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• Audit Findings
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Who are we?

• National Transport Agency for Scotland
• Responsible for:
  – £2bn Annual spend
  – Delivery of Government’s capital road and rail investment programme
  – Manage, Operate and Maintain the Trunk Roads
  – Funding and managing Scottish rail services
  – National concessionary travel and smart ticketing
  – Lifeline air and ferry services
• Over 500 employees in Edinburgh & Glasgow
Role of the Network

- Trunk Road 3,432 km
- Motorways 539 km (16%)
- A roads Dual 512 km (15%)
- A roads Single 2,381 km (69%)
- Local Road 54,776 km

- 6% of total Scottish road network
- 37.5% of all traffic
- 63% of all HGV traffic
- 2,007 bridges and 4,100 other structures

- Asset Value £18 billion
- 4 Operating Companies
- 4 DBFOs
Skid Resistance

Summary: This Standard describes how the provision of appropriate levels of skid resistance for trunk roads will be managed. It details how measurements of skid resistance are to be made and interpreted and is complemented by HD 96 (DMRB 7.5.1), which sets out advice on surfacing material characteristics. This latest revision has changed requirements for setting investigatory levels, for annual SGRIM surveys, for determining the characteristic SGRIM coefficient and has further updates in line with current policy.
Survey Strategy

• SCRIM

• Previously 50% annually
• MSSC with benchmark sites

• Now 100% Annually
• 3rd year move to CSC
## Long List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority 1</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 2</td>
<td>3014</td>
<td>2490</td>
<td>1715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 3</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 4</td>
<td>12,071</td>
<td>13,806</td>
<td>13,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,888</td>
<td>18,429</td>
<td>16,574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site Priority by Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Level</th>
<th>2012 Total</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority 1</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 2</td>
<td>1715</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 3</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 4</td>
<td>13,172</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>2286</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>6933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16,574</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>3027</td>
<td>3675</td>
<td>8537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prioritisation

Prioritisation Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Wet Skidding Crashes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority 1</td>
<td>1 or more wet skidding crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 2</td>
<td>No wet skidding crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 3</td>
<td>No wet skidding crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 4</td>
<td>No wet skidding crashes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process

- Site Category Review (desk based)
- Create long list (system generated)
- Initial Investigation (desk based)
- Detailed Investigation (site based)
- Templates to assist investigations
- Reports uploaded to database
- Prioritise actions for work programmes
Delivery

- 4th Generation Contract
- 4 Operating Companies
- Geographical Units
- All aspects of road maintenance and network management
- Includes delivery of skid policy
- Delegated authority and responsibility
Risks to Transport Scotland

- Incorrect application
- Insufficient resource
- Inconsistency of approach
- Overly conservative approach
- Recommendations do not lead to action
- Policy not effective in achieving aims
Mitigation & Support

- Skid Manager Role – Key Staff in 4G
- Monthly progress monitoring
- Annual audit of system
- Annual audit investigation sites
- Annual Report
- Skid Policy Users’ Group (SPUG)
Audit findings

• Sufficiency of resources
• Appropriateness of resources
• Differing approaches
  – Initial investigation process
  – Consideration of crash data
  – Site category reviews
• Closing the loop
• Funding allocation
Future developments

• Policy effectiveness and benefits
• Prioritisation model
• Revision to HD28 & TS Guidance
• Software development to support
• Research into skid performance based on material type and aggregate source
Summary & Conclusion

• Skid Policy has matured
• OC Contract successfully delivers policy
• Mitigation measures effective at managing the risk
• Future developments
  – Enhance the policy
  – Ensure its effectiveness
  – Improve efficiency
  – Lead to better skid performance