

6.8 Quantification of impacts and value for money

6.8.1 Impact

The effects of individual capital projects such as road widening and junction improvements can be modelled with a degree of accuracy. Where this approach is used then appropriate modelling has been used to assess the impact.

Other impacts such as some public transport improvements and Smarter Choices interventions are much more difficult to quantify. We do not fully understand the scale of the impact of individual or collections of measures and the transferability from locations where the impact has been measured to other locations. An initial assessment has had to be made for each corridor of the possible impact of such measures. There is a high risk that the assessments will not be accurate.

The impact of the interventions is identified on the tables for each corridor (see Sections 6.3 to 6.7) and the Appendices.

6.8.2 Value for money

Individual schemes will be subject to value for money assessments commensurate with the value and impact of the scheme. The partnership is building up knowledge of scheme impacts and the best ways of achieving value for money through monitoring of LTP schemes. Use is also made of case studies and best practice from other authorities in deciding which schemes to implement

We are continuing to carry out assessment of the impact of projects with a 'before and after implementation' monitoring regime. This has been carried out across West Yorkshire for a number of years (See Annual Monitoring Reports) and we are gradually building up a picture of what is effective and the likely benefits if implemented elsewhere. In addition, we intend to learn further from the best practice of other District Councils and PTEs.

The Partnership will seek opportunities to make sensible and accountable use of public funding. Opportunities for greater efficiency will also be pursued in line with the 'Gershon Report' Releasing Resources for the Frontline: Independent Review of Public Sector Efficiency.

In terms of delivery of the interventions in this delivery plan appropriate staff, consultants and contractors will be used to achieve the best result for the finance available. Value for money will be achieved through:

- efficient planning and delivery of schemes with focus on achieving shared priorities and LTP objectives;
- achieving added value through combining schemes, for example implementing integrated transport schemes as part of highway maintenance schemes;
- maximising capital investment through revenue and other sources of funding;
- working in partnership with other organisations to achieve wider benefits and additional match funding;
- benchmarking with other comparable authorities to tackle excessive costs and poor performance;
- making more effective use of technology to plan and manage improvements to the existing transport system rather than building new infrastructure wherever possible; and
- more emphasis on 'smarter choices' to win hearts and minds of people which will make it easier to implement controversial but essential proposals.

6.9 Resources

6.9.1 Staff

Each authority has a limited pool of skilled staff capable of developing and delivering most of the interventions identified in this delivery plan. Where there are shortages of numbers of staff or specialist skills then consultants will be used to fill the gaps.

There are framework agreements in place in most of the district councils and in Metro with transportation and highway design consultants who have wide skills bases available to call on. The costs of employing consultants will be met from the individual project budgets.

6.9.2 Finance

The costs of delivering the interventions are shown in Table 6.1 to Table 6.15. Most of the corridor specific projects are funded mainly through the LTP capital allocations or DfT major scheme funding. Funding for the revenue schemes for 2007/08 has been identified in the authorities' revenue budgets and similar levels of funding are anticipated to continue in future years.

6.9.3 Construction

Where construction is required then either the authorities' direct labour organisations or framework contractors can be used at fairly short notice. For larger construction projects, formal tendering procedures will be used to select an appropriate contractor.

6.10 What we could do with additional funding

In our choice of corridors for monitoring the congestion target we selected a number of routes where there were few interventions planned through the LTP funding. On these and other corridors there is scope for identifying additional interventions that could be delivered before the end of LTP2.

With further funding, the possibility of achieving more than the set target will be considerably increased. However the level and certainty of future year's funding are critical to this as we are already one year into the 5 year LTP2 period and there can be a long lead in time to delivering new projects.

It is proposed to implement most effective schemes on corridors where they will do most good in the time available for the delivery of the target. The implication of this is that we will try to identify and then implement 'quick wins' on the busiest corridors. At this stage it is not possible to identify the schemes which would be implemented but some studies to identify potential schemes and their impact have started.

