

| Scheme Name: Blackpool ITM Scheme  |   |   |              |   |  |             |   |           |  |
|--|---|---|--------------|---|--|-------------|---|-----------|--|
| <b>Scheme Description:</b><br>The Blackpool ITM Scheme consists of installing 16 fully functional variable message signs, 19 parking guidance information signs with variable elements, a car park monitoring system, CCTV and 24 static parking signs.  |   |   |              |   |  |             |   |           |  |
| <b>The purpose of this review is to examine the evidence base for the above scheme in order to identify any gaps. Additional work can then be undertaken on the scheme to ensure the business case for the scheme is comprehensive, which will limit the risk of future challenges.</b><br><br>The criteria used for the assessment is based upon the DfT document, 'The Transport Business Cases' (January 2013).<br><br>The review which has been undertaken is based upon:<br>- Scheme SOBC and supporting appendices |   |   |              |   |  |             |   |           |  |
|  |   |   |              | <b>KEY</b><br><div><div></div> = Significant additional work required</div> <div><div></div> = Some additional work required</div> <div><div></div> = Sound evidence base</div>   |  |             |   |           |  |
| A RAG analysis has been undertaken to highlight areas where there appears to be insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the scheme has followed DfT best practice. Recommendations have been included on work which should be undertaken to strengthen the business case for the scheme.   |   |   |              |   |  |             |   |           |  |
| Business Case  | Criteria  | Evidence  | RAG Analysis | Recommendations (Jacobs 10.08.15)   | Remaining recommendations following a review of the updated SOBC (Jacobs 03.09.15)   | Updated RAG | Blackpool responses to how the remaining recommendations have been addressed (Blackpool 09.09.15)                                       | Final RAG |  |
|  |   | <b>SOBC Report</b>  |              | - Insert an Executive Summary which contains a description of scheme.<br>- Insert a summary at the end of each of the 5 cases.<br>- Remove the blank Recommendations section (p23)<br>- Remove our Document Control Sheet (p2)<br>- Remove Appendix K.<br>- Include references and data sources for any statistics quoted<br>- The report makes several references to the scheme being updated at the 'Detailed Design Stage'. The work required should be clarified given the SOBC is the application for funding.<br>- Need to ensure consistency between the figures quoted in the SOBC, the SYSTRA report and the AECOM report.<br>- SOBC, SYSTRA report and the AECOM report will need updating to reflect the revised scheme costs and economic appraisal.  | Need to include an executive summary (which references the scheme costs, BCR, GVA benefits etc.) and ideally chapter summaries.<br><br>Update contents page and page numbers. Remove red text and highlighted text and update report version to be FINAL (this is the final business case which will get published on the LEP website therefore needs to be complete).   |             | Executive summary included in SOBC, which has been updated to address the second point.   |           |  |
| <b>STRATEGIC</b>   | Existing arrangements for the provision of services   | Include a description of the current situation<br>The current situation is described in section 1.2, explaining that cars overflow from central car parks onto the promenade in peak times, which adds to congestion on the transport network.<br>Can services be better utilised, or are more fundamental changes required?<br>The strategic case explains that improvements are required to make the network more efficient and more appealing to visitors.<br><b>What are the constraints?</b><br>Section 1.5 outlines that there are no significant delivery constraints beyond those pertaining to any scheme of this type, including contractor availability and inclement weather. Section 1.5 also states that the council has apportioned appropriate match funding to support the grant requested to deliver the scheme and that an experienced engineering and project management team is in place to procure and deliver the works necessary.                                     |              | Include a description of the scheme in section 1.1 which is consistent with scheme outlined in the revised costs spreadsheet<br><br>Include figures to evidence the fact that visitor numbers have increased in recent numbers and are forecast to increase further.<br><br>Include figures to evidence the statement that most visitors arrive by car.<br><br>Need to include any relevant text from the AECOM report and the SYSTRA report in the strategic case as apposed to just a reference to the appendices.  |  |             |   |           |  |
