

Detailed Appraisal     D3 (Part 5): Route Management between: Aberdeen and North East Scotland (A90), Edinburgh and Dundee (A92), Ayrshire and Dumfries (A76), Edinburgh and North West England (A68/A7/A702), Edinburgh and North East England (A1), the A83, A85, A828								
Estimated total Public Sector Funding Requirement:				<i>Capital Costs/grant</i> <i>Annual Revenue Support Present</i> <i>Value of Cost to Gvt</i> <i>BCR/PVB</i>		£100m - £250m - £50m - £100m N/A		
Summary Impact on STAG Criteria	Environment Safety Economy Integration Accessibility and Social Inclusion	---	--	-	0	+	++	+++
(Judgement based on available information against a 7pt. scale.)								
Intervention Description:								
These routes generally perform well, and as such no objectives have been established to address corridor specific issues.								
However, there is a need to maintain and operate these safely in the context of a route management strategy. This intervention would include a variety of localised improvements that would be undertaken in tandem with, and driven by, the trunk road maintenance contracts.								
Summary: Rationale for Selection								
There are a number of corridors where no strategic issues relating to network performance have been identified, however there is an ongoing need to maintain and operate the network safely. These route action plans would perform this role.								
These interventions would therefore address isolated constraints, and although the immediate benefits would be felt at a more local level, for example through isolated junction improvements, the programme of works would contribute towards the need to maintain and safely operate the network.								

Table D3.5.1 STPR Objectives

STPR Objectives	
<p><u>National Objective 1:</u> To promote 'competitive' inter-urban journey times.</p> <p><u>National Objective 2:</u> To reduce inter-urban journey time on public transport.</p> <p><u>National Objective 3:</u> Promote journey time reduction on the trunk road network for prioritised vehicles and users (e.g. HOV, freight, bus) or provide improvements to journey time reliability.</p> <p><u>National Objective 4:</u> To promote journey time reductions between the Central Belt and Aberdeen/Inverness primarily to allow business to achieve an effective working day between these centres.</p> <p><u>National Objective 5:</u> Maximise the labour catchment area in city regions (favouring PT and HOVs and balancing with other policy measures that promote reduction in need to travel).</p> <p><u>National Objective 6:</u> Support the development and implementation of the emerging national development interventions.</p> <p><u>National Objective 7:</u> Reduce CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions per person km</p> <p><u>National Objective 8:</u> Stabilise total CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions</p> <p><u>National Objective 9:</u> Reduce CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions in line with expectations from the emerging climate change bill.</p> <p><u>National Objective 10:</u> To promote continuing reduction in accident rates and severity rates across the strategic transport network, supporting the work of the Strategic Road Safety Plan.</p> <p><u>National Objective 11:</u> To promote seamless travel.</p>	<p><b>1: Slightly Positive</b> - A number of the managed corridors provide links for 'inter-urban' journeys. Route improvements on the corridors between Edinburgh and Dundee, and Edinburgh and the north of England could reduce 'inter-urban' journey times between the Central Belt and cities in other parts of the UK.</p> <p><b>2: Slightly Positive</b> – Road improvements on the corridors linking Edinburgh and Dundee, and Edinburgh and the north of England would benefit public transport on each of the corridors, with reduced journey times improving bus services.</p> <p><b>3: Slightly Positive</b> – The general improvements on each of the corridors would not specifically be aimed at directly promoting journey time reductions for prioritised vehicles; however road improvements on each of the corridors would result in all road users experiencing a degree of reduction in journey times.</p> <p><b>4: Slightly Positive</b> – The general improvements on each of the corridors would not directly promote journey time reductions between the Central Belt and Aberdeen/Inverness; however road improvements would reduce journey times on each of the corridors.</p> <p><b>5: Neutral</b> – Although journey time benefits are expected, the intervention would not significantly address this objective.</p> <p><b>6: Neutral</b> – This intervention is associated with the managed corridors and is not considered to impact on supporting the development and implementation of the emerging national development interventions.</p> <p><b>7: Neutral</b> - Although there would be an improvement in journey time reliability it is not considered that this would result in an increase in car usage and therefore have any impact on CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions.</p> <p><b>8: Neutral</b> – This intervention would not have any impact on stabilising CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions.</p> <p><b>9: Neutral</b> - This intervention would not result in a reduction in CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions.</p> <p><b>10: Positive</b> – Infrastructure improvements such as 2+1, widening and realigned sections would assist in reducing accident and severity rates on the managed corridors. Provision of safer overtaking opportunities and improved access to the trunk roads via junction improvements would result in a reduction in the number of severe accidents on these sections.</p> <p><b>11: Neutral</b> – This intervention would not have any impact on promoting seamless travel.</p> <p><b>12: Neutral</b> – It is not considered that this intervention would improve the competitiveness of public transport</p>

<p><u>National Objective 12:</u> Improve the competitiveness of public transport relative to the car.</p> <p><u>National Objective 13:</u> To improve overall perceptions of public transport.</p>	<p>relative to the car as any infrastructure improvements would improve journey times for all road users.</p> <p><b>13. Neutral</b> – It is possible that reductions in journey times may result in slightly improved perceptions of bus services.</p>
--	--

