TRANSPORT SCOTLAND

An agency of The Scottish Government

A9/A96 INSHES TO SMITHTON SCHEME

STAGE 2 SCHEME OPTIONS ASSESSMENT
VALUE FOR MONEY WORKSHOP

(CVRL Ref: 6174)

REPORT

Version: 30 June 2017

JACOBS

CONTACTS

Craig Cameron
Transport Scotland
Major Transport Infrastructure Projects (MTRIPS)

Email: Craig.Cameron@transport.gov.scot

Alan Duff / Helen Gregory
Jacobs

E-Mail: alan.duff@jacobs.com
helen.gregory@jacobs.com

Glyn Harrison
Capital Value & Risk Limited

E-mail: cvrlglynharrison@btconnect.com

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

1 INTRODUCTION

A one day Stage 2 Value for Money Workshop for the improvement options associated with the A9/A96 Inshes to Smithton scheme was held on 28th June 2017 with representatives of Transport Scotland (TS), their consultant, Jacobs and The Highland Council (THC).

Transport Scotland required an independent facilitator to manage the VfM study. Capital Value & Risk Limited (CVRL) was commissioned to undertake the study which incorporated the workshop.

The workshop was preceded by a briefing meeting on 20 June 2017 with TS, Jacobs and CVRL. Glyn Harrison facilitated the workshop with support from Amanda Harrison. The workshop was held at the Radisson Blu Hotel, Glasgow.

1.1 WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

As part of developing the scheme and in accordance with TS VfM procedures, the workshop was convened to undertake a value for money review of the proposed scheme options.

The purpose of the workshop was to reach consensus on the emerging preferred route for the scheme. The use of an Option Assessment Table was used to facilitate this process which took into account the utility score, capital cost and value index.

The workshop also addressed any specific issues/actions arising from the assessment process and for completion of Stage 2 study.

The resulting outputs from the workshop are recorded in this, the Workshop Report.

2 AGENDA

2 AGENDA

The workshop agenda timings were flexible but all elements were included.

9.45 **Coffee**

10:00 **Introduction**

- Introductions, objectives, process, agenda, rules & roles
- Welcome and Scheme History and Current Status – TS (5-10mins)
- Q&A

10:15 **Session 1– Scheme Information**

- Scheme objectives, key constraints and route options described including Traffic/Economics, Engineering, Environment, and capital costs –Jacobs
- Development Plan – Highland Council / TS (10mins)
- Q&A

11:00 **Session 2 - Option Matrix Assessment**

1. Option assessment criteria, scoring and weighting explained - Jacobs.
2. Economy
    a. Evaluation review process:
        i. Each evaluation criteria to be introduced and initial scoring for each to be provided by Jacobs.
        ii. Discussion on the performance of each option against the criteria.
        iii. Undertake any changes to the draft scoring for each criterion if necessary.
3. Safety
4. Environment

12.30 **Lunch**

13.30

- Environment cont'd
- Integration
- Accessibility and Social Conclusion
- Other

15.00 **Tea/Coffee**

15.10 **Options Assessment – Summary**

- Incorporation of capital costs
- Review of utility score and value index
- Discussion on the outputs from the matrix evaluation and rankings of options against key metric.

- Taking into account the above what is the preferred route option to take forward?
- Are there any sensitivity analyses to be considered on the outputs?

16.00 **Workshop Summary and Actions**

- Confirm the preferred route option?
- Way Forward for the study process.
- Actions Arising from workshop– Who? What? When?

16.30 **Workshop Close**

3 WORKSHOP BACKGROUND

3.1 SCHEME BACKGROUND

The Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR), published in 2008, set out the Scottish Government's transport investment priorities over the coming decades. Specific trunk road interventions emerging from the review included upgrading the A96 between Inverness and Nairn to dual carriageway with a new link connecting the A96 and A9 south of Inverness.

In 2010, Transport Scotland commissioned Jacobs to undertake the A96 Inshes to Nairn Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 2 Assessment, which included consideration of options for a new link road connecting Smithton on the A96 with Inshes on the A9.

Following this initial work, public exhibitions were held in 2012 where Transport Scotland presented proposals for a dual carriageway trunk link road between Inshes and Smithton. A number of concerns were raised by members of the public on the scale of the scheme proposals and the severance, accessibility and integration impacts of the scheme.

