

APPENDIX C - Assurance Summary

VERSION 1 24.11.2021

1 – SCHEME DETAILS

Project Name	A.631 Rotherham to Maltby Bus Corridor	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Total Scheme Cost	£3,160,267
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£2,548,860
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	81%
Current Gateway Stage	FBC	MCA Development costs received to date	£45,000

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?

It is clear what the MCA is being asked to fund through a package of priority bus improvements on the A.631 between Maltby and Rotherham where there are currently delays in bus journey times at peak times. These are:

- The construction of an additional bus lane between Addison Road, Maltby and Denby Way, Hellaby
- An extension of the existing bus lane at Wickersley School towards the water works, as an additional lane,
- Changes to the bus stop at Brecks Crescent

However, because of increased cost of the scheme, changes to the bus stop at Brecks crescent will only go ahead if risks are not realised and can be managed within the MCA funding for this scheme or funding vired from another RMBC TCF Scheme (if there is any flexibility remaining).

3. STRATEGIC CASE

Options assessment

Is there a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options and the choice of the Preferred Way Forward?

	<p>The preferred option was determined at OBC after reviewing 5 alternative viable options to determine the best engineering solution. Those options have been narrowed down for FBC and some dropped for strategic reasons. The FBC therefore considers 2 options with the preferred having been refined from OBC.</p> <p>The preferred option is considered the most deliverable to improve public transport benefits and bus operator viability and is not dependent on wider network improvements.</p>
<p><i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i></p>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>There is no planning approval required as works can be delivered under permitted development rights and existing Highway authority powers. There will be TRO's required which are expected to be completed by June '23.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>There are no adverse consequences which remain unresolved. However, there are potential adverse consequences associated with modal shift. There is a risk that modal shift from car may reduce congestion and so release suppressed demand for car travel, potentially for longer trips, so increasing car mileage and its adverse impacts, notably carbon emissions. However, the promoter does not anticipate this to be so significant to materially offset benefits on the local network.</p>
<p><i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i></p>	<p>The FBC demonstrates a clear link between improving bus times in the specific areas to support mode shift from car journeys resulting in:</p> <p>Stronger</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enabling people to access opportunities for education, jobs and training sustainably by improving the reliability and journey times of the bus service along the route. Improved access to these opportunities will lead to a higher employment rate in areas that the route links into <p>Fairer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enabling people to access opportunities for education and training sustainably. Improved access to these opportunities will lead to a higher skilled workforce in areas that the route links into. • Improved opportunities for access to employment and education for the areas will lead to a higher skilled workforce and consequently higher earnings in areas that the route links into. • Will encourage people to travel by public transport over private cars by making the bus service quicker and more reliable leading to improved Health through propensity to cycle and/or walk part of the journey to/from bus stops. <p>Greener</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved air quality through the reduction in private car use. • facilitate the transition to a low carbon transport network, by creating a modal shift away from the private car towards public transport.
<p>4. VALUE FOR MONEY</p>	
<p>Monetised Benefits:</p>	
<p><i>VFM Indicator</i></p>	<p><i>Value</i></p>
<p><i>R/A/G</i></p>	

Net Present Social Value (£)	-£989,479	
Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment	0.39	
Cost per Job		

Non-Monetised Benefits:

Non-Quantified Benefits	<p>Carbon Impacts – while not modelled and assessed within the FBC, the indication of mode shift and increase in bus patronage should generate positive benefit relative to the Do-Minimum.</p> <p>Air Quality –should achieve positive benefits to air quality through the mode shift and increase bus patronage relative to the Do-minimum scenario.</p> <p>Access to Opportunities – reduced journey times and improved journey time reliability will allow greater access to employment and education opportunities.</p>
-------------------------	---

Value for Money Statement

Taking consideration of the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, and the uncertainties, does the scheme represent value for money?

5. RISK

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

Top 5 key risks

No.	Risk	Likelihood (High, Med, Low)	Impact (High, Med, Low)	Mitigation	Owner
1	Unforeseen utility works	35%	High	Timely issue of NRSWA notices. Continuous review of utility locations supplemented with trial pits at critical locations and ground penetrating radar surveys during works lead in. Seek opportunities to design out need for diversions, as far as practicable, to be considered at detailed design.	RMBC
2	Narrow & substandard traffic lanes and footways on part of Bawtry Road likely to be raised at Road Safety Audit with no alternatives available	20%	Med	Ensure robust consideration of any road safety audit concerns, informed by all available evidence and design guidance, corroborated across multiple sources where possible.	RMBC

3	Part or full funding not approved by SYMCA to cover past and forecast project costs	15%	High	Early engagement and open conversation with SYMCA re. funding. Transparent and realistic cost forecasting.	RMBC
4	Actual inflation differs from level assumed at tender. Cost of materials and fuel increases beyond predicted levels.	45%	Med	Minimal mitigation possible however the tendered rates will be set for the duration of the contract to further mitigate this risk. Agree prices in advance where possible but ensure they are realistic and allow for instability in the economy.	PM & Contractor
5	Additional and/or extended tarmac layers at tie-ins or within scheme where lower layers to be retained (Assumptions re: existing build up / infrastructure prove to be optimistic, or where more extensive resurfacing required)	30%	Med	Full mitigation not possible, however where possible, the detailed design has sought to minimise the tie-in risk.	PM

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 for the scheme?

Only the risk regarding the potential reliance on wider TCF programme capacity to fund the full delivery.

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

None

6. DELIVERY

Is the timetable for delivery reasonable?

Yes the timetable seems reasonable with a 14 month works programme.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes, established procurement route followed to select preferred contractor.

What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process? Has the promoter confirmed they will cover any cost overruns?

90% cost certainty. Yes this is appropriate given the type of contract and risk sharing. The cost includes a risk allowance of £494k based on comprehensive risk review and also a 10% inflation allowance.

Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO? Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed off this business case?

Yes, clear governance with organogram illustrating tie in of Project Team to established governance structures.

FBC not signed yet.

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

Yes public consultation has taken place 22% in favour 70% in opposition. Main concerns being increased congestion. Which the promoter has dismissed as there is negligible allocation of roadspace away from motorised traffic; and concerns regarding the frequency and reliability of the bus service (which the promoter believes are arguments which in practice support the scheme as the purpose of the bus lane is to improve the reliability of buses, and to improve the attractiveness and commercial position of bus services).

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes, an M&E plan has been provided. Outcomes to be measured through SYMCA bus journey time and patronage data.

7. LEGAL

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

Yes considered and deemed not relevant for this type of action by the Council.

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Recommendation	Proceed to Contract
-----------------------	---------------------

Payment Basis	Defrayal
----------------------	----------

Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)

The following condition is to be included within the Grant Agreement –

- A requirement for the scheme promoter to provide written confirmation that there is sufficient budget to complete the project before commencement of the Brecks Crescent works

The following condition is to be satisfied before drawdown of funding –

- All required statutory consents must be satisfied