

Cabinet – 12 December 2012

Local Transport Plan Capital Programme – Scheme Prioritisation Tool

Portfolio: Councillor Adrian Andrew, Deputy Leader, Regeneration

Related Portfolio: Councillor Tom Ansell, Transport and Environment

Service: Regeneration – Strategic Transportation

Wards: All

Key decision: Yes

Forward plan: Yes

1. Summary

- 1.1. The West Midlands Local Transport Plan (LTP) sets out the transport strategy for the metropolitan area, together with a funded implementation plan. The Walsall Transport Strategy 2010 is in line with this and sets out how the LTP will be implemented in the Borough. To support the delivery of the LTP, the Department for Transport (DfT) awards 'Integrated Transport Block' (ITB) grant funding to the relevant transport authority in each locality. In the case of the West Midlands Metropolitan Area, this is the West Midlands Integrated Transport Authority (ITA). The executive arm of the ITA, corporately known as Centro, then distributes this grant funding to the component metropolitan districts (on a per capita basis) to be used to implement the LTP in their area.
- 1.2. Walsall Council utilises the funding it receives from Centro to deliver three headline work programmes: Major Scheme Development and Delivery; Strategic Transportation; and Road Safety and Active Travel. The ITA holds Walsall to account for how this funding is utilised. Creating a transparent process of how the ITB funding is allocated and utilised within the Borough is now required to help demonstrate accountability to the ITA.
- 1.3. This report outlines a methodology for the proposed allocation of ITB capital funding for 2013/14 and future years. A further report will be presented to Cabinet in early 2013 to endorse a detailed 2013/14 Local Transport Plan capital programme for the Borough based on the output of the prioritisation process.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1. That Cabinet approves the allocation of the Integrated Transport Block funding between the three headline programmes as described in paragraphs 3.5 to 3.9 of this report for 2013/14 and notes indicative allocations for subsequent years.

- 2.2. That Cabinet approves the use of a non-subjective prioritisation tool to determine the work programme of two of the three headline programmes as described in paragraphs 3.13 to 3.29 of this report for 2013/14 and subsequent years.
- 2.3. That Cabinet agrees to receive a further report before April 2013 to endorse a detailed 2013/14 Local Transport Plan capital programme for the Borough based on the output of the prioritisation process.
- 2.4. That Cabinet delegate authority to the Executive Director for Regeneration, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transportation, to manage any changes to the detail of the prioritisation tool, and to the 2013/14 programme allocations in order to manage the overall budget within approved limits.

3. Report detail

- 3.1. As of 2011/12, Integrated Transport Authorities (ITAs) are designated as the 'accountable body' for Local Transport Plans (LTPs) and the government funding allocated to deliver them. Integrated Transport Block (ITB) funding is now allocated to Walsall Council via the ITA/Centro (previously it was allocated directly by government).
- 3.2. As the accountable body to the Department for Transport (DfT), ITA/Centro have indicated that slippage of funding into the next financial year will only be permitted in certain circumstances. ITA Members have indicated that failure to spend each year's allocation may result in a reduction in the amount of funding allocated to a Metropolitan District in future years. Additionally, more rigorous monitoring of expenditure is now being employed to ensure that Districts are using funds to deliver the aims and objectives of the West Midlands LTP, and that funding is used in line with the DfT's grant conditions.
- 3.3. Within Walsall Council, the Strategic Regeneration Team manages the ITB capital funding. However, not all of the resources are spent by the Team – other teams/sections have a pivotal project development and delivery role. The Team is also responsible for reporting regionally on spend and is accountable to the Transport Delivery Group (currently chaired by Centro) and the ITA Finance and Delivery Committee.
- 3.4. Due to the changes in the management of the budget by ITA/Centro it will not be possible to 'slip' funds so easily in the future, and there is the real risk of claw-back. It is therefore imperative that all funding allocated to Walsall Council is, wherever possible, spent within the financial year it is allocated to ensure that the Council is not financially penalised by ITA/Centro in future years.

