said they would contribute individually, or as part of a partnership, result in just under £59k budget, which is considerably less than the £160k required to continue current work.

For under £65k budget, the question of ECMA continuing has been raised. A further request has been made to each of the 33 authorities to try and reach £70k, which would result in a proportion of an officer’s time, and engagement with government and rail industry, rather than commissioning further technical consultancy moving forward.

Action: AM to agree RTP budget moving forward with other RTPs, which was suggested at £26k if reaching overall target of £160k, £14K if reaching £70k.

2 subgroups: Technical. This will be disbanded. Communication and Economics to continue.

AM has arranged to meet Jim Eadie MSP, Chair of Transport and Infrastructure committee in Scottish Govt in March. Cllr Imrie and AM to attend, along with a councillor from northern England.

Do ECMA have a list of up to date Chief Executives within the LA’s? Action: All to check this within their RTP area.

7. Bus Issues
(i) Note of Chairs meeting with CPT 3rd Dec 2014
EG action regarding Bus Registration is awaiting update, will progress at future meetings.

Meeting notes approved.

8. Aviation Issues
(i) Davies Commission /National Connectivity Task Group (DM)
The task force provided an update to the commission by February deadline. There will be a press event on the 16th March in London, hoping to do something in Scotland, to launch report.

Report is backed by a large amount of information and research focusing on legal, economic, finance, and historic details, all with the aim of reinforcing that if a new runway is developed in London that it should
improve connectivity to the whole of the UK, including Scotland. DM highlighted that RTP chairs should be happy with this report, as Scotland is well represented. A STAG analysis has been carried out and DM verbally listed the objectives.

Overall the report suggested that the UK Government looks at current legislation and current conditions, which may allow for a 3rd runway in the south of England, which could be at either Heathrow or Gatwick.

**Action:** DM to circulate report on 16th March to all. **DM**

9. **Low Emission Strategy Consultation Response (DM)**

DM provided a copy of the Low Emission Strategy for Scotland Consultation.

An additional paper was provided in the meeting for members' consideration, which provided Nestrans response, highlighting the cluttered active travel landscape across Scotland. Sustrans are not happy with this response.

Additionally, the article within LTT has raised concern.

EG highlighted a consultation regarding public sector Climate change, and whether there could be a joint response to the Low Emissions Strategy and also the Climate Change consultation.

**Action:** EG to circulate details of other consultation. **EG**

Additionally National Walking and Cycling Network due for release on 19th March.

10. **AOB**

RR- RCP. Ranald provided a verbal update following communication received via email during Chairs meeting from Improvement Service which was discussed.

**Action:** Secretariat to provide a written response on the RTP position, which will be copied to the minister with signatures of all RTP chairs. **RR**

11. **Dates of next Meetings**

2/3rd June, HITRANS

WD apologies as in Brussels.

**Items for Noting**

The Chair moved and it was agreed that the papers submitted for the following items be noted.

12. **Infrastructure and Capital Investment Committee Freight Inquiry (EG)**

Noted.

13. **SCA Hydrogen Bus Initiative (RR)**

Noted.
14. Highland ITP Project (RR)
Noted
Low Emission Strategy
RESPONDENT INFORMATION FORM
Please Note this form must be returned with your response to ensure that we handle your response appropriately

1. Name/Organisation
Organisation Name
Scotland’s Regional Transport Partnerships

Title  Mr ✓ Ms □ Mrs □ Miss □ Dr □  Please tick as appropriate
Surname
Robertson
Forename
Ranald

2. Postal Address
   c/o Hitrans
   7 Ardross Terrace
   Inverness

   Postcode IV3 5NQ  Phone 01463: 719002  Email info@hitrans.org.uk

3. Permissions - I am responding as…
   Individual / Group/Organisation

   (a) Do you agree to your response being made available to the public (in Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site)?

   (b) Where confidentiality is not requested, we will make your responses available to the public on the following basis
       Please tick ONE of the following boxes
       Yes, make my response, name and address all available
       Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address
       Yes, make my response

   (c) The name and address of your organisation will be made available to the public (in the Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site).
       Are you content for your response to be made available?

       Please tick as appropriate ✓
       Yes ☐ No
d) We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?

Please tick as appropriate  

√ Yes
The Scottish Government published its Consultation Draft of a Low Emission Strategy (LES) for Scotland in January 2015. A report was considered by the Chairs of Scotland’s seven Regional Transport Partnerships at their meeting in Kirkwall on 4 March 2015 and the following comments were approved as a joint response to the consultation.

