

Local Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund



Application Form

The level of information provided should be proportionate to the size and complexity of the scheme proposed. As a guide, for a small scheme we would suggest around 10 to 15 pages including annexes would be appropriate and for a larger scheme, 15 to 30 pages.

A separate application form should be completed for each scheme up to a maximum of one large bid and one small bid for each local highway authority.

Applicant Information

Local authority name(s)*: Lancashire County Council (LCC)

**If the bid is a joint proposal, please enter the names of all participating local authorities and specify the lead authority*

Bid Manager Name and position: P L Mayes Assistant Director Commissioning
Contact telephone number: 01772 535231
Email address: peter.mayes@lancashire.gov.uk

Name and position of officer with day to day responsibility for delivering the proposed scheme.

Scheme Manager:- Mr David Leung,
Designation Project Manager Design and Construction,
Contact telephone number: 01772 534483
Email address: david.leung@lancashire.gov.uk

Postal address: Lancashire County Council
PO Box 78 County Hall
Fishergate
Preston
Lancashire
PR1 8XJ

When authorities submit a bid for funding to the Department, 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. The Department reserves the right to deem the business case as non-compliant if this is not adhered to.

Please specify the weblink where this bid will be published:

<http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/council/transparency.aspx>

SECTION A - Scheme description and funding profile

A1. Scheme name: **Exceptional M65 Motorway Infrastructure Maintenance**

A2. Headline description:

Exceptional M65 Motorway Infrastructure Maintenance

Please enter a brief description of the proposed scheme (in no more than 50 words)

LCC is one of the very few local authorities to have direct responsibility for a section of the motorway network. This bid is for exceptional motorway infrastructure maintenance on the M65 between J10-14 involving the replacement of the central steel crash barriers with concrete barriers that meet current standards. The scheme also involves the replacement of side crash barriers and upgrading the driver information matrix signs.

The scheme mitigates major safety risks on a strategically important route and supports the Burnley-Pendle Growth Corridor. The scheme is shovel ready for delivery in 2015/2016 as appropriate back ground preparation has been completed to allow on site work to commence rapidly on funding approval. The BCR for this scheme is 2.74, providing high VfM. The scheme is forecasted to reduce accidents as shown in the table below:-

Accidents over 50 years (2016-2065)

Severity	Do Nothing	Do Something	Reductiont
Fatal	8	4	4
Serious	94	51	43
Slight	526	473	53
TOTAL	628	528	100

A3. Geographical area:

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

This scheme will be undertaken on the 9.5km stretch of the M65, between J10-14 which is owned by Lancashire County Council. This part of the M65 lies within the Burnley-Pendle Growth Corridor one of the key growth areas in Lancashire Enterprise Partnerships' Strategic Economic Plan.

OS Grid Reference: 384621:437202 (refers to junction 12 – centre of proposed works)

Follow attached link to the LCC MARIO system (Maps & Related Information Online) for a map of Lancashire <http://mario.lancashire.gov.uk/agsmario/default.aspx>

Postcode: N/A

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.

Attached see Appendix 1 is a map showing the extent of the Burnley-Pendle Growth Corridor showing the scale of development around the scheme as identified in the Burnley Pendle Growth Corridor and Lancashire Enterprise Partnership's Strategic Economic Plan analysis.

Also attached at Appendix 2 and Appendix 3 are maps showing the key constraints on the route.

A4. Type of bid (please tick relevant box):

Small project bids (requiring DfT funding of between £5m and £20m)

Major maintenance, strengthening or renewal of bridges, tunnels, retaining walls or other structures

Major maintenance or renewal of carriageways (roads)

Major maintenance or renewal of footways or cycleways

Major maintenance or renewal of drainage assets

Upgrade of Street Lighting

Large project bids (requiring DfT funding of between £20m plus)

Major maintenance, strengthening or renewal of bridges, tunnels, retaining walls or other structures

Major maintenance or renewal of carriageways (roads)

Major maintenance or renewal of footways or cycleways

Major maintenance or renewal of drainage assets

Upgrade of Street Lighting

A5. Equality Analysis

Has any Equality Analysis been undertaken in line with the Equality Duty? Yes No

A copy of this is attached at Appendix 4, which shows that no groups will be disadvantaged as a result of undertaking this scheme.

