

Funding for Local Transport: Safer Roads Fund



Department
for Transport

Application Form

The level of information provided should be proportionate to the size and complexity of the scheme proposed. As a guide, we would suggest around 10 to 15 pages including annexes would be appropriate.

A separate application form should be completed for each scheme.

Applicant Information

**Local authority name(s)*: North East Lincolnshire Council (NELC, lead authority),
Lincolnshire County Council (LCC)**

Bid Manager Name and position: Debbie Swatman. Traffic Team Manager

Contact telephone number: 01472 324514

Email address: debbie.swatman@nelincs.gov.uk

**Postal address: Origin 2, Origin Way, Europarc. Grimsby. North East Lincolnshire
DN37 9TZ**

When authorities submit a bid for funding to the Department for Transport, as part of the Government's commitment to greater openness in the public sector under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, they must also publish a version excluding any commercially sensitive information on their own website within two working days of submitting the final bid to the Department for Transport. The Department for Transport reserves the right to deem the business case as non-compliant if this is not adhered to.

Please specify the web link where this bid will be published:

<https://www.nelincs.gov.uk/roads-parking-transport/business-cases-and-funding-bids/>

SECTION A - Scheme description and funding profile

A1. Scheme name: A18 (Laceby to Ludborough)

A2. Headline description:

Please enter a brief description of the proposed scheme (in no more than 100 words)

The proposed scheme will address a combination of potential road safety risks (identified through VIDA), reported injury collision issues and known concerns regarding the structure of the highway on the A18 between Laceby, North East Lincolnshire and Ludborough, Lincolnshire.

Consequently, the scheme includes an integrated programme of countermeasures suggested by VIDA together with alternative solutions where considered more appropriate.

Countermeasures include carriageway widening (haunching), carriageway resurfacing, skid resistance upgrades, localised vehicle restraint systems, rumble edge lining, roadside hazard removal, speed limit reduction, signing upgrades, street lighting, junction improvements including provision of traffic islands, ghost islands and a roundabout.

A3. Geographical area:

Please provide a short description of area covered by the bid (in no more than 50 words)

Please append a map showing the location (and route) of the proposed scheme, existing transport infrastructure and other points of particular interest to the bid e.g. development sites, areas of existing employment, constraints etc.

The length of the eligible section of A18 covered within the bid is 15.6km; starting from the A46 junction at Laceby, North East Lincolnshire to the junction with the A16 near Ludborough, Lincolnshire.

A map showing the extent of the route is appended.

Length of eligible road section: **15.6km**

OS Grid Reference: **520713/405838 to 530200/394800**

Postcode: **DN37 7LG to DN36 55G**

Appendix: **A**

A4. Equality Analysis

Has any Equality Analysis been undertaken in line with the Equality Duty?

Yes – no issues identified.

SECTION B – The Business Case

B1. The Scheme – Summary/History (Maximum 200 words)

Please outline what the scheme is trying to achieve

The route is currently identified as being 'high risk' in the 2016 EuroRAP report with a risk rating of one and two stars. The proposed measures are intended to both address specific road safety issues and reduce the collision risk to road users on the A18 and therefore the number of people killed and seriously injured on this road over the next 20 years. This improvement in road safety performance will support a reduction in the EuroRAP classification from 'high risk' to 'low/medium' risk (minimum three star risk).

Following an assessment of the route by the Road Safety Foundation the VIDA software tool has been used to identify a series of potential countermeasures to address collision risk along the route. Following review by the Local Authorities project team, a shortlist of VIDA countermeasures, that are considered appropriate for the route, have been taken forward within the proposed scheme. In addition, the Road Safety Engineers in the two highway authorities have identified further countermeasures, using traditional collision analysis methods, that address specific road safety issues along the route.

Countermeasures include carriageway widening (haunching), carriageway resurfacing, skid resistance upgrades, localised vehicle restraint systems, rumble edge lining, roadside hazard removal, speed limit reduction, signing upgrades, street lighting, junction improvements including provision of traffic islands, ghost islands and a roundabout.

B2. The Strategic Case (Maximum 350 words)

This section should set out the rationale for making the investment and evidence of the existing safety problems.

