

Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation response to Wales Roads Review – Initial Panel Report

CIHT CYMRU COMMITTEE COMMENTS MAY 2022

The Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation (CIHT) provides strategic leadership and support to help our members develop, deliver and maintain sustainable solutions for highways, transport infrastructure and services.

CIHT is a chartered professional body for those working in highways and transportation.

We support our members throughout their careers by providing:

- industry-recognised training and qualifications
- professional standards
- research and business information
- leadership on key transportation related issues

We have members across the world, working in the public, private, academic, research and not-for-profit sectors.

CIHT is the only body to offer the full range of professional transportation qualifications including Chartered Engineer, Incorporated Engineer, Engineering Technician, Certificate of Competency in Road Safety and, uniquely, Chartered Transport Planning Professional.

These qualifications ensure that our members work to high professional standards on behalf of the societies we serve.

We have a network of valued partner organisations – representing the private, public, research and education sectors – that support and collaborate with us in our work and align to our values.

Our work is governed by our Royal Charter. Our object states that we exist:

“To advance for the public benefit the science and art associated with highways and transportation in all their aspects: and to promote education, training and research and development of the said science and art.”

This response is from the CIHT CYMRU Committee that represents CIHT members in Wales.

INTRODUCTION

This paper provides a response from the CIHT Cymru Committee to the request for feedback at the Roads Review Stakeholder Consultation Workshop held on 15 March 2022.

As one of the objectives of the Roads Review is to ensure that road investment is fully aligned with the delivery of the new Wales Transport Strategy’s (2021) ambitions and priorities, it is useful at this stage to consider key aspects of that document. It is understood that Welsh Government is in the process of preparing a Delivery Plan for the new WTS. A delivery plan is certainly needed in order to make robust decisions on transportation issues.

An example of how this could work is from Scotland; there is the National Transport Strategy being supported by a Delivery Plan and a Strategic Transport Projects Review.

A brief outline of the new WTS together with an overview of the Scottish Governments National Transport Strategy and its supporting Delivery Plan and Strategic Transport Projects Review is given in Background Information at the end of this response.

Not every section of the Wales Roads Review: Initial Panel Report have been commented upon. The focus has been on the key sections, essentially dealing with outcomes. It is understood the quantitative/qualitative analysis of schemes subject to review will not be made publicly available. This is disappointing as CIHT members have shown a keen interest in understanding the findings of this Review and sharing this information will be helpful in gaining support to the process.

CONTEXT OF THE REVIEW

Comments on this section are as follows:

This describes that Welsh Government has identified the need the reduce CO2 emissions across the whole economy by 63% by 2030. In the transport sector it is stated that one means of helping achieve the CO2 emissions reductions is to reduce that number of car miles travelled per person by 10% by 2030 (from 2019) and to increase the proportion of trips by sustainable modes (public transport and active travel) to 35% by 2025 and 39% by 2030. However, this is only part of the picture as Welsh Government's ambitions go further, as set out in the Net Zero Wales Carbon Budget 2 (see below):

Transport sector ambition statement
We aim to reduce emissions from passenger transport by 22% in 2025 (from 2019) and 98% in 2050 through demand reduction, modal shift and the uptake of low carbon technologies.
Our aim is to reduce the number of car miles travelled per person by 10% by 2030 and to increase the proportion of trips by sustainable travel mode (public transport and active travel) to 35% by 2025 and 39% by 2030.
By 2025 10% of passenger car travel will be by zero emission car and 48% of new car sales will be zero emission, we will have a comprehensive network of electric vehicle charging points, and will also have transitioned a large proportion of our bus, taxi and private hire vehicles fleet to zero emission vehicles.

This ambition statement is important as WG recognises the need for decarbonising public transport as well as investing in a comprehensive network of electric vehicle charging points. Roads will play a key road in accommodating increases in passenger transport in the coming years. In the overall context of the new Wales Transport Strategy the Review Panel need to consider WG's Priority over the next five years to upgrade, improve and future proof the road network, addressing congestion pinch points, journey reliability, road safety and resilience. This is a key priority as adapting the highway network for increased capacity for public transport and active travel is vital to achieve modal shift.