SECTION B – The Business Case

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

Please select what the scheme is trying to achieve (this will need to be supported by short evidence in the Business Case).

The M65 runs between the M6 at Preston and Colne. The Highways Agency own the section between J1-10, whilst LCC own the remaining section between J10-14.

This route carries a significant amount of traffic and has a 2-way AADT flow of between 38,282 (J13-14) and 44,452 (J12-13), which is anticipated to rise 43,494 (J13-J14) and 58,141 (J12-13) by 2031.

To the travelling public this road is regarded as a seamless motorway with no evidence on route as to the separation of ownership. They will expect all parts, regardless of ownership, to be maintained to a consistent motorway standard.

This is a key route and artery for the whole of East Lancashire. Supporting a key growth area with the defined potential in the Lancashire Enterprise Partnership's Strategic Economic Plan to deliver in the region of 900 homes and the potential to generate 10,000 extra jobs and over £500m in GVA (i.e. uplift in of the value of goods and services produced in the area).

The scheme proposes to:-

- Replace the central reservation vehicle restraint systems between J10-14 and upgrading the communications system along this stretch of road. The central reserve barriers were subject to a series of inspections in 2010/2011 which gave rise to concerns about the general condition of these barriers and in particular the ability of the barriers to contain a 'cross-over' collision with on-coming traffic. Given impacts and severities of such incidents on safety and operation of the route the scheme needs to be funded now and through DfT Maintenance Challenge Fund as LCC would not have the ability to undertake the works to the same extent, or in the timescales required, without DfT support. The assessment advised that the barriers no longer meet the minimum current standards and that cross-over collisions would become increasingly likely if the barriers were not replaced.
- An appropriate program of replacement of nearside and slip road crash barriers,

The scheme will bring the vehicle restraint systems on the M65 between J10-14 up to the required minimum standard and meets key objectives to protect safety, route operation and the key economic function of the route in East Lancashire; securing access to the M6, Manchester other and key economic centres across Lancashire and the North.

B2. The Strategic Case (Maximum 650 words)

This section should set out the rationale for making the investment and evidence of the existing transport problems, set out the history of the asset and why it is needed to be repaired or renewed. It should also include how it fits into the overall asset management strategy for the authority.

In particular please provide evidence on the relevant questions/issues at paragraph 15 onwards of the accompanying Challenge Fund guidance.

Supporting evidence may be provided in annexes – if clearly referenced in the strategic case. This may be used to assist in judging the strength of your 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 are the current problems to be addressed by your scheme? (Describe any economic, environmental, social problems or opportunities which will be addressed by the scheme.

The M65 plays an essential role in the economy of East Lancashire, connecting people and businesses internally as well as providing the primary means of access to Central Lancashire and the M6, particularly for freight. East Lancashire has a growing portfolio of higher value industries with aerospace, advanced manufacturing, advanced flexible materials, digital and creative industries all featuring strongly in the area's economy, including manufacturers who rely on 'just-in-time' delivery from multiple suppliers who require access to reliable, safe and efficient road network at all times of the day.

The Burnley-Pendle Growth Corridor comprises a number of existing and future strategic employment sites across the districts of Burnley, Pendle and Hyndburn including Burnley Bridge, Weaver's Triangle, the Aerospace Supply Park, Pendle Gateway and other developments such as the UCLan Knowledge Zone in Burnley town centre. Many of these lie in close proximity to the M65 and/or require effective access to and from it. The principal objective of the Burnley-Pendle Growth Corridor strategy is to support economic growth through the implementation of a £12m programme of localised interventions from 2015/16 focused on reducing current and projected congestion, improving journey time reliability and widening sustainable travel opportunities. The programme is included in the Lancashire Growth Deal announced in July 2014 in support of the delivery of approximately 900 houses and 10,000 jobs through to 2030.

