

**Church of Scotland – Ministries Council
Planning and Deployment Committee
2011 Blue Book Table**

Part I. Revised population

1. 2009 Population Projections

Population is the primary factor in determining the number of ministries each Presbytery is entitled to. When the National Guidelines for the Deployment of Ministries were agreed in 2005 it was based on the 2001 Census. This raw data was analysed to discover the number of people the Church of Scotland was responsible for in each Presbytery. This enabled a calculation to be done, which gave each Presbytery a percentage of the total ministries available to the church. In 2005 this was based on 1125 ministries being available. In 2010 the General Assembly approved a revision, based this time on 1000 ministries. This revision however still relied on the 2001 census information.

It was known in 2005, and especially in 2010, that the 2001 census information was out of date. The GROS (General Register Office of Scotland) publishes regular population updates, but until now it has not been possible to relate this to Church of Scotland Presbyteries. The readily available information relates to Local Authorities and few Presbytery boundaries match Local Authority ones.

During the autumn of 2010, Dr Fiona Tweedie, a statistician, offered her services to the Council. The Council wants to record its thanks for her time and expertise willingly given. She has examined GROS data and been able to relate it to Presbytery boundaries. The most up to date information available is population projections for 2009. Using this information the Council is now able to revise the 1000 Ministries table to take into account population changes since 2001.

2. Revising the 1000 Ministries Table.

The same methodology used in 2005 and 2010 has been used in this table. That is:

- Rather than the entire population of the Presbytery, it is the proportion of the population the Church of Scotland is responsible for. This excludes those people who, in the census, indicated an allegiance to another faith or denomination.
- A Priority Area Weighting has been applied to the 58 parishes the General Assembly has designated as Priority Area parishes. (In 2005, there were 54 parishes). The weighting that was and still is used is, 2. The effect is to double the ministry these parishes receive.
- A geographic weighting of 1.5, 2, 3 and 3 has been given to Presbyteries categorised as urban/rural, rural/urban, scattered rural and island respectively.

The projected population of Scotland in 2009 was 5,194,000, an increase of 131,989 or 2.61% from the 2001 population, which was 5,062,011. Since there has not been an increase in the number of FTE ministries available, this would indicate that a Presbytery would need to show an increase in population of more than 2.61% before receiving an increase in ministries. By the same token, any Presbytery showing anything less than a population increase of 2.61% would have a decrease in ministry numbers.

3. Under reporting in 2005

The situation, however, is more complicated. The 2005 National Guidelines Table was based on a total population for Scotland of 4,879,519 people. It was known at the time that this figure was inaccurate. Two main reasons identified for this were:

- Not every parish and/or Presbytery submitted complete postcodes for their area.

- The blocks of census data often crossed parish boundaries. In order to avoid double counting (ie allocating the same person to more than one parish) it appears some people may not have been allocated to any parish.

In 2005 it was acknowledged that the population information was not entirely accurate, but was the most accurate available to the Church at the time, and was many times more accurate than any information the church had had before.

The 2005 table was missing 182,492 people, 3.6% of the total population. Since it was not possible to know which Presbytery these people belonged it was decided to assume that they were spread evenly across the country. That is, each Presbytery was assumed to have 3.6% more people.

In reality the under reporting was not uniform and the new table reflects this. For example:

- Perth (increase of 24.73%) and Dunkeld & Meigle (increase of 22.64%) probably reflects a significant under reporting in the 2005 table.
- Lothian (increase of 5.28%) and Dunfermline (increase of 6.91%) probably reflects actual population growth and indicates that the population figure used in 2005 was accurate. The means that since 2005 these Presbyteries have had a 3.6% over allocation in ministry numbers which has now been corrected.

In the 2011 table the missing 3.6% have been included. The Church is working with exactly the same population as the Scottish Government. This means that, in effect, there has been increase of 314,481 people for the Church since 2005, an increase of 6.44%. The consequence of this is that for Presbyteries the 'no change' figure is an increase of 6.44%.

4. Outcome

Presbyteries showing an increase in population of more than 6.44% will have an increase in ministry numbers. Presbyteries showing anything less than an increase in population of 6.44% will have a decrease in ministry numbers.

Taking into account the change in population since 2001 a revised percentage (of the total ministries available to the whole church) allocated to each Presbytery has been calculated. Table 1 d shows what it means for each Presbytery on the basis that the church can afford 1000 FTE ministries. Table 2 offers further detail for Presbyteries that have Priority Area Parishes, showing the proportion of the population that live in Priority Area Parishes and indicating the number of ministries that should be deployed in them.

