Objective	Sub-Objective	Element	REQUIRED EVALUATION	INITIAL 1YA EVALUATION Methodology	DETAILED 3YA and/or 5YA	EVALUATION Methodology
Objectives	Transport Planning Objectives	TPOs should be agreed at appraisal and refined as appropriate.	Minimum requirement for all projects.	1. Comment on whether Transport Planning Objectives are likely to be achieved.	STANDARD  1. Change in TPO indicator (quantitative where possible) using pre and post data.	n/a
Obje	Wider Policy / Transport Objectives	Contribution of project to wider policy / transport objectives	Minimum requirement for all projects. Quantified impacts only where impact has been forecast / identified.	<ol> <li>Comment on whether project contribution towards Wider Policy / Transport Objectives likely to be achieved.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Qualitative assessment of project contribution toward Wider Policy / Transport Objectives Indicators.</li> </ol>	1. Quantitative (where feas toward Wider Policy / Tran
	Project Programme	-	Minimum requirement for all projects. Advanced level optional at Detailed evaluation.	<ol> <li>Compare predicted and actual construction programme.</li> <li>Establish reasons for variance.</li> </ol>	1. Update 1YA if required.	1. Update 1YA if required. 2. Establish reasons for va
Process	Process	-	Minimum requirement for all projects.	<ol> <li>Confirmation of project management process through review of availability of key / statutory documentation produced over project cycle and required to support evaluation.</li> <li>Confirm that RSA Stage 4 Audit; Cycle Audit; Accessibility Audit; Land Compensation Surveys have been undertaken as required.</li> <li>Confirm that ES Mitigation measures are in place (reported under Environmental Criteria).</li> </ol>	1. Update 1YA if required. 2. Confirm RSA Stage 5 complete.	n/a
ators	Traffic Volumes	-	<b>Minimum</b> requirement for all projects. Advanced level optional at Detailed evaluation.	For project and wider network (as required e.g. bypassed section): 1. Comparison of pre (up to 3 years) and post opening traffic volumes and traffic composition if classified data is available. 2. Comparison of opening year forecast and actual traffic volumes and traffic composition if classified data is available.	<ul> <li>For project and wider network (as required e.g. bypassed section):</li> <li>1. Comparison of pre (up to 3 years) and post (up to 5 years) traffic volumes and traffic composition if classified data is available.</li> <li>2. Comparison of evaluation year forecast and post opening traffic volumes and traffic composition if classified data is available.</li> </ul>	Evaluation can extend to n traffic characteristics (e.g. expanded to cover a wider
Operational Indicators	Vehicle Speeds	-	Required only where impact has been forecast and / or relates to Transport Planning Objectives.	<ul><li>For project and wider network (as required e.g. bypassed section):</li><li>1. Comparison of pre and post opening vehicle speeds.</li><li>2. Comparison of opening year forecast and actual vehicle speeds.</li></ul>	For project and wider network (as required e.g. bypassed section): 1. Comparison of pre and post (up to 5 years) vehicle speeds. 2. Comparison of evaluation year forecast and post opening vehicle speeds.	Evaluation can extend to n traffic characteristics (e.g. expanded to cover a wider
Operatio	Journey Times	-	Required only where impact has been forecast and / or relates to Transport Planning Objectives.	<ul><li>For project and wider network (as required e.g. bypassed section):</li><li>1. Comparison of pre and post opening travel times.</li><li>2. Comparison of opening year forecast and actual travel times.</li></ul>	For project and wider network (as required e.g. bypassed section): 1. Comparison of pre and post (up to 5 years) travel times. 2. Comparison of evaluation year forecast and post opening travel times.	Evaluation can extend to n traffic characteristics (e.g. expanded to cover a wider
	Journey Time Reliability	-	Evaluation of Journey Time reliability is reported under User Benefits - Quality / Reliability Benefits.	-	-	
Environment	Noise and Vibration	DMRB, STAG and NISR	Minimum requirement for consideration at site visit.No further evaluation required if there are no issues identified / no specific relevance; anddoes not relate to Transport Planning Objectives.	<ol> <li>Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES have been implemented and are in satisfactory condition and to identify any additional issues / mitigation requirements.</li> <li>Review post-construction monitoring report, where available, for satisfactory performance of mitigation measures.</li> <li>Determine whether NISR 1st year assessment has been undertaken and any associated measures put in place.</li> <li>If traffic flows are 25% more or 20% less than expected than assume that the local noise impact is likely to be either 'worse than' or 'better than' expected</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES are in satisfactory condition and to identify any additional issues arising since 1YA site inspection.</li> <li>Comparison of 3/5YA observed vs. forecast traffic flows from ES. If traffic flows are 25% more or 20% less than expected then assume that the local noise impact is likely to be either 'worse than' or 'better than' expected.</li> <li>Determine whether any Part 1 Claims (under the Land Compensation Act 1973) have been made.</li> <li>Review of any existing noise survey / monitoring data pre and post construction including that collected to assess Part 1 Claims.</li> <li>If undertaking 5YA evaluation determine whether NISR 5th year assessment has been undertaken and any associated measures put in place.</li> <li>Noise surveys could also be utilised to spot check locations such as sensitive residential properties.</li> </ol>	Standard Evaluation + 1. Where flows are 25% m volumes, traffic compositio available. Review any nois consider the need for furth greater. Compare to the fi consider appropriate mitigs adverse than those identifi 2. Potentially review mone STAG methodology.
Env	Global Air Quality (Carbon Dioxide (CO <sub>2</sub> )	DMRB and STAG	Minimum requirement for consideration at site visit. No further evaluation required if there are no issues identified / no specific relevance; and does not relate to Transport Planning Objectives.	<ol> <li>Desk top review of as-built drawings to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES have been implemented.</li> <li>Review actual vs. forecast traffic from ES. If variance &lt;10% then assume scheme appraisal robust.</li> </ol>	Review actual vs. forecast traffic from ES. If variance <10% then assume scheme appraisal robust. Else review traffic flows, traffic composition and speeds as a proxy for expected change in emissions.	<ol> <li>Calculate the Present V change in carbon emission change in vehicle kilometri 2. Re-model the impacts to outturn data. Compare to consider appropriate mitigi shown to be more adverse 3. Potentially review mone STAG methodology.</li> </ol>