|  | Problem Identification  | <b>How have the problems been identified?</b><br>The problems have been identified in section 1.2, although the source of some of the data is not clear.<br><b>Provide quantification of the extent of the problems</b><br>The extent of the problem has been identified quantifiably using car park usage analysis in the SYSTRA report.   |              | Append car parking usage data to the SOBC and include a summary of the extent of the 'overflowing' problem in the Strategic Case.<br><br>Report References / data sources need to be provided for all figures quoted in the SOBC  | Further info on the extent of the problem has been provided in section 1.2. However no car parking usage data has been provided - is any available which could be included / appended?   |             | A graph showing the upward trend in car parking levels has been incorporated in the SOBC.   |           |  |
|  | The need for investment   | <b>Why is the scheme needed now?</b><br>Section 1.2 outlines that the main car parks in the Town Centre overflow at peak time, and cause local congestion. The resort's economic and social issues have grown as foreign holiday access has increased. Blackpool is now the 6th most deprived local authority area in England and Wales.  |              |   |  |             |   |           |  |
|  | Impact of scheme not being delivered  | <b>Impact on transport network, economy, future development, other schemes etc.</b><br>Section 1.1 outlines that visitor numbers are expected to increase significantly over the next decade. A poor road system with visitors delayed in traffic congestion would not encourage repeat visitors.   |              | Suggest inserting a sub heading which clarifies the impact of not delivering the scheme (i.e. more congestion > discourages visitors > discourages development etc.)  |  |             |   |           |  |
|  | Study Area / affected population  | Include a plan showing the scheme location.<br>A Plan is included in the Appendix of Appendix C. However, there is no reference in the SOBC report.<br><b>Provide a description / plan of targeted population.</b><br>Section 1.1 outlines the number of visitors to Blackpool that would benefit from the scheme. There is no plan included.   |              | Append a scheme over view plan to the SOBC report.<br><br>Confirm the location of the VMS signs - the AST and the SYSTRA report states that there will be a VMS sign on various routes (including the M55) which is inconsistent with the photos in the AECOM report.   | Scheme plan included in Appendix A, however doesn't show the location of the VMS signs on the M55 - need to amend accordingly.   |             | Appendix A has been amended to show the indicative locations of signs on the M55 in advance of junctions 3 & 4.                         |           |  |
|  | Scheme Objectives   | <b>What are the aims of the proposed scheme, and how do they address all the problems identified?</b><br>Section 1.3 outlines that the scheme will help motorists navigate and encourage them to find the most appropriate car park for their primary destination. This will minimise search trips and thus reduce congestion, particularly on the Promenade, where the public realm has been substantially enhanced in recent years.   |              | Need to define how the strategic objectives were derived.<br>Need to clarify the impact of the scheme on the strategic objectives.  | No robust evidence of how the scheme objectives were derived - need to link to the existing problems and issues.<br>Currently the SOBC just states that 'The promotor's view is that the scheme's key objectives are'.   |             | The SOBC has been revised accordingly.  |           |  |
|  | Strategic Fit (e.g. DfT's business plan and wider government objectives).                         | <b>How does the scheme contribute to key objectives, including wider transport and government objectives?</b><br>Section 1.1 outlines the project directly supports a range of strategic documents, in particular the 'Renewal of Blackpool' which is one of only four specific objectives in the Lancashire LEP 'Strategic Economic Plan'.   |              | Need to reference which other Strategic Documents the project supports in section 1.3<br><br>Need to emphasize how the scheme contributes to the objectives of the LEP (as set out in the SEP).<br><br>Need to reference wider transport and government objectives.   |  |             |   |           |  |
