

BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL

Place Scrutiny Commission

Monday 15th September 2014

Report of: Peter Mann, Service Director -Transport

Title: MetroWest Update

Ward: Citywide

Officer Presenting Report: Alistair Cox/ Service Manager, Strategic City Transport

Contact Telephone Number: 0117 922 2357

RECOMMENDATION

To review progress on the West of England Metro West rail programme.

Summary

The Appendices contain two reports providing an update on Metro West programme delivery prepared for the West of England Local Transport Board on the 12th September, 2014.

a) Appendix A – Metro West Preliminary Business Case

A Preliminary (Strategic Outline) Business Case has been prepared for the first phase of MetroWest covering Portishead line, Severn Beach line and enhancements to services between Bristol and Bath.

This Preliminary Business Case is the first of three business cases; subsequent Outline and Full business cases will update the information presented in the Preliminary Business Case with more refined assessments based on the more detailed scheme development work to be undertaken from autumn 2014.

The first element of the MetroWest programme proposes to deliver a half hourly local service for:

- The Severn Beach line (hourly for St. Andrews Road and Severn Beach stations),
- Bath to Bristol line (an additional hourly service overlaid with the existing hourly service and timed to provide an overall half hourly service), and
- A reopened Portishead line with stations at Portishead and Pill (also serving Parsons Street and / or Bedminster station subject to further technical work).

Full technical appendices for this report can be found at:

<http://www.travelwest.info/mw/p1/pbc>

b) MetroWest and Rail Update

This report provides an update on MetroWest and other rail issues. It includes high level reporting on costs and funding for MetroWest Phase 1 and 2.

Policy

MetroWest is embedded with relevant West of England transport and planning policies.

Consultation

Internal

N/A

External

N/A

Context

N/A

Proposal

N/A

Other Options Considered

N/A

Risk Assessment

N/A

Public Sector Equality Duties

N/A

Legal and Resource Implications

N/A

AGENDA ITEM 12 - APPENDIX A

**West of England Joint Transport Board
12th September 2014**

Agenda Item 6

Agenda Item 6 - MetroWest Preliminary Business Case

Purpose

1. To update the Joint Transport Board on the MetroWest Preliminary Business Case and to make recommendations to take the scheme forward to Outline Business Case (Programme Entry) stage.

Background

2. A Preliminary (Strategic Outline) Business Case has been prepared for the first phase of MetroWest covering Portishead line, Severn Beach line and enhancements to services between Bristol and Bath. More detail and a link to the full report can be found in Appendix A.
3. This Preliminary Business Case is the first of three business cases; subsequent Outline and Full business cases will update the information presented in the Preliminary Business Case with more refined assessments based on the more detailed scheme development work to be undertaken from autumn 2014.
4. The first element of the MetroWest programme proposes to deliver a half hourly local service for:
 - The Severn Beach line (hourly for St. Andrews Road and Severn Beach stations),
 - Bath to Bristol line (an additional hourly service overlaid with the existing hourly service and timed to provide an overall half hourly service), and
 - A reopened Portishead line with stations at Portishead and Pill (also serving Parsons Street and / or Bedminster station subject to further technical work).

Preliminary Business Case

5. The Preliminary Business Case demonstrates that the scheme is value for money, has a commercial footing, is financially affordable and is deliverable in 2019. The Preliminary Business Case demonstrates there are no fundamental impediments to the delivery of the scheme. More detailed technical work needs to be undertaken and reported through subsequent business cases, before the scheme can proceed to construction in 2017.
6. The confirmed infrastructure requirements include:
 - Rebuilding the disused Portishead to Pill line (5km);
 - Closure of historic crossings and provision of a vehicle bridge at Sheepway Gate Farm and a pedestrian bridge near Trinity School;
 - New station at Portishead;
 - Reopening of former station at Pill and provision of car parking;

- Double track works at Pill and Ashton Gate area;
 - Possible improvements to highway access to Pill tunnel;
 - Environmental mitigation measures;
 - Enhancement of Parson Street junction;
 - New signals for the entire line between Temple Meads and Portishead;
 - Bathampton turn-back (crossover to allow trains to turn around at Bath off the main line);
 - Additional signalling at Avonmouth station to facilitate turn-back;
 - Partial reinstatement of down relief line between Parson Street and Temple Meads to assist recessing and regulation of freight trains.
7. The infrastructure requirements are the same for the two best performing options, 5B and 6B, except for a minor difference in regard to location of an additional signal at Avonmouth, which does not appreciably change the capital cost of the scheme.
 8. In respect of operational feasibility, the train timetable modelling demonstrates a symmetrical (clock face) service pattern for the proposed half hourly train services.
 9. The Preliminary Business Case has been subject to an independent review in accordance with the West of England Local Transport Body Board Assurance Framework (see Appendix B for a link to the review). A response to the red and amber issues by the MetroWest Core Project Team is set out in Appendix C attached to this report.
 10. The economic indicators for the scheme represent a range of Benefit Cost Ratios (BCR) for the options between 2.28 and 5.99. This provides confidence to take the scheme forward in that all the options have a BCR above 2:1. It should be noted that the highest performing options in BCR terms are not necessarily the best performing in terms of operating efficiency and service reliability. As we progress the work to the next stage, we will have a better understanding of the operational business case and the 'first cut' of the BCR of the scheme we take through to delivery.
 11. The estimated capital cost for the scheme is £58.159 million and this comprises of:
 - £2.761 million in feasibility costs leading up to Programme Entry
 - £6.093 million preparation costs from Programme Entry to Full Approval
 - £49.306 million construction costs
 12. Compared against the available budget there is potentially a capital budget pressure; however, there is a high level of contingency included in the cost profile and, hence, no change to the total budget is proposed at this time. Further work will provide more robust cost estimates and enable us to better understand the true financial position as part of the Outline Business Case in late 2015.