The M65 has a higher utilisation rate per lane than the western length of motorway owned by the HA and supports a higher than national average of distribution businesses. J12-13 is currently the heaviest trafficked section, with a two-way Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flow of 44,452. As traffic levels are expected to increase significantly it is anticipated that the 2-way AADT count will increase by 24% to 58,141 by 2031. As more dependency is placed on the M65 it would be potentially disastrous for the economy of the area if use of this strategic link were restricted, as alternative roads tend to follow historic routes dictated by the topography rather than travel demand. As a consequence most are poorly aligned and unsuitable for carrying high volumes of traffic, particularly heavy goods vehicles. It is essential therefore that this work is undertaken as soon as possible to reduce accidents, risk and the potential for major incidents on the route; as the barriers are life-expired this will only increase as traffic grows.

Jacobs UK Ltd, the County Council's Technical / Professional Services Framework Consultant, have recently undertaken a STATS19 analysis which shows a high number of fatal and serious injuries along the route, which makes upgrading the barriers essential. See table below.

Year	Number of Accidents			Total
	Fatal	Serious	Slight	
2008	2	49	322	373
2009	4	31	302	337
2010	5	47	236	288
2011	3	46	260	309
2012	1	58	262	321
Total	15	231	1382	1628

Further details can be found on page 68 in Appendix 5. Jacobs have calculated that the BCR for this scheme is 2.74. Anything above 2 is regarded as providing high VfM.

In January 2005, the Highways Agency (HA) issued its new policy (Interim Advice Note 60/05), recommending the use of concrete barriers to reduce the risk of crossover incidents on central reservations of motorways with high traffic levels. These were incorporated into the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (Volume 2, Section 2, Part 8), TD19/06 which sets out the Requirement for Road Restraint Systems (RRS).

As a result it is now HA policy that all new motorway schemes use high containment concrete barriers in the central reserve. These are also to be used on all existing motorways as part of ongoing upgrades and through replacement as and when existing systems have reached the end of their useful life. In addition, there is a requirement to use a rigid concrete safety barrier with an H1 or greater containment level on the central reserve on motorways or roads constructed to motorway standard with a two-way AADT flow greater or equal to 25,000

vehicles/day. All sections of the M65 between J10-14 have a two-way AADT flow greater than 33,000 vehicles per day.

There are a number of benefits of installing concrete barriers. When they are struck, they don't usually need to be repaired and don't need as much regular maintenance as steel barriers, which minimises the exposure and risk to operatives working on high speed roads when setting up traffic management etc. Other benefits include:

- They don't damage the vehicle as much.
- They (usually) don't need any repair after a crash. Currently, repairing barriers will involve closing a road/ lane for repairs to be carried out, with workers being put at risk on the road.
- They work equally well with heavier vehicles.
- Only one concrete barrier is needed in the central reservation to serve both sides of the road.
- There is no headlight dazzle through the barrier.
- They need less space as they don't 'deform' like steel barriers.

In the UK, crossover incidents account for over 200 motorway crashes and 40 deaths a year. A concrete barrier will significantly reduce the risk of cross-over accidents and reduce the number of reported accidents, as supported by studies on the M25, which show that on sections with concrete barriers there were 70% fewer reported accidents compared to other systems, leading to a positive effect on traffic flows as there are fewer lane closures, delays, tailbacks or traffic jams.

This scheme will therefore not only reduce the risk of a cross-over accident but will also help to improve the reliability of this road so that it can support the 24% increase in traffic that is expected as a result of businesses being attracted to East Lancashire and the Burnley-Pendle Growth Corridor. The scheme will also reduce the very significant financial implications arising from short term unavailability of the M65 and longer term reductions.

It is estimated the cost of one such accident and the resultant investigations, delays and remediation would exceed the total cost of the scheme. The loss in reputational terms would be immense.

Why the asset is in need of urgent funding?

