

Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund Tranche 2A Value for Money Pro-Forma

The pro-forma should be filled in with as much of the 'specific data' as possible - with supporting data / information included where possible.

Not all elements will be relevant for every bid - however we would expect for most bids 'specific data' will be available for at least rows 1 and 2.

In the 'Specific Data' Column - please supply the information in the units/format requested.

The 'Other Supporting Data' column should be used to provide salient details not captured under 'Specific Data' and/or further supporting information.

Please add any further information on scheme benefits either at the end of this pro-forma or within the body of the main bid (or annexes)

Input data	Specific Data	Other Supporting Data / Information (either input directly or provide reference to supporting information reported elsewhere)	Information requested
Length of Scheme	65.61km	65.61km over which some 20.55km length of carriageway could be actually repaired. See Appendix A	Provide length of route covered by the scheme - if an area wide scheme then provide total route length covered by scheme.
Number of vehicles (or users) on affected section (split by vehicle type if possible)	3,551 (Total Vehs - Average Annual Daily Traffic) 2,765 (Cars - AADT) 562 (LGV - AADT) 225 (HGV - AADT)	AADT and length for each section of affected road obtained. Overall AADT is the weighted average. Cars, LGV, and HGV then calculated by applying the split observed on the A142.	Provide an estimate of the traffic flow on the section of route covered by the scheme - also provide details of the data used to support that estimate (e.g. age, type and duration of count, etc.).
Details of required restrictions/closures if funding not provided (e.g. type of restrictions; timing/duration of restrictions; etc.)	(restriction type - text description) (start date of restriction - MM/YYYY)	Current restrictions on the network include 20mph advisory speed limits and diversions. These restrictions are supported by a consistent area wide signing protocol agreed by both authorities, including advisory signing in place since the drought damage occurred and in some cases permanent signing to reduce the risk of accidents and minimise any claims.	Provide details of any future restrictions. E.g. If restrictions to particular vehicle types will be needed in the do minimum (i.e. without funding) provide details of why they are required, what vehicle types are covered and when such restrictions will come into place.
Length of any diversion route, if closure is required (over and above existing route)		Not applicable. No closure proposed	Provide estimate of the length of diversion route over and above existing route. It would be helpful to support this with some mapping to demonstrate this.
Average extra time per vehicle on diversion route (over and above existing route)	4.35 minutes	Not applicable. However, observations show average speed of traffic on affected roads by some 5 mph, based on comparison using TomTom speed data. Overall increase in journey time would be 4.35 minutes	Provide estimate of the average extra time vehicles would spend on the diversion route over and above existing route. It would be helpful to support this with details of any data used/assumptions made (e.g. source of speed data used in any calculations).
Regularity/duration of closures due to flooding: (e.g. number of closures per year; average duration of closure (hrs); etc.)	(number of closures/year) (duration of closure - hrs) (length of diversion - Km) (extra time in using diversion - mins)	Not applicable - not flooding related	Provide estimates of closures / durations /delay and provide details of the data used to support those estimates (e.g. number of years of data etc.).
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 the scheme)	(DM Total Accidents/yr) (DM Slight Accidents/yr) (DM Serious Accidents/yr) (DM Fatal Accidents/yr) (DM Accident Rate - PIA/MVKm) (DS Total Accidents/yr) (DS Slight Accidents/yr) (DS Serious Accidents/yr) (DS Fatal Accidents/yr) (DS Accident Rate - PIA/MVKm)	Safety benefits are anticipated through the implementation of the carriageway resurfacing.	Provide estimates of accidents (split by severity if possible) or accident rates for the without scheme (DM) case and the with scheme case (DS). Provide details of the data and assumptions/analysis used to support these estimates (e.g. number of years of data, etc.).
Number of existing cyclists; forecasts of cycling usage with and without the scheme (and if available length of journey)	(DM cyclists/day) (DM av trip length - Km) (DS cyclists/day) (DS av trip length - Km)	Although the proposal does not directly impact of the number of cyclists, the number of cyclists continues to grow across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and an improvement to the condition of rural roads may encourage an increase in cycling across the area.	Provide estimates of the number of cyclists (and if possible trip length) for the without scheme (DM) case and the with scheme case (DS). Provide details of the data and assumptions/analysis used to support these estimates.
Other salient information for the VfM Case	In the Do Minimum scenario some £504,000 per annum is spent on trying to fix the affected roads without success. Repairs last less than 1 year. In addition the minimum reduction in speed is some 5mph, though can be considerable higher, where some affected roads can only be reasonably and safely be driven at 20mph.		A description of the do-minimum situation (i.e. what would happen without Challenge Fund investment). Details of significant monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits of the scheme.