The new Wales Transport Strategy and the supporting Net Zero Carbon Budget have challenging targets and priorities. At this stage it is difficult to have confidence that they can

be achieved without supporting information from WG that the aims are deliverable and affordable in the timescales set out. As such it would be beneficial to undertake a further review of road schemes after a delivery plan supporting the new WTS has been prepared in context of how highway schemes can contribute to achieving net zero by creating an environment that helps deliver the sustainable transport hierarchy.

OBJECTIVES AND TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE REVIEW.

Comments on the stated Objectives for the Roads Review are set out below:

- to ensure road investment is fully aligned to the delivery of Llwybr Newydd the Wales Transport Strategy ambitions and priorities, Welsh Government Programme for Government commitments and Net Zero Wales.

It is not clear how the Review Panel will be able to achieve this objective given that a delivery plan for the new Wales Transport Strategy has yet to be developed. In what context will the road investment be assessed? Roads can play a crucial role in enhancing public transport and indeed active travel. As recognised in Section 1.1 most of the road schemes currently in development in Wales were conceived before the adoption of Net Zero Wales, Llwybr Newydd the Wales Transport Strategy. Therefore, all the road schemes under review should be reassessed using the WelTAG process to align with all other transport interventions across Wales.

The commitment to fully align road investment with the new WTS is noted and accepted. Of particular note is the Welsh Government's priority in the WTS to "upgrade, improve and future-proof our road network, addressing congestion pinch points and investing in schemes that support road safety, journey reliability, resilience, modal shift and electric bike, motorbike and vehicle charging" is a key element to the Roads Review. It would appear the Roads Review process as set out is placing less importance on road safety, particularly as there is no specific Road Safety Criterion on which schemes will be assessed (as would be the case with WelTAG). This, in our view, is an omission and it should be a key consideration by the Review Panel.

- to develop a set of criteria which identify appropriate circumstances for expenditure of Welsh Government funds on roads.

By utilising WelTAG in the Roads Review there will not be a need for the Review Panel to develop a new set of criteria (although it is recognised some supplementary criteria may be required in areas such as carbon reduction). WelTAG is a recognised and well understood method of examining all types of transport projects. It is also noted that WelTAG is currently under review. The appropriate circumstances are set out in the new Wales Transport Strategy and also the Net Zero Wales Carbon Budget 2. Examples of these include WG's priority to:

- maintain and operate the Strategic Road Network in a way that meets our statutory obligations, minimizes adverse environmental impacts, promotes active travel, sustains and creates employment in Wales and reduces the backlog of maintenance
- upgrade, improve and future-proof our road network, addressing congestion pinch points and investing in schemes that support road safety, journey reliability, resilience, modal shift and electric bike, motorbike and vehicle charging.

- to use these criteria to recommend which of the current road projects should be supported, modified, or have support withdrawn

The WelTAG process can be used to determine how particular projects could be adapted to achieve the modal shift, for example:

- by introducing bus/high occupancy vehicle lanes and or active travel infrastructure
- developing park and ride opportunities
- linking with transport hubs

The focus should be on making better use of the highway assets, ranking schemes in priority order against one another (rather than deciding on withdrawing support). Modifying road schemes as appropriate to meet the required criteria (through WeITAG) should also be a key aim of the review. A balanced approach should be adopted in assessing schemes ~~the~~ ~~projects~~ they should not automatically 'fail' if additional capacity is provided for private transport.

- to provide guidance on reallocating road space on parts of the road network which might in future benefit from enhancement.

Agreed with reallocating road space, but the appraisal for this should be through a WeITAG approach. However, it will be important to recognise the strategic and regional aspects as well as the potential community benefits of the road scheme. Not all road schemes will require re-allocation of road space.