Allocation of Integrated Transport Block Funding

- 3.5. In addition to ensuring that all funding is utilised and that it is spent in line with agreed financial profiles, ITA/Centro will be closely monitoring what each District spends and delivers. Schemes within Walsall need to meet the objectives of the LTP and deliver the monitoring aims. At present Walsall's ITB is split between three headline programmes: -

- Major Scheme Development and Delivery Programme (managed by Strategic Transportation Team, Regeneration Directorate)
- Strategic Transportation Programme (managed by Strategic Transportation Team, Regeneration Directorate)
- Road Safety and Active Travel Programme (managed by Transportation Forward Planning, Neighbourhoods Directorate)

3.6. The division of the funding is currently via a non-specific method. Analysis of the past five years of allocations to the three programmes has been conducted – see **Appendix A**. This showed that the average allocation was 27.6 per cent to the Major Scheme Development and Delivery Programme; 40.6 per cent to the Strategic Transportation Programme; and 31.8 per cent to the Road Safety and Active Travel Programme.

3.7. It is proposed that for 2013/14 the split between the three headline programmes should be based on the average allocation over the past five years, which reflects ‘transport need’ within the Borough. Within the Major Scheme Programme, local delivery costs for approved schemes will be guaranteed in line with any DfT or Local Transport Body endorsed business case¹.

3.8. Based on the current future planning assumptions from DfT, this would have the following proposed impact in 2013/14. An indicative allocation based on the same proportional division of resources across programmes is also shown for 2014/15.

Fig. 1 – Proposed and Indicative Future Year Allocations

	Current 2012/13 (£k)	Proposed 2013/14 (£k)	Indicative 2014/15 (£k)
Major Scheme Development & Delivery Programme (of which reserved for DSDA Access Project)	375	411 (375)	585 (375)
Strategic Transportation Programme	675	605	860
Road Safety & Active Travel Programme	440	474	674
Total	1,490	1,490	2,119

3.9. It should be noted that anticipated contributions to finance the implementation of the DSDA Access project are required each year until 2019/20.

¹ The development of major transport schemes is generally funded using ITB resources prior to any scheme approval. The majority of delivery costs come from the government’s major scheme programme (which will be devolved to Local Transport Bodies from April 2015), but a proportion of delivery costs have to be contributed locally. In the case of the DSDA Access Project, this is approximately 40% of the total scheme costs, of which approximately half are resourced from ITB funding over several years.

Delivering a Strategic Transportation Programme

- 3.10. The Strategic Transportation Team utilise their proportion of the ITB to develop and deliver 'major' and 'strategic'² schemes which meet the aims and objectives of the LTP and Walsall Transport Strategy and bring benefit to Walsall transportation system. Determining which schemes are delivered at present is conducted via a subjective process, with no specific methodology utilised. Ensuring that the schemes delivered are selected via a process that assesses them non-subjectively is vital in creating a strong position to justify schemes selected for delivery in Walsall.
- 3.11. The Road Safety and Active Travel team at present use a ranking methodology to determine which schemes are delivered from their allocation of the ITB. This provides the Team with a strong basis to rationalise their decision-making. (No change is proposed to this methodology for this element of the programme.) Consequently, the Strategic Transportation Team has devised a spreadsheet-based tool which scores potential schemes against the LTP aims and objectives, therefore making the selection of specific schemes non-subjective.
- 3.12. Introducing a formal allocation of resources between headline programmes and utilising the prioritisation tool for the Major Scheme Development Programme and the Strategic Transportation Programme will allow for better co-ordination and management of the ITB resources and ensure that any funding allocated can realistically be utilised within the financial year, and that it is spent on projects which meet the aims and objectives of the LTP.