ADVANCED

asible) assessment of project contribution nsport Objectives Indicators.

ariance.

o more disaggregated examination of .g. by peak hour, journey purpose, etc); or ler network coverage.

o more disaggregated examination of .g. by peak hour, journey purpose, etc) or der network coverage.

o more disaggregated examination of .g. by peak hour, journey purpose, etc) or der network coverage.

more than forecast, compare traffic ition (HGVs) and vehicle speeds if data is noise monitoring data where available and rther surveys where actual traffic is 25% or e findings of the ES and, if necessary, tigation if the results are shown to be more

tified in the ES. tisation of benefits / impacts as per the

: Value Benefit (PVB (£)) of the total sions due to the project based on the actual etres travelled / fuel consumed.

to global air quality over study area using to the findings of the ES and, if necessary tigation if the results of the assessment are see than those identified in the ES.

etisation of benefits / impacts as per the

Objective	Sub-Objective	Eloment	REQUIRED	INITIAL 1YA	DETAILED 3YA and/or 5YA	EVALUATION Methodology
Objective	Sub-Objective	Element	EVALUATION	EVALUATION Methodology	STANDARD	ł
	Local Air Quality (Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> ) and Nitrogen Dioxide (NO) <sub>2</sub> )	DMRB and STAG	<b>Minimum</b> requirement for consideration at <b>site visit</b> . No further evaluation required if: No issues identified / no specific relevance; and does not relate to Transport Planning Objectives.	<ol> <li>Desk top review of as-built drawings to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES have been implemented.</li> <li>Site visit to confirm mitigation measures where relevant and to identify any additional issues / mitigation requirements.</li> <li>Review actual vs. forecast traffic from ES. If variance &lt;10% then assume scheme appraisal robust.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES, where relevant are in a satisfactory condition, and to identify any additional issues arising since 1YA site inspection.</li> <li>Review actual vs. forecast traffic from ES. If traffic flows vary by more than +/- 10% AADT than expected than assume that the local air quality is likely to be either 'worse than' or 'better than' expected. Compare traffic volumes, traffic composition (HGVs) and vehicle speeds if data is available.</li> <li>Desk top analysis using published air quality data for the road links where available, compared to the findings of the ES and against National Air Quality Standards to determine if exceedances have occurred.</li> </ol>	Re-model the impacts to lo outturn data. Where flows simple assessment based representative receptors. C ES and against National Ai whether exceedance is like appropriate mitigation if the to be more adverse than th
	Water Quality, Drainage and Flood Defence	DMRB and STAG	Minimum requirement for consideration at site visit. No further evaluation required if there are no issues identified / no specific relevance; and does not relate to Transport Planning Objectives.	Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES have been implemented and are in satisfactory condition and to identify any additional issues / mitigation requirements.	<ol> <li>Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES are in satisfactory condition and to identify any additional issues arising since 1YA site inspection.</li> <li>Desk top analysis of water quality data from SEPA, where available, compare against forecasts under the Water Framework Directive.</li> <li>Review any information on flood or drainage issues at the completed scheme.</li> </ol>	Standard Evaluation + 1. Sampling of water quality ground water reserves acro- against the results of the E for the watercourse. 2. Determine level of impace
