



WEST MIDLANDS Local Transport Plan

WEST MIDLANDS LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN





Chair: John Anderson

Please reply to:

CEPOG Support Team
Centro House, 16 Summer Lane
BIRMINGHAM, B19 3SD

Phone: (0121) 214 xxxx

Fax: (0121) 214 7348

E-mail: CEPOGCoreSupport@centro.org.uk

Peter Matthews
Government Office for the West Midlands
Transport Team
Sustainable Futures Directorate
5 St. Philips Place,
Birmingham,
B3 2PW

Date: 11 August 2009

Dear Peter,

West Midlands Congestion Target Delivery Plan – August 2009 Assessment

Following consideration of a report at the Monitoring Group on the 29th July, we are pleased to enclose Form A, the self assessment element of the above, together with a review of the Plan recently been undertaken. I trust you will find that these demonstrate that the West Midlands Authorities are actively managing our programme of works and making progress towards achieving our LTP congestion target. If you have any queries or wish to discuss any issues would you contact in the first instance the officers below.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A Adams'.

Councillor Angus Adams
Chair, WM P&T Sub-C'ttee

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ted Richards'.

Councillor Ted Richards
Vice-Chair, WM P&T Sub-C'ttee

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John McNicholas'.

Councillor John McNicholas
Lead Opposition Spokesman

Officer Contacts:

Stuart Everton – Congestion Target Delivery Plan Responsible Officer, Walsall Council

Tel. 01922 652560; Email: evertons@walsall.gov.uk

George Parsons – CEPOG Support Team

Tel. 0121 214 7353; Email: georgeparsons@Centro.org.uk

Form A – Urban Area self-assessment: Key criteria and indicators

Note: This form shows the four key criteria and a number of positive and negative indicators, but it does not preclude other relevant indicators being taken into account.

Key Criteria	Positive Indicators	Negative Indicators	Urban Area comments and evidence
<p>Is the congestion programme being delivered?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Milestones are being achieved. ○ A record of dates when specific actions are completed is available. ○ Outline of resources allocated to implement programmes is available. ○ Schemes and policies in the programme have been delivered. ○ There are reasonable extenuating circumstances to explain any slippages. ○ Performance fund is being used effectively. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No evidence of delivery of the programme. ○ Slippages apparent in key schemes and policies. ○ Area is unable to provide an explanation of slippage. ○ No records of any resources allocated to the programme to confirm that work has been undertaken. ○ Performance fund is not being used effectively. 	<p>We continue to deliver our programmes and policies to achieve our congestion target. Six of the seven ‘milestone’ schemes programmed for 2008/09 were completed on time, the seventh completed in 2009/10. Three milestone schemes have been completed early. Only 70% of the remainder of the original programme has been delivered due to greater consultation etc. The Plan also identified desirable but unprogrammed schemes to be delivered if funds became available. All of tranches 1 &2 reward funding has been allocated to tackling the target.</p> <p>Details are set out in Chapters 1 & 2 of the Congestion Target Delivery Plan Review (CTDPR) August 2009.</p>

Key Criteria	Positive Indicators	Negative Indicators	Urban Area comments and evidence
<p>Is the congestion programme being kept under review, and updated to take account of new information?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Programme is regularly monitored and reviewed, and an updated version is available. ○ Regular progress discussions are held with the GO and other stakeholders. ○ There is evidence to show data is being used to analyse performance and identify hot spots. ○ Completed interventions and policies are being analysed. ○ Analysis of relevant trends and policies e.g. journey time data and traffic flows, bus and rail patronage figures. ○ Amendments considered to interventions, programme, milestones and trajectory using this evidence and information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Programme is not being monitored or reviewed. ○ Records are not kept or are inaccurate. ○ Plan has not been updated since initial sign-off. ○ Feedback received from DfT/GOs at time plan was developed has not been actioned. ○ Changes in circumstances in area are not evident in any revised plan. ○ No analysis of interventions, data or policies taking place. ○ New information and evidence is not available, and/or not being used. 	<p>The programme is monitored monthly through the IMPREST system and a detailed route based review undertaken. Internal and external stakeholders are updated and issues discussed eg consideration of the business community's quick wins suggestions; other LA initiatives, etc. These have influenced the delivery programme.</p> <p>The resolution of technical difficulties with the journey time data has enabled detailed analysis of trends and this is complemented by traffic and occupancy surveys. The trajectory has been modified accordingly. Analysis of interventions has been appropriate to their scale.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Details are set out in Chapters 3-5 & 7 of the CTDPR August 2009.</p>
<p>Are key risks being actively monitored and mitigated?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Risk Register is regularly reviewed and updated. ○ New risks are identified, while expired risks are cleared. ○ Full consideration of events that may have an adverse impact on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No evidence that risks are regularly monitored and updated. ○ Programme has been adversely affected by events, with no mitigation action 	<p>We have adopted a "toolkit of best practice" approach in recognition that different projects will need different approaches. A generic risk library is incorporated into the IMPREST system and is</p>