Strategic Transportation Prioritisation Tool

- 3.13. It is proposed that from 2013/14 onwards the Major Scheme Development Programme and the Strategic Transportation Programme is prioritised using a non-subjective tool. This will involve a 'call for projects' each autumn. Project details will be captured on a pro forma and then be assessed using the spreadsheet-based tool. This will be the basis for inclusion of projects in the following year's programme.
- 3.14. The tool to be used to prioritise schemes will allow schemes proposed by, amongst others, MPs, councillors, officers, business representatives and residents to be all assessed equally. Once all schemes have been assessed, they can be ranked according to their score and cost. The total cost of all proposed schemes would be compared against the total budget for that year. If not all schemes can be funded from the budget, then those schemes which rank the highest will be selected.
- 3.15. Each scheme will be assessed on its costs and benefits, and will be analysed against LTP policy. Illustrations of the prioritisation tool are shown at **Appendix B** and a more detailed explanation of how the prioritisation tool will be applied is included at **Appendix C**. A summary of how the tool works is described below.

² 'Major schemes' have traditionally been defined as those schemes over £5m in value (although post-2015 this threshold will be removed). In this context, 'strategic schemes' are significant schemes, but below the £5m threshold e.g. junction improvement schemes.

- 3.16. In order to understand how much the scheme will ultimately cost, all components of delivering a project will be quantified and collated. This includes: the total cost to design the scheme; any costs associated with conducting a consultation exercise; total cost to construct the scheme; any maintenance above and beyond standard highway maintenance; inclusion of a contingency fee for higher risk schemes; and the deduction of any third party contributions to the scheme.
- 3.17. As well as totalling the complete cost of the scheme, a simple cost-benefit analysis will also be undertaken. Costs associated with the scheme are scored first, followed by impact. Scoring the scheme against these categories enables it to be viewed in a wider context and how its cost relates to that of other schemes and its impact upon the Borough specifically.
- 3.18. Each category is scored 'low', 'medium' or 'high'. This scoring system allows the magnitude and impact of the scheme to be easily captured. A summary of the categories is detailed below.
- 3.19. There are three cost magnitude categories, with the first being build cost. This allows comparison between the total Strategic Transportation Team budget and the cost of the scheme. The lower the total cost of the scheme the better the score, this provides potential for a greater number of schemes to be delivered from the budget.
- 3.20. The second category is that of maintenance cost. Considering the maintenance cost of a scheme is important in reducing any future burden on council funding. Schemes will be assessed in line with the approved 'Maintainability Audit' and the Highways Asset Management Plan (HAMP). Schemes which result in a high maintenance cost (over and above normal highways maintenance) will be scored 'low'.
- 3.21. Finally, the input from external bodies towards the schemes cost is scored. An external contribution towards a scheme offers better value for money on capital funds, however it is acknowledged that in economically challenging times there is less opportunity to acquire such contributions.
- 3.22. Impact scoring also encompasses three different factors. Geographical extent of the scheme is scored first. This allows for schemes which cover a wider geographic area of the Borough to score higher than those which focus solely on one street. Schemes which are delivered over a wider area of the Borough provide a greater impact for the limited funding available.
- 3.23. Distributional impact is scored secondly; this allows the most deprived areas of the Borough to be considered in the development of schemes and contribute greater to the score of the scheme. Utilising a map detailing the Lower Super Output Areas³ of the Borough, schemes which pass through the most deprived areas score higher.
- 3.24. The final impact category is that of public acceptance. Schemes which are endorsed by MPs or councillors score higher, as this will ensure that a scheme is able to be delivered with the confidence of local stakeholder support.

³ Lower Super Output Areas are geographical units created to aid the collation of data for Indices of Deprivation.

3.25. ITB funding is provided to deliver the policies and targets of the West Midlands LTP. It is therefore important that schemes are assessed against these. There are five LTP objectives: -

- i. Economy: *Support for economic regeneration; increasing employment and low carbon technologies.*
- ii. Climate Change: *reduce emission of green house gases to aid improvements to air quality on the Borough.*
- iii. Health, Personal Security & Safety: *improve health, personal security and safety of people travelling within the Borough.*
- iv. Equality of Opportunity: *tackle deprivation and worklessness, enhancing opportunity and social inclusion for all age groups by improving access to key services and destinations.*
- v. Quality of Life & Local Environment: *enhance quality of life for people in the Borough as well as improving the quality of the environment.*

3.26. Each scheme is scored against each objective with a score of '0' to '3' being received. A score of '0' represents no impact, increasing to '3' where a scheme has a high impact on achieving the West Midlands LTP objective.