In addition, further traffic modelling work carried out before and after the public exhibitions highlighted the degree of inter-dependency between Inshes, Raigmore and Smithton junctions, and the adjacent road networks.

In view of public and other stakeholder feedback from the 2012 exhibitions, Transport Scotland commissioned Jacobs to carry out the A9/A96 Connections Study.

This work was carried out following Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG) principles, which look at all modes of transport including walking, cycling and public transport. The Connections Study examined the wider context of the A9/A96, looking at challenges, opportunities and issues concerning traffic between Inshes, Raigmore and Longman junctions. The final Connections Study Report recommends the grade-separation of the Longman junction and proposes two possible options for a single carriageway road connecting the A9 at Inshes across to the A96 at Smithton.

In 2014, Transport Scotland held public exhibitions to present the results of the A9/A96 Connections Study. Options C and D were identified as the best performing options.

Since then, Transport Scotland appointed Jacobs to take forward the next stage of assessment work being the route options assessment process on the A9/A96 road connection between Inshes and Smithton.

Nine sub-options were developed from Options C and D identified in the Connections Study. Following a sifting process, 3 options with an "A" and "B" variant to reflect the alternative alignment close to Ashton Farm were identified to be progressed to the next stage of the assessment process.

A Public Exhibition was held in August 2016 to present the findings of the sifting exercise and present the options being taken forward for further assessment as part of the DMRB Stage 2 Assessment process. Since the exhibitions and following feedback from the public the options have been further refined and developed. A detailed description of the options is provided in Section 3.3.

3.2 SCHEME OBJECTIVES

The route options assessment process takes into account the scheme objectives and the Scottish Government's five appraisal criteria, which are:

a. Environment
b. Safety
c. Economy
d. Integration
e. Accessibility and social inclusion.

The scheme specific objectives are:

1. To encourage more effective use of the road network hierarchy and thereby improve the operation of the network for longer distance and local journeys.

2. To contribute to The Highland Council's Development Plan aims for development east of the A9, and to complement the benefits arising from the dualling of the A96.

3. To improve safety for motorised and non-motorised users where the trunk and local road network interact.

4. To maximise opportunities for active travel and public transport connections arising from the road infrastructure improvements.

3.3 ROUTE OPTIONS

The following are the route option decriptions. Plans of the options can be found as part of the workshop presentations in Appendix A.

Option 1A:

The proposed alignment ties into the proposed grade separated A96 Smithton junction, to be delivered as part of the A96 Dualling Inverness to Nairn (including Nairn bypass) scheme, it continues through agricultural land where it passes to the west of Ashton Farm. From Ashton Farm it passes in a south west direction to form a roundabout to the east of Inverness Retail and Business Park. The western arm of this roundabout extends to tie in to Inverness Retail and Business Park. The proposed alignment then passes between the two elements of a scheduled monument and over the Highland Mainline railway via an overbridge. It continues south west to the proposed Cradlehall Roundabout (a four arm roundabout that ties into the existing Caulfield Road North). The proposed alignment passes on an embankment over Culloden Road via an overbridge, through Inshes Smallholdings and over the A9 via an overbridge. The proposed alignment then continues through Dell of Inshes where it ties into THC's Inshes Ph2 proposed roundabout at Inshes Retail Park. This option also includes a lane gain arrangement on the A9 Southbound between Raigmore and Inshes.

Option 1B:

The proposed alignment ties into the proposed grade separated A96 Smithton junction, to be delivered as part of the A96 Dualling Inverness to Nairn (including Nairn bypass) scheme and continues in a south west direction through agricultural land where it passes to the east of Ashton Farm. From Ashton Farm it continues in a south west direction to form a roundabout to the east of Inverness Retail and Business Park. The western arm of this roundabout extends to tie in to Inverness Retail and Business Park. The proposed alignment then passes to the east of a scheduled monument and over the Highland Mainline railway via an overbridge. It continues south west to the proposed Cradlehall Roundabout. The Cradlehall roundabout is a four arm roundabout that ties into the existing Caulfield Road North. The proposed alignment continues on an embankment over Culloden Road via an overbridge, through Inshes Smallholdings and over the A9 via an overbridge. The proposed alignment then proceeds in a north west direction through Dell of Inshes where it ties into THC's Inshes Ph2 proposed roundabout at Inshes Retail Park.