Scotland’s Regional Transport Partnerships are statutory organisations working closely with local authorities and other bodies to provide strategic transport policy and guidance for transport in their regions. Each has an approved, statutory Regional Transport Strategy, which contain policies including those to reduce the effects of transport on climate, noise and air quality and to reduce the environmental impacts of transport, in support of national targets.

The draft Low Emission Strategy recognises the role of Regional Transport Partnerships and the importance of collaborative working, acknowledging the need for strategic and region-wide policies. Reflecting this, RTPs should specifically be included in the Governance arrangements for the LES as illustrated in Figure 1 on page 8. Although RTPs are members of STEP they should also be represented on the Low Emissions Strategy Partnership Group and/or the Transport sub-group of LESPGB.

It is noted that the LES is focussed on air quality and that other “co-benefits” are seen as secondary, although recognising that “natural synergies” exist. The Strategy could benefit by being clearer in proposing solutions that contribute to multiple objectives, for example that reducing carbon emissions should be a stated aim through complementary policies, rather than a co-benefit. It should not be assumed that improving air quality will necessarily result in reduced carbon – policies should be developed which contribute widely rather than on a single high level factor in the hope that wider benefits will accrue. One example has been the move to diesel cars, with lower carbon emissions but harmful emissions affecting air quality and human health.
CONSULTATION QUESTIONS
Q1 Do you think the Mission, Vision and Objectives for the Low Emission Strategy are appropriate? If not, what changes would you suggest?

The Mission “To protect and enhance health, wellbeing, environment, place-making and sustainable economic growth through improved air quality across Scotland” is supported and welcomed.

We would suggest rewording the Vision statement for clarity to read “Scotland’s air quality will be amongst the best in Europe”.

The six Objectives on page 4 are supported, although it is suggested that the Transport Objective should be re-ordered and widened to recognise that technology and flexibility may also have a role to play in reducing emissions from transport through more flexible working practices, video-conferencing, online retailing, etc. It is suggested that the Objective should be changed to read “A Scotland that reduces transport emissions through enabling fewer trips; promoting modal shift away from the car; encouraging more efficient and sustainable freight and urban logistics; and supporting the uptake of technology and cleaner fuels, to lower emission alternatives.”

Q2 Do you think the proposed actions will deliver the Mission, Vision and Objectives? If not, what changes to the actions would you suggest? Are additional actions required? If so, please suggest what these might be.

Yes, subject to the following comments.

The Actions on pages 5, 6 and 7 do not correspond to the Actions contained throughout the document. Many of the Actions on pages 22 to 34 lack any target dates for implementation (e.g. a 100% declassification of Local Air Quality Management Areas). The Actions appear to be unfunded and aspirational – the actions should be clearer and should be focussed on what Scottish Government can do working in partnership with others. For example, rather than “Local authorities should ensure….”, the wording should be along the lines “The Scottish Government will work with and support local authorities to….”. Many of the actions are vague and not SMART e.g. Consider, Review, Assess etc.

As a general point of presentation, there are many sections in the document which refer to Local Authorities where RTPs will also have a major role and contribution to make – e.g. in relation to promoting Active Travel, Travel Planning and improving public transport (see specific Action comments below). It is suggested that the term “Transport Authorities” should be used to include both Local Authorities and RTPs.

In its current form, the strategy includes reference to many supporting and related policies and legal obligations which are likely to change over time resulting in a strategy that will be increasingly outdated. There may be merit in preparing a high level strategy document with a separate action plan(s). This would set broad policy aims which would remain relevant over time, aid clarity of purpose while enabling the action plan(s) to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate a changing policy and regulatory landscape. This also applies to references to various funding streams such as the Green Bus Fund which are currently in place but which may be superseded or ended over time. More generic terms might better apply in the strategy.
Action 9a needs to recognise the conflicting demands placed on traffic management. Measures which optimise traffic flow could result in dis-benefits for public transport users, pedestrians and cyclists, potentially undermining efforts to promote Active Travel and more sustainable travel generally. The priority should be to optimise sustainable travel.

Action 9b is unclear and is not explained in the supporting narrative on page 25 – presumably this refers to parking policies?

Action 10b should also include reference to RTPs, reflecting the work that all RTPs undertake on promoting cycling and the joint Active Travel officer relationships which most RTPs have with Sustrans.

