

## Appendix A2 - Assurance Summary

VERSION 1 24.11.2021

1 – SCHEME DETAILS			
<b>Project Name</b>	Tram Train Magna Stop including Park and Ride	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	SYMCA	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£7,216,812
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	TEB	<b>MCA Funding</b>	£6,537,935
<b>Programme name</b>	TCF	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	91%
<b>Current Gateway Stage</b>	FBC	<b>MCA Development costs</b>	£367,893
		<b>% of total MCA allocation</b>	5%
2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION			
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 new platforms</li> <li>- Fully accessible footbridge with lifts and stairs</li> <li>- Passenger Information</li> <li>- Passenger Shelters</li> <li>- Platform Lighting</li> <li>- Security/CCTV</li> <li>- P&amp;R car park improvements (150 spaces)</li> <li>- Safe and secure active travel/pedestrian link to/from the new tram train stop</li> <li>- Cycle Storage</li> </ul>			
3. STRATEGIC CASE			
<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	<i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i>		
	<b>Yes</b>		

Strategic policy fit	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p><b>It meets all three objectives – Stronger, Fairer, Greener</b></p>									
Contribution to Carbon Net Zero	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p>									
SMART scheme objectives	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <p><b>Increased tram AND public transport patronage</b>  <b>High levels of passenger satisfaction</b>  <b>Increased walking and cycling to new stop</b>  <b>Increased P&amp;R usage</b>  <b>Mode shift</b></p> <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)?</i></p> <p><b>The scheme objectives are consistent with strategic objectives</b></p>									
Options assessment	<p><i>Is there a genuine Options assessment and is there a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options and the choice of the Preferred Way Forward?</i></p> <p><b>No. Yes.</b> The starting point for the scheme development is the existing tram-train extension to Rotherham and the need to encourage greater use of it by residents and visitors to destinations. The Magna Science Adventure Centre (a registered charity with RMBC a trust member) is located at Templeborough (close to the A6178) has recently received Levelling Up funding to expand its offering. It is the largest visitor attraction on the tram-train extension not to be served by the tram and the adjacent stops are over 2km away. An option to not improve the parking facilities to enable Park and Ride is presented in the shortlisted option. The promoter has clarified that the Park and Ride development cost is £0.5m - a very small proportion of the total scheme cost, but, based on modelling, it is likely to generate about half the scheme patronage, benefit and revenue, also contributing to decongestion along the route and improving the journey experience for existing bus users. The scheme will benefit the Magna site itself by making it more accessible.</p>									
he	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p><b>Yes.</b> Planning consent and Network Change. Expected completion March 2023. Station license and safety verification Nov 23. Land required from Magna. No issues expected.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p><b>No.</b> Minimal operational and maintenance liabilities.</p>									
FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).	<p><i>Does the scheme still align with strategic objectives?</i></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><i>Have the conditions of approval granted at OBC been complied with?</i></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="562 1206 2004 1404"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="562 1206 1473 1235">Condition at OBC</th> <th data-bbox="1473 1206 2004 1235">Response</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="562 1235 1473 1294">1. highlight P&amp;R journey time savings for current commuters and others (to urban centres);</td> <td data-bbox="1473 1235 2004 1294">Appendix G para 2.5.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="562 1294 1473 1353">2. benefits of and to Magna to be highlighted – numbers currently visiting by car from tram-accessible origins could support the “need” argument.</td> <td data-bbox="1473 1294 2004 1353">Appendix G para 2.3.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="562 1353 1473 1404">3. Role of Magna – how dependent further development is on access. Views of management and other local stakeholders could be usefully included;</td> <td data-bbox="1473 1353 2004 1404">Appendix G para 2.3.4 and 3.4.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Condition at OBC	Response	1. highlight P&R journey time savings for current commuters and others (to urban centres);	Appendix G para 2.5.4	2. benefits of and to Magna to be highlighted – numbers currently visiting by car from tram-accessible origins could support the “need” argument.	Appendix G para 2.3.4	3. Role of Magna – how dependent further development is on access. Views of management and other local stakeholders could be usefully included;	Appendix G para 2.3.4 and 3.4.3
Condition at OBC	Response									
1. highlight P&R journey time savings for current commuters and others (to urban centres);	Appendix G para 2.5.4									
2. benefits of and to Magna to be highlighted – numbers currently visiting by car from tram-accessible origins could support the “need” argument.	Appendix G para 2.3.4									
3. Role of Magna – how dependent further development is on access. Views of management and other local stakeholders could be usefully included;	Appendix G para 2.3.4 and 3.4.3									