Environment	Geology	DMRB and STAG	Minimum requirement for consideration at site visit. No further evaluation required if there are no issues identified / no specific relevance; and does not relate to Transport Planning Objectives.	<ol> <li>Site visit to confirm mitigation measures, including contaminated land mitigation measures, identified in ES have been implemented and are performing as expected and to identify any additional issues / mitigation requirements.</li> <li>Review contaminated land / groundwater monitoring data, where available, for satisfactory performance of mitigation measures.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES are in satisfactory condition and to identify any additional issues arising since 1YA site inspection.</li> <li>Assess sites of particular geological importance during site visit - evaluate degree to which the project has affected hydrogeology or buried / damaged important geological deposits or outcrops.</li> <li>Review of available information regarding sites (SNH and Local Authorities) and contaminated land (SEPA and local authorities) to establish whether mitigation measures have been implemented and are in satisfactory condition.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Repeat Standard Assess beyond).</li> <li>Consultation with the Lo whether contaminated land and to identify any addition</li> </ol>
	Biodiversity and Habitats	DMRB and STAG	Minimum requirement for consideration at site visit. No further evaluation required if there are no issues identified / no specific relevance; and does not relate to Transport Planning Objectives.	<ol> <li>Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES have been implemented and are in satisfactory condition and to identify any additional issues / mitigation requirements.</li> <li>Review post-construction monitoring information, where available, for satisfactory performance of mitigation measures.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES are in satisfactory condition and to identify any additional issues arising since 1YA site inspection. Reference should be made to the guidance set out in DMRB Volume 10, Section 4 for information.</li> <li>Obtain data on any Road Traffic Accidents involving protected species as per the Maintenance Term Contracts, and any wildlife road kill data available.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Repeat Standard Assess beyond) to show the trend recommend further studies required.</li> <li>Stakeholder consultation local wildlife groups should likelihood for additional pro area.</li> <li>Site inspection and habit changes in the surrounding (other surveys may be dee depending upon the projec</li> <li>Repeat protected specie</li> </ol>
	Landscape	DMRB and STAG	Minimum requirement for consideration at site visit. No further evaluation required if there are no issues identified / no specific relevance; and does not relate to Transport Planning Objectives.	Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES have been implemented and are performing as expected and to identify any additional issues / mitigation requirements.	<ol> <li>Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES are in satisfactory condition and to identify any additional issues arising since 1YA site inspection. Reference should be made to the guidance set out in DMRB Volume 10, Section 3.</li> <li>Utilise information in Landscape Character assessments to determine whether the guidance for particular Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) has been incorporated into the project design.</li> </ol>	1. Repeat Standard Assess beyond) to show the trend record how the project has landscape following the est
	Visual Amenity	DMRB and STAG	Minimum requirement for consideration at site visit. No further evaluation required if there are no issues identified / no specific relevance; and does not relate to Transport Planning Objectives.	Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES have been implemented and are performing as expected and to identify any additional issues / mitigation requirements.	<ol> <li>Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES are in satisfactory condition and to identify any additional issues arising since 1YA site inspection.</li> <li>At site visit, take photographs from the key viewpoints identified in the ES and assess against the identified changes in the ES or photomontages.</li> <li>Determine whether any Part 1 Claims (under the Land Compensation Act 1973) have been made and review.</li> </ol>	1. Repeat Standard Assess beyond) to show the trend record how the implemente identified in the ES and any produced following the esta