Action 10c should also refer to the statutory Regional Transport Strategies, which are more current and are refreshed periodically – many, non-statutory, Local Transport Strategies have not been updated since their original production some 15 years ago.

Maximising the role of softer behavioural change measures should be listed as a specific action under 10 : Active Travel. These can include Travel Plans for existing public and private sector employers, promotion of car-sharing, car clubs etc. Travel awareness raising also ties in effectively with Greener Scotland and air quality awareness.

Action 11a should refer to RTPs as well as Local Authorities, reflecting the fact that RTPs are eligible and indeed have bid successfully for Green Bus Fund funding to support bus improvements. This could be covered by simply referring to working with “operators and transport authorities”.

Action 13a should recognise that there may be other schemes to address this issue – for example Transport for London intends that the Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) should be expanded outside London. There is also an issue with continuing affordability for transport authorities funding ECOstars or similar schemes.

Action 13b should include reference to RTPs as a Lead Partner with TS, reflecting the fact that regional FQPs have already been established by the RTPs, as acknowledged on pages 28 and 29.

Action 14a should also be considered by SDPAs, linking with Action 14e.

Action 14e should include RTPs given the close working which already exists between RTPs and SDPs on integrating strategic transport and land use policy and planning. It is also suggested that HOPS should be involved in taking forward this action.

Action 14h should include reference to RTPs as well as LAs – RTPs employ Travel Plan officers who work closely with both the public and private sectors to embed Travel Planning and maximise its effectiveness.

Action 14j should include SDPAs and RTPs as partners reflecting the fact that many transport-related emissions relate to cross-boundary travel and solutions which would potentially benefit from the proposed central low-emissions fund will include cross-boundary infrastructure and facilities (e.g. strategic Park & Ride as defined in RTSs and STPR).

Reflecting the above comments the Glossary on page 7 should include RTPs.

Q3 Does the Setting the Scene section summarise accurately the current policy situation? Please suggest changes if not.

It is considered that section 5 covers the main issues. Acknowledgement of the role of RTPs and their statutory Regional Transport Strategies on page 14 is welcomed. It is also noted that between 1990 and 2012, Scotland has seen a 59% reduction in particulates, 65% decrease in oxides of nitrogen and a 79% decrease
in sulphur dioxide and that air quality in Scotland compares favourably with the rest of the UK and other EU member states. Transport emissions account for 30% of Carbon Monoxide, 38% of NOx and 20% of particulates.

Q4 Does the Way Forward section give a reasonable outline of what further action is needed to deliver an effective Low Emission Strategy? Please suggest changes if not.

The LES states that “Central Government cannot deliver improvements to air quality on its own”. However, although this is accepted, Government does need to accept its responsibility and take the lead, working collaboratively and consistently with partners to achieve common aims. Trunk roads carry 38.6% of traffic in Scotland, and many Air Quality Management Areas relate to trunk roads. We would therefore welcome a clearer statement in the strategy on the split of national, regional and local responsibilities.

In addition, it will be crucial that the LES is reflected in wider Scottish and UK Government policy (albeit the Scottish Government cannot dictate the latter). While local actions may improve air quality, decisions taken at a national level may undermine the LES or be contradictory to it. This would include decisions in areas like renewable energy or determinations by Ministers on referred or “called in” planning applications, UK Government decisions on fuel duty etc.

One way of encouraging more sustainable development and with it reducing emissions would be to strengthen current planning policy to ensure that public transport, walking and cycling are given greater priority in planning decisions about housing and other development. Currently, planning applications often fail to embed public transport and walking and cycling as part of the design of new housing, retail developments etc. Indeed many housing applications are positively hostile to public transport and walking with little opportunity for buses to penetrate housing developments and little by way of walking and cycling routes. Often the only way to easily or realistically access local services is by car.

Related to this is the need to ensure that the whole life costs of decisions about transport but also a range of other government investments are captured and not simply accounted for at the point of delivery. For example, while electrification of the rail network is welcome, this should also reflect the fact that the electricity is derived from a mix of energy sources including fossil fuel.

The Scottish Government needs to ensure that sufficient funding is available to enable implementation of the LES and to enable local authorities to conduct the actions required of them.

