



Assurance Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	T0018 IPort Bridge	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	SYLTE	Total Scheme Cost	£5,798,291
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£5,458,141
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	100%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i></p> <p>Yes. As described in the OBC, it is proposed to install a new 0.5km bus and active travel link between New Rossington and the Iport to make PT a viable option for workforce and visitors. Design changes since OBC include a slight lengthening of the bridge span, addition of verges on the western approach and verge widening between cycle and footway, addition of a footway link to the north-east, additional planting and green bus shelters. This has not changed the overall scheme cost cited at OBC.</p>	
Strategic Case	
<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i></p> <p>Yes, there is a clear strategic rationale, demonstrating strong linkage to transport strategy goals, mayoral commitments and policies, the SEP, the RAP and TCF objectives.</p>
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p>As above</p>
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i></p> <p>Yes</p>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To improve public transport and active travel connectivity to the iPort by November 2022, through the delivery of a new public transport and active travel bridge link over the River Torne. 2. To achieve 9% bus mode share for employee journeys to iPort by November 2023. 3. To increase the walking and cycling mode share for shorter journeys to the iPort for employees and visitors by 27%, by November 2023. 4. To reduce public transport journey time by 4 minutes for employees and visitors to the iPort by November 2022. 5. To increase bus patronage on the 55/56 bus service in Doncaster by 9% by November 2023. 6. To achieve improvements in air quality and health and wellbeing, to be measured through objectives 3, 4 & 5. <p>The response to clarification questions raised by the assessor at OBC stage confirm that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The baseline position against which changes cited in objectives 3,4 and 5 will be measured is that at September 2019. 2. 'Shorter journeys' in objective 3 will be those of less than 5km. 3. Air quality improvements will not be quantified directly in the monitoring and evaluation plan, but will be inferred from measured changes in mode share.

	<p>Ideally, these clarifications should have been made explicit in this FBC.</p> <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i></p> <p>Yes</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>Yes. Three 'Do Something' options for meeting the objectives have been considered: two different alignments for a bus & active travel bridge (south, north); and one active travel only bridge option (north). These appear to be all the realistic options for addressing the current limited green connectivity of iPort with the community to the east. Two of the options have been sifted out through a structured process of considering strengths and weaknesses, with the preferred option (bus & active travel bridge) taken through to the economic, commercial, management and financial case assessments.</p> <p>This appears to be a reasonable and proportionate approach given the nature of the scheme.</p>		
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Planning consent (expected imminently).• TROs are required (for the bus gates to restrict parking). 3 months.• Licence agreement with Harworth for construction of the scheme.• Licence agreement with Verdion for construction of the scheme.• Rights of access agreement with Verdion.• S.38/S.278 Agreement (Highways Act 1980) for adopted highway.• Environment Agency agreement for construction of a bridge over a Main River and discharge of surface water. <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>The main potential adverse consequence of the bridge going ahead is localised noise disbenefit to the rear of properties on Heatherfields Crescent, which has been recognised by the promoter in the design. The main potential adverse consequence of the scheme not going ahead is continuing poor green connectivity between iPort and the residential area to the east. This will lead to poorer employment prospects for residents of that area (particularly for non-car-owning households) and a constrained labour market for iPort businesses.</p> <p>The potential adverse consequences of the scheme not going ahead appear to significantly outweigh those of going ahead.</p>		
Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	<p><i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i></p> <p>2.71 (down from 2.89 at OBC due cost increase net of OB reduction to 4%)</p> <p>Low growth – 2.63</p> <p>High Growth – 2.79</p>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p>Slight Beneficial:</p> <p>1. Enviro and Social Noise, LAQ, GHG, Landscape,</p> <p>2. Distributional User benefits skewed to poorer communities Accidents – reductions to benefit cyclists (Moderate) Security – improved for vulnerable Severance Accessibility</p> <p>Slight adverse: Water environment (to be mitigated)</p>
<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p>		<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p>	

No, there appear to be no shortfalls that would threaten the robustness of the appraisal. The approach adopted appears proportionate, reasonable and in line with webTAG guidance. It is noted that the benefit estimate for bus users may be slightly conservative as the additional two-minute time saving for bus services serving the south of iPort from 2025-26 was omitted from the benefit calculation.