6.10.1 Revenue

Because of the uncertainty of continuity of the level funding, any revenue funding would have to be used on a number of discreet projects rather than providing long term ongoing support.

We propose to use the funding (depending on the amount available) for:

- "Kick start" subsidy of bus services, e.g. to new industrial areas, and substantial publicity to try and turn them into commercial services;
- promotion of Smarter Choices;
- support for travel plan development;
- start up costs for schemes such as car share; and
- investigations and implementation of 'quick win' projects, e.g. improvements to signal timings and linking using existing installations.

6.10.2 Capital

The amount and timing of capital allocations is also uncertain. We have not had the luxury of being able to design schemes in anticipation of funding, so lead in time becomes an issue. We need to know availability of funding at least 1 year in advance for sizeable projects, e.g. a Traffic Regulation Order for a bus lane takes 9 months, and a Compulsory Purchase Order can easily take 24 months.

We propose to use funding for:

- acceleration of current programme, where possible;
- additional permanent automatic traffic count equipment to be able to track changes in throughput on the corridors being monitored as part of the target; and
- development of new 'quick win' projects e.g. improvements to junctions within the existing highway boundary.

For future years we will use the funding for:

- acceleration of current programme, where possible; and
- develop and implement new capital projects, e.g. junction improvements, HOV lanes public transport information.

In LTP2 we identified a number of schemes that we would develop if funding was made available. A number of these relate to the corridors being monitored for the Congestion Target. Most of these schemes were included in the recent review of Regional Funding Allocations but with mixed outcomes:

- A647 Leeds Road/A6177 Killinghall junction, Bradford (estimated cost £1.2m) was included in a bid submission for the "Bradford-Leeds Corridor" which was not prioritised by the Regional Transport Board (RTB)
- A629 Wakefield Road, Huddersfield Bus Priority, Huddersfield (£0.8m) was included in the "Wakefield/Huddersfield/Halifax Connectivity" package for post 2014 funding. This scheme has not been prioritised by the RTB for implementation, but was included on a "reserve list" as part of the RTB's response to requirements of the Government's Developing a Sustainable Transport System (DaSTS) during 2009.
- Newton Bar Park and Ride/ Bus Priority/ Gyratory, Wakefield (£3.8m) this was included in the bid submitted for the "North Wakefield Gateway": the RTB has identified this as a reserve scheme for any pre 2014 funding that might become available.
- Huddersfield-Dewsbury-Leeds QBC (£1.2m) was included in the bid submitted for "Huddersfield to Leeds Connectivity for post 2014 funding. - This scheme has not been prioritised by the RTB for implementation, but could be included on a "reserve List" as part of the RTB's response to requirements of the Government's DaSTS process during 2009.
- Bus / rail Park and Ride sites (not all on the target routes) (£2.8m) were included in the bid for "Leeds Rail Growth Package". This has been accepted by the RTB as a priority for pre 2014 funding. This will deliver new rail stations at Apperley Bridge and Kirkstall Forge. Additional parking is to be provided at Crossflatts, Sowerby Bridge, Pontefract Monkhill, Mirfield, Todmorden and Sandal and Agbrigg. These measures are expected to be delivered between 2011/12 and 2012/13

We will continue to explore opportunities to identify/secure funding for those measures not prioritised in the recent review of the RFA.

ENABLING ACTIONS AND DELIVERY LEVERS

We would also like to introduce Smartcard ticketing to significantly reduce bus boarding times as this is judged as by far the most effective way of speeding up bus movements in most urban areas. The “YorCard” scheme is currently the subject of a DfT funded pilot in South Yorkshire; future Major Scheme funding for this smartcard will be dependant on successful outcomes of this trial. There is also extensive use of the family of MetroCard pre-paid tickets.

The Leeds City Region Transport Vision and the Leeds TIF project have identified a number of potential congestion related projects. Work is continuing to develop these schemes more fully and to secure funding for them. It is unlikely that any of these will be implemented before 2012.