|  | Option Identification   | <b>How were potential problems identified?</b><br>Section 1.2 outlines that to inform the Economic Case, car parking usage data has been analysed.<br><b>Evidence that alternative options (covering a range of different modes) were considered</b><br>There is evidence alternative schemes have been identified in section 1.7. A do minimum option which includes a modern technology upgrade. A Do something (2013 Local Pinch Point Fund scheme) which includes traffic monitoring.   |              | Need to clarify the difference between Option 2 and Option 3.<br><br>A paragraph should be inserted to emphasise that the preferred scheme would benefit public transport as well.<br><br>Need to justify why an ITM scheme is the best solution to the problem. Were alternative modes considered?<br><br>Also need to clarify how the preferred scheme was reached (i.e. how were the location and number of VMS required determined and optimised). Need to justify why a lower cost option consisting of fewer cameras would not work as well.  | Need to clarify the difference between Option 2 and Option 3.<br><br>Need to justify why an ITM scheme is the best solution to the problem. Were alternative modes considered?<br><br>Also need to clarify how the preferred scheme was reached (i.e. how were the location and number of VMS required determined and optimised). Need to justify why a lower cost option consisting of fewer cameras would not work as well.  |             | The SOBC has been revised accordingly.  |           |  |
|  | Early Assessment and Sifting  | <b>Methodology for sifting options</b><br>The methodology used is not clearly stated  |              | As commented above, need to clarify the difference between Option 2 and 3 (and the difference in the benefits)<br><br>Include the strategic objectives in Table 1.7 and then conduct a qualitative RAG analysis to show how each of the 3 options contributes to each strategic objective. This should help to justify why option 3 is the preferred option.  |  |             |   |           |  |
|  | Identification of short listed options  | <b>How were the potential options shortlisted?</b><br>Section 1.2 outlines that the scheme was first identified in 2013 and included in an unsuccessful bid to the Department for Transport (DfT).<br><b>What were the other shortlisted options?</b><br>There are 2 other options listed: Do Minimum and a 2013 Local Pinch Point Fund scheme  |              |   |  |             |   |           |  |
|  | Consideration given to the economic, environmental and social benefits of the possible approaches | <b>What are the high-level strategic and operational benefits envisaged? How do they link to the objectives of the scheme?</b><br>Section 1.2 highlights the benefits of the scheme.  |              | Reference the range of benefits that will be realised in addition to the congestion benefits - include a sentence saying these have been assessed in the economic case.   |  |             |   |           |  |
|  | Consultation / stakeholder engagement   | <b>Provide details of any consultation events or stakeholder engagement that has taken place / is planned?</b><br>Section 1.6 highlights that the scheme in outline has been discussed at the Highway's Consultative Forum, to which all key stakeholders are invited and regularly attend.<br><b>Who was consulted? Include consultation results where available</b><br>No further information has been provided on further consultation<br>Letters of support have been requested from BBLG, BPB, ME and HSC  |              | Letters of Support are to be appended to the SOBC once received.<br><br>Confirm the ownership of the car parks and whether the rates charged at each are the same. I presume they are all council owned and therefore no implication if visitors are being directed from one car park to another.   | Letters of support received<br><br>Car park ownership point not addressed  |             | Car park ownership point now addressed in the SOBC (1.6).   |           |  |
|  | Preferred Option  | <b>How was the preferred option identified? Reasons why it was the preferred option.</b><br>The table in section 1.7 identifies the preferred option and alternative options.   |              | The SOBC needs to clarify why the preferred option has been selected (see above recommendation for including a RAG analysis in the table in section 1.7)  |  |             |   |           |  |
|  | Traffic Modelling work undertaken   | <b>Details of any traffic modelling work which has been undertaken.</b><br>Has the need for any further traffic modelling work been identified? Results of modelling work<br>No traffic model has been used. Section 1.2 of the SOBC references the fact that the SYSTRA report contains details of the economic assessment undertaken.   |              |   |  |             |   |           |  |
|  | Level of public support considered?   | <b>What are the attitudes of key groups (e.g. the general public, residents, businesses and wider stakeholders) to the proposed scheme?</b><br>Section 1.6 outlines the local businesses who will benefit from the scheme.  |              | Awaiting Letters of Support   |  |             |   |           |  |
|  | Key risks and constraints identified?   | <b>What are the main risks associated with delivering the scheme?</b><br>Include a Risk Register containing appropriate mitigation measures.<br>The main risks are identified in Risk Register in Appendix G  |              |   |  |             |   |           |  |