Supporting evidence may be provided in annexes – if clearly referenced in the strategic case. This may be used to assist in judging the strategic case arguments but is unlikely to be reviewed in detail or assessed in its own right. So you should not rely on material included only in annexes being assessed.

What and where are the current road safety problems to be addressed by your scheme?

What road safety options have been considered and why do the proposed ones provide the best solution, particularly in terms of meeting the objective of reducing fatal and serious injury collisions?

What is the impact and the expected road safety benefits / outcomes of the scheme? If

possible, provide information on the likely KSI reductions as a result of the scheme.

The Road Safety Foundation in their EuroRAP report of October 2016 identified a 15.6 km section of the A18 between Laceby, North East Lincolnshire and Ludborough, Lincolnshire as a 'high risk road' with a star risk ratings of only one and two. This risk rating was based on the number of KSI's on the route over the three year analysis period (2012 – 2014), where there were a total of 10 fatal and serious collisions resulting in 7 fatalities, 12 serious injuries and 39 slight injuries.

A plan showing the locations of the fatal and serious collisions is attached as Appendix B.

Analysis of the injury collisions has shown 44% involved adverse road conditions, 41% vehicles losing control/skidding and 22% included right turning vehicles.

Road safety options considered have come from a combination of applying the VIDA software tool on the route and an analysis of collision data to identify potential improvement measures. The proposed scheme has incorporated measures identified through both these methods of identification and therefore has the benefit of addressing both potential long-term road safety risk, identified through VIDA, and specific road safety issues along the A18.

A schedule of the proposed schemes and associated countermeasures is attached at Appendix C.

The proposed programme of measures are focused on addressing the key road safety issues as follows:

- **Adverse weather:** carriageway resurfacing, skid resistance upgrades; speed limit reduction
- **Losing control/skidding:** carriageway widening (haunching), localised vehicle restraint systems, rumble edge lining, roadside hazard removal, speed limit reduction
- **Right turning vehicles:** signing upgrades, street lighting, junction improvements including provision of traffic islands, ghost islands and a roundabout.

The scheme collision savings are currently being appraised by the Road Safety Foundation as part of their determination of the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR). Further information will be submitted on receipt of the returned information.

B3. The Financial Case – Project Costs

Before preparing a scheme proposal for submission, bid promoters should ensure they understand the financial implications of developing the scheme (including any implications for future resource spend and ongoing costs relating to maintaining and operating the asset), and the need to secure and underwrite any necessary funding outside the Department for Transport's maximum contribution.

*Please complete the following tables. **Figures should be entered in £000s** (i.e. £10,000 = 10).*

Table A: Funding profile (Nominal terms)

£000s	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total
<i>DfT Funding Sought</i>	0	£1,796	£1,026	0	£2,822

<i>LA Contribution</i>	0	0	0	0	
<i>Other Third Party Funding</i>	0	0	0	0	

Notes:

(1) Department for Transport funding will not be provided beyond 2020/21 financial year.

B4. The Financial Case – Local Contribution / Third Party Funding

Please provide information on the following points (where applicable):

- a) *The non-DfT contribution may include funding from organisations other than the scheme promoter. Please provide details of all non-DfT funding contributions to the scheme costs. This should include evidence to show how any third party contributions are being secured, the level of commitment and when they will become available.*

As the proposed scheme cost does not exceed the threshold of £0.2m per km of eligible road, no local contribution is required, as set out in the bid guidance.

Highway Authority will be taking on the future maintenance liability for the implemented works which will be prioritised and funded from the future capital maintenance allocations.

B5. The Financial Case – Affordability and Financial Risk (maximum 300 words)

This section should provide a narrative setting out how you will mitigate any financial risks associated with the scheme.

Please provide evidence on the following points (where applicable):

- a) *What risk allowance has been applied to the project cost?*

The proposed scheme has a risk allowance of 15%

Feasibility and preliminary design work has been undertaken. Detailed proposals have been produced that identify the exact nature and extent of the proposed works and the effect on any Statutory Undertakers Apparatus in the area.

The agreed risk allowance includes for where precise quantity estimates can only be established following detailed design and potential 'unforeseen risks' that may arise during commencement of work on site.