The section on Active Travel should provide an opportunity to better influence active travel policy towards achieving the Government’s key objectives. For example, proposals contained in the National Planning Framework (NPF3) to develop a national walking network has missed the opportunity to focus where real difference could be achieved, by linking communities and focussing on urban areas – there needs to be an appropriate re-balancing of priorities and resource allocation between the need to improve active travel infrastructure within and between communities with the significant investment which has previously been made in leisure and long-distance networks for recreation. Similarly, funding for cycling should be focussed on providing real change in every day journeys, short trips within urban areas, emphasis on commuter cycling and focussed on communities.
As noted above, there is a need to more effectively define and align the roles and responsibilities of the various national, regional and local agencies and this particularly applies to those involved in promoting and delivering active travel. Regional Transport Partnerships, working with their partner local authorities and other bodies such as Transport Scotland, Sustrans, Cycling Scotland and Paths for All, offer an effective means of developing and managing locally appropriate initiatives and programmes to promote active travel, focusing on the key issues relating to transport and environmental objectives in their regions. The collaboration between RTPs and Sustrans on embedded Active Travel officers, to support the development and implementation of Active Travel strategies and programmes, could usefully be developed to perform a greater role in the development and coordination of national programmes and funds for active travel at a regional level.

The Action to “Consider how statutory Quality Bus Partnerships could be more effective” should be more outcome focussed, along the lines of “Promoting partnerships between bus operators and transport authorities to promote more fuel efficient services and deliver improved services for the benefit of passengers and the environment”.

References to the potential for changes in the bus regulatory framework which might make it easier to set up SQPs are welcome. Given the level of public investment and subsidy provided to the bus industry, not simply through BSOG, Green Bus Fund and Bus Improvement Fund, but also through supported and schools’ contracts, investment in bus stations, bus stops and shelters, the purchase of vehicles for lease, administration of ticketing products and machines, development of smartcard, investment in road infrastructure including bus boarders and bus laybys, real time bus information systems, quality bus corridors and bus priority signalling,

Given this level of public investment it is essential that bus operators are seen to be proactive in meeting LES objectives. There is scope to strengthen SQP arrangements to encourage and / or require bus operators to green their fleets and to drive improved quality standards generally to encourage modal shift from car.

The action for “All local authorities to ensure that they have a corporate travel plan consistent with any local air quality action plan” should be extended to “All public sector organisations...”.

Through their existing role and work on Travel Planning at a regional level, RTPs are well placed to support this and the achievement of national objectives to extend the implementation of Travel Planning contained within RPP2.

The section on Behaviour Change also needs to recognise the number of campaigns and organisations working in this field. There is a need to align and coordinate these to ensure greater collaboration, consistency, efficiency and effectiveness.

Finally, reference to Community Planning is welcome since there are few references or commitments in recent SOAs to air quality targets or indeed transport generally.

Q5 What are your views on the proposals for the National Modelling Framework?

Developing a National Modelling Framework provides the opportunity to ensure a
standardised approach in a consistent and meaningful manner. Initial focus on Strategic Development Plan areas could miss an opportunity to involve all relevant local authorities and Regional Transport Partnerships in developing local models and assessments to ensure that all relevant transport interventions are also included. As indicated in the response to Q2 above, RTPs and their strategies have an important role and contribution to make to the proposed LES and should be involved in the development of the proposed modelling framework.

It will be important that the National Modelling Framework is more than simply about representing air quality but should be about testing interventions and scenarios to tackle air quality issues and considering the interplay between air quality modelling and transport modelling. For example, SPT already has the functionality through its policy model to consider the implications of transport scenarios on emissions and air quality which is used to support the development of the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan and it will be important to build on this established framework.

The role of new developments should not be over-emphasised. Existing air quality issues will continue to be generated and influenced by existing land uses. New developments are likely to have a more limited effect on these.

The AQA modelling process should recognise that RTS reviews are increasingly being aligned with the SDP review process and should also incorporate progress/review of relevant STPR proposals.

Q6 What are your views on the proposals for the National Low Emission Zone Framework?

Low Emission Zones will require a level of consistency and Scottish Government should take the lead in providing consistent guidance and overview. However, it is important that decisions are made locally, including a regional dimension through coordination with neighbouring authorities and Regional Transport Partnerships to be appropriate for local circumstances. It is important that measures are agreed within regional groupings and are in line with national guidelines.

The proposed framework is concerned with new vehicles but consideration should also be given to standards for existing vehicles – e.g. can these be upgraded to Euro VI and, if so, at reasonable cost? Also, with regard to enforcement, Police have withdrawn the national traffic warden service and the wider implications of this also need to be considered.