- to consider how any savings might be allocated, in order to ensure problems on the road network are addressed, and in particular to make recommendations on how to tackle the backlog of road maintenance.

Considering where savings might be achieved is supported but for the Review the Panel will need require specialist input from design teams (and potentially contractors) as the considerations will need to be quite detailed to yield robust results. In line with the comments above the WeITAG process should be employed in this element of the review. It is also considered that a realistic review can only be undertaken following the preparation of a delivery plan for the new WTS.

The section sets out that "going forward" WeITAG (currently being reviewed), will ensure that all transport projects are aligned to the delivery on the new WTS ambitions and priorities. It seems that the new WTS was developed outside the WeITAG process so it's difficult to see how this will be achieved. The new strategy should have been developed using the recognised tool which is WeITAG, just like the Scottish Government used the Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG) (i.e., its equivalent of WeITAG) to develop its National Transport Strategy, supporting Delivery Plan and Strategic Transport Projects Review.

SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

As stated above, there is no need for the Panel to develop its own criteria for the review. WeITAG (with some additional specific criteria) would provide the best form of review and prioritisation of schemes. The Scope presented is relatively narrow and a doesn't include criterion to cater for adapting a scheme to accommodate public transport and or active travel measures. Similarly, there is no regional or urban/rural context of the scheme, which we consider will be important in the selection factors as will be the community benefit forthcoming.

Not accepting a scheme if private vehicle capacity is increased could potentially miss opportunities. Say for example a park and ride site could be introduced in a proposed highway improvement scheme which would allow significant numbers of car journeys to a city centre to be intercepted. Whilst car trips to and from and P&R site would increase locally, the overall miles travelled by road into the city would be reduced (along with that CO2 reductions). On that basis because the local trips on the highway improvement increased the scheme would be rejected even though overall there would be a net benefit. That does not seem right. Focusing on not increasing 'private car capacity' is very negative and it implies an anti-car approach. However, that does not come across in WG's Transport Sector Ambition Statement (as in previous section). It's going to be important to adopt a

balanced approach throughout the review process. A lot should depend on the extent of any increase in private vehicle capacity and whether it can be mitigated or other benefits, such as removing a congestion pinch point, accrue from the overall scheme.

It is important to remember that many schemes were never prepared to address climate change criteria, so the only way to assess them properly is to review them under the new criteria. Overall, there needs to be an open-minded approach with consideration of options to adapt, if necessary, the scheme to achieve the climate change goals and the priorities, ambitions and goals of the WTS.

It is understood from discussions at the workshop on 15 March 2022 that there are no intentions to have regular/periodic 'reviews' of the Roads programme. It would be beneficial to our members to understand how future roads and transport projects will be assessed for inclusion in future Wales Transport Delivery plans.

CRITERIA AND REVIEW PROCESS

Without an understanding as to whether the new WTS can be delivered within the timescale and to budget it is not seen how the Panel could develop robust procedures. The interim report does not identify any weighting to the various criteria and what balance there may be in making judgements and panel recommendations. It is not clear whether the nine criterion are listed in order of importance or whether each has different weighting. The overall impression is that it's just a pass or fail. Despite the statement to the contrary, it certainly comes across as a 'tick-box' approach as a means of accepting or failing a road scheme.

While there will be existing scheme data, reports and drawings for the Panel to review, the robustness of such 'evidence' to assess whether it is compatible with the aims, priorities and goals of the new WTS is uncertain at this stage. There would appear to be no further opportunity to submit evidence to respond to the findings of the Panel.

Comments on the individual criterion are set out given below

Criterion 1 – Case for Change

The text in the initial report refers to consideration of each schemes purpose and location. This implies there will be a regional and or strategic context to the considerations, yet the overall impressions is that such factors do not feature in the new WTS. Without a robust appraisal being undertaken using WelTAG along with the new WTS, supported by a Delivery Plan how will this criterion be assessed robustly? It is essential that the first step in the review is for WelTAG to be used to see how the scheme performs against the WTS and its Delivery Plan. As already stated the scheme's development would most likely not have included the climate change goals and the sustainable transport hierarchy forming the new criteria.

