

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 | (Km) | Drainage – 3.180km Gullies – 636 | <i>Provide length of route covered by the scheme - if an area wide scheme then provide total route length covered by scheme.</i> |
| Number of vehicles (or users) on affected section (split by vehicle type if possible) | (Total Vehs - Average Annual Daily Traffic) | The AADT on these routes varies from 7,500 to 20,000, based on 2015/2016 figures; | <i>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.).</i> |
| | (Cars - AADT) | See Supporting documents Appendix E – Traffic Flow Data | |
| | (LGV - AADT) | | |
| | (HGV - AADT) | | |
| Details of required restrictions/closures if funding not provided (e.g. type of restrictions; timing/duration of restrictions; etc.) | (restriction type - text description) | The Councils priority is that a safe and reliable resilient network is available for the user at all times. However it is likely that failure to address the problems identified through the intelligent gully cleansing initiative will ultimately lead to the risks of flooding / standing water and associated pavement deterioration requiring closures or restrictions. | <i>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.</i> |
| | (start date of restriction - MM/YY) | | |
| Length of any diversion route, if closure is required (over and above existing route) | (Km) | The nature of the highway network in Derbyshire, outside of the resilient and principal road networks, is narrow with poor vertical and horizontal alignments. Diversion routes are not practical, particularly for HGV's. | <i>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.</i> |
| Average extra time per vehicle on diversion route (over and above existing route) | (mins) | The nature of the highway network in Derbyshire, outside of the resilient and principal road networks, is narrow with poor vertical and horizontal alignments. Diversion routes are not practical, particularly for HGV's. | <i>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).</i> |
| Regularity/duration of closures due to flooding: (e.g. number of closures per year; average duration of closure (hrs); etc.) | (number of closures/year) | This information is held at a local area / sub-area maintenance depots and it is not possible to collate the information in the time frame required for the submission. | <i>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.).</i> |
| | (duration of closure - hrs) | | |
| | (length of diversion - Km) | | |
| | (extra time in using diversion - mins) | | |
| 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 | (DM Total Accidents/yr) | Accident figures are available for the resilient network. A search for accidents within 50 metres of each defective gully location indicates the following accidents in wet / damp road conditions in 2015/2016:- | <i>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.</i> |
| | (DM Slight Accidents/yr) | | |
| | (DM Serious Accidents/yr) | | |
| | (DM Fatal Accidents/yr) | | |

| Input data | Specific Data | Other Supporting Data / Information (either input directly or provide reference to supporting information reported elsewhere) | Information requested |
|--|---|--|--|
| with the scheme) | (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) | Fatal: 1 Serious: 17 Slight: 137 See Supporting documents Appendix F – Accident Data It is anticipated that following the alleviation of standing water and potential road surface icing on the carriageway these figures will reduce. | <i>number of years of data, etc.).</i> |
| 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) | Whilst the Peaks are popular for recreational cycling, there is limited information available regarding cyclists on the resilient network. The scheme will benefit cyclists in wet weather due to reduced standing water and ultimately through a reduction in carriageway deterioration in the nearside lane predominantly used by cyclists. See Supporting documents Appendix F – Accident Data | <i>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.</i> |
| Other salient information for the VfM Case | Provide a textual description or reference to salient part of main bid | | <i>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.</i> |