Option 2A:

The proposed alignment ties into the proposed grade separated A96 Smithton junction, to be delivered as part of the A96 Dualling Inverness to Nairn (including Nairn bypass) scheme, it continues through agricultural land where it passes to the west of Ashton Farm. From Ashton Farm it passes in a south west direction to form a roundabout to the east of Inverness Retail and Business Park. The western arm of this roundabout extends to tie in to Inverness Retail and Business Park. The proposed alignment then passes through between the two elements of a scheduled monument and over the Highland Mainline railway via an overbridge. It continues south west to the proposed Cradlehall Roundabout (a four arm roundabout that ties into the existing Caulfield Road North). The proposed alignment passes on an embankment over Culloden Road via an overbridge, through Inshes Smallholdings and over the A9 via an overbridge. A diverge slip road off the A9 southbound and a merge slip road onto the A9 southbound form a junction onto the proposed alignment to the east of the proposed A9 overbridge. The proposed alignment then continues through Dell of Inshes where it ties into THC's Inshes Ph2 proposed roundabout at Inshes Retail Park. This option also includes a lane gain arrangement on the A9 Southbound between Raigmore and Inshes. As part of this option the Inshes overbridge carrying Culloden Road over the A9 will be demolished and reconstructed to provide appropriate headroom for the new A9 diverge lane.

Option 2B:

The proposed alignment ties into the proposed grade separated A96 Smithton junction, to be delivered as part of the A96 Dualling Inverness to Nairn (including Nairn bypass) scheme, it continues through agricultural land where it passes to the east of Ashton Farm. From Ashton Farm it continues in a south west direction to form a roundabout to the east of Inverness Retail and Business Park. The western arm of this roundabout extends to tie in to Inverness Retail and Business Park. The proposed alignment then passes to the east of a scheduled monument and over the Highland Mainline via an overbridge. It continues south west to the proposed Cradlehall Roundabout. The Cradlehall roundabout is a four arm roundabout that ties into the existing Caulfield Road North. The proposed alignment continues on an embankment over Culloden Road via an overbridge, through Inshes Smallholdings and over the A9 via an overbridge. A diverge slip road off the A9 southbound and a merge slip road onto the A9 southbound form a junction onto the proposed alignment to the east of the proposed A9 overbridge. The proposed alignment then continues through Dell of Inshes where it ties into THC's Inshes Ph2

proposed roundabout at Inshes Retail Park. This option also includes a lane gain arrangement on the A9 Southbound between Raigmore and Inshes. As part of this option the Inshes overbridge carrying Culloden Road over the A9 will be demolished and reconstructed to provide appropriate headroom for the new A9 diverge lane.

Option 3A:

The proposed alignment ties into the proposed grade separated A96 Smithton junction, to be delivered as part of the A96 Dualling Inverness to Nairn (including Nairn bypass) scheme, it continues through agricultural land where it passes to the west of Ashton Farm. From Ashton Farm it passes in a south west direction to form a roundabout to the east of Inverness Retail and Business Park. The western arm of this roundabout extends to tie in to Inverness Retail and Business Park. The proposed alignment then passes between the two elements of a scheduled monument and over the Highland Mainline railway via an overbridge. It continues south west to the proposed Cradlehall Roundabout (a four arm roundabout that ties into the existing Caulfield Road North) and ties into Culloden Road. The Caulfield Road North approach to Culloden Road is to be widened. A new overbridge running parallel with the existing Inshes overbridge will be provided to accommodate two traffic lanes in each direction of travel. This option also includes a lane gain arrangement on the A9 Southbound.

Option 3B:

The proposed alignment ties into the proposed grade separated A96 Smithton junction, to be delivered as part of the A96 Dualling Inverness to Nairn (including Nairn bypass) scheme, it continues through agricultural land where it passes to the east of Ashton Farm. From Ashton Farm it passes in a south west direction to form a roundabout to the east of Inverness Retail and Business Park. The western arm of this roundabout extends to tie in to Inverness Retail and Business Park. The proposed alignment then passes to the west of the scheduled monument and over the Highland Mainline via an overbridge. It continues south west to the proposed Cradlehall Roundabout (a four arm roundabout that ties into the existing Caulfield Road North) and ties into Culloden road. The Caulfield Road North approach to Culloden Road is to be widened. A new overbridge running parallel with the existing Inshes overbridge will be provided to accommodate two traffic lanes in each direction of travel. This option also includes a lane gain arrangement on the A9 Southbound

3.4 SCHEME COSTS

Scheme cost estimates have been developed and are shown in the table below. Prices are at (2015 Q2 prices excluding VAT); the cost estimates include a quantified risk allowance, contingency and 25% optimism bias.