13. The initial estimate is that operational costs will not be fully covered by the forecast revenue during the early years of operation and the net train service subsidy requirement ranges from £1.141 million to £1.765 million pa average for the first 3 years. This is broadly in line with the range of previous estimates in the original consultant study (Halcrow West of England Rail Studies, 2012 and 2013).
14. The preliminary assessment, however, utilises relatively pessimistic assumptions regarding the operational costs. Likewise, in terms of the forecast revenue from the fare box, a cautious approach has been used in relation to the average fare yielded from Portishead, Pill and Severn Beach line stations and the extent of additional demand arising from the Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone and other planned interventions such as the Bristol residents parking scheme. This approach has resulted in a baseline forecast train service requiring a potential subsidy during the first three years of operation and can be regarded as a worse case scenario.
15. Both the operational costs and the forecast revenue will be analysed in greater detail in the preparation of the Outline Business Case. We have strong evidence from recent years of local rail passenger demand outstripping Department for Transport (DfT) Rail forecasts. We anticipate that we will be able to develop a more robust case for the enhanced demand as we move through the Outline and Full Business Case.
16. Whilst confirmation of the length of the Direct Award for the Great Western Franchise is still awaited it is proposed to now work with FGW to develop the best possible operational business case. This will inform the potential cost of any opening year operation but also assist with us making the case to DfT to include the service pattern in the next franchise.

Stakeholder Engagement

17. The following stakeholder engagement has been undertaken during the Preliminary Business Case preparation:
 - Liaison with Network Rail about GRIP1/2, Railsys modelling and other technical issues;
 - Liaison with First Great Western about operational matters;
 - Ongoing MetroWest Stakeholder meetings;
 - Ongoing engagement with rail interest groups;
 - Public consultation about Portishead Station location; and
 - Liaison with some statutory environment bodies to inform the Environment Impact Assessment Scoping work.

Risk

18. Key risks will form part of the quarterly reporting to the Board. Risks at the project and programme level will be managed through the Rail Programme Board.

Equalities Implications

19. New stations and services provided under MetroWest will be designed to meet all statutory accessibility standards. Affordability issues will need to be considered as evidence shows that people from minority ethnic backgrounds, disabled and older people have a lower ability to pay. Consultation will ensure wide opportunities for diverse groups to have their say. Equality Impact Assessments will be undertaken and maintained and updated as the MetroWest projects progress.

Resources (finances and personnel)

20. This Board endorsed the MetroWest budget for 2014/15 for approval by the four councils; these budgets have now been approved. The MetroWest programme budget requirement for 2015/16 totals approximately £4.4m (of preparatory costs for Phase 1 and 2), split amongst the four promoting authorities plus Growth Deal funding. This funding package will need to be approved by the authorities through their individual budget-setting processes.

21. Delivering MetroWest will require additional resources and funding. MetroWest train services will require financial support from the local authorities for the first three years. Subject to meeting value for money criteria the Department for Transport may fund the services from then on.

Environmental Impact Assessment

22. Whilst rail's share of journeys to work is modest, modern rolling stock contributes less carbon emissions than other forms of transport. Reinstating the railway line between Pill and Portishead, new services on the Portishead and Henbury Lines and the construction of new stations under Phase 1 and Phase 2 will have a visual and environmental impact.

Recommendations

23. We are seeking the following recommendations:

- 1) To endorse the Preliminary Business Case.
- 2) To endorse progressing to the Outline Business Case (Programme Entry).
- 3) To recommend continued work with First Great Western on the operational business case.
- 4) To bring back to Joint Transport Board the Outline Business Case in late 2015.

Appendices

Appendix A - MetroWest Phase 1 Preliminary Business Case

Appendix B - MetroWest Phase 1 Preliminary Business Case Review

Appendix C - MetroWest Phase 1 Project Team Response to Business Case Review

Author

James Willcock, North Somerset Council
MetroWest Phase 1 Project Manager
Email: james.willcock@n-somerset.gov.uk
Tel: 01934 426414

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**Background Papers:**

The GRIP 2 cost estimate has been redacted from publication because it is commercial sensitive, such that its publication would dis-advantage the commercial position of the councils in relation to the cost and delivery of the scheme.

Appendix A: MetroWest Phase 1 Preliminary Business Case

The Phase 1 Preliminary Case is made up of the following documents:

Preliminary Business Case

- Strategic Case
- Economic Case
- Commercial Case
- Financial Case
- Management Case

Appendices

Appendix A – GRIP1/2 report including scheme drawings, Timetabling/capacity analysis report

Appendix B – EAST assessment of Options report

Appendix C – Socio-economic Appraisal Report, Network Rail

Appendix D – MetroWest phase 1 Forecasting Report

Appendix E – Wider Economic Impacts Report

Appendix F – Portishead Station Options Appraisal

Appendix G – Highway design drawings and cost

In all it runs to over 400 pages along with technical drawings that it is not possible to reproduce in A4 format. For this reason the Preliminary Business Case is not reproduced here.