Population is always changing and so the church will need, periodically, to revise the percentage of total ministries allocated to each Presbytery. It is also inevitable that when the population is measured through a census, there will be some differences from a statistical projection. In 2012 or 2013 when the data from the 2011 census becomes available the Council will look again at population figures for each Presbytery. Presbyteries therefore should be aware that the table is not fixed. There will always be an element of provisionality in plans, which will have to evolve and adapt as circumstances change.

Part 2. Geographic Weighting

I. The need for revision

The General Assembly 2010 instructed the Council 'to review the allocation of geographical weightings used in the 2005 Guidelines and report to the 2011 General Assembly.'

Geography, after population, is the most significant factor in determining what percentage (of the ministries available to the church) each Presbytery should be allocated. The General Assembly has recognised that both the density of population and the remoteness of parishes has an impact on the time needed to provide ministry. In 2004 it approved six categories and allocated Presbyteries to these. (See Table 3). In practice this means that an Island Presbytery receives three times as many ministries as a City Presbytery per head of population.

Following the 2004 Assembly, Presbyteries had the opportunity to comment on the categories and/or appeal against their classification. Nine Presbyteries did appeal and offered reasons, none of which were found to be persuasive. The 2005 Assembly adopted the categories and the weightings. While it was acknowledged that there was a degree of subjectivity in the weightings there was a sense within the Church that it was about right. The categories reflected the reality of Scotland's geography and Presbyteries which were similar to each other had the same weighting.

Since 2005 there has been, in some quarters, a murmur of unease about the way geographical weightings have been calculated. The Council has wondered whether it is possible to find a more objective measure to use, and, if one is found, whether the church will want to adopt it.

2. Possible indicators

Before the Assembly instructed the Council to review geographical weightings it had already begun to explore two indicators with a view to seeing if this would offer a more objective basis for geographic weightings. The first indicator, How Rural is that Parish, is an indicator of remoteness; it measures small settlements' proximity to large settlements. The second indicator, Population Density, is an indicator of the spread of people across a Presbytery. While both are useful, for National Guidelines Purposes the second, population density, is more significant. Geographic Weightings are intended to address the differences in providing ministry in different Presbyteries. Since parish ministers (87% of the Church's ministries) are resident in communities (whether large or small) proximity creates less of a challenge than population density does.

Indicator 1: How Rural is that Parish?

In 2010 the Mission and Discipleship Council presented a table to the General Assembly that listed every parish that was either rural, or remote rural according to the Scottish Government definition. Using this information an exercise was conducted in which every parish was given a weighting of 1, every accessible rural parish was given an additional weighting of 0.23 and every remote rural parish was given an additional weighting of 2. Using this method it is possible to produce a weighting for every Presbytery. Table 4 indicates what the impact of adopting these weightings would be. Presbyteries on this table are ranked according to the degree of change they would experience, with Jedburgh having a 33% reduction in ministry numbers and Lothian having a 39% increase in ministry numbers.

The Council reached the conclusion that this indicator did not offer a better way of calculating geographic weightings.

- It penalised what would be generally accepted as more rural Presbyteries like Jedburgh, Lochaber, Duns and Lewis at the expense of what would be generally accepted as less rural ones, like Lothian, Dumfries and Kirkcudbright and Ayr. This reflects, as mentioned earlier, the fact that for the provision of ministry, population density is more significant than proximity to large settlements
- It necessitated a level of change (both increase and decrease) that the church could neither cope with nor accept, even if it was persuaded that the change was justified.

Indicator 2: Population Density.

Table 5 lists the population density for every Presbytery. Sutherland has the lowest density, Glasgow the highest. An attempt was made to create a geographic weighting scale that correlated to population density. It proved impossible to create one that the Council believed was either workable or acceptable.

However the Council did consider that Table 5 was useful. Once Island Presbyteries are excluded – their weighting has more to do with accessibility than population density, a justifiable exception to the point made earlier – it would be expected that Presbytery weightings would fall in a straight line from Sutherland at 3 to Glasgow at 1. If any Presbytery fell outside this pattern this might indicate that its weighting warranted examination.