#### IУ

## ADVANCED

- Docal air quality over the study area using ws are 10% more than forecast consider a ed on DMRB methodology at
- . Compare the data to that predicted in the Air Quality standards to determine
- kely to occur. If necessary, consider
- the results of the assessment are shown those identified in the ES.

ality from affected watercourses and cross the study area for comparison ES and Water framework Objectives set

bact on drainage and flood hydrograph.

essment methodology after 5 years (or

Local Authority and SEPA to determine and mitigation is performing as expected ional issues / mitigation requirements.

essment methodology after 5 years (or nd in impacts over the time period and to ies / mitigation measures if deemed to be

tion with Scottish Natural Heritage and uld be undertaken to determine the protected species to be present in the

abitat survey to identify any significant ling environment compared with predicted leemed appropriate at this stage ject and the surrounding environment). cies surveys undertaken during the EIA.

essment methodology after 5 years (or nd in impacts over the time period and to as been integrated into the wider establishment of any mitigation.

essment methodology after 5 years (or nd in impacts over the time period and to nted project compares to the impacts any photomontages that may have been stablishment of any mitigation.

Objective	Sub-Objective	Element	REQUIRED	INITIAL 1YA	DETAILED 3YA and/or 5YA	
	- Oub-Objective		EVALUATION	EVALUATION Methodology	STANDARD	
	Agriculture and Soils	DMRB and STAG	Minimum requirement for consideration at site visit. No further evaluation required if there are no issues identified / no specific relevance; and does not relate to Transport Planning Objectives.	Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES have been implemented and are performing as expected and to identify any additional issues / mitigation requirements.	<ol> <li>Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES are in satisfactory condition and to identify any additional issues arising since 1YA site inspection.</li> <li>Review soil testing data and site photographs from pre and post construction phases where available.</li> <li>Identification of exact land-take from areas of Prime Quality Agricultural Land and compare against the figures from the ES.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Repeat Standard Assest beyond).</li> <li>Consultation with affect Directorate for Agriculture viability of farm holdings for project.</li> </ol>
Environment	Cultural Heritage	DMRB and STAG	<b>Minimum</b> requirement for consideration at <b>site visit</b> . No further evaluation required if there are no issues identified / no specific relevance; and does not relate to Transport Planning Objectives.	Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES have been implemented and are performing as expected and to identify any additional issues / mitigation requirements.	<ol> <li>Desk top analysis and site inspection to determine where direct impacts or impacts to the setting of cultural heritage features has occurred. Review the effectiveness of the implemented mitigation measures.</li> <li>Review archaeological report from project construction phase and further assess any identified mitigation measures recommended.</li> <li>Stakeholder consultation with Historic Environment Scotland and the Local Authority Archaeology Departments.</li> </ol>	1. Repeat Standard Asses beyond).
	Physical Fitness, Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects	STAG (Physical Fitness), DMRB (Pedestrians and Others)	Minimum requirement for consideration at site visit. No further evaluation required if there are no issues identified / no specific relevance; and does not relate to Transport Planning Objectives.	Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES have been implemented and are performing as expected and to identify any additional issues / mitigation requirements.	<ol> <li>Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES are in satisfactory condition and to identify any additional issues arising since 1 YA site inspection.</li> <li>Pre and post monitoring, where available, to determine change in number of walk and cycle trips (outcomes).</li> <li>Consultation with local authority and local community groups.</li> </ol>	1. Repeat Standard Asses beyond).