Key Criteria	Positive Indicators	Negative Indicators	Urban Area comments and evidence
	<p>delivery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigations are proposed, being considered or being analysed. 	<p>taken or proposed.</p>	<p>maintained to assist the development of individual scheme risk registers. Risks to achieving the target are reviewed annually and potential adverse interventions eg regeneration proposals recognised and their impact mitigated where possible.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Details are set out in Chapter 8 of the CTDP August 2009.</p>
<p>Is there good evidence of wider ownership and visibility of the target and programme within and across the authorities in the congestion area?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Governance arrangements support wider ownership and engagement in the target. ○ High level of visibility of the target within the area and the authorities. ○ Joined up approach within and between the authorities. ○ Senior officials are engaged and committed to the target and the congestion programme. ○ Senior level engagement in the monitoring and decision making processes for the programme. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Governance arrangements do not ensure wider ownership and engagement in the target. ○ Disjointed approach within the urban area and authorities. ○ Fragmentation or isolated expertise and delivery partners ○ Senior officials have little engagement in delivery of the target, do not input into decision making process nor challenge delivery. 	<p>Governance arrangements have been reviewed and modified to enhance delivery and ensure co-ordination with other initiatives. The implementation of the reward funding has been delegated to the project Team and reporting of all delivery is to a Senior Officer Management Board and a Member Monitoring Group.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Details are set out in Chapter 6 of the CTDP August 2009.</p>

1 Programme Delivery	3
2 Use of Reward Funding	7
3 Monitoring	11
4 External / Internal Stakeholders	13
5 Relationship with Other Initiatives	15
6 Review of Governance	19
7 Analysis of Trends and Review of Target Trajectory	21
8 Risks	27
Appendices	29
Appendix 1 - Programme Delivery Analysis August 2009	30
Appendix 2 - External Stakeholder Review	34
Appendix 3a - WM Congestion Routes 2007 Proposals	38
Appendix 3b - WM Congestion Routes 2009 Proposals	40

Tables

Table 1.1 Completed Milestone Schemes	3
Table 2.1 Proposed Allocation of Current Reward Funding - CAPITAL	7
Table 2.2 Proposed Allocation of Current Funding - REVENUE	9
.....	34
.....	36

Figures

Figure 6.1 Modification to the Congestion Target Delivery Plan Governance	20
Figure 7.1 Average Traffic Speeds - Route 4: A34 Stratford Road	22
Figure 7.2 Impact of Interventions on Route 4: A34 Stratford Road near to Birmingham City Centre	23
Figure 7.3 Revised Congestion Target Trajectory - August 2009 (7-10am inbound on 19 Target Routes)	25

Chapter 1: Programme Delivery

1.1 The West Midlands Congestion Target Delivery Plan (CTDP) 2006/11 (2007) sets out to accommodate, in the context of the Department for Transport Public Sector Agreement 4, on target routes in the AM Peak (0700 – 1000) an expected increase in travel of 4% with a 5% increase in journey times between 2005 and 2011. The central strand of the strategy developed to deliver this target is the Interventions Programme 2006/11. This summary provides a progress update on the programme for the GOWM DfT August 2009 Submission and a suggested way forward.

Delivery of Milestone Schemes

1.2 The Plan included an initial programme of costed schemes that would deliver our LTP2 congestion target. Sixteen of these, some of which are major schemes, were identified as having a significant individual impact on congestion levels. The completions of these schemes, amounting to £75m, were identified as ‘milestones’, see Table 1.1 ‘Completed Milestone Schemes’.

1.3 Six of the seven ‘milestone’ schemes identified for implementation by the end of 2008/09 have been completed. The seventh scheme at ‘The Rock’ in Wolverhampton (route 18, scheme 1) has also now been completed.

1.4 In addition it has been possible to implement two schemes on route 51 Bus Showcase (schemes 1 & 2) ahead of their original 2011 completion date. Also Stage 1 of the phased Selly Oak Relief Road scheme (Route 5, scheme 8) has also been completed.