The asset requires urgent funding because:-

- It has reached the end of its practical life,
- The nature and size of the project makes it extremely difficult to fund from normal maintenance allocations, resulting in delay to the project, additional accidents, unreliability and loss of economic productivity and performance,
- There are huge cost benefits and economies of scale in replacing the vehicle restraint barriers as one project, which will result in less disruption and greater cost savings than undertaking piecemeal work,
- The safety risks on this key strategic route are increasing,
- There is an increasing risk of cross-over accidents with potential loss of life.
- Any serious cross over accident would have serious financial implications.
- The aftermath of any serious accident would have a severe curtailment in the usability of this key strategic route,
- The scheme supports Growth Deal works in the same area which will improve key junctions between J10-14 of the M65 as part of the Lancashire Growth Deal agreed with central government,

- There are several development sites along this route which are being actively developed that will significantly increase use of this strategic route over the next few years and exacerbate the risk of cross-over accident,
- The above factors indicate that it is appropriate to deliver the scheme as rapidly as is possible to support on-going works and initiatives to promote the economy in one of Lancashire's key growth corridors,
- It is understood that the HA is preparing to replace central reservation barriers on the length of the M65 which is its responsibility. This scheme will dovetail with the HA scheme and provide consistency along the route.

What options have been considered and why have alternatives have been rejected?

The following options have been considered:-

- Do nothing: Sooner or later a major failure is likely to occur with potential for loss of life, reputational damage and damage to the economy of East Lancashire.
- Carry out limited maintenance: - Whilst this would improve the resistance to cross over accidents, this approach was rejected as it would incur very significant costs with no assurance of significantly reducing the risk of cross-over accidents in the long term,
- Replace with similar:- this option was rejected as the replacement barrier would not satisfy current standards and would produce a maintenance intensive asset that would cause traffic disruption on a regular basis,
- Piecemeal replacement: - the replacement of barriers piecemeal over a number of years within the constraints of available budgets was rejected as a large proportion of the costs are in the set up and traffic management. The project timetable would be unacceptably long with increasing risks on those sections of barrier which had not been replaced but would continue to deteriorate and pose a greater risk.
- Wholesale replacement of the barriers: - the option to replace all the barriers between J10-14 in one operation is considered to be the most cost effective solution per kilometre and delivers the lowest ongoing cost per kilometre. This option will also support any HA replacement programme from J10 to the M6 interchange as it is understood that they have come to the same conclusion as LCC regarding the existing steel crash barriers, and are developing a scheme to replace the safety barriers on their section of the M65 with a concrete equivalent. The scheme proposed by LCC will therefore dovetail to the HA scheme and ensure that safety barriers along the whole length are to the same standard. As well as providing direct benefits from the start, the scheme also reduces on-going revenue spend for the council.

What are the expected benefits / outcomes?

Economic

- Any possible restriction or temporary withdrawal of this key strategic route through closure will be reduced so that the M65 can continue to support the businesses served by it. This is particularly important as few effective alternative routes exist in the area.
- The scheme dovetails completely with significant improvement works at major junctions between J10-14 as part of the Burnley Pendle Growth Corridor strategy which are designed to increase the operational efficiency of the motorway junctions and improve traffic flows.
- The scheme will secure an efficient motorway link to development sites currently identified and in process of delivery between J10-14 which in turn are predicted to increase usage of the route.

Communications

- The scheme will compliment other schemes being undertaken in close proximity which includes improvement to rail links and stations:-

- a) Burnley Manchester Road Station improvements (completed).
- b) Rose Grove station improvements
- c) The Todmorden Curve reinstatement project to facilitate introduction of a rail service to Manchester from East Lancashire, via Burnley Manchester Road,

The scheme enables business located in the Burnley-Pendle Growth Corridor to be better connected to other parts of the UK, Europe and the rest of the world, which has the potential to generate greater economic growth for the area.

Safety

- The M65 J10-14 will be returned to a safe operating standard for the travelling public with an appropriate ability to contain, prevent and reduce cross-over accidents,
- This scheme will reduce the requirement to put traffic management restrictions in place along the motorway and reduce the need to expose operational staff to working on this high speed road.

Maintenance

- The whole life costs of this asset are minimised and maintenance costs on an ongoing basis are reduced compared to the present time and not actually undertaking the work.