Criterion 2 – Objectives Alignment with Current Policy

This will only be possible if the scheme is re-appraised against the new criteria. As already stated this would involve using WelTAG. It is considered that the Panel would need extensive support as each of the scheme identified for review would need to be appraised in this way yet there appears to be intention to share these appraisal findings. It is noted that opportunities for increasing sustainable freight movements is specifically mentioned. It is not clear why this aspect is singled out and equally whether it just refers to freight movement by roads only. Opportunities for transfer from road to rail freight movement should also be considered even if the scheme needs modification to cover wider strategic issues. The giving over of road space is a stated goal in the new WTS and as such the scheme should be judged on whether, for example, bus lanes or high occupancy vehicle lanes can be introduced. Similarly, each scheme assessment should also consider the potential for providing increased public transport usage and active travel provisions. The approach

should be to determine whether an existing asset (which the highway is) can be adapted to achieve the aspirations and goals to reduce CO2 emissions.

One of the key underlying Priorities of the WTS is to, (within the next 5 years):

- upgrade, improve and future-proof our road network, addressing congestion pinch points and investing in schemes that support road safety, journey reliability, resilience, modal shift and electric bike, motorbike and vehicle charging

This and other 'road' priorities need to feature in this criterion.

Criterion 3 – Examination of All Appropriate Options

As with the criteria outlined above this one seems to be a pass/fail in relation to increasing private car capacity. It is likely that during the development stages of these schemes, each would have aligned with its objectives and performance criteria applying at each stage. It would be beneficial that schemes are re-assessed using WeITAG as outlined above in order for the Panel's review to be robust. A great deal of public money has been invested in getting each of the schemes to their current stage and it would be unfortunate if potentially viable schemes were not assessed for their adaptability to suit new goals and current policy. The process as currently set out could result in viable schemes being cancelled in the Road Review. It would therefore be useful if the 'scoring criteria' used in the review process could be clearly set out.

The only way the Panel can address what is effectively the final question of this criteria (about whether the proposed solution would have emerged with the 'current' scheme objectives and policy) is for the existing problems and scheme options to be re-assessed using the WeITAG.

Criterion 4 – Effect on CO2 Emissions

Reference to the Terms of Reference relating to future road investment and the need to avoid increasing CO2 emissions is noted. However, it is not clear whether this relates to emissions by the private car, heavy and light goods vehicles, and indeed public transport vehicles. The new WTS does not appear to lay down any detail as to how decarbonisation of public transport will be achieved. The ambition by WG to decarbonise public transport is supported but the deliverability is questioned at this stage. As a large proportion of public transport vehicles are currently diesel powered how will Criterion 4 be applied for say bus priority schemes?

The criterion as currently drafted shows that Panel seems to be prejudging the outcome of the review, with the reference to 'road schemes that increase CO2 emissions are unlikely to be appropriate. As already stated above the road schemes to be reviewed are unlikely to satisfy new aims and policies because their development pre-date such requirements. To achieve a robust outcome of the Roads Review each scheme needs to be re-assessed on the current requirements of the new WTS and the climate change commitments and be given the opportunity to review their design to minimise carbon impacts.

The second paragraph of Criterion 4 covers CO2 emissions relating to construction, operation, and maintenance. The intention seems to relate to road scheme alone but surely the same issues equally apply to any new or upgraded infrastructure provisions, i.e., public transport (bus and rail) as well as active travel schemes. This selective focus on one infrastructure intervention has the potential to miss opportunities. Therefore, all transportation schemes/interventions should be looked at as a whole and appraised as part of a collective review. This is what the Scottish Government did in preparing its Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR2). Such an approach could lead to more robust decisions on future investment on transportation.

