**Meeting Notes**

**Job Title**  
A18 – A180 Link Road

**Job Number**  
D087019

**Venue**  
DfT, Great Minster House

**Date**  
29th October 2007

**Present**  
Steve Berry, DfT  
Richard Mace, DfT  
Steve Grayson, DfT  
John Collins, DfT  
Dick Crump, North East Lincolnshire Council  
Simon Moss, North East Lincolnshire Council  
Alan Beswick, JMP  
Martin Revill, JMP  
Emma Warman, JMP

**Apologies**

**Distribution**  
Those present

**Topic**  
A18 – A180 Link Road Major Scheme Business Case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proposed Option</td>
<td>DfT queried why the most direct option had not been chosen. NELC demonstrated the difficulties created by the Scheduled Ancient Monument by production of an Aerial Photograph.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Low Cost Alternative | It was noted that the proposed option is the lowest cost road option and the only lower cost option is to implement a series of HGV bans. It was explained that this course of action would result in moving the problem to a different locations, with successive increases in diversion length.  
It was agreed that there is no realistic low cost alternative to be appraised, and this is to be suitably demonstrated to DfT by the inclusion of maps and accompanying explanation of the weight limit option in the submission document. |
| 3. Public Transport Alternative | It was agreed that there is no realistic public transport alternative as the main focus of the project is freight. Similarly, because of the early dispersal of the freight in question, there is no sensible rail alternative. |
| 4. Modelling | JC had advised previously that an interpeak model will be required. EW presented the proposed methodology as set out in the scoping document. NELC and JMP considered the proposed methodology to be proportional to the scheme.  
In order to fully consider the proposed methodology, JC requested evidence of existing data and additional information which would be used |
to support the proposed methodology.

Evidence and explanatory notes will be produced to DfT prior to submission in support of the proposed methodology.

JMP will identify the existing data available and any gaps within that data. Based upon this any additional surveys can be identified to provide suitable evidence with which to populate the model.

Consideration also needs to be given to the modelling of HGV speeds to ensure that the evidence on which the appraisal is being based is appropriate to the case.

An operational assessment of the roundabout using ARCADY will be required to demonstrate that traffic does not queue back on to the level crossing. Turning flows will be taken from the future year SATURN models.

5. Consultation
Consultation will continue with Network Rail regarding the measures to ensure that the scheme will not impact on the level crossing.
Consultation will continue with the Highways Agency.

6. Economic Appraisal
It was agreed that only a qualitative assessment is required, rather than a formal Economic Impact Report. This needs to demonstrate that the scheme does not make things worse for deprived communities.

The DfT requested that a BCR is produced for a 30 year appraisal period as well as the standard 60 year appraisal.

7. Scheme Costs
The costs produced by Opus will be reviewed by JMP.

The costs table needs updating to show 50% contribution to preparatory costs, and the profile of the overall local contribution.

5% inflation looks reasonable but an underlying inflation figure appropriate to the region should be used.

10% local contribution is a minimum.

8. Programme
Major Scheme Business Case (MSBC) should be submitted this financial year, however, if new surveys are required this could delay the submission.

The DfT requires 4 weeks notice of Programme Entry submission. Then, for a small scheme, a 6 month period from submission is likely before a decision is made.

The DfT suggested that the Conditional Approval and Full Approval stages could possibly be combined due to the simplicity and scale of the scheme. This would also depend on the procurement method proposed.

9. Project Management
The DfT highlighted the importance that the new guidance places on demonstrating Project Management of the scheme in MSBC.
Meeting Minutes

Date  
17 April 2008

Meeting date  
10 April 2008

Venue  
Department for Transport

Job No/ Name  
D087019

Present  
Steve Berry - DfT,  
Peter Apostolou - DfT,  
John Collins - DfT,  
Simon Moss - NELC,  
Ian Turvey - JMP,  
Emma Warman - JMP

Subject  
A18-A180 Link Road

Meeting items

| Actions |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Meeting items** | **Actions** |
| 1. SB explained the changing roles at DfT and stated that PA would now be dealing with the A18-A180 scheme. |  |
| 2. JC reiterated that the methodology needs to be compliant with guidance including checking whether variable demand modelling is required but DfT accepted that some degree of proportionality is appropriate. |  |
| 3. JC liked that new HGV data had been collected since the last meeting, however, clarification is required as to how this data is going to be used. The DfT also thought that the matrix disaggregation was appropriate and that there is potentially sufficient count data for matrix calibration and validation. |  |
| 4. The original TUBA analysis needs to be examined to determine where the benefits are coming from:  
  - If there are significant benefits to LGVs, then further work to improve the LGV matrix will be required.  
  - Are there significant benefits accruing from the inter peak.  
  If the scheme has borderline vfm and/or significant benefits accrue from movements that are not well represented in the model, then more information/refinement will be required for the modelling. JC advised RSIs on the B1210 and Station Road through Stallingborough could be used to enhance the analysis if required. | JMP |
| 5. The methodology proposes using journey to work data to Immingham Docks. JC wondered whether we could use Journey to Work data to other zones. | JMP |
6. Need to validate against more journey time routes including the A180 and A1173. JC stated that ITIS data could be used as long as there is sufficient data available. Therefore need to check standard deviations for the data.  

7. The spatial extent of the model needs to ensure any rerouting effects are captured if required. Therefore need to check journey time and distance for alternative routes. Also check RSI data for the A180.  

8. JC would look at any further evidence regarding the modelling prior to the submission of the MSBC, however, he would need warning of when to expect anything so that he can programme it into his schedule.  

9. PA would like to visit the site. NELC to organise in conjunction with Mark Duggleby at GOYH.  

| Distribution | Those present |  
| Name/ Signed | Emma Warman |  

NELC