	Land Use	DMRB	Minimum requirement for consideration at site visit. No further evaluation required if there are no issues identified / no specific relevance; and does not relate to Transport Planning Objectives.	Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES have been implemented and are performing as expected and to identify any additional issues / mitigation requirements.	<ol> <li>Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES are in a satisfactory condition and to identify any additional issues arising since 1 YA site inspection.</li> <li>Identification of exact land-take from different land uses and compare against the figures from the ES. Consultation with affected landowners following the implementation of the project regarding the operation of affected land uses.</li> </ol>	1. Repeat Standard Asses beyond).
	Vehicle Travellers	DMRB	<b>Minimum</b> requirement for consideration at <b>site visit</b> . No further evaluation required if there are no issues identified / no specific relevance; and does not relate to Transport Planning Objectives.	Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES have been implemented and are performing as expected and to identify any additional issues / mitigation requirements.	<ol> <li>Site visit to confirm mitigation measures identified in ES are in a satisfactory condition and to identify any additional issues arising since 1YA site inspection.</li> <li>At site visit, take photographs from the key viewpoints identified in the ES and assess against the identified changes in the ES or photomontages.</li> <li>Review pre and post opening traffic flows and speeds as a proxy for expected change in driver stress.</li> </ol>	1. Repeat Standard Assest beyond) to show the trend record how the implement identified in the ES and ar produced following the est 2. Re-model driver stress Compare to the findings of additional mitigation to be
Safety	Accidents	Change in Annual Personal Injury Accidents (total and by severity) Total Discounted Savings	<b>Minimum</b> requirement for all projects. Advanced level optional at Detailed evaluation.	For project and wider network (as required e.g. bypassed section): 1. Comparison of pre and post opening accidents by severity & location using STATS19 3 Years pre opening data against 1 Year post opening data 2. Review RSA to establish whether any further investigation / post- implementation mitigation required 3. Link to any anecdotal evidence from Stakeholder Engagement	<ul> <li>For project and wider network (as required e.g. bypassed section):</li> <li>1. Comparison of pre and post opening accidents by severity &amp; location using STATS 19 3 Years pre opening data against 3/5 Years post opening data.</li> <li>2. Comparison of predicted vs. observed accident numbers and establish reason for variance.</li> <li>3. Review RSA to establish whether any further investigation / post-implementation mitigation required.</li> <li>4. Link to any anecdotal evidence from Stakeholders.</li> <li>5. Analysis of accident causation factors (where project targeted specific accident types).</li> </ul>	Standard Evaluation + 1. Stakeholder Consultation understanding of project of 2. If accident savings are economic assessment for actual data.
	Security		<b>Minimum</b> requirement for all projects. Advanced level optional at Detailed evaluation.	<ol> <li>Desk top analysis and site visit to assess any changes to security.</li> <li>Link to anecdotal evidence from Stakeholders.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Desk top analysis and site visit to assess any changes to security.</li> <li>Link to anecdotal evidence from Stakeholders.</li> </ol>	Standard Evaluation + 1. Consultation with stake groups, local schools or c of project outcomes.

#### qv

## ADVANCED

ssment methodology after 5 years (or

ected landowners and Scottish Governmen ire, Food and Rural Communities on the following the implementation of the

essment methodology after 5 years (or

essment methodology after 5 years (or

essment methodology after 5 years (or

essment methodology after 5 years (or nd in impacts over the time period and to ented project compares to the impacts any photomontages that may have been establishment of any mitigation. ss over study area using outturn data. s of the ES and, if necessary recommend e considered.

ation (e.g. community groups) to gain

ct outcomes. re significant contributor to PV, update for personal injury accident savings using

keholder groups (e.g. walking / cycling r community groups) to gain understanding