3. Consultation.

The Council consulted Presbyteries with a view to discovering the degree of disquiet with the method currently being used to calculate geographic weightings. Whilst making it clear that comments of any kind were welcome, it invited Presbyteries to answer three questions, which elicited the following response:

- Do you think the geographical weightings are broadly speaking fair?
 - Yes 17 response
 - No 1 response
 - Half/half 1 response
- Do you think Presbyteries that are similar to yours are in the same group?
 - Yes 14 responses
 - Mostly 3 responses
 - No 1 response
- Do you think the system should:
 - Not be altered at all 3 responses
 - Have minor adjustments 12 responses
 - Be radically overhauled 3 responses.

The Council is grateful to the twenty Presbyteries who responded, many of whom also submitted comments. It is the Council's conclusion that the Presbyteries have delivered a clear message. Namely, that the current geographic weighting system, whatever its imperfections, is fair and workable. The opinion of Presbyteries in this matter is crucial. Any change in weightings will involve a transfer of ministries from one to another. In other words, one Presbytery's weighting can only be increased (resulting in an increase in ministry numbers) if another Presbytery has its weighting reduced (resulting in a reduction in its ministry numbers.)

Three Presbyteries, Ayr, Lothian and Moray, did not respond to this consultation but communicated their unhappiness with the present system. Their responses might be classed as an appeal against their weighting. The Council also considered that the comments submitted by two other Presbyteries, Uist and Irvine & Kilmarnock were, in effect, an appeal against their weighting. It is perhaps significant that all five Presbyteries, Ayr, Irvine & Kilmarnock, Lothian, Moray and Uist, also were among those who lodged an appeal, or expressed grave disquiet in 2005 against their weighting.

4. Minor adjustments

The Council concluded that since

- There was no obvious new measure to calculate geographic weightings
- The majority of Presbyteries did not want radical change

it should explore minor adjustments to address anomalies and that those Presbyteries that had aired their grievances in both 2005 and 2010 were the cases that should be considered. It decided that the two indicators, How Rural is Your Church and Population Density should be used to establish whether any of these Presbyteries should be given an increase in ministry numbers.

The result of this exercise fell into three groups:

- Ayr and Lothian:
 - Population density similar to Urban/Rural (weighting 1.5) rather than Predominantly Urban (weighting:1)
 - How Rural: this indicator suggests Lothian is the most and Ayr the third most under weighted Presbytery
 - Therefore additional ministries should be allocated.
- Irvine & Kilmarnock and Moray
 - Population density: placed in the right group.
 - How Rural: this indicator suggests that both are slightly under weighted, but in comparison to other Presbyteries the case is not pressing.
 - Therefore additional ministries should not be allocated.
- Uist:
 - Uist as an Island, has the highest weighting of 3. The Council is not persuaded that in terms of geography it is different from Lewis, Orkney and Shetland.
 - The Council recognises that Uist faces particular issues that arise from its size and its denominational composition.
 - The Council has stated its willingness to assist the Presbytery in finding solutions to these issues but believes that to change the geographic weighting simply confuses matters.

5. Additional Ministries for Ayr and Lothian.

The Council considered two ways by which additional ministries might be allocated to Ayr and Lothian,

a. Intermediate weighting of 1.25

It would be possible to create an intermediate weighting of 1.25. However for this to work, as well as Ayr and Lothian rising from 1.0 to 1.25 other Presbyteries would have to fall from 1.5 to 1.25. The list in Table 5 reveals that Stirling, St Andrews are possible candidates. (The island of Arran makes Ardrossan a justifiable break in the pattern).

Ultimately the Council decided not to do this.

- The degree of change (increase of 25% and decrease of 16%) is not thought to be desirable
- Presbyteries want a system that is simple and clear, and have indicated that they do not want significant change.

b. Using the contingency.

In the proposed 2011 table (Table 1) there will be a contingency of 29.2 ministries. The Council believes addressing Ayr and Lothian's claim would be a legitimate use. It believes that, despite the other demands that will be made on the contingency, it is possible to use up to 25% for this purpose.

Therefore the Council, subject to the Assembly agreeing to continue the current method of allocating geographic weightings, has decided to allocate 4.0 additional ministries to Ayr and 3.5 additional ministries to Lothian. The effect of this, once the population changes outlined in the previous section are implemented, will result in both Ayr and Lothian having a net increase of 3 FTE ministries.

In its 2010 Report (1.4.10) the Council indicated that population change and problems with geographic weightings were two of the uses to which the contingency budget could be put. Now that current population figures have been used and geographical weightings have been examined (with adjustments made for Ayr and Lothian) it is unlikely that the Council would agree to any further allocations from the contingency fund on these two grounds.