	Cost Range
Opt 1A/B	£35m – £45m
Opt 2A/B	£43m - £53m
Opt 3A/B	£25m - £35m

3.5 OPTIONS ASSESSMENT TABLE

The Option Assessment Table utilised and completed at the workshop is reproduced in Section 4. The main criteria used for the assessment were:

1. Economy
2. Safety
3. Environment
4. Integration
5. Accessibility and Social Inclusion
6. Other

Under the main criteria, a number of sub-criteria were assessed.

Each of the main criteria was allocated an equal weighting. Sub-criteria have been allocated weightings to reflect relative importance within the main criteria. For each assessment criterion the best performing option was allocated a score of 10 and the other options were then individually scored relative to the best.

The product of the weighting and the individual scores gives a utility score for the objective criteria. The summation of all utility score provides a total utility score for each option. The utility score is then divided by capital cost to provide a Value Index measure.

4 WORKSHOP OUTPUT

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The following sub-sections provide details on the outputs from the workshop sessions:

- Information
- Options Matrix Assessment
- Forward Plan/Actions

4.2 SESSION 1 - INFORMATION

An opening welcome from TS including explaining the Scheme History and Current Status was followed by Jacobs explaining the Scheme objectives, key constraints and route options along with information on the Traffic modelling. An update was given by THC on their Inshes Phase 2 scheme and their Development Plans were outlined.

Presentation information can be found in Appendix A.

During the various presentations the following discussion points or questions were noted:

1. Operational Modelling Summary
    a. The Highland Council scheme "Inshes Phase 2" is being developed in parallel with the Transport Scotland Inshes to Smithton scheme.

    b. THC noted that their traffic modelling gives different information from that provided by Jacobs/TS. The principal differences between the two assessments are likely to be the method of determining growth and wider reassignment effects.

    c. Jacobs are taking account of future growth and reassignment across the wider network by making use of the Moray Firth Transport Model (MFTM). Jacobs are content with their strategic and operational traffic modelling which has also been audited and approved by independent consultants.

    d. THC is content with the forecast scenarios used in the assessments: traffic – high growth; economics – low growth; environmental assessment – high growth.

2. Inshes Phase 2 Scheme and Development Plans
    a. The City Deal reflects THC's development plan.

    b. The SuDS infrastructure shown on the illustrative Phase 2 plans is now no longer required.

    c. For Inshes to Smithton option assessment purposes it is assumed that the Phase 2 scheme is implemented in full. Also, as part of the Do Minimum base line, the assumption is that the A96 Inverness to Nairn scheme is also completed.

    d. As part of the master planning exercise, a protocol is to be developed to achieve developer contributions.

3. Options
    a. Noted that Tesco is part of a larger retail site.

    b. THC thought that the A9 lane gain was a very beneficial part of the project to help reduce congestion.

    c. The existing weaving length between Raigmore and Inshes is 385m, with the proposed lane gain improving the weaving length to 660m. TS Standards Branch was consulted re the lane gain and provided with a technical paper outlining the various aspects of implementing this proposal.

    d. It was noted that the existing northbound lane gain arrangement between Inshes and Raigmore works very well.

Option 2 A & B

    e. Ques: Does the reconstructed Inshes overbridge as part of this option have additional traffic lanes? Ans: The current design proposal reflects a like-for-like replacement, but there may be advantages to considering upgrading the number of lanes.

    f. Ques: Why is the demolition of the bridge required under this option? Ans: In order to accommodate new compliant slip roads, the existing bridge would need to be demolished to allow suitable headroom clearance.

Option 2 PM Peak

g. The capacity of Tesco car park is approximately 500. Option 2 is the worst for the retail park because it attracts the highest levels of traffic in both directions, including a lot of right-turning traffic. In Option 1, the traffic stays on the A96.

h. It might make matters worse if traffic came off at Aldi but THC have not yet considered this in detail so no mitigation has been considered. There may be some further work to do on this depending upon which route option is chosen.