The full document can be viewed at <http://www.travelwest.info/mw/p1/abc> . Printed copies for public inspection will be provided for the Joint Transport Board meeting.

Appendix B: MetroWest Phase 1 Preliminary Business Case Review

This document can also be viewed at <http://www.travelwest.info/mw/p1/abc> and printed copies for public inspection will be provided for the Joint Transport Board meeting

Appendix C: MetroWest Phase 1 Project Team Response to Business Case Review

	Reviewer Comment	Project Team Response
Red Issues	<p><i>The Railsys modelling indicates the modelled timetable is achievable but the 6 unit options are ‘towards the upper ceiling and ... further modelling is required at GRIP 3’ (Page 3, Section 0, Executive Summary). The potential implications of this further work on the BCR would be useful to understand and specifically whether, if the timetable was not robust, this would have a material impact on either costs and/or benefits, and hence the overall BCR. More importantly at this stage of option selection, to understand if it has a material effect on the relative performance of the options considered. On this latter point we recommend that the Promoter clarifies the position as to whether, in the Promoter’s view, further operational testing at the next stage could materially alter the recommendation to take forward to single option development Option 5B enhanced timetable with 6 train units.</i></p>	<p>On the basis that there is no pressing need to select a preferred train service option at this stage and given that more detail train timetable modelling needs to be undertaken in preparation of the Outline Business Case, the text in the Preliminary Business Case has been amended to:</p> <p><i>Executive Summary</i> <i>“The Preliminary Business Case work indicates that Option 5B enhanced (6 car units) is the best performing option. More detailed assessment of the options will be required for the Outline Business Case, before a final decision can be made on the preferred option.” and</i></p> <p><i>Finance Case section 5.4</i> <i>Option 5B scenarios have the best performing Benefit to Cost Ratio and operating revenue (requiring less subsidy than option 6B). More detailed assessment of both options will be required for the Outline Business Case, before a final decision can be made on the preferred option.</i></p> <p>The amended text has been incorporated in the final version of the Preliminary Business Case appended to this report.</p>
Amber Issues	<p>Strategic Case</p> <p>24. some inconsistencies between the strategic case and the economic case,</p> <p>25. inadequate policy / strategy support from Network Rail,</p> <p>Economic Case</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more detailed required on the cost-benefit performance (economic appraisal) of the options. • more detail required on the profile of the rail benefits (e.g. 	<p>All amber issues to be address in the preparation of the Outline Business Case scheduled to be completed by November 2015.</p>

	<p>GIS plots showing geographic distribution of benefits).</p> <p>Commercial Case</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• suggests further evidence is needed to support the case for the scheme to be included within the 5 year direct award GW franchise Sept 2015 to 2020.• more context required in relation to the recent GW franchise specification consultation document.• More detail required in terms of rail industry activities and milestones in relation to inclusion of the train service in the direct award GW franchise. <p>Finance Case</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• More detail required on operating costs to in order to form a view as to whether the costs are reasonable.• More detailed sensitivity testing of operating costs <p>Management Case</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Suggests further information required to explain the Councils' track record or delivering major transport schemes on another party's asset base.• More detail required is respect of risk assumptions and risk management.	
--	--	--

AGENDA ITEM 12 - APPENDIX B

West of England Joint Transport Board
4 July 2014

Agenda Item 7

MetroWest and Rail Update

Purpose

1. This report provides an update on MetroWest and other rail issues. It includes high level reporting on costs and funding for MetroWest Phase 1 and 2 as shown below.

MetroWest Phase 1 and 2 – Scheme Cost and Profile

Cost*	MetroWest Phase 1	£58.2m
	MetroWest Phase 2	£43m
	Total	£101.2m

Funding	Devolved Major Schemes	£81.4m
	Early development costs	£4.9m
	Total	£86.3m

Shortfall		£14.9m
------------------	--	---------------

* outturn costs.

Funding Profile	Local	Devolved Allocation		Shortfall
		15/16 - 20/21	21/22 – 24/25	
MetroWest Phase 1	£2.1m	£44.9m	-	£10.5m
MetroWest Phase 2	£2.1m	-	£36.5m	£4.5m

Notes:

Figures have been rounded.

Implementation of Phase 2 currently planned to start in 20/21 in advance of the next tranche of devolved funding being available in 21/22.

2. For detail of cost and funding profiles for MetroWest Phase 1 and 2 from 2015/16 to 2024/25 see Figure One.

Funding Opportunities

3. To meet the shortfalls identified above potential funding sources include:
 - Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) Local Growth Fund (LGF) intervention - MetroWest Phase 1 capital cost shortfall £8.4m (2018/19).

- Strategic Economic Plan Local Growth Fund intervention - MetroWest Phase 2 development costs £3.2m (2015/16 - 2018/19).
- Economic Development Fund – Phase 2 now included with the opportunity to use retained business rates to fund the shortfall.