3.27. There are also 14 individual monitoring aims of the West Midlands LTP. It is necessary to state whether or not the scheme would contribute to the achievement of these monitoring targets: -

- a. Improve journey time reliability for goods vehicles
- b. Improve bus reliability
- c. Increase access to employment for people in areas of high unemployment
- d. Improve journey speeds and times on strategic routes
- e. Principal road maintenance to prevent decline of conditions on strategic routes
- f. Encourage modal shift or change in travel behaviour
- g. Increase bus patronage
- h. Encourage active travel by making improvements to walking and cycling
- i. Increase public transport trips to centres in the AM peak
- j. Increase or maintain the proportion of children travelling to school by non car modes
- k. Reduce CO₂ emissions from transport
- l. Improve air quality by reducing NO₂
- m. Reducing road collisions and casualties
- n. Improve safety and security on public transport

3.28. Once scored, all schemes are ranked by their score. Those schemes at the top of the list which collectively are affordable within the total ITB Strategic Transportation budget will be delivered within that financial year. Those which fall just outside can then be considered as contingency schemes if it is not possible to deliver a scheme within that financial year.

3.29. Management of the programme requires dynamic decision-making to minimise slippage. Contingency schemes will be actively developed by the Strategic Transportation Team and Transportation Forward Planning Team so that changes

to the in-year programme can be quickly facilitated and the available resources maximised for the benefit of the Borough.

Approval Process

- 3.30. In line with current arrangements, once a prioritised ITB capital programme has been developed by officers, this programme would be presented to Cabinet for final approval prior to the start of the financial year. This allows political discretion to be exercised over the programme and ensures accountability to local residents.
- 3.31. The authority to agree any changes to the in-year programme (e.g. the introduction of contingency schemes) will be delegated to the Transportation and Environment portfolio holder and the Executive Director for Regeneration.

4. Council priorities

- 4.1. The ITB funding is allocated to the Council to deliver the West Midlands Local Transport Plan. The West Midlands LTP supports the Council's vision that *'Walsall will be a great place to live, work and invest, where people can get around easily and safely'*. Further, it underpins delivery against the corporate priorities, including: -
- Communities and Neighbourhoods – roads, public transport, walking and cycling impact upon all of Walsall's communities and neighbourhoods. Improving transport provision and providing people attractive transport choices helps support our efforts to make the Borough a better place in which to live, work and visit.
 - Economy – high-quality transport infrastructure is essential to supporting existing businesses and attracting new businesses/investment to the Borough. In turn, this sustains and improves employment opportunities for local people.
 - Health and Well-Being – reducing the need to travel and the promotion of sustainable transport modes (walking and cycling) can help improve the health and well-being of our residents.

5. Risk management

- 5.1. The principal risk issue that should be of concern to Walsall Council is that if the ITB funding allocated from Centro is not spent within the financial year there is a strong risk that any under spend may be 'clawed back' or future year allocations reduced. As more rigorous monitoring of funding at a regional level is performed, those authorities who do not spend all their allocation on delivering the West Midlands LTP may see a reduction in their ITB allocation in the future. Utilising the prioritisation tool will allow better management of the programme and provide accountability at a regional level for those schemes selected for delivery.

6. Financial implications

- 6.1. The proposed split of funding as per Figure 1 will allow the Council to meet the ongoing development and implementation costs of the DSDA Access Project; support the development of future major schemes business cases to give the Council the best opportunity to attract implementation resources; and allow the Council to continue to deliver a robust road safety and active travel programme that addresses local transport needs and concerns.
- 6.2. There are no direct financial implications in introducing the prioritisation tool. This tool has been created by officers as part of the general management of the Strategic Transportation Programme and would be administered on the same basis.
- 6.3. If government and/or ITA/Centro increases or reduces future Integrated Transport Block allocations for Walsall, the allocation of resources to programmes and projects will be reviewed accordingly. Financing major scheme implementation costs in line with agreed funding profiles will have priority.

7. Legal implications

There are no direct legal implications as a result of this report.

8. Property implications

There are no proposals within the report that impact on property.