Table I Proposed New FTE Ministries based on current population figures

Presbytery	2005 weighted population	2009 weighted population	2009-2005 % change	2010 Blue Book % of total ministry	New - 2011 % of total ministry	2010 Blue book FTE ministries Inc 7% vacancy	New - 2011 FTE ministries Inc 7% Vacancy	Change from 2010 Blue Book Table
Aberdeen	177712	187541	5.53%	3.59%	3.54%	38.6	38.0	-0.6
Abernethy	30735	35912	16.84%	0.62%	0.68%	6.7	7.3	0.6
Angus	119064	121984	2.45%	2.41%	2.30%	25.9	24.7	-1.2
Annandale and Eskdale	63320	67001	5.81%	1.28%	1.26%	13.8	13.6	-0.2
Ardrossan	112658	113571	0.81%	2.28%	2.14%	24.5	23.0	-1.5
Argyll	146814	155577	5.97%	2.97%	2.94%	31.9	31.6	-0.3
Ayr	126928	130906	3.13%	2.57%	2.47%	27.6	26.6	-1.0
Buchan	107910	111147	3.00%	2.18%	2.10%	23.4	22.5	-0.9
Caithness	45398	44994	-0.89%	0.92%	0.85%	9.9	9.1	-0.8
Dumbarton	103356	106063	2.62%	2.09%	2.00%	22.5	21.5	-1.0
Dumfries and Kirkcudbright	101835	103074	1.22%	2.06%	1.94%	22.1	20.9	-1.2
Dundee	134128	139511	4.01%	2.72%	2.63%	29.2	28.3	-0.9
Dunfermline	103741	110912	6.91%	2.10%	2.09%	22.6	22.5	-0.1
Dunkeld and Meigle	45428	55715	22.64%	0.92%	1.05%	9.9	11.3	1.4
Duns	30562	34401	12.56%	0.62%	0.65%	6.7	7.0	0.3
Edinburgh	339475	384959	13.40%	6.87%	7.26%	73.9	78.1	4.2
Falkirk	147968	158794	7.32%	2.99%	3.00%	32.1	32.2	0.1
Glasgow	604791	664470	9.87%	12.24%	12.54%	131.6	134.8	3.2
Gordon	136228	154657	13.53%	2.76%	2.92%	29.7	31.4	1.7
Greenock and Paisley	187963	188516	0.29%	3.81%	3.56%	41	38.2	-2.8
Hamilton	260234	282862	8.70%	5.27%	5.34%	56.7	57.4	0.7
Inverness	98288	109580	11.49%	1.99%	2.07%	21.4	22.2	0.8
Irvine and Kilmarnock	102315	102347	0.03%	2.07%	1.93%	22.3	20.8	-1.5
Jedburgh	56574	58417	3.26%	1.15%	1.10%	12.4	11.8	-0.6
Kincardine and Deeside	70301	77764	10.62%	1.43%	1.47%	15.4	15.8	0.4

Kirkcaldy	119043	128071	7.58%	2.41%	2.42%	25.9	26.0	0.1
Lanark	70958	74994	5.69%	1.44%	1.41%	15.5	15.2	-0.3
Lewis	34554	34862	0.89%	0.70%	0.66%	7.5	7.1	-0.4
Lochaber	39864	39076	-1.98%	0.81%	0.74%	8.7	7.9	-0.8
Lochcarron - Skye	36108	37948	5.10%	0.73%	0.72%	7.8	7.7	-0.1
Lothian	141161	148612	5.28%	2.85%	2.80%	30.6	30.1	-0.5
Melrose and Peebles	64050	67242	4.98%	1.30%	1.27%	14	13.6	-0.4
Moray	96839	102269	5.61%	1.96%	1.93%	21.1	20.7	-0.4
Orkney	50610	52490	3.71%	1.03%	0.99%	11.1	10.6	-0.5
Perth	102492	127841	24.73%	2.08%	2.41%	22.4	25.9	3.5
Ross	67596	78205	15.69%	1.37%	1.48%	14.7	15.9	1.2
Shetland - see note	47538	54939	15.57%	0.96%	1.04%	8.0	8.0	0.0
St Andrews	90530	96264	6.33%	1.83%	1.82%	19.7	19.5	-0.2
Stirling	160754	173227	7.76%	3.25%	3.27%	34.9	35.1	0.2
Sutherland	31122	29977	-3.68%	0.63%	0.57%	6.8	6.1	-0.7
Uist	11328	10777	-4.86%	0.23%	0.20%	2.5	2.2	-0.3
West Lothian	127443	138760	8.88%	2.58%	2.62%	27.7	28.1	0.4
Wigtown and Stranraer	50950	50196	-1.48%	1.03%	0.95%	11.1	10.2	-0.9
England				0.47%	0.47%	5.1	5.1	-0.0
Contingency				2.43%	2.43%	28.4	29.2	0.8