Phasing Opportunities for Phase 2

4. It should be noted that capital funding for Phase 2 through the devolved major scheme allocation only comes on stream in 2021/22 and therefore opening the scheme in 2021 will be a significant challenge.
5. Phasing opportunities to bring forward funding for Phase 2 include:
 - Seek agreement for early drawdown of devolved funding for 2021/22 for Phase 2.
 - Borrow against 2021/22 allocation to enable start in 2020/21.

MetroWest Progress

6. The Board receives a high level report on progress on MetroWest Phases 1 and 2 and the latest versions can be found in Appendix One and Two. The format of these reports is being simplified as used for the Phase 1 and 2. With work focusing on the Preliminary Business Case for Phase 1 (Agenda Item 6) the old format has been retained for this report. The new format will be used for all future Joint Transport Boards. A summary of recent, current and planned activities over the next few months is provided below.

MetroWest Phase 1

- The Preliminary Business Case with the GRIP Stage 1-2 report and the recommendation to endorse progressing to the Outline Business Case (Programme Entry) is covered by Agenda Item 6.
- Project Management Resources – a fixed term post to Oct 2017 has now been appointed for project management support and to lead on specific work streams and functions.
- Development Consent Order (DCO) – discussions taking place with Network rail about who is best placed to promote the order.
- Portishead Station Public Consultation closed on 28 July 2014 with over 400 responses and 1,000 comments on the three station options. There was overwhelming support for the reopening of the Portishead line and 91% of people said they would use the station on the basis that one of the three station locations is built.
- Case to be submitted to the Office of Rail Regulation regarding the possibility of ‘exceptional circumstances’ to allow a level crossing at Quays Avenue in Portishead.

MetroWest Phase 2

- GRIP Stage 1-2 and Preliminary Business Case technical briefs finalised and published July 2014 (specification identifies a Henbury 'loop', with sensitivity test for a 'spur').
- Network Rail capability (timetable) analysis work ongoing, to feed into GRIP 1-2 study.
- South Gloucestershire Council concluding GRIP Stage 1-2 Development Services Agreement with Network Rail.
- Network Rail seeking tender price from its framework consultant for GRIP 1-2 study.
- CH2MHill being commissioned to start Preliminary Business Case work September 2014.
- Bristol New Stations High Level Assessment Study has been looking at potential locations at Ashley Down, Horfield and Ashton Gate (part of the New Stations Package, not MetroWest Phase 2). Initial draft study reports have been produced and some initial feedback from Network Rail has been provided. Further work to understand the value for money of the potential station locations will be undertaken in the coming weeks, considering the impacts of future developments such as Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood and the Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone, and potential new services through MetroWest.

Timescales for Phase 1 and 2

Key decisions/milestones	Date
Phase 1	
Phase 1 Preliminary Business Case and Joint Transport Board endorse progression to Outline Business Case (Programme Entry) for GRIP Stage 3).	September 2014
Phase 1 Outline Business Case and seek powers and procurement decision by Joint Transport Body.	October 2015
Phase 1 Full Approval decision by Joint Transport Body	October 2017
Phase 1 construction	December 2017 to May 2019
Phase 1 opening	May 2019
Phase 2	
Phase 2 Preliminary Business Case and single option (for GRIP Stage 3) decision by Joint Transport Body.	March 2015
Phase 2 Outline Business Case and seek powers and procurement decision by Joint Transport Body.	June 2016
Phase 2 Full Approval decision by Joint Transport Body	March 2020
Phase 2 construction	April 2020 to March 2021
Phase 2 opening	May 2021

Figure One: MetroWest Scheme Cost and Profile (£M)

Scheme	Pre 15/16	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/12	23/24	24/25	Total
Phase 1	£1.28	£1.99	£2.53	£18.94	£29.93	£2.49	-	-	-	-	-	£58.16
Phase 2	£0.69	£1.41	£0.42	£0.87	£0.89	£0.24	£29.25	£9.23	-	-	-	£43.0
Total	£1.97	£4.4	£2.95	£19.81	£30.82	£2.73	£29.25	£9.23	-	-	-	£101.16

MetroWest Funding and Profile (£M)

Scheme	Pre 15/16	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/12	23/24	24/25	Total
Confirmed Local Funding	£2.74	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	£2.74
Other Local Funding		£1.70										£1.70
Devolved Major Schemes Phase 1	-	-	-	£28.40	£16.50	-	-	-	-	-	-	£44.90
Devolved Major Schemes Phase 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	£36.50	-	-	-	£36.50
Total	£2.74	£1.70	-	£28.40	£16.50	-	-	£36.50	-	-	-	£85.84

Shortfall (-Surplus)	-£0.77	£2.70	£2.95	-£8.59*	£14.32	£2.73	£29.25	-£27.27	-	-	-	£15.32
----------------------	---------------	-------	-------	----------------	--------	-------	--------	----------------	---	---	---	--------

*Phase 1 development costs for Oct 2015 to March 2016 and 2016/17 drawn down from 2017/18 budget

Stakeholder Engagement

7. Stakeholder meetings now take place after each Joint Transport Board. The second one at The Guildhall in Bath on 14 July 2014 was well attended including representatives from Wiltshire and Monmouthshire Councils. The focus of the meeting was on MetroWest Phase 1 and the Portishead stations options consultation and an update on Phase 2. A good range of questions were generated covering issues around station facilities, accessibility, funding, cross boundary working and Saltford station. The next meeting is at the South Gloucestershire Council offices in Kingswood on 22 September 2014, 4pm to 6pm.