Sensitivity testing has been carried out to understand the impact of lower and higher bus demand on net present value (NPV) and benefit/cost ratio (BCR). The sensitivity testing has been carried out under low growth and high growth scenarios as recommended in Section 4.2 of TAG Unit M4, yielding values of 2.63 and 2.79 (values that are still in the 'high' value-for-money category).

No sensitivity testing has been carried out on walking and cycling demand, although it is recognised that such fluctuations in walking and cycling demand are unlikely to have a significant impact on the forecast overall BCR given that the majority of calculated benefits relate to bus operation improvement.

No

Value for Money Statement

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

Yes, the scheme represents high value for money.

Risk

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

Risk	Mitigation	Owner
1. Volume of Peat encountered is larger than estimates resulting in time and cost impact	Additional boreholes sunk to assess ground conditions to estimate volumes. Disposal off site has been reduced through agreement to reuse as part of Harworth enabling works.	Scheme promoter (DMBC/SYPTE)
2. Ground conditions encountered during piling operations not what are envisaged	Further boreholes sunk to assess ground conditions	Scheme promoter (DMBC/SYPTE)
3. Working in winter/adverse weather causes programme delays and productivity reductions		Scheme deliverer up to 1 in 10 weather event. Scheme promoter above this level.
4. Design issues result in additional costs being incurred.	Scheme design checked/assessed and approved.	Scheme promoter (DMBC/SYPTE)
5. Steel price fluctuations could add greater cost than envisaged previously.	Project QS has undertaken an assessment of risk against potential price fluctuation.	Scheme promoter (DMBC/SYPTE)

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. However, the scheme is reliant upon Verdion (the Iport operator, which has to date been fully engaged in the process) being willing to allow buses ongoing access to the private iPort road network on completion. A draft Head of Terms (HOT) has broadly been agreed. It is expected that the HOT will be signed off by all parties imminently. Verdion is currently drafting the licence and deed of dedication documents. It is expected that these draft documents will be issued to DMBC / SYPTE within the next week for review and comment. Likewise the scheme is dependent on commercial bus services being diverted into the iPort and using the new link. First has been engaged with throughout the scheme. First is supportive of the project, provided a letter of support as part of the planning application, and intend to divert their 55/56 buses into the iPort.

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

No.

Delivery

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

Yes.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes. The procurement strategy has involved using the MHA+ framework, under which it is understood that Eurovia has been selected as contractor. The latest project programme provided in Appendix L to the FBC appears to have clear milestones for the procurement process.

What is the level of cost certainty

85%, based on detailed design and independently of contractor. The cost estimate includes a 26% allowance for inflation (above 5% p.a.) and risks at the 80% confidence level. If steel prices rise by 5% p.a. the inflation allowance will be used up, leaving 16% for other risks, which is comparable to other schemes in the programme.

and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process?

Yes.

- Prior to tendering there will be a further update to the cost plan. The applicant states (5.2) *"The target cost will be reviewed, and value engineering meetings held to see if savings can be achieved through the duration of the project. As works are progressed defined costs are tracked against the target cost. The contractor will also provide predicated outturn costs on a monthly basis to review against budget/target cost. The above should enable costs to be tracked through the construction phase and decisions taken if overspend is being predicted."*
- The risk of capital cost overruns or benefit reduction is ultimately the MCA's.

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

No,

- but applicant confident the residual risk pot and their and their stakeholders experience in cost and risk management is adequate.
- DMBC say they will meet the required ongoing maintenance costs for this scheme, although the strains this (and other schemes) will put on the council's budget are likely to be significant in future.
- **N.B. The maintenance of four bus shelters will cost the PTE/MCA approximately £22K p.a.**

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

Yes. Yes.

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

No

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

Yes, this took place in August 2020 : “A statement of community involvement is included as **Appendix S**. For the people that completed a questionnaire survey, approximately 69% of respondents support or strongly support the scheme.” (1.3)

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes. It is stated that SYPTE will be responsible for monitoring and SCR for evaluation, within the overall TCF programme Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. The proposed monitoring procedures appear reasonably well thought through.

Legal

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

Yes, No

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	FBC Approval
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p>Prior to contract execution –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Planning consent to be confirmed by SYPTE/DMBC• Heads of Terms for construction/access rights into the site in perpetuity, signed by SYPTE, Harworth and Verdion• Written confirmation that DMBC will meet ongoing highway and bridge maintenance costs• DMBC to provide a MCA appendices A• Final project costs to be confirmed <p>To be included in contract –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clawback on outputs	