9. Staffing implications

There are no intended implications on staffing by prioritising projects in the manner described in this report. However, it should be noted that ITB funding helps support existing posts in both the Regeneration and Neighbourhoods directorates because work programmes are managed by the Strategic Transportation Team and Transportation Forward Planning Team. A significant proportion of legitimate scheme development and supervision costs are also incurred by transport planners and engineers via the Timesheet Management System.

10. Equality implications

- 10.1. As part of the delivery of the West Midlands LTP consideration has been given to ensuring that the needs of all sections of the community are considered in transport projects. Further the West Midlands LTP has been subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment.
- 10.2. The ITB capital programme will assist in improving facilities for all modes of transport; this will be led through the development of Sustainable Urban Mobility

Plans, which will focus on improving access to key services and facilities such as education, job opportunities and health care facilities.

11. Consultation

11.1. The West Midlands LTP has been the subject of wide consultation with partners and stakeholders. Major public consultation was undertaken in 2010/11 on the strategies themselves, while partners and stakeholders are consulted with respect to individual transport projects.

11.2. The West Midlands authorities have been commended for the comprehensive nature of involvement in developing previous LTP strategies and when consulting on transport schemes.

11.3. Consultation on the proposal to introduce a prioritisation tool has been undertaken with officers in both the Regeneration and Neighbourhood directorates.

Background papers

West Midlands Local Transport Plan 2011-2026

West Midlands Local Transport Plan, Implementation Plan 2011-2026

Author

Matt Crowton

Transportation Strategy & Policy Manager

☎ 654358

✉ crowtonm@walsall.gov.uk



Tim Johnson
Executive Director
Regeneration

12 December 2012



Councillor Tom Ansell
Portfolio holder – Transport & Environment

12 December 2012



Councillor Adrian Andrew
Deputy Leader
Portfolio holder – Regeneration

12 December 2012

APPENDIX A

	2008/9		2009/10		2010/11		2011/12		2012/13		Average Percentage
	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage	
Major Scheme Development & Delivery	£790k	29%	£700k	25%	£706k	31%	£387k	28%	£375k	25%	27.6%
Strategic Transportation Team	£1.063m	39%	£1.135m	41%	£780k	34%	£605k	44%	£675k	45%	40.6%
Road Safety & School Travel Team	£886k	32%	£949k	34%	£791k	35%	£390k	28%	£440k	30%	31.8%
TOTAL	£2.739m	100%	£2.784m	100%	£2.277m	100%	£1.382m	100%	£1.490m	100%	100%

Calculation of average yearly split

APPENDIX B

Scheme Prioritisation Framework	
Scheme Title	
Lead Officer	
Scheme Type	
Location	
Scheme Description	
Estimated Scheme Costs	
Design	£ -
Consultation	£ -
Construction	£ -
Maintenance	£ -
Contingency	£ -
Total Build Cost	£ -
External Contribution	£ -
External Contributors Name	
Total Cost (less contribution)	£ -
Policy & Targets Assessment Score	0
Cost Benefit Analysis Score	0
TOTAL SCORE (Max Score = 47)	0
TOTAL SCORE AS PERCENTAGE	0%