Table 1.1 Completed Milestone Schemes

Congestion Route No.	DfT Route Reference	Scheme No.	Scheme Description
Original Programme Completed by 2008/09			
4	A34 Bham	11	Red Route Walford Road to Ring Road
5	A38 Bham	6	Pebble Mill New signals
11	A461Walsall	1	Remodelling of Arboretum junction and introduction of traffic signal controls
13	A454 Walsall	12	Remodelling of Pleck Road junction and upgrading of traffic signal controls (end of April)

Congestion Route No.	DfT Route Reference	Scheme No.	Scheme Description
14	A449 Wton	1	Red Route M54 jct 2 to City Centre (<i>pilot since replaced by alternative measures</i>)
14	A449 Wton	2	Five Ways Bus Gate
Additional Schemes Completed Early			
12	A34 Sandwell	1	Route 51 Bus Showcase measures Scott Arms to Merrions Close
12	A34 Sandwell	2	Route 51 Bus Showcase Spouthouse Lane to Scott Arms
5	A38 Bham	8	Phase 1 of Selly Oak Relief Road (full scheme due to be completed 2011)
Further 2008/09 Schemes Now Completed			
15	A41 Wton	1	The Rock junction capacity improvement

1.5 The remaining milestone schemes have been reassessed:

- Implementation of signals on A38 at Longbridge junctions (route 5, scheme 3) remains at 2011 although dependent on major redevelopment of the area
- Implementation of Red Routes and Showcase treatments on the A4123 route Wolverhampton, (route 16, scheme 10), is to be now done as a joint scheme with Dudley MBC and to be considered for the Smarter Routes initiative, but remains for completion by 2010/11
- Completion of the A454 Wolverhampton City Centre Approach scheme (route 13, scheme 15) has slipped from completion in 2009 to 2010/11
- Completion of the A449 Wolverhampton Vine Island / Wobaston Road scheme (route 14, scheme 4) has slipped from 2010 to 2011
- The Highways Agency have a completion date for 2009/2010 for the signalisation of junction 2 of the M54 (route 14, scheme 5)
- Completion of the A41 Expressway / All Saints Way junction improvement (route 17, scheme 5) in West Bromwich has experienced some delay in obtaining developer contribution, consequently the start date is now set for the spring of 2010

A web based system for monitoring capital schemes has now been introduced and is being used by all Districts to monitor their capital programmes. The system monitors expenditure, delivery stages, risks, outputs and outcomes. It contains a generic risk library to improve the assessment of scheme deliverability and has the ability to systematically monitor the outcomes from individual schemes.

The system is used to monitor major schemes and IT Block funded programmes of schemes. It will enable individual schemes and programmes to be 'tagged' and their implementation regularly monitored. The governance arrangements have also been reviewed, see Chapter 6: 'Review of Governance'.

Overall Programme Analysis

The basis used to determine progress was to compare the planned programme of intervention delivery during the period 2006/08 against the actual. In addition each intervention was assigned a Red-Amber-Green status depending on a delivery assessment, within the CTDP life timescale, and a route commentary offered to give a flavour of achievements, issues and progress, see 'Appendix 1 - Programme Delivery Analysis August 2009'.

The analysis showed during the financial year periods 2006 to 2009, the 2007 Plan anticipated 68 Interventions being completed. The actual number was 49 (72%) so about 30% slippage could be argued. This is simplistic given the complexities of developing coherent route interventions and the issues of planning, design, consultation, emerging route strategies like Red Routes and Bus Showcase, stakeholder involvement, and of course resources and funding. However, it does give a realistic feel for where we are in delivering the plan and where we should be focussing our attention to get the maximum benefit to help achieve our stated congestion target.

With 49 interventions 'complete', 4 are 'underway', 46 are 'programmed' and 69 are 'not programmed'. Clearly the greatest challenge for the delivery authorities is the volume of outstanding interventions to be delivered within the Plan life. Note also that some programme information is sparse in terms of detail and 12 interventions are likely to be delivered outside the Plan life. Further, though the majority of interventions have Green status ('complete/underway/programmed within 2006/11 Plan life') a significant number are Amber or Red (in total 45%). So given the 21 months that remain focus must be given to those routes where there is danger of slippage or no delivery, e.g. Routes 6, 10, 15, 16 and 17.

However, significant achievements should be noted too and there are highlight routes where progress has been good or excellent, i.e. Routes 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11 and 18.

In conclusion, there has been some good progress though some slippage and there must be some concern about delivering the outstanding interventions. So there needs to be a re-evaluation and prioritisation by the Delivery Team of the intervention programme to ensure that the maximum benefit and effect is gained in achieving our target within the remaining life of the Plan.