Criterion 5 – People and Communities

It is considered that any community benefit the road scheme might provide is extremely important, even if CO2 is increased. A balanced assessment is required of the scheme's merits and disbenefits rather than a pass/fail because of one factor.

Criterion 6 – Good for the Environment

Similar to Criterion 5 this is a crucial factor to be considered, but the same issues apply in terms of the criteria's score in the overall context. (i.e. Is it a pass/fail situation?). The potential of any impacts could vary depending upon the scheme's location and its strategic importance, i.e., each scheme needs to be looked at in context of its particular location/place in the community. The potential or not for any mitigation measures should impacts arise in the review are not covered in the criterion's text.

Criterion 7 – Good for Planes and the Economy

This is a crucial factor in any review. Again, the scheme should be re-assessed using the new goals and objectives, using WelTAG for this criterion to be robust. Assessing against the new WTS is one thing but being confident that the scheme can be delivered is quite another. Therefore, a Delivery Plan for the WTS needs to be developed beforehand. To establish whether or not the scheme is good value for money the Panel will need to be supported by a technical team to undertake the analysis. Overall, the text for this criterion appears to underplay the importance of economic performance relative to the other appraisal criteria.

Criterion 8 – Culture and Welsh Language

In broad terms it is unlikely that the schemes listed will have significant impacts (positive and negative) in respect of this criteria. Without knowing any weighting/scoring proposals it is difficult to comment on whether this criterion will result in incorrect decisions from this review.

Criterion 9 – Robustness against Different Possible Futures

This criterion seems to require an assessment of a scheme's compatibility with the well-being aspects of Future Generations Act and its overall robustness for a range of possible future scenarios, policies and social trends. Considering the long-term is one of the 5 Ways of Working under the Act and that will be scheme specific. All of these aspects can be covered by a review of each project. However, the other 4 Ways of Working (Integration, Involvement, Collaboration and Prevention) are more subjective as they are principally about the actions of public bodies and individuals addressing well-being aspects and actions to prevent problems. The criterion refers to the need to address a scheme's value for money and how this may be affected by economics, demographic and other changes not anticipated (at the time of appraisal). This implies that Criterion 9 will be applied to the 'current' status of the scheme, but as indicated in earlier sections a re-appraisal of the scheme is required based on the new WTS (and using WelTAG). There should also be an opportunity for schemes to revisit their 'design' requirements to address the findings of this Review. Various scenarios can therefore be appraised to robustly address the Criterion 9.

One of the key aims of the new WTS is to achieve a modal shift away from the car towards public transport and active travel. It may benefit scheme appraisal if a specific criterion could be added to assess whether the highway proposal can provide or be adapted to accommodate dedicated public transport services and/or active travel provisions.

The means of scoring a scheme against this criterion is not clear. Reference to the Future Generations Act, bearing in mind that it seems central to the new WTS, implies that a scheme's compatibility to it, or not, could result in a failure. It is important therefore for a scoring mechanism to be confirmed by the Review Panel /Welsh Government to understand

the intent and to ensure consistency in scheme development and appraisal. This applies to all of the nine criteria set out in the Initial Draft document.

REVIEW PROCESS

The reference to the scheme reviews being undertaken using a systematic process by Panel members, with the Secretariat and technical support is noted. Given the existence of WelTAG, which is a recognised and well used appraisal process, the need to implement a new process is unnecessary (and somewhat contradictory). Whilst reviewing the existing data, reports and the like is useful background to a scheme's current status, the importance of re-appraising each scheme against the new WTS must not be underestimated. Without such re-appraisals the Panel's reviews will not be robust.