|  | Connectivity with other schemes assessed?   | <b>How does the scheme impact on other planned schemes?</b><br><b>What is the overall level of impact in combination with other connected schemes?</b><br>No other proposed schemes are mentioned.  |              | Need to consider the impact of this scheme on any other proposed scheme in the proximity of Blackpool (i.e. Blackpool Tramway Extension.)   |  |             |   |           |  |
| <b>ECONOMIC</b>  | Outline approach to assessing value for money.  | <b>Evidence of any VIM assessment which has already been undertaken.</b><br>VIM assessment has been undertaken, and estimated using combination of observed data and assumptions outlined in section 2.2  |              |   |  |             |   |           |  |
|  | Consideration of economic, environmental, social and distributinal impacts.                       | <b>Qualitative / Quantitative assessment of the likely impact of the scheme</b><br>Quantitative assessment is described in detail in the appended SYSTRA report. The economic appraisal for the Strategic Outline Business Case has been carried out in line with Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG) where applicable.  |              | See comments contained in the email sent by Leighton Cardwell to Jeremy Walker on 03/08/15.   | Section 2.2 states that the construction period is 2015-2017. Needs revising to say 2016/17 to be consistent with programme.<br><br>Doesn't seem to be an adjustment for inflation to the capital costs.   |             |   |           |  |
|  | Appraisal Summary Table   | <b>Has an AST been produced?</b><br>An AST is included in section 2.5.  |              | The economic appraisal will need updating to address the changes to the methodology and the revised scheme costs. The economic case (and AST) will subsequently need updating.<br><br>Section 2.3 (Sensitivity and Risk profile) should summarise the results of the sensitivity tests undertaken instead of focusing on the 'Light Pool' project.  | As requested previously we need to see what the GVA benefits would be if you didn't include the 0.5% increase in visitor spend per capita and the subsequent impact on the BCR.<br>Jacobs to discuss with SYSTRA<br>Consideration of Seasonality impact on AADT figure<br>• Accidents v incidents (congestion) – has a 15 minute JT saving being assumed for accident AND incidents?<br>• Car occupancy - assumed 3 people - evidence?<br>• GVA query – what is the impact on the BCR if remove the uplift in spend benefits   |             | Section 2.2 revised. Jacobs spoken to SYSTRA on 7th September. SYSTRA to address the remaining points.                                  |           |  |
|  | BCR   | <b>Details of any economic appraisal work which has already been undertaken.</b><br>Section 2.2 outlines the economic appraisal that has been carried out in line with TAG where applicable. The appraisal methodology and assumptions are reported in Appendix D.<br><b>Provide an indication of the likely VIM (using relevant schemes to benchmark where appropriate) where VIM assessment not been completed yet.</b><br>Section 2.4 outlines the summary of economic outputs including the BCR.  |              | Section 2.4 - insert a table to present the results of the economic appraisal. Need to be clear that the scheme is only high VIM when you include the GVA benefits.   |  |             | Jacobs - Sensitivity tests have been undertaken to test the impact on the BCR of altering key assumptions where limited evidence exists |           |  |
| <b>FINANCIAL</b>   | Scheme Cost   | <b>Please provide as much detail as possible, including:</b><br>- scheme development costs<br>- itemised construction costs<br>- running costs<br>- maintenance costs<br>- range cost estimates<br>The AECOM report states that the Capital Costs, Staff Training Costs, 10 year Maintenance and 10 year Management Costs, Total Cost = £2.4m.<br>Section 3.1 of the SOBC states that Traffic Management during the scheme implementation phase is not included. However section 5.5 suggests there will be low impact during implementation.<br><b>How were the scheme costs calculated?</b><br>The AECOM report states that the costs presented should be used as a guide only and are not fixed. Up to date costs should be obtained from professional sources prior to undertaking any changes.   |              | See comments contained in the email sent by Peter Hibbert to Jeremy Walker on 04/08/15.<br><br>The Financial Case will subsequently need updating to reflect the revised scheme costs, as will the SYSTRA and AECOM reports (currently there is inconsistency between these reports).<br><br>Include a detailed cost breakdown table in section 3.2 which clearly defines all costs associated with the scheme and distinguishes between capital costs and revenue costs.<br><br>Clarify how the cost estimates have been derived.<br><br>Confirm arrangements for maintenance costs - will need to include a letter from Blackpool director stating that Blackpool will cover all revenue costs and the budgets this funding will come from.<br><br>Confirm spend profile for both capital and revenue costs separately - current financial case says that all money will be spent by 2016/17 - however this is inconsistent with the appendices which state a 3 year spend. Also the maintenance costs will be split over 10 years. | The scheme costs have been updated to split out the capital costs from the revenue costs. Funding Arrangement have subsequently been updated to reflect the fact that Blackpool will cover 30% of the capital costs and 100% of the revenue costs.   |             |   |           |  |