Chapter 2: Use of Reward Funding

2.1 To date DfT have awarded us £2,468,645 'reward funding' based on the submission of our plan to achieve our congestion target and our progress towards it. The allocation of the original Plan-based funding (£585,000) has been drawn down by authorities on the basis of the proposals agreed by P&T Sub in January 2008. After allocating 25% to Centro, this was distributed on a population basis to enable implementation to be started quickly. It was felt this was not necessarily the best use of the funding and resulted in too small a sum for the smaller authorities for them to make a significant impact.

2.2 The two tranches of performance-related funding, allocated in (July 2008 and February 2009), were therefore amalgamated to £1,883,645 (£941,823 capital, £941,823 revenue). The Congestion Target Delivery Team considered the proposals put forward by individual authorities. These totalled £2,612,700 (£1,798,200 capital, £814,500 revenue). The proposals were therefore prioritised on the basis of their contribution towards achieving / exceeding by 2010/11 our network wide target and vfm.

2.3 The agreed programme is listed in Table 2.1 'Proposed Allocation of Current Reward Funding - CAPITAL' and Table 2.2 'Proposed Allocation of Current Funding - REVENUE'. This amounts to £1,908,500 (£1,299,500 capital, £609,000 revenue) with some £25,000 over programming. Some £357,700 revenue funding will need to be capitalised. The remainder of the proposals (together with any further proposals put forward) will be considered in the light of any future reward funding.

2.4 The programme agreed will be managed in accordance with the agreed delegations to minimise any slippage with quarterly reporting to Monitoring Group.

Table 2.1 Proposed Allocation of Current Reward Funding - CAPITAL

Route	Ref	Proposal	Cost (£)	Earliest Start	Authority
04	13	A34 Stratford Road / Monkspath Hall Road Roundabout Junction Interim Capacity and Pedestrian / Cycle Improvements. Objective: To relieve congestion on A34 N/B and Monkspath Hall Road arms and control movement of peds and cycs to the overall operational and safety benefits of the junction for all users	100,000	2009/10	Solihull
04	14	A34 School Road / Stratford Road Junction	250,000		Bham
05	11	Longbridge Rail Park & Ride Provision. Scheme to provide 282	117,500	2009	Centro

Route	Ref	Proposal	Cost (£)	Earliest Start	Authority
		new park & ride spaces (including disabled provision) at Longbridge Station together with lighting, fencing and CCTV. (Related to scheme R22)			
09	C9 Ref 3	B4113 Foleshill Road Traffic and bus lane enforcement cameras	120,000	2009/10	Coventry
10	05	A4600 Walgrave Road / Ansty Road MOVA (junction with Sewall Highway) linked to R17	62,000	2009/10	Coventry
13	17	Introduction of loading and parking facilities	50,000		Walsall
13	18	Improvements to Wolverhampton Road / Primley Avenue & Lane Avenue Junctions	100,000		Walsall
13	19	Improvements to Wolverhampton Road – Alumwell Road Junction	50,000		Walsall
13	20	Willenhall Road Route Treatment	60,000		Wton
16	14	Contribution to signal upgrades at junctions with: a) Junction Ivyhouse Lane b) Bank Street c) Mason Street	290,000		Dudley
17	07	Installation of MOVA at key junctions; Old Meeting Street / Church Lane on the A4196	100,000	2009/10	Sandwell
		Total Capital	1,229,500		

Table 2.2 Proposed Allocation of Current Funding - REVENUE

Route	Ref	Proposal	Cost (£)	Earliest Start	Authority
01	10	A34 - Birchfield Road / Trinity Road - SCOOT Validation	5,000		Bham
04	15	A34 Stratford Road Corridor. Objective: To relieve congestion on A34 corridor by introducing business and residential travel advice and plans (essentially travel to work). Focusing on modal shift towards sustainable modes and meeting wider strategies set by the Local Strategic Partnership	130,000	2009/10 to 2010/11	Solihull
04	16	A34 Shirley to Robin Hood - Signal Validation	10,000		Bham
04	17	A34 Robin Hood to Walford Road - Signal Validation	20,000		Bham
05	12	Longbridge Rail Park & Ride Provision. Scheme to provide 282 new park & ride spaces (including disabled provision) at Longbridge Station together with lighting, fencing and CCTV. (Related to scheme C4)	117,500	2009	Centro
06	09	A456 Hagley Road - SCOOT and Validation - Rotton Park Road to Highfield Road	10,000		Bham
06	10	A456 Hagley Road - SCOOT and Validation - Lordswood Road	5,000		Bham
06	11	A456 - Hagley Road - extension of lane to roundabout at Five Ways	40,000		Bham
Various Bham	-	TravelWise - Additional Resource	11,000		Bham
08	02	A4114 Holyhead Road SCOOT detector repairs and validation	10,000	2009/10	Coventry
09	04	B4113 Foleshill Road SCOOT detector repairs and validation	31,000	2009/10	Coventry