Social

- East Lancashire will be supported by a low maintenance motorway for the foreseeable future.

Please provide information on the geographical areas that will benefit from your scheme. You should indicate those areas that will directly benefit, areas that will indirectly benefit and those areas that will be impacted adversely.

Attached at Appendix 1 is a map showing the areas that will benefit from this scheme. The M65 is used for freight, business and commuters to key economic centres of Burnley, Blackburn, Preston and Manchester. There will be no areas adversely affected by this scheme.

What will happen if funding for this scheme is not secured - would an alternative (lower cost) solution be implemented (if yes, please describe this alternative and how it differs from the proposed scheme)?

- The financial benefits of procurement of the scheme as one project would be lost,
- The safety risks currently present would continue and safety would deteriorate,
- The scheme would be delayed significantly if funding was not available beyond the initial LCC contribution identified below,
- The risks of a major failure of the vehicle restraint systems would increase,
- National standards would be undermined,
- Would risk future growth potential as additional accidents and severities would be more likely.

What is the impact of the scheme?

LCC is unusual in having responsibility for 9.5km of motorway. The scheme enables the authority to ensure that national containment standards are satisfied by its motorway assets central reservation vehicle restraint systems.

The impact of the scheme will be significant, securing a strategic route in the east of the county with reduced maintenance needs and costs that will serve existing and future development sites and support the Burnley-Pendle Growth Corridor.

The scheme protects the viability and continued availability of this key strategic route and reduces significant future safety liabilities.

The scheme delivers the best whole life cost scheme and provides an asset with minimal future maintenance requirements.

The scheme reduces the risk of significant financial exposure to the authority resulting from a critical failure of the vehicle restraint systems and aligns LCC approach to the HA view on the provision of a concrete safety barrier and provides consistency along the whole length of the M65.

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'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	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Total
<i>DfT Funding Sought</i>	£5100			5100
<i>LA Contribution</i>	£1500			1500
<i>Other Third Party Funding</i>				

Notes:

- 1) Department for Transport funding must not go beyond 2017-18 financial year.*
- 2) A minimum local contribution of 10% (local authority and/or third party) of the project costs is required.*

LCC's contribution equates to almost 23% of the scheme costs which is significantly more than the minimum 10% local commitment required.

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.

The authority has allocated £1.5m to the scheme which is equivalent to 23% of the total projected costs.

- b) Where the contribution is from external sources, please provide a letter confirming the body's commitment to contribute to the cost of the scheme. The Department is unlikely to

fund any scheme where significant financial contributions from other sources have not been secured or appear to be at risk.

Have you appended a letter(s) to support this case? Yes No N/A

- c) Please list any other funding applications you have made for this scheme or variants thereof and the outcome of these applications, including any reasons for rejection.

[This scheme has not been subject to a previous bid.](#)

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 (you should refer to the Risk Register – see Section B10).

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

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

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

[The authority has identified a strategic reserve of an additional £1.1m to allow for unexpected variance due to unforeseen factors. This contingency represents almost 17% of the total scheme costs and represents a sensible level of risk given the nature of this scheme and recognises that any additional spend will be met by LCC.](#)

- b) How will cost overruns be dealt with?

[LCC as one of the largest authorities in England has a good track record on delivery and is capable delivering this scheme on time and on budget. Should cost over-runs occur, these will be met from LCC's strategic reserve, which is almost 17% of the total scheme costs.](#)

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

The main risks to project delivery timescales are:-

- [• Safety barrier works involving central reservation working on the M65 are most efficiently performed in the summer school holiday period. Advanced planning has been carried out to allow works on the M65 to be completed in summer 2015 should DfT funding be secured. Minor delay will not significantly affect costs.](#)
- [• Delays in tendering for safety barrier works beyond April 2015 may delay the project to late summer 2015, but are not expected. LCC has strong management and procurement systems in place to mitigate such risks.](#)

B6. The Economic Case – Value for Money

- a) **If available for smaller scheme bids, promoters should provide an estimate of the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of the scheme.**

[The attached BCR calculations have been produced by Jacobs for LCC. This provides the DfT with an independent, technical assurance of the value for money case associated with this scheme. This has been developed using WebTAG accident values of prevention, and detailed](#)

accident analysis to inform a robust BCR for the scheme rather than providing high-level analysis of potential benefits or BCRs from other similar schemes inclusive of risk and optimum bias. A copy of the BCR calculation is attached at Appendix 6.