Risk

8. Key risks will form part of the quarterly reporting to the Board. Risks at the project and programme level will be managed through the Rail Programme Board.

Equalities Implications

9. New stations and services provided under MetroWest will be designed to meet all statutory accessibility standards. Affordability issues will need to be considered as evidence shows that people from minority ethnic backgrounds, disabled and older people have a lower ability to pay. Consultation will ensure wide opportunities for diverse groups to have their say. Equality Impact Assessments will be undertaken and maintained and updated as the MetroWest projects progress.

Resources (financial and personnel)

10. This Board at its meeting on 2 December 2013 endorsed the MetroWest Phase 1 budget of £1.53m and Phase 2 budget of £0.4m for 2014/15 for approval by the four councils. These budgets have now been approved.
11. Delivering MetroWest will require additional resources and funding. MetroWest Phase 1 and Phase 2 train services will require financial support from the local authorities for the first three years. Subject to meeting value for money criteria the Department for Transport may fund the services from then on.

Environmental Impact Assessment

12. Whilst rail's share of journeys to work is modest, modern rolling stock contributes less carbon emissions than other forms of transport. Reinstating the railway line between Pill and Portishead, new services on the Portishead and Henbury Lines and the construction of new stations under Phase 1 and Phase 2 will have a visual and environmental impact.

Other rail updates

Great Western Specification Consultation

13. The West of England's response to the Great Western Specification Consultation was endorsed by the Joint Transport Board on 4 July 2014. Following points raised at the Board an addendum was sent to the Department for Transport covering Bristol to Cardiff services to be extended to Swansea, clarification that South West Trains services refer to the London Waterloo to Salisbury to Bristol services and the need for improved connections for all local rail services. The addendum was accepted by the Department.
14. To date there is no update as to what time period length the Direct Award will be for. First Great Western is the only bidder.

First Great Western Update

15. First Great Western will provide a verbal update on recent activities.

Network Rail Update

16. Network Rail will provide a verbal update on recent activities at this meeting.

Access for All

17. Concerns over the replacement of stepped railway footbridges as part of the Great Western Main Line electrification with like for like structures has led to a letter from the Chairs of the Joint Transport Board and Local Enterprise Partnership to Patrick McLoughlin, Secretary of State for Transport. The letter can be found in Appendix Three. To date no response has been received.

Electrification

18. Consultants ARUP have been undertaking a study into the feasibility of extending rail electrification in the West of England. Following advice from First Great Western, timescales were extended to accommodate issues around rolling stock and discussions between First Great Western and the Department for Transport over future rolling stock cascades. The study will feed into Network Rail's Electrification Route Utilisation Strategy, setting out options for further electrification, due towards the end of 2014. A workshop has been arranged with ARUP in mid- September to finalise the study report.

Portway Park & Ride platform

19. It was hoped that the second Network Rail Value Management Workshop for the project would be held in September 2014. Unfortunately due to Network Rail's current busy programme of works, including electrification and Filton Bank four tracking, this workshop has been delayed until early 2015. Network Rail is currently procuring consultants for GRIP 3 project development. Sufficient time has been built into the programme to achieve a Summer 2016 opening date, depending on the costs that emerge through the project's development.

Saltford

20. Work has been ongoing on Saltford station. On the timetable side Network Rail has warned that “an additional stop will further increase the risk of any delays accrued by this service spreading to the wider MetroWest route.” However, they consider this risk “needs to be managed throughout the development process, but is not an insurmountable obstacle (in timetabling terms) to an additional Saltford station.” More technical work on timetabling will clearly be required. In the meantime the High Level Option Assessment report by CHM2Hill can now be finalised and reported to Bath & North East Somerset Council Members for further consideration regarding the next steps for this project.

Recommendations

That the Board:

- 1) Note progress on MetroWest Phase 1 and 2.

Appendices

Appendix One	MetroWest Phase 1 Highlight Report
Appendix Two	MetroWest Phase 2 Highlight Report
Appendix Three	Replacement footbridges letter to Patrick McLoughlin, Secretary of State for Transport

Author: James White, West of England Office
Tel: 0117 903 6867; Email: james.white@westofengland.org

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Background Papers:

None

Project Name:	Metro West Phase 1
----------------------	---------------------------

1. DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMME			
Key Milestones	Current	Last Reported	Baseline
Completion of GRIP 1 & 2 Output Definition & Feasibility	June 2014	June 2014	April 2014
Submission of Multi Option (Preliminary) Business Case to JTB	Sept 2014	July 2014	May 2014
Joint Transport Board (JTB) Independent Review of Preliminary Business Case	Sept 2014	June 2014	June 2014
JTB Approval of Business Case, Confirmation of Preferred Option and Devolved 'Funding in Principle'	Sept 2014	July 2014	July 2014
Confirmation by the 4 councils of overall project funding package, inc source of prep, capital and revenue funding	Oct / Nov 2014	Sept 2014	Sept 2014
Commence GRIP 3 Option Selection	Dec 2014	Sept 2014	Sept 2014
<i>Procure Parliamentary Agents (start TWAO work stream) – replaced by below:</i>			Sept 2014
Development Consent Order pre-application process	Oct 2014	Sept 2014	
Completion of GRIP 3 Option Selection and Outline Business Case	Oct 2015	Oct 2015	Sept 2015
Submission of Outline Business Case to JTB	Oct 2015	Oct 2015	
JTB Independent Review of Outline Business Case	Oct 2015	Oct 2015	
JTB Approval of Outline Business Case, equivalent of Programme Entry	Oct 2015	Oct 2015	
<i>Submit draft TWAO – replaced by below:</i>			Oct 2015
Submit Development Consent order	Jan 2016	Jan 2016	
Commence Formal Procurement	Oct 2015	Oct 2015	Oct 2015
Completion of GRIP 4 Single Option Development	July 2016	July 2016	July 2016
<i>TWAO Public Inquiry – replaced by below:</i>			Sept 2016
DCO Hearing	Oct 2016	Oct 2016	
Tender Prices Received for construction and train service	Oct 2016	Oct 2016	Mar 2017
Completion of GRIP 5 – Detailed Design	May 2017	May 2017	May 2017
<i>TWA order received – replaced by below:</i>			Sept 2017
DCO received	Sept 2017	Sept 2017	
Submission of Full Business Case to JTB	Oct 2017	Oct 2017	Sept 2017
JTB Independent Review of Full Business Case	Oct 2017	Oct 2017	Oct 2017
JTB Approval of Full Business Case and award Devolved Funding	Oct 2017	Oct 2017	Nov 2017
Councils Authorise train service subsidy requirement and other liabilities	Nov 2017	Nov 2017	
Award of Contracts – construction and train service	Nov 2017	Nov 2017	
Full vegetation clearance	Nov 2017	Nov 2017	
Construction Start – GRIP 6	Dec 2017	Dec 2017	Nov 2017
Construction Completion	April 2019	April 2019	April 2019
Commencement of Passenger Train Services	May 2019	May 2019	May 2019
Project handover and close – GRIP 7 & 8	May 2020	May 2020	April 2020

2. KEY ACTIVITIES THIS REPORTING PERIOD

GRIP Stage 1-2 report completed July 2014 and included as an appendix to the Preliminary Business Case.

Preliminary Business Case completed September 2014 to support a Joint Transport Board decision on 12 September 2014 to endorse the Preliminary Business Case and endorse progressing to the Outline Business Case (Programme Entry). The Outline Business Case to be brought back to the Joint Transport Board in late 2015. To bring back to Joint Transport Board the Outline Business Case in late 2015. Environmental assessment is progressing, and is two year programme leading to an Environmental Impact Assessment and Environmental Statement.

Two train service options are included for economic appraisal in the Preliminary Business Case. Both are considered by Network Rail to provide a sound service pattern. Option 5B - Severn Beach to Bath Spa, Avonmouth to Portishead and Portishead to Bristol Temple Meads requires six train sets. Option 6b - version 2 Portishead to Bath, Portishead to Avonmouth and Severn Beach to Bristol Temple Meads requires seven train sets. Option 6B version 2 has a reduced train performance risk whilst 5B has a slightly higher level of demand for 'cross Bristol' travel. Network Rail to produce an updated an updated Forecasting Report.

Project Management capacity is to be increased, a fixed term post to Oct 2017 has been appointed for project management support and to lead on specific work streams and functions. Further additional resources are planned from autumn as the project moves from stage 1 Option Development to Stage 2 Project Case.

Development Consent Order (DCO) discussions are taking place with Network rail about who is best placed to promote the order and related technical issues.

Portishead Station Public Consultation has been launched, which is consulting on three sites options. Consultation started 13 June 2014 and closed on 28 July 2014. Exhibition events took place at Portishead Methodist Church, High Street, Portishead on Tuesday 24 and Saturday 26 June 2014. A consultation leaflet was produced and postcards delivered to every property within the surrounding area of the rail line. There was overwhelming support for the reopening of the Portishead line and 91% of people said they would use the station on the basis that one of the three station locations is built. Positive and negative comments were made about the closeness of all options to both the town centre and nearby residents. People were concerned about the amount of parking that would be available on each option and its possible impact on nearby residential streets. Other issues raised included: pedestrian access; space for station facilities; highway and traffic issues and the noise/visual impact of the sites.

3. PROJECT MILESTONES FOR THIS REPORTING PERIOD

Milestone	Last Reported	Forecast/ Actual Date	Comment	Status
Finalise the Joint Promotion Agreement	04-07-14	Oct 14	The four Councils have entered into an Initial Promotion Agreement. This will be augmented by a Joint Promotion Agreement prior to commencing GRIP 3.	Ongoing
Enter into a Development Services Agreement with Network Rail	28-02-14	March 14	North Somerset Council has entered into a Development Services Agreement with Network rail on behalf of the four councils.	Complete
Completion of GRIP 1-2	04-07-14	04-07-14	The GRIP 1-2 study will be reported in September 2014 as part of the Preliminary Business Case.	Complete
Completion of the Preliminary Business Case	04-07-14	12-09-14	Due to delays with the Railsys train timetable modelling (inc Crossrail Iteration 5) and the impacts of all Network Rail's committed CP5 schemes on network capacity. This work has now progressed and will feed into the economic appraisal for the preliminary business case.	On-going