Shetland Note

GA 2010 report (1.4.9) allocated Shetland 8 ministries rather than the 10.3 ministries allocated by the formula. Based on the 2009 population, the formula allocates 11.1 ministries to Shetland. For the reasons indicated in 2010 (Shetland Arrangements), the 2011 figure will continue at 8 ministries. The additional 0.8 ministry has been added to the contingency, raising it in 2010 to 28.4 and in 2011 to 29.2.

Table 2 Ministries for Priority Area Parishes

Presbytery	Total	Priority Area	Priority Area	Priority Area	Total	No of FTE
	CofS	CofS	CofS	CofS	Ministries	Ministries
	Population	Population	Population	population		Priority Area
	(Weighted)	(Unweighted)	(Weighted)	as % of whole		
Ardrossan	113571	1203	2406	2.12%	23	0.5
Ayr	130906	4088	8176	6.25%	26.6	1.7
Dundee	139511	20325	40650	29.14%	28.3	8.2
Edinburgh	384,959	14943	29886	7.76%	78.1	6.1
Glasgow	664470	154374	308748	46.47%	134.8	62.6
Greenock and Paisley	188516	4591	9182	4.87%	38.2	1.9
Hamilton	282862	10573	21146	7.48%	57.4	4.3
Inverness	109580	4034	8068	7.36%	22.2	1.6
Irvine and Kilmarnock	102347	3085	6170	6.03%	20.8	1.3
Stirling	173227	3393	6786	3.92%	35.1	1.4
Total		220609	441218			

Table 3 Geographical Weightings Categories

Group A	City	Group D	Rural/Urban
Weighting 1.0		Weighting 2.0	
Aberdeen		Annandale & Eskdale	
Dundee		Caithness	
Edinburgh		Dunkeld & Meikle	
Glasgow		Duns	
		Gordon	
Group B	Predominantly Urban	Jedburgh	
Weighting 1.0		Ross	
Ayr		Wig' & Stranraer	
Dumbarton			
Dunfermline		Group E	Scattered Rural
Falkirk		Weighting 3.0	
Greenock & Paisley		Abernethy	
Hamilton		Lochaber	
Irvine & Kilmarnock		Lochcarron - Skye	
Kirkcaldy		Sutherland	
Lothian			
West Lothian		Group F	Island
		Weighting 3.0	
Group C	Urban/Rural	Argyll	
Weighting 1.5		Lewis	
Angus		Orkney	
Ardrossan		Shetland	
Buchan		Uist	
Dumfries & Kirkcudbright			
Inverness			
Kincardine & Deeside			
Lanark			
Melrose & Peebles			
Moray			
Perth			
St Andrews			
Stirling			