MAIN CONCERNS WITH REVIEW

- The selection criteria for scoring each scheme to pass or fail have not been confirmed. It is crucial that such criteria are set out to ensure robustness.
- The review criteria does not cover the important consideration of road safety. This is a key requirement and must be included in the Roads Review. The WTS is aspirational but also very challenging and its deliverability has yet to be tested. Preparation and publication of the Delivery Plan is vital to address this aspect.
- It is focused on roads schemes only; but like the Scottish Government there would be benefit in addressing transportation interventions schemes as a whole to improve the robustness of decision making. In that regard the means of decarbonising public transport and indeed freight vehicles and rolling stock will be important considerations.
- The Context of the Review refers to Welsh Government's aim to reduce the number of car miles travelled per person by 10% by 2030. The means of achieving this is not defined but the issue raises a number of questions. Is it intended to be legally enforceable? How will it be monitored? Does the aim apply to 'conventionally' powered cars only? Basically, it seems out of step with the full Transport Sector Ambition Statement covered in the opening section of these comments.
- There are around forty strategic road network schemes alone to be reviewed, within a 9-month delivery window. Has the Panel the resources available to review all schemes, particularly given the need to use WelTAG throughout.
- The very substantial investment (capital and revenue) required to achieve the priorities and aims of the WTS, could influence decisions with road schemes being dropped based on the Sustainable Transport Hierarchy approach. The importance of roads in facilitating public transport and active travel provisions must not be overlooked in the Review process.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

NEW WALES TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2021

The new strategy is intended to shape the transport system in Wales over the next 20 years aimed at helping the Welsh Government achieve its target of net zero by 2050. The strategy sets out three priorities and three ambitions to achieve this by essentially changing the way we travel with fewer cars on the road, with more journeys made by walking, cycling or using public transport. Welsh Government recognises the strategy is ambitious, but the aim is to focus on reducing the need to travel, especially by private car. Where new transport infrastructure might be needed the strategy calls for a new approach. This would be through using the Sustainable Transport Hierarchy (STH) set out in the strategy, to give priority to meeting the demands for walking, cycling and public transport ahead of private motor vehicles. The strategy is quite wide ranging and aspirational, but it contains little detail as how it might be delivered. Welsh Government recognises a Delivery Plan is required and it will be published in the future. Implementing the commitments in the WTS with require very large capital investment on some major transport infrastructure provisions across Wales. An example of this is one of WG's priorities, over the next 5 years, is to "deliver our public transport Metro systems in all parts of Wales to improve services and better integrate other public transport and active travel with the rail system".

The Sustainable Transport Hierarchy is as follows:

- Walking and Cycling
- Public Transport
- Ultra-low Emissions I Vehicles
- Other Private Motor Vehicles

CIHT would suggest that the Sustainable Transport Hierarchy should include 'wheeling' at the top – i.e., Walking, Wheeling, and Cycling. CIHT supports a vision and validate system of transport delivery and has been undertaking work to better integrate planning to sustainable transport¹. The triple access system² that incorporates digital connectivity is also something CIHT recommends as this will enable people to work remotely and supports the reduced need for travel. Behavioural science highlights how the physical environment is the largest factor for behavioural change because it takes into consideration whether there are appealing and safe ways where people can walk and cycle and also the availability of public transport services³.

The new Strategy was only issued in 2021 so a delivery plan to implement it has yet to be developed.

Key Areas of Concern with New Wales Transport Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliverability of the Strategy. Urgent need to prepare and publish an associated Delivery Plan.• The availability of suitable financial budget to deliver the priorities and outcomes of the WTS

¹ <https://www.ciht.org.uk/knowledge-resource-centre/resources/better-planning-better-transport-better-places/>

²

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301344809_Guidance_for_transport_planning_and_policymaking_in_the_face_of_an_uncertain_future

³ <https://www.ciht.org.uk/news/five-minutes-on-behaviour-change-and-net-zero/>

- At face value the WTS is ambitious, but it comes across as somewhat anti-car. The Sustainable Transport Hierarchy (STH) is fine and the strategy has an aim to achieve a 45% modal share for public transport and walking and cycling by 2040, which represents a 13% increase from the present figure. Given the STH is that ambitious enough?
- It is not clear how decarbonisation of public transport will be achieved.
- Is the 5 year time frame given to deliver the wide range of schemes within the Priorities of the various Mini Plans or the WTS achievable? Take for example the Priority to - “upgrade, improve and future-proof our road network, addressing congestion pinch points and investing in schemes that support road safety, journey reliability, resilience, modal shift and electric bike, motorbike and vehicle charging”. That’s a bid ask.