|  | Funding Arrangements  | <b>Detail the funding sources and values which have been outlined.</b><br>Section 3.4 identifies that Blackpool Council has apportioned the necessary match funding (30%) and will be responsible for any cost overruns.<br><b>Outline any potential risks to securing funding.</b><br>Section 3.4 highlights that the project depends entirely on the successful award of grant funding from the Lancashire LEP.   |              | As above - need to confirm that funds are in place to cover the maintenance costs.  | Section 3.1 states a provisional Growth Fund allocation of £2.4m (should say £1.7m as the £2.4m included the Local Contribution).<br>Reference what the revenue costs for the scheme are and that they will be covered by BBC.<br>Update section 3.5 to state the risk allowance is 20% on both the capital and revenue costs.<br>Update the reference to the Section 151 letter in section 3.4 (currently says appendix F when it is actually appendix G)   |             | The SOBC has been revised accordingly.  |           |  |
|  | Key Risks   | <b>Please provide a risk register including mitigation measures.</b><br>Section 4.4 outlines that the Risk Register is included in Appendix G.<br><b>Has any sensitivity analysis been undertaken? What are the results?</b><br>Sensitivity testing has been been undertaken, and described in Appendix D, but there is no mention of the results in the text   |              | Need to obtain Appendix F (Section 151 letter)<br><br>Mention the sensitivity testing that has been undertaken, which is described in the SYSTRA report   | Section 151 letter has been received which references that BBC will cover all of the revenue costs (circa £100k / year) and any increase in capital costs  |             |   |           |  |
|  | <b>COMMERCIAL</b><br>Is there a robust contracting and procurement strategy?                      | <b>Outline the intended procurement strategy.</b><br>The intended procurement strategy is not clearly identified<br><b>How was the proposed procurement approach developed?</b><br>Section 4.2 outlines that Blackpool Council has a dedicated Corporate Procurement Team whom will support the procurement activity and appointment. This will ensure all procurement rules and regulations are met both internally and at EU level.<br><b>Have Local Authority contributions been secured?</b><br>Section 3.4 outlines that Blackpool Council has apportioned the necessary match funding (30%), and there will be a letter from the council's Section 151 officer which has to be included in Appendix F.<br><b>Have preparation costs been budgeted for?</b> Unknown<br><b>Have any third party funding arrangements been secured?</b><br>Include details of any other potential funding risks.<br>Section 3.4 outlines that Blackpool Council will be responsible for any cost overruns. |              | Need to outline the intended procurement strategy for scheme construction.<br>Need to outline the intended procurement strategy for maintenance services.<br><br>Outline what will be assessed in the PQO.<br><br>Clarify what type of contract will be used between contractor and client (e.g. NEC3 Option A).<br><br>State what criteria will be used to determine which tender to go with.<br><br>Clarify who will cover Scheme Preparation Costs<br><br>Outline the contract length.<br><br>Clarify the 'existing framework arrangements' which will be used to procure services.  | Clarify the 'existing framework arrangements' which will be used to procure services and whether it will be a mini-bid or direct award.<br><br>Need to outline the intended procurement strategy for maintenance services.<br><br>Will there be a PQO and if so what will be assessed and when will this be issued?<br><br>Clarify what type of contract will be used between contractor and client (e.g. NEC3 Option A) -for both construction and maintenance services?<br><br>State what criteria will be used to determine which tender to go with.<br><br>Outline the contract length (for both the construction period and maintenance services) |             | The SOBC has been revised accordingly.  |           |  |

|            |  |  |  |  |   |  |   |  |