4. PROJECT MILESTONES FOR THE NEXT REPORTING PERIOD

Milestone	Forecast Date
Finalise the Joint Promotion Agreement	Oct 14
Confirmation by the 4 councils of overall project funding package, inc source of prep, capital and revenue funding	Oct/Nov 14
Commence GRIP 3 Option Selection	Dec 14
Development Consent Order pre-application process	Oct 2014

5. PREPARATION AND CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Metro Rail Phase 1 - JTB Highlight Report Project Cost

<i>Costs £k at Out Turn Prices</i>		2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Preparation	Local	304	1,746							2,050
	Devolved Allocation					3,380				3,380
Construction	Local						8,448			0
	Devolved Allocation					24,984	16,536			41,520
Total	Local	304	1,746			0	8,448			10,498
	Devolved Allocation					28,364	16,536			44,900
	Total	304	1,746			28,364	24,984			55,398
Last Reported	Local	429	1,621			0	8,448			10,498
	Devolved Allocation					28,364	16,536			44,900
	Total	429	1,621			28,364	24,984			55,398
Baseline	Local	429	1,621			0	8,448			10,498
	Devolved Allocation					28,364	16,536			44,900
	Total	429	1,621			28,364	24,984			55,398

6. SIGNIFICANT CURRENT PROJECT RISKS

Risk	Mitigation
Delay in securing project funding package including both devolved funding and any local contribution.	Engage with JTB and key decision makers and s151 officers on funding package.
Stakeholder expectations beyond the scope of the project – potential scope creep	Early engagement with stakeholders, identification of the issues, programme and project Comms to lead engagement and counter adverse publicity from opponents.
Delay to programme due to delay in securing project funding package	Ensure JTB and key decision makers of the 4 councils are aware of key programme milestones. Provide sufficient information to JTB and key decision makers to aid decision making. Note - Confirmation of overall project funding package, inc source of prep, capital and revenue funding is required upon completion of the Preliminary Business Case.

DECISIONS REQUIRED OF THE JOINT TRANSPORT BODY BOARD

As per the Preliminary Business Case report to the Joint Transport Board on 12/09/14.

Appendix Two: MetroWest Phase Highlight Report, September 2014

SCHEME / PROJECT NAME : MetroWest Phase 2

KEY FORECAST OUTPUTS: ~£85m GVA

1. MILESTONE COMPLETION DATES	Baseline	Last Reported	Current
GRIP 1 Output Definition	Jan 2014	Apr 2014	Jun 2014
GRIP 2 Feasibility (option development)	Oct 2014	Oct 2014	Dec 2014
Outline Business Case – Option Selection	Dec 2014	Dec 2014	Mar 2015
GRIP 3 Option Selection (single option outline design)	Apr 2016	Apr 2016	Apr 2016
Outline Business Case Approval	Mar 2015	Jun 2016	Jun 2016
GRIP4 Single Option Development (reference design)	May 2017	Mar 2018	Mar 2018
Secure statutory powers	Nov 2018	Apr 2019	Apr 2019
GRIP5 Detail Design (final signalling design)	May 2018	Apr 2019	Apr 2019
Contract Prices	Nov 2017	Jul 2019	Jul 2019
Full Business Case Approval	Mar 2019	Mar 2020	Mar 2020
GRIP 6 Construction Start	May 2019	Jul 2020	Jul 2020
GRIP 6 Construction Completion	Oct 2020	Mar 2021	Mar 2021
Operation	Dec 2020	May 2021	May 2021

2. KEY ACTIVITIES AND ISSUES THIS REPORTING PERIOD

Preliminary outputs from Network Rail timetable capability analysis due autumn 2014.
GRIP 2 feasibility report being commissioned from Network Rail.

3. KEY PROJECT MILESTONES / ACTIVITIES FOR THE NEXT REPORTING PERIOD

Milestone	Forecast Completion Date
Network Rail timetable capacity analysis report	Oct'14
Commission CH2MHILL to prepare preliminary outline business case	Nov'14
Network Rail GRIP 2 feasibility report	Dec'14

4. SCHEME COST – TOTAL BUDGET £43m (Split between Funders below)

<i>Devolved Major Scheme Funding: £36m</i>	<i>SEP: £3m</i>	<i>SGC / BCC / NSC: £2m</i>	<i>S106: £2m & land</i>	-----
--	-----------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-------

5. Top 3 Current Project Risks

Risk	Mitigation
Failure to secure JTB and/or DfT requirements/approvals at key milestones	The scheme will have to be adjusted to secure a BCR > 2.0 or it will not qualify for

(e.g. Outline and Full Business Case full social BCR >2.0).	Devolved Major Scheme Funding.
Delay in securing local funding contribution to meet scheme programme.	Seek confirmation from the S151 officers that local contributions can be secured from alternative sources if required.
Interest Groups, Residents Groups etc. opposing the scheme, causing delays and increasing costs.	Early identification of the issues; maintain ongoing public engagement. Invest in pro-active Comms to counter adverse publicity from opponents.

