

Finance and Resources Committee

10.00am, Thursday, 27 November 2014

Newbridge Public Transport Study Appointment of Consultant

Item number	7.22
Report number	
Executive/routine	
Wards	1 - Almond 3 - Drum Brae/Gyle

Executive summary

This report seeks the approval of the Committee to appoint AECOM Limited to undertake a Public Transport Study for the Newbridge area, following a competitive tendering process.

The cost of award of the contract is £55,873.78 (excluding VAT).

Links

Coalition pledges	P44 , P45
Council outcomes	CO9 , CO10 , CO18 , CO22
Single Outcome Agreement	SO1

Newbridge Public Transport Study Appointment of Consultant

Recommendations

- 1.1 It is recommended that the Committee approves the appointment of AECOM Limited to undertake the Newbridge Public Transport Study for the three month duration of the contract.

Background

- 2.1 The Forth Replacement Crossing Public Transport Strategy (FRCPTS) was published in January 2010 by Transport Scotland, in conjunction with the South East Scotland Regional Transport Partnership (SEStran) and the relevant local authorities. A refreshed Strategy was prepared in August 2012 by Transport Scotland, SEStran, the City of Edinburgh, Fife and West Lothian Councils, Scotrail, Lothian Buses, Stagecoach, First Bus and the Confederation of Passenger Transport. The FRCPTS's purpose is to support the Forth Replacement Crossing by delivering effective public transport facilities, and to ensure that levels of service provided for all transport modes is at least equal to that which was provided in 2006.
- 2.2 Demand for travel across the Forth exceeds capacity in the peak periods. Looking to the future, the adopted and emerging land use plans of the adjacent local authorities indicate a continued increase in the demand for travel across the Forth in both directions.
- 2.3 The analysis of cross-Forth demand that was undertaken to develop the FRCPTS shows that the future origins and destinations remain broadly similar to those at present. However, considerable growth forecast at some of these sites (including Edinburgh Airport and west Edinburgh), as well as land releases at Winchburgh and West Lothian, mean the level of transport demand at these locations is predicted to increase substantially.

- 2.4 The analysis demonstrated that implementation of a range of schemes and measures are required to deliver the level of service outlined in the FRCPTS. These included public transport improvements at the Newbridge Interchange, along with bus lanes on the A8 westbound and A89 eastbound approaches. Improvements at Newbridge were also proposed as part of the West Edinburgh Transport Appraisal and Transport Infrastructure for West Edinburgh Phase 1 (TISWEP) study undertaken by Halcrow on behalf of the City of Edinburgh Council in 2010 and 2011 respectively.
- 2.5 When the FRCPTS was refreshed in August 2012, Newbridge was still identified as the main contributor to delay for public transport and general traffic movements on the south side of the Forth. The refreshed Strategy stated that further assessment at Newbridge should be focused on improving public transport provision and not on any specific infrastructure improvements which would benefit general traffic.
- 2.6 The study being commissioned takes full account of the content of the FRCPTS and focuses on improving the flow of public transport in the vicinity of Newbridge Interchange, ideally without creating detriment to other traffic. A subsidiary aim of the study is to ensure that provision for walking and cycling on the corridor is improved.
- 2.7 The study is a joint initiative between Transport Scotland, SEStran, West Lothian Council and the City of Edinburgh Council. The City of Edinburgh Council agreed to take the lead role in the production of the study on behalf of the project partners.
- 2.8 There is no existing contract in place. This is a one off requirement and therefore there is no current service/supply contract due to expire.

Main report

- 3.1 The teams within Transport do not have the skills and capacity to undertake the required works in 2014/15. It was therefore proposed to appoint transport planning consultants support to undertake the study using the Scotland Excel Framework for Engineering and Technical Consultancy (Lot 2 – Transport Planning). The Framework provides a common approach to the procurement of engineering consultancy services which should realise benefits for both Councils and suppliers in terms of cost savings and adoption of best practice.
- 3.2 The suppliers on the Framework all satisfy the criteria for the study, and have been quality tested as part of the tender and award process for this Framework. All suppliers were therefore invited to submit tenders as part of a mini-competition utilising the Public Contracts Scotland Quick Quote facility. Five tender submissions were received.

- 3.3 Due to the bespoke nature of the project, the tender evaluation process was undertaken using a quality/price ratio of 60% quality and 40% price. The quality criteria was further split into two categories - proposed methodology (60%) and experience (40%).
- 3.4 Tenders were evaluated individually by each member of the Technical Evaluation Panel. On completion of the individual qualitative evaluation, a moderation meeting was held, and attended by the members of the Technical Evaluation Panel. Individual scores were reviewed and debated and a consensus score was reached for each tender by the Panel. The consensus score and justification for the decision was recorded.
- 3.5 Commercial and Procurement services separately undertook the price evaluation of the tender responses. The quality and price scores were then weighted and ranked out of 100 as per the Invitation to Tender, to determine the winner of the mini Competition. The process used to determine the winning tendered bid was issued with the tender documentation to ensure transparency.
- 3.6 The scores are listed in the table below

Rank	Bidder	Quality Score	Price Score (weighted)	Total Score
1	AECOM Limited	56.7	19.0	75.7
2	Bidder A	60.0	12.4	72.4
3	Bidder B	51.1	14.4	65.5
4	Bidder C	23.7	40.0	63.7
5	Bidder D	23.7	15.2	38.9

- 3.7 Tendered prices ranged from £26,557.69 to £85,397.26.