It is suggested that the timescale in section B1 should be reviewed. The ability of authorities to undertake an LEZ assessment within 12 months of publication of the Strategy will be dependent upon finance and is unduly restrictive. Flexibility may be needed if it is considered that alternative measures are not working or if, for example, at some point in the future a downward trend in pollutants changes and re-consideration of an LEZ may be needed in response.

It will be important to consider how to enforce LEZs e.g. who will control access to LEZs and it will be necessary to work with the DVLA to access vehicle records to link with the ANPR system.

Q7 What are your views on the proposed Key Performance Indicators? Are any different or additional Indicators required?

Eight KPIs are proposed. The collection of related data, including for the modal
split KPIs, can be costly but it is unclear how the data should be collected, who should collect it and whether funding will be available where this entails new information gathering. It is agreed that to be effective, the LES will require meaningful monitoring to take place, but it is necessary to produce data or to offer funding for data to be collected.

The mean travel to work time indicator may not tie in with reduced emissions as a shift in mode from car to public transport, cycling and walking could increase travel time, while reducing car traffic and alleviating congestion, with a consequent reduction in pollutants. In addition, the mean travel to work time indicator remains broadly constant as improvements in journey time often have the effect of encouraging people to live further afield from their place of work.

The cycle path network density indicator would need careful consideration – i.e. does this refer to on-street cycle lanes or off-street paths? – and how effective, for example, are off street routes that may take longer than on-street routes and be less attractive for non-leisure journeys?

There does appear to be a split of responsibilities here which is quite concerning as local authorities are assigned the KPIs and Scottish Government is assigned the outcomes and objectives. This would appear to place the onus very much on local authorities to deliver without a recognition that success will be driven by external factors, including the need for behavioural change and Scottish Government policy.

Finally, many KPIs are influenced by a host of factors including economic and behavioural that need also to be factored.
Respondent Details

**Consultation on Climate Change Public Bodies Duties Reporting.**

RESPONDENT INFORMATION FORM

*Please note*: this form **must** be returned with your response to ensure that we handle your response appropriately.

1. **Name/Organisation**
   **Organisation Name**
   Scotland’s Regional Transport Partnerships

   **Title**  Mr ☑  Ms ☐  Mrs ☐  Miss ☐  Dr ☐  Please tick as appropriate

   **Surname**
   Robertson

   **Forename**
   Ranald

2. **Postal Address**
   c/o Hitrans
   7 Ardross Terrace
   Inverness

   **Postcode**  IV3 5NQ  **Phone**  01463 719002  **Email**  info@hitrans.org.uk
CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Question 1: Do you agree that the powers in the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 should be used to improve climate change reporting by public bodies?
Yes ☑ No ☐

All public bodies have an important and central role to play in contributing to achievement of Climate Change objectives and targets. The duties and extent of expected compliance with the “Required Reporting” template at Schedule 2 should be proportionate to individual public bodies’ specific statutory roles, duties and functions.

Question 2: Do you agree that standardised reporting will improve the quality and consistency of climate change information reported by public sector major players?
Yes ☑ No ☐

It is agreed that standardised reporting will bring significant benefits in improving the quality and consistency of information reported. As indicated in response to Q1, the duty and “Required Reporting” should be sufficiently flexible to enable public sector bodies to adapt reporting to appropriately reflect their specific roles, duties and functions. As major players RTPs have, and already play, a key role in contributing both directly and indirectly by working with a range of partners and stakeholders, including partner Councils, Health Boards, Universities and FE establishments, and also through their role as statutory Community Planning partners. In many cases the work which RTPs undertake, for example in relation to encouraging behavioural change in favour of more sustainable transport modes, travel patterns and reducing the environmental impacts of transport, support other public sector “major players”, the private sector, communities and businesses, where the responsibility for delivery, measurement and reporting of outcomes will rest with the individual agencies supported. In such circumstances it may not always be possible or appropriate for RTPs to record and report in the way and to the level prescribed. In developing the reporting framework consideration should be given to enabling and encouraging reporting across a number of public sector bodies through Community Planning Partnerships.

Question 3: Do you agree with the policy subjects and questions included in the proposed climate change reporting form (see Schedule 2 to the draft order)?
Yes ☑ No ☐

Guidance accompanying the reporting form should recognise that the range and extent of policy and projects subjects covered will apply to a greater or lesser extent across the diverse range of public sector bodies covered.