	4. Specific quantified targets for patronage, mode shift (from bus and car-all-the-way), P&R occupancy, based on modelling, needs to be included.	Appendix G para 2.3.1, 2, 3 and 4. Summarised in 2.3.6
	5. Total P&R occupancy currently across route would add to confidence in assumptions made;	Overall results stated to be consistent with demand observed at Rotherham Central and Parkgate
	6. Jobs by type currently within the walking catchment of the proposed tram-train stop and current mode shares.	Appendix G para 2.3.3
	7. A clearer statement than that provided in xxxx as to why the VDM model (SCRTEM1) was considered inappropriate;	Appendix G para 2.3
	8. Appraisal results for Option B in more detail to highlight importance of P+R provision as well as access to Magna (by road and tram);	Appendix G para 3.1 FBC section 2.2 and 2.11
	9. Consideration of post COVID levels of congestion given lower demand growth. This could be done by adjusting the MECs assumptions;	A number of adjustments have been made to TAG and PDFH factors which account for changes to trip rates etc. It is largely recognised that trips are back to (if not exceeding) pre-covid levels, even if trip patterns are slightly 'flatter' (AM/PM peaks are less defined, and additional non-commuter trips to shops etc are happening on weekends as opposed to during the week).
	10. why mode shift from bus to tram-train is desirable, and the potential numbers of trips that may be diverted to P&R, or through mode-shift to tram-train from other modes, and the net impact on SYPTTE's revenue budget of increased tram/reduced bus revenue;	Appendix G (the EAR) gives proportion of demand using carpark. This is based on PDFH methodology. Bus usage to Magna stated to be small in EAR
	11. Detailed QRA with p50 risks specified and base costs revised to Grip 5 levels of certainty;	Appendix H - but doesn't have monetised amounts
	12. A full DIA for impacts in-scope.	Appendix K
	13. Source of match funding.	ITB and revenue funds

#### 4. VALUE FOR MONEY

##### Monetised Benefits:

<i>VFM Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>R/A/G</i>
<i>Net Present Social Value (£)</i>	<b>£3.47m</b>	
<i>Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment</i>	<b>2.57</b>	
<i>Cost per Job</i>	<b>n/a</b>	

##### Non-Monetised Benefits:

<i>Non-Quantified Benefits</i>	<b>LAQ benefits only partially reflected in modelling</b>
--------------------------------	---

## Value for Money Statement

*Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?*

### 5. RISK

*What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?*

The main risks and mitigation measures being taken are:

	Risk	Like-likelihood (High, Med, Low)	Impact (High, Med, Low)	Mitigation	Owner
1.	Supertram closure due failure to secure renewal funding	Low	High	Ongoing work on Mass Transit OBC	SYMCA
2.	Accuracy of estimates at current stage ES3	Med	Med	QCRA to be continually monitored	SYMCA (Project Manager) ; Network Rail
3.	Delay due no agreement on the future 'operating' model for the new Tram Train stop	Low	High	Discussions ongoing Linked to 1.	SYMCA (Project Manager /Legal/Tram Concession Manager)
4.	Planning Permission not being granted without onerous conditions	Low	Med	RMBC planning officer consulted	SYMCA (Project Manager)
5.	Performance of Network Rail (Delivery to programme and cost)	Low	High	Keep performance of NWR under review with regular cost monitoring.	SYMCA (Project Manager)

*Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)*

**No**

*Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?*

**No**

*Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?*

**No**

### 6. DELIVERY

*Is the timetable for delivery reasonable and has the promoter identified opportunities for acceleration?*

**Yes, Yes**

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

**Yes**

*What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process?*

60% The promoter considers this may be pessimistic as the contractor NWR is very well aware of the scheme's requirements and costs. However, at FBC or GS5 it is required to be at 75%.

*Has the promoter confirmed they will cover any cost overruns without reducing the benefits of the scheme?*

**No.**

*Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO?*

**Yes.** Pat Beijer

*Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed off this business case?*

**Yes** (dry)

*Has public consultation taken place and if so, is there public support for the scheme?*

**Yes.** Feedback from consultation process indicated 90% respondents strongly support the scheme

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

**Yes.** See Appendix J

## 7. LEGAL

*Has the scheme considered Subsidy Control compliance or does the promotor still need to seek legal advice?*

**Yes. No. Scheme is of no benefit to a specific commercial enterprise.**

## 8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

<b>Recommendation</b>	Proceed to Contract
<b>Payment Basis</b>	Defrayal

### Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)

***The following conditions must be satisfied before contract execution.***

1. Confirmation of approval to use other form of funding for scheme costs in excess of TCF2 allocation

***The following conditions must be satisfied before drawdown of funding.***

2. Confirmation of ongoing requirement for Magna tram stop in wider Mass Transit renewal OBC