Measures of success

- 4.1 The provision of a robust study fit for purpose and able to support the delivery of the Forth Replacement Crossing Public Transport Strategy.
- 4.2 The Preliminary Designs of the study will:
- a detail how any proposals are likely to improve public transport journeys through the Newbridge interchange;
 - b develop and test designs at the interchange and its approaches;
 - c provide designs focused on developing additional public transport capacity and/or Intelligent Transport Systems-based solutions;

- d provide designs for localised queue jumps or taking a more strategic corridor-based approach. The extent and lengths of bus lane required should be determined as part of the study; and
 - e provide design options for a cycle and pedestrian crossing of the A89.
- 4.3 Evidence of traffic modelling options.
- 4.4 Evidence of consultation with various parties, especially dialogue with bus operators to discuss the practicalities of any proposals.
- 4.5 Recommendations - The study shall ultimately recommend a preferred and costed option to take through to a more detailed design stage should a single option emerge. However, this may be revisited where a number of options emerge.

Financial impact

- 5.1 The costs associated with procuring this contract are estimated at up to £10,000.
- 5.2 This study is being carried out in collaboration with Transport Scotland, West Lothian Council and SEStran. A budget of £100,000 was earmarked for the study with Transport Scotland making a 50% contribution and West Lothian Council and the City of Edinburgh Council both making a 25% contribution.
- 5.3 Based on the winning tender the contract will cost £55,873.78 of which the City of Edinburgh Council will contribute £13,968.
- 5.4 This opportunity represents a saving of £44,126.22 against the overall budget for the study.

Risk, policy, compliance and governance impact

- 6.1 The risk of not accepting the recommendation could result in the following:
- Risk to the Council's reputation as the lead partner for this study.
 - Failure to properly manage and mitigate the anticipated increase in traffic flows arising from the Forth Replacement Crossing.

Equalities impact

- 7.1 There are no adverse equalities or human rights impacts arising from this report.

Sustainability impact

- 8.1 The impacts of this report in relation to the three elements of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 Public Bodies Duties have been considered and the outcomes are summarised below.

8.2 It is anticipated that the outcomes of the study will:

- reduce carbon emissions as infrastructure improvements will improve traffic flow, reduce congestion and carbon emissions, and thus make a contribution to better air quality; and
- help to achieve a sustainable Edinburgh as an improved transport system with improved journey time reliability and based on suitable alternatives to the car, will reduce congestion and enable everyone to have the best possible access to jobs and essential services.

Consultation and engagement

9.1 Whilst no consultation has been required to date, this will be a key element of the study and the successful consultant has proposed a two-stage approach to stakeholder engagement.

9.2 The first stage will involve identifying key stakeholders who need to have input to the project at an early stage, in order to fully appreciate their concerns. This will also give stakeholders an opportunity to discuss problems and prioritise desired network improvements. It is envisaged that these stakeholders will include SEStran, public transport operators, Police Scotland, cycling organisations and other stakeholder groups.

9.3 The second stage of consultation with stakeholders will enable feedback to be provided on the proposed improvement schemes and results from the various model tests. This stage will aid selection of a preferred option and may necessitate further design development and model testing.

Background reading/external references

CEC's Active Travel Action Plan

http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/info/20184/roads_and_transport/1062/active_travel

John Bury

Acting Director of Services for Communities

Contact: Callum Smith, Senior Professional Officer

E-mail: c.smith@edinburgh.gov.uk | Tel: 0131 469 3592

Links

Coalition pledges	P44 - Prioritise keeping our streets clean and attractive P45 - Spend 5% of the transport budget on provision for cyclists
Council outcomes	CO9 - Edinburgh residents are able to access job opportunities CO10 - Improved health and reduced inequalities CO18 - We reduce the local environmental impact of our consumption and production CO22 - Moving Efficiently – Edinburgh has a transport system that improves connectivity and is green, healthy and accessible
Single Outcome Agreement	SO1 - Edinburgh's Economy Delivers increased investment, jobs and opportunities for all
Appendices	Appendix 1 – Procurement Process

Appendix 1 - Summary of Tendering and Tender Evaluation Processes

Contract	Newbridge Public Transport Study
Contract period (including any extensions)	3 months (dates to be arranged with supplier)
Estimated contract value	Firm Price of £55,873.78 ex VAT
Standing Orders observed	2.4 Requirement to advertise 5.1.b Selection of the most economically advantageous tender
Portal used to advertise	www.publiccontractsscotland.co.uk
EU Procedure chosen	Mini competition via Quick Quote
Tenders returned	5
Tenders fully compliant	5
Recommended supplier	AECOM Limited
Primary criterion	Most economically advantageous tender to have met the qualitative and technical specification of the client department
Evaluation criteria and weightings and reasons for this approach	<p>Because of the bespoke nature of the project, it was felt necessary to put an emphasis on Quality at 60% weighting of final score, and Price at 40%.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Quality criteria was split into two categories- Experience (40%) and Proposed Methodology (60%). Experience was sub-scored on both team cvs (16%) and how experience from previous work would deliver the project. It was felt that this balance offered would be in the best interests of the delivery of the study.</p>