Table 4 **How Rural Is That Parish**

Presbytery	2010	2005	New	Weighting	2010	Ministries	Ministries
	% of	Weighting	Weighting	change	Number	with new	change
	Ministry			from 05	Ministries	Weighting	from
							2010
Jedburgh	1.15%	2	1.34	-0.66	12.4	8.3	-4.1
Lochaber	0.81%	3	2.38	-0.63	8.7	6.9	-1.8
Duns	0.62%	2	1.45	-0.55	6.7	4.8	-1.9
Lewis	0.70%	3	2.45	-0.55	7.5	6.1	-1.4
Gordon	2.76%	2	1.46	-0.54	29.7	21.7	-8
Inverness	1.99%	1.5	1.11	-0.39	21.4	15.9	-5.5
Angus	2.41%	1.5	1.13	-0.37	25.9	19.6	-6.3
St Andrews	1.83%	1.5	1.15	-0.35	19.7	15	-4.7
Argyll	2.97%	3	2.73	-0.27	31.9	29	-2.9
Perth	2.08%	1.5	1.29	-0.22	22.4	19.2	-3.2
Lanark	1.44%	1.5	1.3	-0.2	15.5	13.4	-2.1
Orkney	1.03%	3	2.81	-0.19	11.1	10.3	-0.8
Annandale & Eskdale	1.28%	2	1.84	-0.16	13.8	12.6	-1.2
Ross	1.37%	2	1.84	-0.16	14.7	13.6	-1.1
Stirling	3.25%	1.5	1.34	-0.16	34.9	31.3	-3.6
Wigtown & Stranraer	1.03%	2	1.85	-0.15	11.1	10.3	-0.8
Abernethy	0.62%	3	3	0	6.7	6.8	0.1
Edinburgh	6.87%	1	1	0	73.9	73.9	0
England	0.47%	1	1	0	5.1	5.1	0
Glasgow	12.24%	1	1	0	131.6	131.6	0
Lochcarron & Skye	0.73%	3	3	0	7.8	7.7	-0.1
Shetland	0.96%	3	3	0	8	10.3	2.3
Sutherland	0.63%	3	3	0	6.8	6.8	0
Uist	0.23%	3	3	0	2.5	2.6	0.1
Aberdeen	3.59%	1	1.01	0.01	38.6	38.8	0.2
Hamilton	5.27%	1	1.01	0.01	56.7	57.1	0.4
Greenock & Paisley	3.81%	1	1.02	0.02	41	41.6	0.6
Ardrossan	2.28%	1.5	1.53	0.03	24.5	25	0.5
Falkirk	2.99%	1	1.03	0.03	32.1	33.2	1.1
Melrose & Peebles	1.30%	1.5	1.53	0.03	14	14.3	0.3
Irvine & Kilmarnock	2.07%	1	1.04	0.04	22.3	23.2	0.9
Kirkcaldy	2.41%	1	1.04	0.04	25.9	26.9	1
Dundee	2.72%	1	1.05	0.05	29.2	30.6	1.4
Dunfermline	2.10%	1	1.05	0.05	22.6	23.7	1.1
West Lothian	2.58%	1	1.05	0.05	27.7	29.2	1.5
Buchan	2.18%	1.5	1.61	0.11	23.4	25.1	1.7
Moray	1.96%	1.5	1.62	0.12	21.1	22.8	1.7
Kincardine & Deeside	1.43%	1.5	1.64	0.14	15.4	16.7	1.3
Dumbarton	2.09%	1	1.2	0.2	22.5	27.1	4.6
Caithness	0.92%	2	2.29	0.29	9.9	11.3	1.4
Dunkeld & Meikle	0.92%	2	2.31	0.31	9.9	11.4	1.5
Ayr	2.57%	1	1.33	0.33	27.6	36.8	9.2
D'fries & Kirk'bright	2.06%	1.5	1.83	0.33	22.1	27	4.9
Lothian	2.85%	1	1.38	0.38	30.6	42.4	11.8
Contingency	2.43%		1		28.4	28.4	0
Totals	100.00%				1075.3	1075.4	0.1

Table 5: Presbytery Population Density

Presbytery	Population density	2005 Weighting
Sutherland	0.003	3
Lochcarron – Skye	0.006	3
Abernethy	0.007	3
Lochaber	0.009	3
Uist (Island)	0.011	3
Wigtown and Stranraer	0.012	2
Dunkeld and Meigle	0.014	2
Argyll (Semi Island)	0.020	3
Ross	0.022	2
Lewis (Island)	0.023	3
Annandale and Eskdale	0.024	2
Jedburgh	0.025	2
Kincardine and Deeside	0.026	1.5
Caithness	0.028	2
Dumfries and Kirkcudbright	0.028	1.5
Duns	0.039	2
Gordon	0.040	2
Melrose and Peebles	0.041	1.5
Buchan	0.044	1.5
Shetland (Island)	0.055	3
Moray	0.063	1.5
Orkney (Island)	0.064	3
Inverness	0.065	1.5
Angus	0.066	1.5
Lanark	0.070	1.5
Perth	0.071	1.5
Ayr	0.072	1
Stirling	0.092	1.5
St Andrews	0.141	1.5
Lothian	0.150	1
Ardrossan (Partial island)	0.159	1.5
Irvine and Kilmarnock	0.337	1
Dunfermline	0.485	1
West Lothian	0.495	1
Dumbarton	0.539	1
Greenock and Paisley	0.602	1
Kirkcaldy	0.784	1
Dundee	0.917	1
Falkirk	1.079	1
Hamilton	1.312	1
Aberdeen	1.374	1
Edinburgh	2.924	1
Glasgow	4.085	1