Scheme Prioritisation Framework

Scheme Title		0	
LTP3 Objectives		Score 0-3	Scoring 1-3 0=no impact 3=greatest impact
Economy	Support for economic regeneration; increasing employment and low carbon technologies.	0	
Climate Change	Reduce emission of green house gases to aid improvements to air quality on the borough	0	
Health, Personal Security & Safety	Improve health, personal security and safety of people travelling within the borough	0	
Equality of Opportunity	Tackle deprivation and worklessness, enhancing opportunity and social inclusion for all age groups by improving access to key services and destinations	0	
Quality of Life & Local Environment	Enhance quality of life for people in the borough as well as improving the quality of the local environment	0	
Total		0	Max Score = 15
LTP3 Monitoring Aims	Does the scheme contribute to achieving these aims?		
Target Group	Contribution to LTP3 Monitoring Aims	Yes/No?	Score
Operational Performance of	Improve journey time reliability for goods vehicles	0	0
	Improve bus reliability	0	0
	Increase access to employment by public transport for working age people who live in areas of highest unemployment	0	0
	Road congestion; improve journey speeds and times on strategic routes	0	0
	Principal road maintenance to prevent the decline of conditions of strategic routes	0	0
Travel Demand and Modal Share	Total road traffic limited in growth, scheme encourages modal shift or change in travel behaviour	0	0
	Increase bus patronage	0	0
	Encourage active travel by making improvements to walking and cycling	0	0
	Increase public transport trips to centres in the AM peak	0	0
	Increase or maintain the proportion of children travelling to school by non car modes	0	0
Economic, Environmental	Reduce CO2 emissions from transport	0	0
	Improve air quality by reducing NO2	0	0
	Reducing road accidents and casualties	0	0
	Improving safety and security on public transport	0	0
Total		0	Max Score = 14
TOTAL MAX SCORE			0 Max Score = 29

Scheme Prioritisation Framework

Scheme Title					0	
Cost Score			Score (Low - High)			
Build Cost Magnitude (12/13 budget £690K)	Low	Less than 1% of total budget	High	1		
	Medium	1-2% of total budget				
	High	More than 2% of total budget				
Maintenance Cost Magnitude	Low	Maintenance cost is zero	High	1		
	Medium	Maintenance cost is between 0% and 50% of build cost				
	High	Maintenance cost is more than 50% of build cost				
External Contribution Magnitude	High	Contribution is 50% or more of the build cost	Low	1		
	Medium	Contribution is between 25% and 49% of the build cost				
	Low	Contribution is less than 25% of the build cost				
Total Score (Max score 9)			3			
Impact Score			Score (Low - High)			
Geographical Extent of Impact	High	Borough wide impact	Low	1		
	Medium	District wide impact				
	Low	Street level impact				
Distributional Impact	High	Direct impact upon most deprived	Low	1		
	Medium	Direct impact upon some deprived				
	Low	Direct impact upon few most deprived				
Public Acceptability	High	Scheme has been proposed/endorsed by an MP/Cllr	Low	1		
	Medium	Scheme has been proposed/endorsed by an Officer				
	Low	Scheme has been proposed/endorsed by a member of the public				
Total Score (Max score 9)			3			
TOTAL SCORE (Max score 18)			6			

Prioritisation Tool: Rationale and Usage

This tool has been created to enable transportation schemes which could potentially be funded from the Strategic Transportation Programme, Integrated Transport Block capital funding to be assessed under the same criteria.

The tool will allow all schemes proposed by MPs, Councillors, officers and residents to all be assessed equally. Once all schemes are assessed then they can be ranked according to their score and cost. The total cost of all proposed schemes would be compared against the total budget for that year. If not all schemes can be funded from the budget then those schemes which rank the highest will be selected.

Estimated Scheme Costs

It is important to understand the total cost of a scheme in the initial stages. This will enable the scheme's cost to be ranked alongside the policy and cost benefit analysis score when it is not possible to fund all schemes.

Each scheme's lead officer should provide an estimate cost of several factors relating to the scheme.

These costs include;

Design costs: cost of officer time to develop and design a scheme including cost of engineer time to conduct detailed design of the scheme.

Consultation costs: for schemes which require consultation, the cost of producing consultation materials and hosting events at external venues should be calculated and added to the costing.

Construction: for schemes which will be constructed in the financial year, the cost of their build, along with associated costs such as TROs and traffic management.

Maintenance: consideration should be taken into account if the scheme will result in above average maintenance costs in the future. Schemes which use bespoke materials and street furniture should include a contingency for future maintenance costs. Walsall Council has a Maintainability Audit which should be used when assessing designs and the cost implications for the future. Additionally, the Highways Asset Management Plan should be consulted.

Contingency: schemes which carry higher risks or whose costs on the outset have the potential to change somewhat, should have a contingency sum built in. Contingency amounts should also be factored in on schemes which have been costed to a precise amount and it may be felt that the total cost may rise above this figure.