Option 3 A & B

i. Ques: Location is on the National Cycle Network route – what provision for NMUs? Ans: All options have an impact on NMUs and this will be looked at in more detail at DMRB Stage 3. Provision for NMUs is a Scottish Government criterion and must be taken into account.

j. It is difficult to differentiate between strategic and local traffic in the modelling. The increase in traffic on Barn Church Road is not unique to Option 3 and is common to all options.

k. Traffic signals may be linked along the corridor to try to maintain progression.

l. The parallel Inshes bridge should not be a constraint to visibility on the approach to the new junction at the retail park.

m. A pedestrian bridge crossing Culloden Road would potentially be of benefit but is not in any of the options at the moment. There would be difficulties accommodating a pedestrian bridge due to the relative level differences

4.3 OPTION ASSESSMENT MATRIX

The purpose and content of the options assessment matrix was explained at the outset by Jacobs.

As the workshop group progressed through the matrix, each evaluation criteria was introduced and an initial scoring for each provided by Jacobs. There was then discussion on the performance of each option against the criteria and any agreed adjustments to the draft scoring was made. The value of sub-criteria weighting was also discussed.

4.3.1 Table 1 – Options Assessment Matrix 1

The following table is the workshop completed options assessment matrix without adjustments for any sensitivity check. The background information presented in support of the proposed scores can be found in Appendix B. Agreed adjustments to the draft scores and any suggested sensitivity tests are noted adjacent to the relevant criteria.

A9/A96 Inshes to Smithton - Options 1, 2 & 3									Workshop Notes/Comments
COMPARATIVE SCHEME ASSESSMENT									
Options Analysis			Route Option 1A	Route Option 1B	Route Option 2A	Route Option 2B	Route Option 3A	Route Option 3B	
Main Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Weighting							
Economy	**EC1**: To encourage more effective use of the road network hierarchy and thereby improve the operation of the network for longer distance and local journeys **(Scheme Objective)**	7	8	8	10	10	6	6	
	EC2: To contribute to The Highland Council's Development Plan aims for development east of the A9, and to complement the benefits arising from the dualling of the A96 **(Scheme Objective)**	7	9	9	10	10	8	8	
	EC3: Transport Economic Efficiency (TEE)	6	10	9	8	7	6	5	Discussion on possible double counting with other criteria. Workshop agreed to keep scores as proposed in but could run a sensitivity check on utility total with EC3 criterion excluded.
	Economy Sub-Total:	**20**	**179**	**173**	**188**	**182**	**134**	**128**	
Safety	**S1**: To improve safety for motorised and non-motorised users where the trunk and local road interact **(Scheme Objective)**	**20**	8	8	9	9	10	10	Option 2 slightly better than 1 taking into account standards issues.
	Safety Sub-Total:	**20**	**160**	**160**	**180**	**180**	**200**	**200**	
Environment / Sustainability	**EN1**: Air Quality	2	10	10	10	10	10	10	
	EN2: Noise and Vibration	3	4	3	6	5	10	9	Further clarification of the differences in Noise & Vibration to be provided post-workshop.
	EN3: Landscape and Visual	3	5	5	5	5	10	10	
	EN4: Ecology and Nature Conservation	2	10	10	10	10	10	10	Agreed, no significant difference between the options.
	EN5: Geology and Soils	1	10	10	10	10	10	10	
	EN6: Road Drainage and the Water Environment (incl. Flood Risk, Fluvial Geomorphology & Water Quality)	2	10	9	10	9	10	9	