- b) *How will cost overruns be dealt with?*

Potential risks have been identified, as much as possible, within the initial feasibility/ preliminary design phase and the agreed risk allowance included in the overall project cost should minimise any cost overruns.

Both local authorities have extensive experience on delivering major projects including large complex highway infrastructure schemes and as such we are confident that the scheme will be

delivered in line with costs set out in within this bid. Project costs will be managed and brought back into line with the predicted budget in the event that unforeseen costs are incurred. However, in the event that the scheme costs exceed the projected budget, any overspend will be met by the relevant local authority.

c) What are the main risks to project delivery timescales and what impact this will have on cost?

A Risk Register identifying the main risks to the overall project is provided in Appendix D.

However with regard to project delivery and costs, the following risks are identified:-

1. Land purchase requirement for the implementation of a new roundabout. The extent of land purchase has been identified within the preliminary design and the potential cost for purchase accounted for in the project costs. However, this is subject to negotiations with the land owner and could have a significant impact on the project delivery timescale. Alternative measures have been identified in the event that the land purchase is not successful.
2. Impact of the construction phase on the NELC network. Considering the volume and nature of traffic using this route on a daily basis, the traffic management, potential road closures and diversion routes will have a significant impact on the remaining network. Phasing of the scheme will have to take into account any agreed major projects already programmed within the borough specifically with regard to the impact on the potential diversion routes.
3. Lack of capacity to undertake project design and supervision. At this stage, it is envisaged that delivery will be undertaken by experienced in-house staff within both local authorities. In the event that additional resource is required, this will be sourced externally at no cost to the project.
4. Cost exceeding allocated budget. Unlikely due to the extensive feasibility work undertaken to this stage and the inclusion of a risk allowance within the scheme cost.

These risks are primarily delivery risks. However, the governance structure for the project includes the appointment of a dedicated Project Board, Project Manager and project delivery team to ensure risk mitigation measures are monitored and instigated in a timely manner. The Project Board will review the scheme Risk Register regularly as part of Project Board Meetings. Further detail on the Project Board and Governance is provided in section B7.

B6. The Economic Case – Value for Money

If available, promoters should provide an estimate of the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of the scheme (particularly for schemes costing more than £100,000)

Where a BCR is provided please provide separate reporting in the form of an Annex to the bid to enable scrutiny of the data and assumptions used in deriving that BCR.

Where a BCR is not available/appropriate other values of value for money should be demonstrated. These should be commensurate with the value of the scheme.

The scheme is currently being appraised by the Road Safety Foundation to determine the

Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR).

Further information will be submitted as Appendix E on receipt of the returned information; however, we anticipate that the BCR will be greater than 2.

B7. The Commercial Case (Maximum 300 words)

This section should set out the procurement strategy that will be used to select a contractor and set out the timescales involved in the procurement process to show that delivery can proceed quickly.

What is the preferred procurement route for the scheme? For example, if it is proposed to use existing framework agreements or contracts, the contract must be appropriate in terms of scale and scope.

**It is the promoting authority's responsibility to decide whether or not their scheme proposal is lawful; and the extent of any new legal powers that need to be sought. Scheme promoters should ensure that any project complies with the Public Contracts Regulations as well as European Union State Aid rules, and should be prepared to provide the Department for Transport with confirmation of this, if required.*

An assurance that a strategy is in place that is legally compliant is likely to achieve the best value for money outcomes is required from your Section 151 Officer below.

Should North East Lincolnshire Council (NELC) be successful in securing funding from the Safer Roads Fund, the proposed strategy for procurement is through NELC's Capital Works Framework for Highways Lot 3. All tendering and appointments for the framework are carried out in accordance with EU guidelines. In order for a contractor to be included on the framework they are assessed in terms of their economic, financial and technical capability. They are also required to be registered with professional trade bodies where relevant.

A mini competition will be carried out between the 7no approved suppliers on the framework under the NEC3 terms which will be undertaken by our in house design team. An invitation to tender will be sent to the suppliers with tenders due back within 4 weeks of the date of the invitation. In order to ensure quality of tender submission, the tender will have a price/ quality split and a quality evaluation will be incorporated into the tender package, consisting of a number of questions which would be scored in accordance with NELC procurement rules. which will be evaluated and assessed by the Project Manager and the Design Team Manager. These quality scoring and tender values will then be added to a scoring matrix to calculate the winning tenderer and the contract awarded. This process is carried out in partnership with the Council's dedicated procurement team.