The BCR for this scheme is 2.74. Anything above 2 is regarded as providing high VfM.

b) For larger schemes costing £20 million or more we would expect the bid to include a BCR and this should align with WebTAG - <https://www.gov.uk/transport-analysis-guidance-webtag>

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. This should include:

- A description of the key risks and uncertainties in the data and assumptions and the impact these have on the BCR;
- Key assumptions including (but not limited to): detail of the data used to support the analysis, appraisal period, forecast years, level of optimism bias applied; and
- A description of the modelling approach used to forecast the impact of the scheme and evidence to demonstrate that it is fit-for-purpose.

c) Please provide the following data which may form a key part of our assessment:
Note this material should be provided even if a BCR estimate has been supplied (unless already covered in a VfM Annex).

A description of the do-minimum situation (i.e. what would happen without Challenge Fund investment).	Higher and increasing accident rates and severities. Urgent repairs would continue. LCC would spend more on maintenance than if this bid was successful.
---	--

Details of significant monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits of the scheme (quantified where possible)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is estimated the cost of one cross-over accident and the resultant investigations, delays and remediation would exceed the total cost of the scheme. The loss in reputational terms would be immense. • Maintenance costs will reduce by £20,000 per annum • Replacement of current barriers following accidents will reduce by £50,000 per annum. • Disruption as a result of crash barrier repairs will be reduced. • Significant improvements in safety will be accrued with both monetary and non-monetary savings. • The overall improvement of the Burnley to Pendle Growth Corridor will potentially accrue significant benefits to local employment and growth.
---	---

Length of scheme (km)	9.5km
-----------------------	-------

Number of vehicles on affected section (AADT in vehicles and if possible split by vehicle type) – to include details of data (age etc.) supporting this estimate.		M65	Distance	2-way AADT Flow		
			(km)	2012	2016	2031
		J10-11	1.2	38282	39831	50070
		J11-12	4.2	41367	43041	54105
		J12-13	1.8	44452	46251	58141
	J13-14	2.3	33254	34600	43494	

d) Other VfM information where relevant - depending on type of scheme bid:

Details of required restrictions/closures if	N/a
--	-----

funding not provided (e.g. type of restrictions; timing/duration of restrictions; etc.)																									
Length of any diversion route, if closure is required (over and above existing route) (km)	Alternative routes to the M65 are limited and incapable of dealing with the M65 traffic over any period of time. Diversion routes are typically in excess of 15km, on single carriageway roads through urban areas.																								
Regularity/duration of closures due to flooding: (e.g. number of closures per year; average length of closure (hrs); etc.)	N/a																								
Number and severity of accidents: both for the do minimum and the forecast impact of the scheme (e.g. existing number of accidents and/or accident rate; forecast number of accidents and or accident rate with and without the scheme)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Accidents over 50 years (2016-2065)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Severity</th> <th>Do Nothing</th> <th>Do Something</th> <th>Benefit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Fatal</td> <td>8</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Serious</td> <td>94</td> <td>51</td> <td>43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Slight</td> <td>526</td> <td>473</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>628</td> <td>528</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Accidents over 50 years (2016-2065)				Severity	Do Nothing	Do Something	Benefit	Fatal	8	4	4	Serious	94	51	43	Slight	526	473	53	TOTAL	628	528	100
Accidents over 50 years (2016-2065)																									
Severity	Do Nothing	Do Something	Benefit																						
Fatal	8	4	4																						
Serious	94	51	43																						
Slight	526	473	53																						
TOTAL	628	528	100																						
Number of existing cyclists; forecasts of cycling usage with and without the scheme (and if available length of journey)	N/a																								

B7. The Commercial Case (maximum 300 words)

This section should set out the procurement strategy that will be used to select a contractor and, importantly for this fund, 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.