External contribution: where a scheme will benefit from a contribution external to funding provided from the Strategic Transportation proportion of the ITB Capital programme, this should be added to this section. Contributions should be included if they are from coordinated working with other Walsall Council teams such as Planned Maintenance and Road Safety. The contribution should be the savings made by combined working, not the cost of other teams scheme. For example, if the

Planned Maintenance scheme is £100,000 and the result of combined working equates to a saving for the Strategic Transportation team of £4,000 then the contribution should be £4,000 not £100,000. For schemes where contributions are made from third parties such as Centro or developers then these can be added in their entirety, if they are not combined working schemes.

Policy and Targets

In order to ensure that schemes proposed to be delivered through ITB funding are working to deliver the policies and target of the LTP3, then the LTP3 themes need to be incorporated into the scoring of schemes.

The LTP3 possess 5 objectives, which each scheme will be scored against. The scoring scheme of 0-3 was used as it offers a range of scores available to select without making the process too complicated. For this scoring system 0 represents no impact, 1 slight impact, 2 some impact and 3 high impact. Incorporating a wider scale would mean that the definition between scores would be less defined, making the selection of a score harder. A severity scale has been used as these are strategic objectives, to which a scheme could be impacting upon, can be scored on a slight to high scale.

LTP3 Objectives

Economy: *Support for economic regeneration; increasing employment and low carbon technologies.* Schemes need to be considered as to how far they will support the economic growth of the borough including increasing employment and supporting low carbon technologies. This may include improving access to employment sites or installing electric vehicle charging points.

Climate Change: *reduce emission of green house gases to aid improvements to air quality on the borough.* The impact of the proposed scheme should be assessed against the ability of the scheme to reduce green house gases by reducing volumes of traffic, encouraging modal shift and using low carbon technology.

Health, Personal Security & Safety: *improve health, personal security and safety of people travelling within the borough.* The severity of the impact that the scheme will have on improving the health of residents, as well as if the scheme will improve the personal security and safety of residents in the borough, especially those who travel by foot, bicycle or on public transport needs to be assessed.

Equality of Opportunity: *tackle deprivation and worklessness, enhancing opportunity and social inclusion for all age groups by improving access to key services and destinations.* The impact that proposed schemes would have on improving worklessness and deprivation through enhancing access to key services and destinations needs to be considered. This may consist of specific schemes targeted at this demographic or improving services between local centres which would benefit all.

Quality of Life & Local Environment: *enhance quality of life for people in the borough as well as improving the quality of the environment.* Finally the impact on the local environment needs to be scored. Improvements to the quality of the environment may include upgrading of bus stop waiting

areas, introduction of public realm features, landscaping, improvements to cycle and walking facilities, and improving journey times for all modes.

LTP3 Monitoring Aims

There are 3 monitoring target groups, creating a total of 14 individual monitoring aims. For each aim the proposed scheme needs to state whether it would contribute or not to the aim. Scores of 'yes' receive 1 mark where as 'no' receives a score of 0. This scoring system has been devised to enable the officer scoring to determine clearly whether or not a scheme will meet the target without the need to incorporate a complex scoring scale. All of the aims are self explanatory and set out clearly what they are monitoring, therefore it should be straight forward to assess whether or not the scheme will contribute to the achieving the monitoring aims.

Cost Benefit Analysis

The cost benefit analysis section of the scoring has been split into two sections, with the first being scoring on costs and the second, impact. Scoring the scheme against these categories provides a greater context of the scheme and how its cost relates to that of other schemes and how it will impact upon the borough specifically. Each of the analysis topics are explained below.

For this section scoring is on a low-medium-high scale. In some cases a 'low' score receives a score of 3 and in other instances a 'low' score receives a score of 1. This scoring system allows the magnitude and impact of a scheme to be represented on a low to high system which then attributes an appropriate score.

Build Cost Magnitude

Why score?

This allows the cost the scheme to be scored against the total cost of the ITB budget. For 2012/13 the budget was £690k. Funds provided to deliver transportation schemes is done so in hope that the best value for money is received. Delivering more small costs schemes enables funding to be spread out across the borough and benefit more residents. The thresholds shown have been chosen as it provided potential for a greater number of schemes to be delivered. The build cost amount is taken from the first section of the scoring process.