THE SITUATION IN SCOTLAND

The Scottish Government introduced its “National Transport Strategy - Protecting Our Climate and Improving Lives” in February 2020. The Strategy sets out the Scottish Government’s vision, which is underpinned by four Priorities, each with three associated Outcomes. The Strategy is quite similar to the new WTS developed by Welsh Government in 2021 with the same focus on reducing CO2 emissions and influencing travel choice away from the private car onto sustainable forms of transport. Clearly, there are some differences in the detail. For example, 37% (2017) of Scotland’s greenhouse gas emissions are accounted for by transport. Wales’s equivalent emissions from transport is 17% (2018). The significant difference between the two figures is explained in part by Scotland’s emissions from Aviation is 15%, whilst for Wales International Aviation and Shipping only accounts for 1% of its emissions. Scotland’s version of the Strategy has a similar Sustainable Transport Hierarchy to that of Wales with ‘Walking and Wheeling’ being top, followed by Cycling with the Private Car being bottom.

Scotland’s Delivery Plan 2020-2022 (for its NTS) addresses the government’s aims and outlines the means of implementation of planned actions across the transportation sectors for active travel, public transport, roads (trunk roads and motorways), freight, seaports and airports. Importantly, the Delivery Plan outlines the investment and actions necessary to decarbonise public transport.

A bullet point summary of key elements of that Plan are as follows:

- “Provision of financial support through innovative financial products to shift to zero emission buses as part of the aim to decarbonise transport. Through the Bus Decarbonisation Task Force the aim is to ensure that the majority of new buses purchased from 2024 are zero -emission”.
- “Explore the potential battery-electric and hydrogen fuel cell buses – investing £120m over 5 years”.
- Scotland’s objective is to decarbonise passenger rail by 2035, ahead of the 2040 target
- “Use the dedicated £25M Scottish Strategic Rail Fund to help unlock specific opportunities for rail freight across Scotland, to help facilitate modal shift”.
- “To achieve resilience on the road network we will design and deliver the programme of already committed trunk road improvements, supporting local and regional economies sustainability”.

- “We will progress delivery of the A9 and A96 Dualling programmes and progress development and statutory authorisation procedures for a number of major trunk road schemes”.
- “Increase the use of asset management across the transport system which includes for a doubling of the investment in bridges and road maintenance with a programme of around £1.5Bn over 5 years to boost repairs and strengthening the network.”
- “Provide support to local authorities to switch electric vehicles and install charging points”
- Increased the public charging point network to 2000 in number during 2022.
- Provide financial support for the installation of home charging points.
- Launch a Bus Priority Fund aimed at enabling local authorities to develop and deliver bus priority infrastructure in partnership with bus operators over the next 5 years. Aim is to make £500M commitment to long term funding for bus priority.
- Finalise the Managed Motorway Strategic Business Case about the reallocation of road space on parts of the motorway network around Glasgow to high-occupancy vehicles, such as buses.

Scotland published its Strategic Transport Projects Review 2 in January 2022. The review the strategic transport network performance. One of its main functions is to inform transport investment in Scotland for the next 20 years by providing evidence-based recommendations on which Scottish ministers can base future transport and investment decisions. The Review considers the transport needs for Scotland’s people and communities and examines active travel, bus, ferry, rail, motorways, and trunk roads as well as passenger and freight access to major ports and airports. These needs are reviewed from national and regional perspectives to reflect their different geographies, travel patterns and demands.

SUGGESTION

The Scottish suite of documents forming the Government’s National Transport Strategy, associated Delivery Plan and the Strategic Transport Project Review should be examined by the Welsh Government as they will assist in Wales developing its own versions of the latter two.