Objective	Sub-Objective	Element	REQUIRED EVALUATION	INITIAL 1YA EVALUATION Methodology	DETAILED 3YA and/or 5YA STANDARD	EVALUATION Methodology
	Transport Economic Efficiency (TEE) User Benefits	Travel Time	<b>Minimum</b> requirement for all projects. Advanced level optional at Detailed evaluation.	Comparison of approximate traffic predictions and actual opening year traffic flows to provide a statement on the likelihood of having over or under predicted the economic benefits during the appraisal. Collection and analysis of survey data restricted to the project and bypassed section for a bypass project.	<ul> <li>Analysis of traffic survey data over the project area (including bypass routes for bypass projects), including the project and any other significant routes:</li> <li>1. Comparison of predicted v outturn journey times and vehicle hours - use volumetric data and journey time surveys (model based figures can be used where pre opening surveys are not present) to calculate journey time impacts by time period and change in vehicular hours.</li> <li>2. Monetise impacts and undertake comparison of predicted v outturn Present Value of Benefits (PVB).</li> </ul>	Standard analysis of traffic intermediate and strategic 1. Re-run of economic mo
		User Charges	Required only where impact has been forecast and / or relates to Transport Planning Objectives.	Where relevant - desk review to establish any likely changes in charges post opening.	Where relevant - simple estimation of volume and charge rates. Noting real changes in charge levels.	Re-run economic modellin
		Vehicle Operating Costs	Minimum requirement for all projects. Advanced level optional at Detailed evaluation.	Use of traffic volumes, and any available journey time evidence as a proxy for VOC changes - noting inherent distance changes from the project (a bypass is typically a longer route).	Proxy journey time, project distance and volume data to estimate impact on VOC - note it may be more appropriate/simpler to re-run the economic models.	Re-run economic modellin
omy		Quality / Reliability Benefits	Required only where impact has been forecast and / or relates to Transport Planning Objectives.	<ol> <li>Observations and anecdotal evidence from local stakeholders.</li> <li>Comparison of pre and post opening route stress (AADT/Congestion Reference Flow) using observed traffic volumes.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Observations and anecdotal evidence from key stakeholders.</li> <li>Comparison of pre and post opening route stress (AADT/Congestion Reference Flow) using observed traffic volumes.</li> </ol>	Standard Evaluation + 1. Determine journey time deviation of journey time. more extensive journey tim (assessment should reflec re-run models using obser
Economy	Wider Economic Benefits	Agglomeration economies		Identify specific developments linked to the project prior to construction, and note status of development.	<ol> <li>Identify specific developments linked to the project prior to construction, and note status of development.</li> <li>Identify indicators - floorspace, direct employment, any identified indirect employment.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Review and analysis of of employment.</li> <li>Determine any changes attributable to the project.</li> </ol>
		Wider benefits arising from improved labour supply	Required only where impact has been forecast and / or relates to Transport Planning Objectives.	<ol> <li>Identify specific developments linked to the project prior to construction, and note status of development.</li> <li>Identify indicators - floorspace, direct employment, any identified indirect employment.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Identify specific developments linked to the project prior to construction, and note status of development.</li> <li>Identify indicators - floorspace, direct employment, any identified indirect employment.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Stakeholder consultatio</li> <li>Review and analysis of of employment.</li> <li>Determine any changes attributable to the project.</li> <li>Stakeholder consultatio</li> <li>Business surveys with r Labour supply catchments project has affected the cat</li> </ol>
	Economic Activity and Location Impacts	Local Economic Impacts	Required only where impact has been forecast and / or relates to Transport Planning Objectives.	<ul> <li>EALI are very project specific. Reference to base document needs to be starting point.</li> <li>1. Minimal impacts anticipated in first year. Need to highlight showstoppers, these will be very local direct impacts from a project - consultation with local planning officers and desk based review.</li> </ul>	<ul><li>EALI are very project specific. Reference to base document needs to be starting point.</li><li>1. Desk review based on discussions with local planning officers.</li></ul>	Business Surveys of sector economic change over the and employment change,
		National Economic Impacts	Required only at Detailed Evaluation on exceptionally large national projects	Should only be assessed or exceptionally large national projects and not normally after 1 year.	Should only be assessed for exceptionally large national projects. Methodology should be agreed with STE Branch.	n/a
		Distributional Impacts	Required only where project is in designated Regeneration Area and impact has been forecast.	<ul><li>EALI are very project specific. Reference to base document needs to be starting point.</li><li>1. Minimal impacts anticipated in first year. Need to highlight showstoppers, these will be very local direct impacts from a project - consultation with local planning officers.</li></ul>	<ul> <li>EALI are very project specific. Reference to base document needs to be starting point.</li> <li>1. Desk review based on discussions with local planning officers - mapping of areas to have gained / lost from transport project - impact on economies assessed through planning officer discussions.</li> </ul>	Business Surveys of sector economic change over the and employment change,
ation	Transport Integration	Services & Ticketing Infrastructure & Information	Required only where impact has been forecast and / or relates to Transport Planning Objectives.	<ol> <li>Site visit to confirm proposed changes to public transport infrastructure / services / ticketing etc have been implemented, are operating as expected and to identify any additional issues.</li> <li>Consultation with TS PM, TS Route Manager and Local Authority.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Site visit to confirm proposed changes to public transport infrastructure / services / ticketing etc have been implemented and operating as expected and to identify any additional issues.</li> <li>Consultation with TS PM, TS Route Manager and Local Authority.</li> </ol>	Standard Evaluation + 1. Consultation with local p perceived change in trans
Integration	Land-use Transport Integration	-	Required only where impact has been forecast and / or relates to Transport Planning Objectives.	1. Comment on strategic fit with local and national planning policies undertaken prior to implementation.	<ol> <li>Confirm strategic fit with local and national planning policies undertaken prior to implementation.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Review of project appra land-use and transport inte potential impact on forecas 2. Stakeholder consultatio</li> </ol>