It is intended that each Local Authority will be responsible for the works on their section of the route. However, the scheme design will be developed in partnership between both authorities to ensure that the signing, lining and other elements of the scheme are consistent.

B8. Management Case – Delivery (Maximum 300 words)

Deliverability is one of the essential criteria and, as such, any bid should set out if any statutory procedures are needed before it can be delivered.

a) *An outline project plan (typically in Gantt chart form) with milestones should be included as an annex, covering the period from submission of the bid to scheme completion. The definition of the key milestones should be clear and explained. The critical path should be identifiable and any contingency periods, key dependencies (internal or external) should be explained. Successful schemes will be subject to quarterly monitoring to assess progress against milestones and to track spend.*

Has a project plan been appended to your bid?

A project plan is included in Appendix F

b) *A statement of intent to deliver the scheme within this programme from a senior political representative and/or senior local authority official.*

A statement of intent to deliver the scheme signed by the NELC Director of Economy and Growth and a letter of support from Lincolnshire County Council is included in Appendix G

B9. Management Case – Governance (maximum 300 words)

Please name who is responsible for delivering the scheme, the roles (Project Manager, SRO etc.) and set out the responsibilities of those involved and how key decisions are/will be made. An organogram may be useful here. This may be attached as an Annex.

North East Lincolnshire Council is in a long term 'Regeneration Partnership' with ENGIE, who will act as a delivery agent for the scheme and will deliver the project on behalf of NELC. A Project Board will be established which will include personnel from both ENGIE and NELC to manage the overall project. NELC will undertake the role of Project Sponsor.

The Board's responsibility is to oversee the development and delivery of this major project providing governance, direction, overall authority for the project and is accountable for its success or failure. The Board will meet on a regular scheduled basis to discuss the scheme development and delivery, identifying any potential issues at an early stage.

The Board is made up of the following key project personnel:-

Project Sponsor
Senior Supplier
Project Manager
Finance Manager

Other personnel will provide support to the Project Manager and attend the Project Board as required. The collective responsibilities of the Project Board members include:

- Accepting and demonstrating ownership and accountability for the project
- Working as a team to provide collective and unified direction
- Agreeing and committing all of the resources required to successfully complete the project

- Effective delegation with appropriate project tolerances and exception management processes
- Facilitating cross functional working ensuring that the project structure is recognised and respected
- Effective decision making including risk, issue and change management
- Project assurance and quality control
- Ensuring timely and effective communication within the project and with external stakeholders

Project Sponsor:

The Project Sponsor is Damien Jaines White, NELC Head of Strategy & Development, Economy & Growth who will have overall responsibility for the scheme.

Senior Supplier:

The Senior Supplier is Mark Scarr, Deputy Head of Highways and Transport, ENGIE. Mark will oversee the design, facilitation, procurement of external resources and implementation of the project and has ultimate accountability on behalf of ENGIE and will report back to the Project Sponsor.

Finance Manager:

The Finance Manager will be Guy Lonsdale, NELC Finance Group Manager

Project Manager:

The Project Manager is Debbie Swatman, Traffic Team Manager, ENGIE. Debbie will be responsible for the day to day management and delivery of the scheme within the North East Lincolnshire area and will report directly to the Senior Supplier.

Within Lincolnshire County Council, this role will be undertaken by Graeme Butler, LCC Road Safety (Accident Investigation) Manager.

Highways Design Team

Experienced highway engineers and road safety professionals will deliver the scheme and oversee the monitoring process, ensuring works are delivered within the budget and on time.

The Project Governance document and an organogram showing the management structure for the scheme is included as Appendix H

B10. Management Case – Risk Management

Risk management is an important control for all projects but this should be commensurate with cost. For projects where the costs exceed £100,000, a risk register covering the top 5 (maximum) specific risks to this scheme should be attached as an annex.