Question 4: What would you consider to be an appropriate deadline date for the annual submission of climate change public bodies duties reports?

From September of each year commencing in 2016 with the first year being a trial, non-statutory period to enable public bodies a full year to develop, plan, resource, test and embed monitoring and reporting systems and processes. Statutory reporting requirements should commence not earlier than September 2017, based on the 2016/17 Financial Year. These timescales, as opposed to the proposals to commence a year earlier in the consultation paper, would allow public bodies to better develop and embed processes for gathering and reporting on appropriate and relevant information and would allow reporting to be broadly aligned with reporting to public sector body Boards and Committees on Annual Accounts, which are likely to contain related financial and performance information.
Question 5: Based on your current level of climate change/sustainability reporting, are there any additional resource implications associated with the proposed reporting requirement?

The reporting requirements require considerably more resource than under e.g. current Carbon Reduction Commitment reporting requirements, which are confined to a public body’s estate, as opposed to the current proposals, which include estate and operations. Whilst the broader and more holistic approach to reporting is supported, the nature and level of information included in “Required Reporting” may require public bodies to develop new in-house, or engage external specialist, support the costs of which could be significant and need to be fully assessed and planned by public sector bodies. The timescale indicated in response to Q4 would afford public bodies sufficient time to identify, consider and plan for additional resource implications.

Question 6:

For public sector respondents only:

- Do you agree with the list of “major players” in Schedule 1 to the draft order?
  Yes ☒ No ☐

- Would you voluntarily provide additional climate change information if recommended by the Scottish Government?
  Yes ☒ No ☐

RTPs would be happy to work with Scottish Government and Transport Scotland to supply further climate change information and develop measurement processes and indicators on a voluntary basis having regard to the scope, nature, complexity, cost and other resource implications of gathering such information.

Question 7: What guidance should be provided for climate change public bodies duties reporting?

Scottish Government should develop comprehensive but flexible guidance, reflecting the comments given in the responses above. Guidance should avoid placing significant additional administrative burdens on public sector bodies, recognising and reflecting the practicalities and costs of data monitoring and reporting. Guidance should consider the impact of the reporting requirements across the public sector and the potential need to develop expertise in this area. Regional workshops and training would be welcome to ensure a consistent approach is being taken by public sector bodies and that there is a clear understanding of reporting requirements.

Question 8: How do you think climate change public bodies duties reports should be monitored?

According to consistent criteria with monitoring undertaken by public bodies themselves, with Government oversight restricted to occasions when non-compliance or limited compliance is evident. Monitoring should be relevant to the
individual bodies and should form the basis for continuous improvement. Monitoring of and any associated reporting on this should avoid “league table” reporting and/or interpretation.

Question 9: What should the consequences be if a major player does not comply with the climate change public bodies duties?

The reasons for any non-compliance should be assessed and addressed through supportive engagement with the public body concerned, including peer support and provision of training if necessary. There should be no financial or other punitive sanctions.

Question 10: Do you believe climate change public bodies duties reports should be validated prior to submission?
Yes, independent □ Yes, internal ☒ Yes, peer to peer □ Not needed □

In terms of corporate governance and accountability, it should be a matter for individual public sector bodies to validate reports internally prior to submission. Any external validation should be a matter for public bodies to agree or seek on a purely voluntary basis.

Question 11: Would you be content for your climate change public bodies duties report to be published annually on the Sustainable Scotland Network (SSN) website?
Yes ☒ No □

Question 12: How much time would your organisation expect to spend preparing a report in accordance with the draft order? (include any external consultancy time)

Broadly three to four months from April 30th of each year, in line with the general period for completion and internal reporting on other related processes, including Annual Accounts.

Question 13: With reference to the draft BRIA, do you think that the policy proposal presented may impact on business, the third sector (voluntary) or any other relevant areas?

No comment.

Question 14: Do you think that the policy proposal presented may impact on people differently depending on characteristics such as age, disability, gender, race, religion or belief, sexual orientation, gender identity or marriage or civil partnership status? Could the proposals enhance equality or good relations? If so, please comment.

Overall it is considered that the proposals will be generally beneficial by encouraging public sector bodies to consider, address and report on their climate change obligations holistically, having regard to other policy and delivery measures including their general equalities duties requirements and obligations.

End of Questionnaire