6. DESIGN DEVELOPMENT / PREPARATION AND CONSTRUCTION COSTS

In £/000's Outturn Prices	Spend to Date	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21 & future	Total
Preparatory fees & costs	103	589	1,413	417	866	893	240	18	4,539
Construction								38,460	38,460
Revenue								tbc	tbc
Totals (Current)	103	589	1,413	417	866	893	240	38,478	42,999
Last Reported	103	559	1,515	313	866	893	240	38,478	42,967
Baseline	300	887	1,073	853	2,045	193	19,230	19,230	43,811
Variance (Current to Baseline)	-197	-298	340	-436	-1,179	700	-18,990	19,248	-812

7. GENERAL COMMENTARY

The scheme budget estimate is based on a Henbury Line 'spur' service, with 4 new stations (two on Filton Bank, two on the Henbury Line) and a Yate turn-back (source: 'West of England Rail Studies, Halcrow, 2012).

Ongoing work by Network Rail will determine the cost for a Henbury Line 'loop' service and refresh the cost estimate for a 'spur' service. CH2MHILL will be commissioned to complete the preliminary outline business case for March 2015, using inputs from Network Rail.

8. COMMENTS FROM TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT / INDEPENDENT REVIEW

Scheme Senior Responsible Owner: Janet Kings, South Gloucestershire Council.
Project Manager: Alistair Rice, South Gloucestershire Council.

Appendix Three: Replacement footbridges letter to Patrick McLoughlin, Secretary of State for Transport

West of England



Rt. Hon. Patrick McLoughlin
Secretary of State for Transport
Department for Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London
SW1P 4DR

Your Ref: Patrick McLoughlin electrification footbridges
Tel: (0117) 9224924
E mail: james.white@westofengland.org
Date: 30 July 2014

Dear Secretary of State

Great Western Main Line electrification - Equalities Act compliant footbridges

We greatly welcome the electrification of the Great Western Main Line and the close working between Network Rail and the local authorities on its implementation.

We do, however, have one area of concern relating to the replacement of footbridges over the railway line.

We were surprised to hear that wherever a footbridge needs replacing a like for like approach is adopted by Network Rail. Where the existing footbridge is already Equalities Act compliant this is not an issue but replacing a non-compliant footbridge with a still non-compliant one is a retrograde measure and not in spirit with the legislation. It is also a missed opportunity to upgrade and significantly improve accessibility. Failure to carry out the works now will simply mean additional expenditure in the future.

A good example of where accessibility issues are being tackled is Bristol City Council working with Network Rail on installing a ramp at Lawrence Hill station while the four tracking of Filton Bank is under construction. Network Rail funding for alterations to the existing stepped footbridge will be match funded by Bristol City Council and hopefully New Stations Improvement Programme (NSIP) funding. A reduced cost scheme is being explored.

Local authority contributions such as those for Lawrence Hill will be limited. In the West of England area we have footbridges at Narrowways Hill, Ashley Hill, Stanley Farm Road, Patchway station and Pilning station which only have stepped access where match funding will be challenging to find.

Patchway has a role as an alternative station to Bristol Parkway when there are diversions in place on the lines to Swindon or Gloucester. The station is also going to be the nearest station to the emerging Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood (5,700 dwellings and employment) until MetroWest Phase 2 and provision of stations on the Henbury line.

Although it has a minimal train service currently, Pilning station acts as the evacuation point for trains bound for South Wales should there be an incident in the Severn Tunnel. Road access to the station is on the opposite side.

Network Rail's plans are simply to replace all these footbridges with new stepped access ones. This falls far short of the relevant legislation whereas if our local authorities were to replace or build a footbridge it would automatically be assumed to be compliant with the Equalities Act. As an example the reopening of the Portishead line as part of our MetroWest Phase 1 scheme will require new footbridges at Galingale Way in Portishead and Pill station. Both are being designed to be fully Equalities Act compliant.

We ask and seek confirmation on what exactly will be provided at Narrowways Hill, Ashley Hill, Stanley Farm Road, Patchway station and Pilning station.

Through First Great Western an Access for All bid was submitted to improve access at stations across our West of England area. Whilst we are pleased that the Weston-super-Mare station approaches scheme was successful we are disappointed that no other schemes were. Had the other schemes been successful some of the issues around Equalities Act compliant footbridges would have been resolved. If footbridges are going to be like for like we request that the Department for Transport and Network Rail provide the funding to make them accessible.

On a related rail issue we have previously raised with your Department the issue of the cascade of Class 165/6s 'Thames Turbos' to the West of England following electrification of the Thames Valley. The Class 165/6s would represent a major improvement on the Class 150/158 currently in service providing greater capacity, accessibility, passenger comfort, reliability, speed and acceleration. Recent statements from First Great Western suggest the cascade is increasingly likely and we add our full support to this happening. We understand that some platform and train clearance works may be required for the Class 165/6 fleet to be fully operational in the West of England and we urge the Department for Transport through Network Rail to ensure this happens alongside electrification.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss all of these issues with you in more detail.

Yours sincerely



Brian Allinson
Chair of the West of England Joint Transport Board
Chair of the Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment Committee, South
Gloucestershire Council



Colin Skellett
Chair of the West of England Local Enterprise Partnership

And on behalf of the Members of the Joint Transport Board:

Caroline Roberts
Cabinet Member for Transport
Bath and North East Somerset Council

Mark Bradshaw
Assistant Mayor for transport, planning, strategic housing and regeneration

Elfan ap Rees
Executive Member for Transport
North Somerset Council

Robert Sinclair
Chief Executive Officer, Bristol Airport

James Durie
Executive Director Business West