A tender process will be used to select main contractors for vehicle restraint barrier replacement, preliminary tender work is being carried out to allow for realisable delivery in 2015. Tender will comply with EU procurement and other legal requirements, be of appropriate value and offer the ability to provide a competitive process.

**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 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.*

B8. Management Case - Delivery (maximum 300 words – for b)

Deliverability is one of the essential criteria for this Fund and as such any bid should set out any necessary statutory procedures that are needed before it can be constructed.

- 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.

Has a project plan been appended to your bid? Yes No

A copy of the project plan for this scheme is attached at Appendix 9. In order that this scheme can start and finish in-year, LCC has already started some of the preparatory works associated with this scheme. The most critical parts of the scheme as a whole, are firstly meeting the DfT scheme bid deadline of 9th February and DfT approval for the scheme. Without these, the scheme cannot progress. .

With regards other key milestones, these are clearly stated in the appendix. Although the works will be undertaken in a sequence, many of the timescales associated with the milestones are considered to be flexible. It is anticipated that contractors will be able to mobilise within the allowed timescales enabling works to start ahead of schedule. The programme has been front-loaded to ensure that as much work as is possible is undertaken as possible in the summer months when day light hours are extended and traffic flows are lower due to school holidays. The programme does allow sufficient time for the concrete barriers to be completed in year should the works over-run. Whilst the replacement of side/slip crash barriers are scheduled to commence once the central barriers are replace, these works could take place concurrently with the main barrier works and at multiple site locations if required, subject to traffic management/safety etc.

b) Please summarise any lessons your authority has learned from the experience of delivering other DfT funded programmes (such as pinch point schemes, local majors, Local Sustainable Transport Fund, and Better Bus Areas) and what would be different on this project as a result.

The County Council is currently delivering the £130m Heysham to M6 Link Road scheme, one of the largest local authority road projects in the country, due for completion in summer 2016. In addition, through the successful Preston, South Ribble and Lancashire City Deal and the Lancashire Growth Deal, the County Council has embarked on delivery of a transport investment programme worth a further £250m over the five year period to 2020/21. This has involved considerable collaboration with the HA, Network Rail and others including the Lancashire Enterprise Partnership.

We have learned a number of lessons from our experience of preparing DfT funded bids for projects and the delivery of those projects. Principally, the importance of a clear project plan properly costed with a sound delivery plan. We have learned that preparation work to support the scope and delivery of projects is invaluable to ensure schemes are, wherever possible, shovel ready when submitted to DfT. A crucial lesson has been to ensure the phasing of project delivery is appropriate and sufficient time is allowed for any detailed planning phase following a successful bid. An important lesson has been to ensure that local support for a scheme is reflected in an appropriate local financial contribution to the scheme and in most cases our contributions have exceeded 20%.

Perhaps the most important lesson we have learned is that we require an ongoing rolling programme identifying exceptional maintenance and replacement projects within the framework of the TAMP, which ensures a clear strategic plan for up to ten years in advance.

We believe we understand and have practical experience of the problems we are likely to encounter and have a realistic deliverable project plan to make sure the allocated resources are used on time and with the projected outcomes.

The importance of good project management has been recognised and our senior management team will be closely involved in the management, governance and delivery of the project to ensure its delivered on time and on budget and with the minimisation of any financial risks.

We have also learned to focus investment in key growth areas to support our economy, not just on areas of high traffic flow.

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.

LCC is proposing to set up a strong Project Board to ensure that works are delivered on time and within budget and will appoint the Deputy Chief Executive (DCE) as Project Manager for this scheme.

The Project Board will be headed by the Director of Community Services and will include a number of lead professionals. The board will review progress on a regular basis and will prepare regular reports to the DCE showing delivery performance, financial performance and any risks to the project. In addition, the DfT will be invited to attend Project Board meetings and will be supplied with relevant documentation.

The DCE will receive regular updates from the Project Board and will have overall responsibility for project. He will provide advice to the Cabinet Member and any reports to Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The DCE will also provide strategic direction and be responsible for major management decisions regarding project delivery and any changes to the project delivery plan.