A9/A96 Inshes to Smithton - Options 1, 2 & 3									Workshop Notes/Comments
COMPARATIVE SCHEME ASSESSMENT									
Options Analysis			**Route Option 1A**	**Route Option 1B**	**Route Option 2A**	**Route Option 2B**	**Route Option 3A**	**Route Option 3B**	
Main Criteria	**Sub-Criteria**	**Weighting**							
	EN7: Cultural Heritage	2	6	8	6	8	8	10	
	EN8: Materials	2	7	6	6	5	10	9	
	EN9: Community and Private Assets (incl. Residential, Commercial & Industrial, Development Land and Agricultural & Forestry)	3	3	3	2	2	10	10	Sensitivity check on Option 1 and 2 scores- are these too low compared to Option 3?
	Environment / Sustainability Sub-Total:	**20**	**132**	**129**	**133**	**130**	**196**	**193**	
Integration	**IN1**: Integration with Local Plans and Policies, Regional and National Policies	20	8	10	8	10	8	10	B options provide more developable land
	Integration Sub-Total:	**20**	**160**	**200**	**160**	**200**	**160**	**200**	
Accessibility and Social Inclusion	**AS1**: To maximise opportunities for active travel and public transport connections arising from the road infrastructure improvements **(Scheme Objective)**	20	10	10	10	10	8	8	Option 3 active travel reduces score
	Accessibility and Social Inclusion Sub-Total:	**20**	**200**	**200**	**200**	**200**	**160**	**160**	
Other	**O1**: Construction impact on road users and local community	7	10	10	4	4	8	8	Significant diverted traffic on local network for Option 2
	O2: Contribution to Operational Resilience	6	9	9	10	10	8	8	
	O3: Promotability	7	4	4	3	3	10	10	Sensitivity test: score lowest 6 or remove Promotability from overall score.
	Other Sub-Total:	**20**	**152**	**152**	**109**	**109**	**174**	**174**	
	Utility		**983.0**	**1014.0**	**970.0**	**1001.0**	**1024.0**	**1055.0**	
	Cost £m (2015 Q1) *		**35.0**	**37.0**	**43.0**	**46.0**	**25.0**	**27.0**	
	Value Index		**28.1**	**27.4**	**22.6**	**21.8**	**41.0**	**39.1**	
	Ranking		**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**1**	**2**	

* Note: Spot costs have been used for the purposes of obtaining the value index. Costs ranges must continue to be used for all other purposes.

4.3.2 Table 2 - Options Assessment Matrix 2

A second review of the Options Assessment Matrix was undertaken at the workshop with the Promotability criterion removed. The respective weightings were adjusted for O1 and O2 to reflect this and all other criteria remained unadjusted. The revised Options Matrix is shown below:

A9/A96 Inshes to Smithton - Options 1, 2 & 3									Workshop Notes/Comments
COMPARATIVE SCHEME ASSESSMENT									
Options Analysis			Route Option 1A	Route Option 1B	Route Option 2A	Route Option 2B	Route Option 3A	Route Option 3B	
Main Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Weighting							
Other	**O1**: Construction impact on road users and local community	10	10	10	4	4	8	8	Significant diverted traffic on local network for Option 2
	O2: Contribution to Operational Resilience	10	9	9	10	10	8	8	
	O3: Promotability	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	Sensitivity test: score lowest 6 or remove Promotability from overall score
	Other Sub-Total:	**20**	**190**	**190**	**140**	**140**	**160**	**160**	
	Utility		**1021.0**	**1052.0**	**1001.0**	**1032.0**	**1010.0**	**1041.0**	
	Cost £m (2015 Q1) *		**35.0**	**37.0**	**43.0**	**46.0**	**25.0**	**27.0**	
	Value Index		**29.2**	**28.4**	**23.3**	**22.4**	**40.4**	**38.6**	
	Ranking		**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**1**	**2**	

* Note: Spot costs have been used for the purposes of obtaining the value index. Costs ranges must continue to be used for all other purposes.

4.4 WORKSHOP CONCLUSIONS AND ACTIONS

The following were the key outcomes of the options assessment process:

1. Option 3B has the highest utility score compared to other Options, followed by Option 3A (a score difference of 31), with Option 2A being the worst (having a score difference of 85 compared to Option 3B).
2. Should criterion EC3 be removed from the scoring process (proposed by some participants on the basis of some possible double counting) it would not change the above Utility ranking order.
3. If promotability is removed (requested sensitivity test), Option 1B is first, followed by Option 3B (a score difference of 11), with Option 2A being worse (having a score difference of 51 compared to Option 1B).
4. In terms of capital cost the lowest cost Option is 3A, followed by Option 3B (a £2m difference). Options 1A and 1B are next, (with £10m and £12m difference respectively compared to Option 3A). The highest cost Options are 2A and 2B (with £18m and £21m difference respectively compared to Option 3A).
5. The measure of Value expressed as an index (or ratio) of Utility divided by Cost results in Option 3A first, closely followed by Option 3B (circa 5% difference). Second are Options 1A and 1B (circa 33% less) and worse are Options 2A and 2B (circa 53% less).