Route	Ref	Proposal	Cost (£)	Earliest Start	Authority
10	06	A4600 Walgrave Road/Ansty Road MOVA (junction with Sewall Highway) related to capital bid C10	11,000	2009/10	Coventry
10	07	A4600 Walgrave Road / Ansty Road SCOOT detector repairs and validation	8,500	2009/10	Coventry
12,16, 17 & 19	-	Travelwise / car share promotion	35,000		Sandwell
13	21	Willenhall Road Bus Lane Enforcement in-bound	60,000		Wton
14	12	Stafford Road Outbound Bus Lane Enforcement	60,000		Wton
14	13	Workplace Travel Planning with Stafford Road Businesses	10,000		Wton
Various Wton	-	Astrid Enhancements	10,000		Wton
All	-	Project Management	25,000	2009	CST
		Total Revenue	609,000		

Chapter 3: Monitoring

3.1 The level of monitoring is undertaken at various levels related to scale and nature of the intervention. It is too early to report formal before / after assessment of our major schemes. However, the longer the time between before and after surveys the greater the likelihood of background changes influencing the assessment e.g. the economic recession.

3.2 At the other end of the scale 'Quick Wins' often relate to traffic signal efficiency or road markings/signing and enforcement of parking restrictions. Individually these make marginal improvements but it would be cost prohibitive to monitor them all when compared with the improvement gained. A typical example is Bristol Road/ Ring Road Junction:

- Traffic light phase identified as requiring modification to allow more vehicles to pass through phase
- Cost £3,000
- Scheme has led to reducing in traffic queues at junction as a result of improved junction flow and reliability

3.3 Similarly the work of Traffic Managers, although not specifically quantified in the Plan contributes towards our target. This includes programmes relating to parking management, decriminalised enforcement, road safety, managing the traffic impact of major events / incidents, Urban Traffic Control operation, car park signage and Variable Message Signs (VMS), Tunnel gantry signing, the further integration into the UTC system of traffic responsive traffic systems such as SCOOT, MOVA and RMS cross boundary liaison, etc. It can be argued that these generally routine operations build up a greater overall network efficiency.

3.4 Whilst monitoring the impact of interventions is by individual authorities, analysis of the Red Route package 1 schemes is being undertaken centrally. This is reported in Chapter 7: 'Analysis of Trends and Review of Target Trajectory'. The analysis of the satellite based journey time information is a valuable tool for identifying, quantifying and monitoring congestion.

Financial Management of the Reward Funding

3.5 The programme of works funded by the reward funding allocation is being delivered through partnership authorities. As described above, the programme was approved by the P&T Monitoring Group. The specific projects have been allocated to an authority for implementation.

3.6 The delivering Authority is then officially notified of the amount of funding they are to receive, (through a budget notification form) which they will then advise on the phasing of the work and the timing for use of the grant.

3.7 The districts then receive funding quarterly in arrears based on the submission of a claim form identifying works completed to date.

3.8 The claim form also allows comparison between actual and original forecast enabling any variance to be identified and discussed and appropriate action taken in accordance with the powers delegated to the delivery team.

3.9 The process mirrors the financial management of key initiatives within the West Midlands and helps aid effective programme management.

Chapter 4: External / Internal Stakeholders

4.1 A review has been undertaken with external members of the Project Team, e.g. emergency services, (with representatives updated as appropriate) and the opportunity given to raise issues of concern. These are summarised in 'Appendix 2 - External Stakeholder Review'.

4.2 An initiative particularly benefiting from close stakeholder involvement has been undertaken with the West Midlands Business Transport Group (WMBTG) which represents the local Chambers of Commerce. A questionnaire requested information on congestion hotspots encountered by their members such as the location, problem, time of day and a potential solution. Some 115 schemes were developed from this "Quick Wins" initiative and, following analysis by the authorities concerned, categorised as:

- Implemented during 2008/09 – 19 (17%)
- To be implemented during 2009/10 – 26 (22%)
- Investigate further – 34 (30%)
- To be Solved via another Scheme – 9 (8%)
- Did not meet LTP objectives; will not be implemented – 27 (23%)

4.3 Sources of funding for implementing the suggestions include the Congestion Target reward funding, existing joint programmes e.g. Bus Showcase, or individual Districts own programmes funded by their Integrated Transport Block.

4.4 Similarly a review has been undertaken with internal stakeholders. These are also summarised in 'Appendix 2 - External Stakeholder Review'.