Full details of governance arrangements and organogram LCC are proposing to put in place, are attached at Appendix 7.

B10. Management Case - Risk Management

A risk register covering the top 5 (maximum) specific risks to this scheme should be attached as an annex including, if relevant and in the top 5, financial, delivery, commercial and stakeholder issues.

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?

Yes

No

[See Appendix 10](#)

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

The scheme will significantly reduce the risk of cross over accidents occurring, which have the potential to be fatal. The scheme is also expected to reduce the number of reported traffic

accidents. As a consequence it is anticipated that the scheme will improve the safety and reliability of the M65. In addition, as concrete crash barriers cause less damage to vehicles that glance them and require much less maintenance there will be less need for police/breakdown service intervention or for LCC to install traffic management to replace damaged barriers. As a consequence delays to traffic should reduce as there will be less need to interrupt traffic flows to recover vehicles etc, repair damaged barriers. As concrete barriers require less maintenance LCC will be able to reduce its maintenance liability and invest monies saved into other asset management activities. Also there will be less need for LCC operatives to work on high speed roads. As a consequence the scheme will provide a safer and more reliable daily commute to the 33,000+ people who use the M65 each day. The scheme will also put the M65 in a much better position to support the 23% increase in traffic that is anticipated as result development in the Burnley Pendle Growth Corridor. The scheme will also integrate with our TAMP (see Appendix 8) by supporting continued improvement in the strategic network.

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. Evaluating the outcomes and impacts of schemes is important to show if a scheme has been successful.

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

The authority will evaluate, measure and report the benefits outcomes and impacts of the scheme during its progress within the following framework:-

Outcome Monitoring - will measure the progress of the scheme and ensure that the expected outcomes are realised. The responsible person in the first instance is the scheme manager who will report outcomes to the project board at monthly intervals.

Initially the key measures of success will be Km of concrete barriers replaced, Km of side barriers replaced, Km of communications replaced

Targets will be used to monitor the above and dashboards will be prepared to monitor progress against targets. These will be submitted to the projects senior responsible owner.

Outcomes will be reported to the DfT. LCC will share details of working practices and methodologies etc. with DfT, HA, HMEP and any other organisation that requests information so that the road construction industry can benefit from LCC experiences.

Process Monitoring - will measure the efficiency of the concrete crash barrier replacement programme so that works are delivered on time so as to reduce traffic delays and the risk of cross-over accidents. This will ensure that the expected outputs from the contractors are achieved and that any issues are raised and resolved in a clear and unambiguous manner.

Benefits Realisation Monitoring - will ensure that the project delivers the anticipated benefits over the life of the project. The project board is responsible for ensuring the project benefits are realised and if possible enhanced during the life of the project.

A key benefit to be determined over a longer period of time, is the effectiveness of the scheme in reducing the risk of cross-over accidents and reducing the severity of accidents involving the central reservation crash barrier. LCC has details of current traffic flows and current accident rates between J10-14 which will be used as the baseline figure. In addition LCC has also

forecasted 'do nothing' / 'do something' accident rates along this route over the period 2016-2065. The 'do something' rates will be LCC's target.

LCC will use existing baseline figures and monitor accidents against the 'do something' targets so that the benefits of the scheme can be properly measured and reported. LCC expects the scheme to lower accident rates from the current rate to below the 'do something' predicted accident rate.

Opportunities

The scheme manager is responsible for the identification of any opportunities for efficiencies which may arise from better working practices over the life of the project.

A fuller evaluation for large schemes may also be required depending on their size and type.

SECTION D: Declarations

D1. Senior Responsible Owner Declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for [scheme name] I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of [name of authority] and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that [name of authority] 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 [name of authority] I declare that the scheme cost estimates quoted in this bid are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that [name of authority]

- 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: Gill Kilpatrick

Signed:

G. Kilpatrick

Submission of bids:

The deadline for bid submission is 5pm, **9 February 2015**

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

roadmaintenance@dft.gsi.gov.uk copying in steve.berry@dft.gsi.gov.uk