Please ensure that in the risk register cost that you have not included any risks associated with ongoing operational costs and have used the P50 value.

Has a risk register been appended to your bid?

A Risk Register showing the main risks and their risk likelihood is included in Appendix D
In summary the main risks are:

1. Land Purchase – Medium (Medium likelihood / high impact)
2. Cost exceeding allocated budget – Low (low likelihood/low impact)
3. Delays in delivering project – Low (low likelihood/medium impact)
4. Lack of capacity to deliver elements of the programme – Low (low likelihood/medium impact)
5. Procurement processes causing delay – Low (low likelihood/low impact).

SECTION C – Monitoring, Evaluation and Benefits Realisation

C1. Benefits Realisation (maximum 250 words)

Please provide details on the profile of benefits, and of baseline benefits and benefit ownership and explain how your scheme design will lead to the outputs/outcomes. This could be achieved by logic maps, text descriptions, etc. Information should focus on road safety benefits.

This should be proportionate to the cost of the proposed scheme.

The anticipated benefits as a result of the scheme are summarised as follows:

1. An anticipated reduction in the number of fatal and serious collisions on this section of the A18.
2. An improvement in the EuroRap rating from 'high risk' to 'low/medium risk';
3. An estimated Benefit Cost Ratio of greater than 2; and
4. Reduced ongoing maintenance costs.

There is likely to be an immediate reduction in the number of collisions and casualties following completion of the scheme as a result of the improved road surface and a more consistent approach to signing and lining along the route. The reduction in ongoing maintenance costs will also be realised straight away as the route is restored to good condition.

C2. Monitoring and Evaluation (maximum 250 words)

Evaluation is an essential part of scheme development and should be considered and built into the planning of a scheme from the earliest stages. Periodic monitoring and evaluating the outcomes and impacts of schemes, in addition to evaluation findings towards the end, is also important to show if a scheme has been successful.

Where possible, bidders should describe any baseline info (or other counterfactual) they will use for the evaluation.

Please set out how you plan to measure and report on the road safety benefits identified in Section C1, alongside any other outcomes and impacts of the scheme. Scheme promoters are

expected to contribute to platforms for sharing and disseminating the lessons learned, as directed by the Department for Transport.

The monitoring and evaluation process will be primarily based on the analysis of before and after injury collision data. The baseline of which will be the same period as the EuroRap assessment 2012 – 2014.

Injury collision data recorded by the Police and provided through the Stats 19 process, to which both Local authorities have access to, will be used to monitor and evaluate the impact of the scheme following completion for a period of 3 years.

In addition, speed and flow surveys will be undertaken at key strategic locations along the route in advance of the final design of the scheme and again following completion to help determine the impact and effectiveness of the implemented measures on driver behaviour.

We would welcome the opportunity to share any data and outcomes with the DfT and other local authorities as part of this process, in addition to participating in, and contributing to relevant platforms and forums as requested by the DfT.

SECTION D: Declarations

D1. Senior Responsible Owner Declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for A18 (Laceby to Ludborough), I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of North East Lincolnshire Council and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that North East Lincolnshire Council will have all the necessary powers in place to ensure the planned timescales in the application can be realised.

Name:

Signed:

Position:

D2. Section 151 Officer Declaration

As Section 151 Officer for North East Lincolnshire Council I declare that the scheme cost estimates quoted in this bid are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that North East Lincolnshire Council

- has allocated sufficient budget to deliver this scheme on the basis of its proposed funding contribution
- will allocate sufficient staff and other necessary resources to deliver this scheme on time and on budget
- accepts responsibility for meeting any costs over and above the DfT contribution requested, including potential cost overruns and the underwriting of any funding contributions expected from third parties
- accepts responsibility for meeting any ongoing revenue requirements in relation to the scheme
- accepts that no further increase in DfT funding will be considered beyond the maximum contribution requested
- has the necessary governance / assurance arrangements in place
- has identified a procurement strategy that is legally compliant and is likely to achieve the best value for money outcome
- will ensure that a robust and effective stakeholder and communications plan is put in place.

Name:

Signed:

Submission of bids:

An electronic copy only of the bid including any supporting material should be submitted to:

saferroadsfund@dft.gsi.gov.uk