#### gy

## ADVANCED

iffic survey data extended over the gic project area + nodels (e.g. NESA) using actual data.

ling program using outturn data.

lling program using outturn data.

ne variability – change in standard e. Where reliability is a key objective, time variability data may be required lect methodology adopted for forecast and served data as appropriate).

of published local and regional indicators

ges in employment patterns potentially ct.

tion with relevant enterprise body. of published local and regional indicators

es in employment patterns potentially ct.

ation with relevant enterprise body. th main employers in area to understand ents, and thus identify proxy for how the e catchments.

ctors identified in base data. Focus on the period. Simple estimates of likely GVA e, business investment rates.

ctors identified in base data. Focus on the period. Simple estimates of likely GVA e, business investment rates.

al public transport operators to establish nsport integration.

raisal methodology to establish whether ntegration was accounted for. Comment or casts.

Objective	Sub-Objective	Element	REQUIRED	INITIAL 1YA	DETAILED 3YA and/or 5YA	EVALUATION Methodolog
			EVALUATION	EVALUATION Methodology	STANDARD	
	Policy Integration		Required only where impact has been forecast and / or relates to Transport Planning Objectives.	1. Comment on strategic fit with wider Scottish policy context undertaken prior to implementation.	<ol> <li>Confirm strategic fit with wider Scottish policy context undertaken prior to implementation.</li> </ol>	n/a
Ision	Community Accessibility	Public Transport Network Coverage	Required only where impact has been forecast and / or relates to	1. Identify any changes to local public transport network through site visit / desk top review including assessment of the bus network coverage, routeing and frequency.	<ol> <li>Identify any changes to local public transport network through site visit / desk top review including assessment of the bus network coverage, routeing and frequency.</li> </ol>	Standard Evaluation + 1. Stakeholder consultative transport operators, common 2. Comparison of local in- to bus stop, bus punctual 3. Re-assess using Acce public transport and emplications supermarket destinations
Social Inclusion		Access to Other Local Services	Transport Planning Objectives.	<ol> <li>Identify any changes to walking / cycling accessibility through site visit / desk top review of changes to footpaths, rights of way, pedestrian crossings, bridges, cycle lanes and cycle routes.</li> <li>Review Cycling Audit and comment on findings / recommendations.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Identify any changes to walking / cycling accessibility through site visit / desk top review of changes to footpaths, rights of way, pedestrian crossings, bridges, cycle lanes and cycle routes.</li> <li>Review Cycling Audit and comment on findings / recommendations.</li> </ol>	Standard Evaluation + 1. Stakeholder consultati local community groups, 2. Analyse pre and post p
Accessibility & S	Comparative Accessibility	Distribution / Spatial Impacts by Social Group		<ol> <li>Identify any changes to access to transport for socially excluded groups through site visit and desk top review.</li> <li>Review Accessibility Audit and comment on findings / recommendations.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Identify any changes to access to transport for socially excluded groups through site visit and desk top review.</li> <li>Review Accessibility Audit and comment on findings / recommendations.</li> </ol>	Standard Evaluation + 1. Stakeholder consultati seekers, disabled people 2. Examine data from Sc
ccess			Required only where impact has been forecast and / or relates to Transport Planning Objectives.			
A		Distribution / Spatial Impacts by Area		<ol> <li>Identify any changes to access to transport for deprived and rural areas through site visit and desk top review.</li> <li>Link to anecdotal evidence from key stakeholders.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Identify any changes to access to transport for deprived and rural areas through site visit and desk top review.</li> <li>Link to anecdotal evidence from key stakeholders.</li> </ol>	Standard Evaluation + 1. Stakeholder consultati seekers, disabled people 2. Examine data from Sc