|------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| MANAGEMENT | Key risks and constraints identified?                        | <p>What are the main risks associated with delivering and implementing the scheme?</p> <p>Section 5.7 outlines that the successful delivery of the Blackpool Integrated Traffic Management project depends entirely on the successful award of grant funding from the Lancashire LEP. The main risks which are beyond the council's control include: Construction inflation, Statutory undertakers' costs and unforeseen ground conditions.</p> <p>Include a Risk Register containing appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The Risk Register is included in Appendix G.</p>   |  | Provide further information on the intended Risk Management Strategies that will be employed (i.e. who will manage the strategy, how will risks be identified).  |   |  |   |  |
|            | Delivery Programme   | <p>Please include indicative timescales for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scheme Development</li> <li>- Design</li> <li>- Procurement</li> <li>- Construction</li> </ul> <p>A Project Programme is included in Appendix H.</p>   |  | <p>Include a simplified programme of key dates in section 5.3 and update narrative accordingly (currently section 5.3 appears inconsistent with the appended programme in terms of when the scheme will be fully operational).</p> <p>Detailed Design stage needs adding to the program.</p>   | Reference key programme dates in section 5.3  |  | The SOBC has been revised accordingly.                            |  |
|            | Governance / Assurance work                                  | <p>Who is in charge? What is the allocation of roles and responsibilities? Is there a Project Board?</p> <p>Section 5.1 outlines the project board structure. An organogram is included with this application in Appendix I.</p> <p>What control measures will be put in place to ensure the scheme development process is managed suitably?</p> <p>Section 5.1 highlights that a Project Board will be established and will meet monthly. The day to day Project Management will rest with the Project Manager who will report to the Project Board.</p> <p>Has a SGAR been undertaken / scheduled?</p> <p>There is no mention of an SGAR</p> |  | <p>Need to name the actual people who will undertake each role and who will sit on the project board.</p> <p>Project Management and Governance Organogram (Appendix I) to be provided</p> <p>Section 5.5 states that a high level communication plan is to be produced (which will form Appendix J) - this should clearly state who will be communicated with, how and the intended frequency.</p> | Need to update organogram to show who will sit on the Project Board.  |  | The organogram has been updated with posts, but not actual names. |  |
|            | Evidence of similar projects that have been successful.      | <p>Provide details of similar projects and their successfulness.</p> <p>No similar projects are mentioned or referenced in terms of operational successfulness.</p> <p>In terms of financial accountability, Section 3.6 outlines that the delivery of the Yeadon Way Local Pinch Point Fund scheme, funded by the DfT, as a recent example of a successfully delivered project.</p>   |  | Include reference to similar projects and comment on successfulness.   |   |  |   |  |
|            | Who is the client / sponsor?                                 | <p>Include details of the client / sponsor of the scheme.</p> <p>Section 1.6 outlines that Blackpool Council will produce and deliver this scheme.</p> <p>Blackpool Business Leadership Group (BBLG) has expressed support for the scheme (see Appendix E) and its members will be kept informed as the scheme develops.</p>   |  |  |   |  |   |  |
|            | Fall back Plans  | <p>Do alternative schemes exist? Is there a lower cost alternative?</p> <p>Section 1.7 identifies the Do Minimum option, but the option is not clearly discussed or quantified.</p>  |  |  |   |  |   |  |
|            | Arrangements for monitoring and evaluating the intervention. | <p>What will constitute success for the project, and how will it be measured?</p> <p>Section 1.4 suggests the council will investigate the use of qualitative surveys, before and after scheme implementation, to help shape and evaluate the scheme.</p>  |  | <p>In accordance with the LEPs Accountability Framework, a Monitoring and Evaluation plan will need to be developed prior to any funds being released.</p> <p>This should identify what metrics will be monitored and when and how the success of the scheme will be measured. The M&amp;E plan should also reference who will pay for any associated data collection costs.</p>                   | A Monitoring and Evaluation plan has not yet been produced - this will need to be done prior to any funds being released and will need to confirm that Blackpool BC has the funds in place to cover any associated costs. |  | An updated M&E plan has been produced.                            |  |