It was noted that should the criteria weightings be adjusted, making them unequal, there would have to be a major change to these before the value ranking changed.

On the basis of the options assessment process, the workshop concluded that Options 3 is the best performing option overall.

With respect to comparing the A and B variants, it is evident that the road will form an important element of THC's masterplan for Inverness East. As these plans are currently in development it is considered appropriate not to be definitive at this stage with regard to the finalisation of the assessment of the A and B variants. This will allow design development and assessment work to be progressed at DMRB Stage 3 and will allow integration with the masterplan proposals to be better considered, alongside all other assessment criteria.

The following were the summary actions arising from the workshop:

4 WORKSHOP OUTPUT

1. Workshop Report to be compiled and issued to all participants within a month.
2. Jacobs to complete DMRB Stage 2 assessment report.
3. TS IDM meeting planned for August 2017.
4. Ministerial announcement to follow in due course.

Ongoing discussions/liaison between TS and THC to continue during the above timeframe.

At the conclusion of the workshop Craig Cameron, TS Project Manager thanked all participants for contributing constructively and positively to the workshop.

5 WORKSHOP LOGISTICS

5.1 PARTICIPANTS

The following participants attended the workshop:

Name	Organisation	Email
Craig Cameron	Transport Scotland, Project Manager	Craig.Cameron@transport.gov.scot
Adam Gould	Transport Scotland, Assistant Project Manager	Adam.Gould@transport.gov.scot
Paul Junik	Transport Scotland, Head of Transport Forecasts and Infrastructure Planning	Paul.Junik@transport.gov.scot
Alan Oliver	Transport Scotland, Standards Advisor	Alan.Oliver@transport.gov.scot
Yvette Sheppard	Transport Scotland, Environment and Sustainability Manager	Yvette.Sheppard@transport.gov.scot
Stephen Orr	Transport Scotland, MTRIPS Strategic Communications	Stephen.OrrComms@transport.gov.scot
John McDonald	Transport Scotland, Development Control	John.McDonald@transport.gov.scot
David Torrance	Transport Scotland, Senior transport Planner	David.Torrance@transport.gov.scot
Marco Bardelli	Transport Scotland, A9 Route Manager	Marco.Bardelli@transport.gov.scot
Malcom MacLeod	The Highland Council, Head of Planning and Building Standards	Malcolm.MacLeod@highland.gov.uk
Colin Howell	The Highland Council, Head of Infrastructure	Colin.Howell@highland.gov.uk
Bryan Stout	The Highland Council, Principal Engineer	Bryan.Stout@highland.gov.uk

Richard Gerring	The Highland Council, Transport Planner Manager	Richard.Gerring@highland.gov.uk
Helen Gregory	Jacobs, Contract Manager	Helen.Gregory@jacobs.com
Alan Duff	Jacobs, Contract Director	Alan.Duff@jacobs.com
Gary Tait	Jacobs, Project Manager	Gary.Tait@jacobs.com
Peter Simpson	Jacobs, Environmental Leadership and Context Manager	Peter.Simpson2@jacobs.com
Euan Barr	Jacobs, Transportation Manager	Euan.Barr@jacobs.com
Stewart Loose	Jacobs, Senior Transportation Consultant	Stewart.Loose@jacobs.com
Avril Regan	Jacobs, Highways Engineer	Avril.Regan@jacobs.com

Apologies:

Alasdair Graham	Transport Scotland, Head of Planning and Design	Alasdair.Graham@transport.gov.scot
Jim Brown	Transport Scotland, North East Unit Manager	Jim.Brown@transport.gov.scot
Graeme Reid	Transport Scotland, Construction Branch	Graeme.Reid@transport.gov.scot
Angus Corby	Transport Scotland, Landscape Advisor	Angus.Corby@transport.gov.scot

5.2 CAPITAL VALUE & RISK TEAM

Facilitator: Glyn Harrison
Assistant: Amanda Harrison

APPENDIX A – WORKSHOP SCHEME INFORMATION

TO BE INCLUDED IN FINAL REPORT

APPENDIX B – OPTION ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – DRAFT SCORING

TO BE INCLUDED IN FINAL REPORT