Table D3.5.2 STAG Criteria

STAG Criteria		
Criteria:	Assessment Summary:	Supporting Information:
Environment:	Neutral	Implementation of route management on peripheral routes would not require any substantial new infrastructure or result in any physical effects. Therefore the effect on landscape, biodiversity and cultural heritage are considered to be neutral.
Safety:	Minor Benefit	The A90 Aberdeen to northeast Scotland (19.3 P.I.A./100MVkm), and A7 between Gretna and Galashiels (19 P.I.A./100MVkm) both have rates above the national rate of 15.5 P.I.A./100MVkm). In addition, based on accident data from 2001 to 2005, the A83, A85 and A828 all have significantly higher accident rates than the national rate. A number of improvements, such as road widening and 2+1 sections could result in accident rate reductions, as national statistics indicate that wide rural single carriageways and those with climbing lanes have a lower accident rate than standard 7.3m rural single carriageways. Fatal accident rates on the A90 Aberdeen to Fraserburgh, A83 and A85 are all significantly higher than the national rate (0.76 fatal accidents/100MVkm), with rates of 1.2, 1.1 and 2.4 fatal accidents/100MVkm respectively. Potential improvements such as widening and the introduction of speed enforcement measures at specific locations would bring these rates closer to the national rate.
Economy:	Moderate Benefit	<p><b>Transport Economic Efficiency (TEE):</b> Realignment and 2+1 sections would provide journey time and safety improvements on each of the managed corridors, thus providing both travel time and accident benefits.</p> <p><b>Wider Economic Benefits (WEBs):</b> Improvements would result in more consistent and reliable journey times, as accidents on each of the routes can lead to substantial delays. A number of these roads are key tourist routes with fluctuating flow and trip patterns, therefore safety improvements would benefit a wide range of users.</p> <p><b>Economic Activity and Location Impacts (EALIs):</b> This intervention would support the general drive to improve safety on the trunk road network, and improve the attractiveness of each of these routes.</p>
Integration:	Neutral	<p><b>Transport Integration:</b> This intervention would have no effect on public transport integration and ticketing.</p> <p><b>Transport and Land Use Integration:</b> This intervention would not affect the need to travel. Minor improvements in strategic journey times on the various managed corridors would not significantly impact on development opportunities in the areas.</p> <p><b>Policy Integration:</b> This intervention would not affect policies related to disability, however may improve connections between the rural communities along these corridors, thus affecting rural affairs.</p>
Accessibility and Social Inclusion:	Minor Benefit	<p><b>Community Accessibility:</b> This intervention would improve accessibility on each of the routes as the intervention could include junction improvements which would provide easier access to the trunk road network.</p> <p><b>Comparative Accessibility:</b> This intervention would not impact on comparative accessibility.</p>

Table D3.5.3 Key Strategic Outcomes

Key Strategic Outcomes (KSO's)		
Objective:	Assessment Summary:	Supporting Information:
Improve Journey Times and Connections:	Minor Benefit	Climbing lanes and realigned sections at various locations would provide additional overtaking opportunities thus reducing the delay caused by slow moving vehicles. In addition to reduced journey times, reducing the number of accidents on the routes would result in improved reliability. Connections with other modes would be improved as a result.
Reduce Emissions:	Neutral	This intervention would not have a significant impact on emissions.
Improve Quality, Accessibility and Affordability:	Neutral	This intervention would increase the quality of road standard at a number of locations along the routes. Proposed 2+1 sections would allow safer overtaking opportunities, which would lead to a reduction in driver frustration. Accessibility would be improved as rural communities within the corridors would have improved access to the trunk road network, via any junction improvement. This intervention would not impact on affordability.

Table D3.5.4 Scottish Government's Strategic Objectives

Scottish Government's Strategic Objectives		
Objective:	Assessment Summary:	Supporting Information:
Safer and Stronger:	Moderate Benefit	This intervention would result in safer sections on the trunk road network, due to widened, realigned and 2+1 sections. Based on national road classification rates, typical rural single carriageway roads have a higher accident rate than widened single carriageway roads and 2+1 sections of rural roads. The improvements would help to bring those corridors with higher than average accident rates, closer to the national rates. It would not improve the quality, accessibility and affordability of public transport.
Smarter:	Neutral	This intervention would have no impact on access to schools, colleges and universities for those living along the corridor.
Wealthier and Fairer:	Minor Benefit	The measures comprised in this intervention would result in a degree of journey time savings, but would not significantly improve connections across Scotland. However, this intervention would result in more reliable journey times by generally upgrading a number of sections of the trunk road network, thus leading to more efficient transfer of goods on the network.
Greener:	Neutral	This intervention would not have any impact on emissions or result in any shift from car to public transport.
Healthier:	Neutral	This intervention would not have any impact on promoting healthier forms of transport or access to health services.

Table D3.5.5 Implementability Appraisal

Implementability Appraisal	
Technical:	No major technical issues are anticipated to arise from this intervention; however design would have to account for conditions along the rural corridors including terrain and land issues.
Operational:	The responsibility for operational issues on the proposed measures in this intervention would remain with Transport Scotland and its maintenance contractors.
Public:	It is considered that route improvements aimed at safety and improving journey times would be generally accepted by the public.