How to score?

Scoring is split into 'low', 'medium' and 'high', if the scheme equates to less than 1% of the total budget (£6,900) the it scores as 'high' as it is allowing more of the budget to be available for other schemes. Schemes which are projected to cost between 1-2% (£6,900 to £13,800) scores 'medium', and those which would cost over 2% (£13,800) would score 'low'.

Maintenance Cost Magnitude

Why score?

It is important to consider the magnitude of the maintenance costs the scheme will result in. For schemes which leave a legacy of high maintenance costs they score a score of one as they will result in being a burden on the councils funding. These thresholds have been used to clearly define the distinction between high, low and zero maintenance schemes in a clear manner. The maintenance cost amount is taken from the first section of the scoring process.

How to score?

Schemes which result in a maintenance cost of zero score the highest with three points. Those which have a maintenance cost up to 50 per cent of the build cost score medium with two points, and where the build cost is high at over 50 per cent of the build cost only one point is awarded.

External Contribution Magnitude

Why score?

External contributions towards a scheme offer better value for money on capital funds. It may also allow for a wide range of improvements to be made or more in depth research to be produced as a larger budget is available. The same thresholds as those in maintenance magnitude have not been used as it is recognised that acquiring external contributions can be difficult, especially in economically challenging climates, therefore the thresholds utilised reflect this. The external contribution amount is taken from the first section of the scoring process.

How to score?

Schemes which score highly are those which will have a contribution of over 50 per cent to the scheme, they receive three points. Where a contribution of between 25 and 49 per cent has been achieved then two points are given and schemes which benefit from 25 per cent or less of external funding receive the lowest score of one point.

Impact Score

Geographical Extent of Impact

Why score?

The wider the impact of the scheme the higher the score as the scheme will bring benefits to a wider portion of the borough's residents. It is important within time of limited funding that schemes are delivered which, where possible do impact upon a greater range of the boroughs population.

How to score?

Schemes which will impact upon the whole of the borough receive high score and three points. Those which will bring district wide benefits score a medium, with two points and those at a street level score only one point as they will only bring impact to a small number of people.

Distributional impact

Why score?

This assessment allows for the most deprived areas of the borough to be considered in the development of schemes and contribute greater to the score of the scheme. The map which accompanies this section of the scoring has been collated by the Economic Intelligence Manager. It details the level of deprivation with the LSOAs (lower super output areas) of the borough. LSOAs are geographical regions which were created to aid the collation of data such as the Indices of Deprivation. Unlike ward boundaries, LSOAs are areas which are less likely to alter allowing direct comparisons to occur. Walsall is a varied borough, possessing some of the countries most deprived areas as well as some of the most affluent areas. The map clearly illustrates LSOAs and where they are within one of five quintiles ranging from, the most deprived to the least.

How to score?

For assessment of this section of the scoring an additional aid is required to establish which LSOAs the scheme passes through. Using the associated map, the location where the scheme will be delivered or impact upon will be established and then assessment of if it passes through any of the most deprived LSOAs in the borough. The legend clearly identifies which are the most deprived 20 per cent of LSOAs and continues through four more quintiles to the least deprived LSOAs. The highest score of 3 is awarded to schemes which pass through one of more of the 20 per cent most deprived LSOAs. Schemes which pass through 20 to 60 per cent of the most deprived LSOAs score 2, and those which pass through the least deprived LSOAs receive the lowest score of 1.

Public Acceptability

Why score?

Political support of a scheme is important in its delivery; at times it can aid in ensuring the scheme is delivered on time and is not subject to delay. Schemes endorsed or proposed by members of the public receive a low mark, these schemes are not discounted, and can become viable solutions, however at times are not wholly considerate of all the elements of which a scheme comprises of.

How to score?

If a scheme has been proposed or is endorsed by an MP or Councillor then it scores the maximum score of three, those schemes which are derived from a Council officer are given a medium score of two and those which a member of the public propose or endorse score only one point.

Rachel Telfer
September 2012

END