		Public Sector Investment Costs	Minimum requirement for all projects. Advanced level optional at Detailed evaluation.	<ol> <li>Comparison of predicted and outturn project costs with reference to timeframes and impact of construction inflation plus overall build programme on outturn costs, as well as the base figures (where available, disaggregate construction, land, preparation and supervision costs).</li> <li>Establish reasons for variance.</li> </ol>	1. Update 1YA if required.	Standard Evaluation + 1. Compare historic chan scheme appraisal, pre-te available, disaggregate c supervision costs. Asses estimate from risk and op understand better project 2. Establish reasons for v
ment		Present Value of Transport Benefits	Minimum requirement for all projects. Advanced level optional at Detailed evaluation.	Reference to User Benefit and Accident 1 Year analysis to develop a <i>qualitative</i> assessment of benefits against forecast estimate.	Reference to User Benefit and Accident 1 Year analysis to develop a qualitative assessment of benefits against forecast estimate.	Comparison of forecast a benefits highlighted abov model for some of the ele
overn		Present Value of Cost to Government	Minimum requirement for all projects.	Re-estimated based on outturn costs.	Re-estimated based on outturn costs.	n/a
Cost to Governme		Net Present Value	Minimum requirement for all projects. Advanced level optional at Detailed evaluation.	Reference to PVB and PVC changes to develop a <i>qualitative</i> assessment of benefits against forecast estimate.	Reference to PVB and PVC changes to develop a <i>qualitative</i> assessment of benefits against forecast estimate.	Reference to PVB and P assessment of benefits a
Cos		Benefit-Cost to Government Ratio	Minimum requirement for all projects. Advanced level optional at Detailed evaluation.	Reference to PVB and PVC changes to develop a <i>qualitative</i> assessment of benefits against forecast estimate.	Reference to PVB and PVC changes to develop a <i>qualitative</i> assessment of benefits against forecast estimate.	Reference to PVB and P assessment of benefits a
		Benefit-Cost to Government Ratio (including WEBs)	Required ordination: Required only where WEBs are a key feature of the project objectives.	Reference BCR <sup>1</sup> and assessment of WEBs impact to identify qualitative assessment.	Update 1YA as required. Reference BCR <sup>1</sup> and assessment of WEBs impact to identify qualitative assessment.	n/a
		Benefit-Cost to Funding Agency Ratio	Required only where significant investment from 3rd parties >10% capital cost.	Reference BCR <sup>1</sup> and assessment of whether wider project capital support did materialise.	Update 1YA as required. Reference BCR <sup>1</sup> and assessment of whether wider project capital support did materialise.	n/a

### ogy

ADVANCED

- ation with local stakeholders e.g. public ommunity groups.
- l indicators pre and post opening nearness uality and mode share.
- cession to model changes in access to mployment, education, health and
- 103
- ation with local stakeholders e.g. Sustrans, os, walking groups and cycling groups. st pedestrian / cyclist counts.
- ation with specific focus groups e.g. job ble, ethnic minorities. Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation.
- ation with specific focus groups e.g. job ple, ethnic minorities. <u>Scottish Index of Multiple</u> Deprivation.
- hange in predicted vs. actual costs. (e.g. at h-tender and tender, outturn) and where e construction, land, preparation and sessment to breakdown the effects of point l optimism bias in the cost calculations to lect cost structures. or variance.
- t and outturn PVB based on evidence of ove - this may be a re-run of the economic elements.
- PVC changes to develop a *quantitative* s against forecast estimate.
- PVC changes to develop a *quantitative* s against forecast estimate.