## Standard Safety Interventions Funding Application

# 1. Funding application

**Application Contact Details**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Approved organisation name** | [Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency] |
| **Submitter** | **Name** | [name] |
| **Role** | [role] |
| **Contact email** | [email] |
| **Contact phone** | [phone] |
| **Date of submission** | [01/02/2021] |

**Confirmation of SSI funding pathway**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cost >$2M? | Y | Straight forward/low risk? | Y | Meet [investment criteria](https://www.nzta.govt.nz/resources/standard-safety-intervention-toolkit/)? | Y |

**Project Summary Details**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project name** | [TIO project name] |
| **Project summary** | *Road safety improvements to reduce deaths and serious injuries (refer below for further details).*Add a short and concise summary statement of what this application is addressing i.e. SST, SC or Speed, on location ABC, to apply XYZ intervention, as part of the SIP response to R2Z. Problems, benefits, as relevant to the project, and/or location-specific information, to be included where possible.Example project summary has been provided below for review phase:**Overview****Safety characteristics summary****This funding application***This application* ***requests funding to design and implement*** *Standard Safety Interventions to address safety problems on this corridor. The SSI identified as appropriate are:***SSI 1 – XXXX**  |
| **Programme alignment** | Road to Zero (R2Z) – Speed and Infrastructure (SIP) Strategic Implementation Programme*Note if identified in the Pipeline Development Tool, or if ‘no’ programme alignment, identify urgency / sequencing of SSI* |
| **Primary benefit** | Safety | **Region (RTC)** | [RTC region] |
| **Total estimated cost** | $ XX M | **FAR %** | 100% |
| **Funding source** | Road to Zero Activity Class |
| **Funding sought**(refer also to annual cashflow forecast section below) | Programme level-cost estimate shown for each relevant phase for reference, indicating what funding is being sought at this application (to be confirmed through pre-implementation)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Phase** | **Value** | **Sought at this funding application** |
| Pre-Implementation | $ | Y/N |
| Implementation | $ | Y/N |
| Property | $ | Y/N |

. |
| **TIO Initiative** | **Name** | [TIO initiative name – should match project name above] |
| **ID** | [TIO initiative ID] |
| **SAP Phase Number**(Waka Kotahi) | Pre-Implementation (required) | [number] |
| Implementation (if known) | [number] |
| Property (if applicable) | [number] |
| **TIO updated?** | Y | **SAP updated?** | Y | **Funding available?** | Y |

**Recommendation**

|  |
| --- |
| That the National Manager Programme and Standards, Transport Services:* **Endorses** the [TIO project name] safety improvements project and **recommends** that
* The Chief Financial Officer, Corporate Support, **Approve** funding to [Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency] for [pre-implementation, implementation, property] of the [TIO project name] at a cost of $XX (including [8]% admin).

. |

**Strategic Alignment and Investment Story**

|  |
| --- |
| **Alignment with Road to Zero Strategy 2020-2030**In December 2019, the New Zealand Government launched Road to Zero; NZ’s road safety strategy for 2020-2030. This strategy is underpinned by the Vision Zero approach where no-one is killed or seriously injured in road crashes, and where no death or serious injury while travelling on our roads is acceptable. The Road to Zero strategy introduced clear targets to reduce road trauma. The overall target is a 40% reduction in deaths and serious injuries (DSI) by 2030 when compared to 2018 levels. Amongst the numerous focus areas under Road to Zero that are working together to achieve this outcome, there was a significant amount of robust evidence based work undertaken in the development of the Road to Zero strategy which indicated that speed management measures and infrastructure improvements could provide approximately half of the overall DSI reduction. Output (intervention) indicators for ongoing measurement of meeting contribution targets are included in this programme, which include metrics such as length of median barrier, length of speed management, number of roundabouts etc. **Alignment with Road to Zero Speed and Infrastructure Programme Business Case**The purpose of the Road to Zero Speed and Infrastructure (SIP) PBC is to give effect to the NZ Government Cabinet endorsed programme developed as part of the Road to Zero Strategy. GPS 2021 clearly states that investment through the Road to Zero activity class will be targeted towards those interventions identified as being key to achieving the target reductions in DSI’s sought through Road to Zero.As part of the development of Road to Zero Waka Kotahi created the Integrated Intervention Logic Model (IILM) to test the impact of the alternatives and options within each focus area, individually and in combination, on the number of DSI’s that occur over a specified time-period. This has been refined and optimised by working with regional teams and local authorities to develop a 10 year programme that is realistic and implementable – the Strategic Implementation Programme, with interventions grouped into implementable corridors or types of interventions at the treatment philosophy level. The programme development process considered the full 10 year period in order to ensure a good design pipeline, efficient delivery, lessening the impact of works on the public and provide greater flexibility to deliver alongside other work programmes.This programme development process confirms a list of corridors and intersections on the [state highway] network for safety improvements, with agreed treatment approaches, implementation timing and high level (programme) cost estimates. **Project Investment Story***This will be the specific investment to this package/project.**To be prepared based on workshops, PDT and Scenario Tool planning outputs.**Needs to tell the full corridor/project story and identify the parts that are covered in this particular funding application.*The xx corridor is identified in the Road to Zero Speed and Infrastructure (SIP) PBC Delivery Programme for safety improvements.The following safety improvements are identified for this section of [state highway]: * xx

Insert a summary map for this and nearby projects showing locations and timing, or and a Gantt chart as relevant. |

**Detailed Option (Project) Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Scope** | Describe the scope.*Plain description of the scope, including what the scope provides for e.g. turnaround location, primary treatment and supporting treatments etc.* |
| **Location description** | Describe the location/extent in words – simple description.Add an overview of the relevant problems and DSI statistics. Additional information about the corridor as relevant, include * freight route / %,
* walking and cycling,
* tourism,
* any notable land use (eg schools, industry etc),
* expected growth / change,
* current AADT,
* speed limits etc.
 |
| **Length** | X km / Intersection | **ONRC** | X |
| **Location map** | Insert a simple location map illustrating location/extent. *Snip from MapHUB basemap with red line around corridor/ project extent* |
| **Location references**(use only for corridors and individual intersections – do not use for urban or regional packages)(use start only for individual intersections)  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Start location** |
| RS/RP | X |
| WGS84 | Latitude: X | Longitude: X |
| NZTM | Northing: X | Easting: X |

.

|  |
| --- |
| **End location** |
| RS/RP | X |
| WGS84 | Latitude: X | Longitude: X |
| NZTM | Northing: X | Easting: X |

 |
| **Project interfaces** | *Outline any project interfaces within or outside of R2Z-SIP.* *High level and key ones only, main focus is intervention, outcome and timing – not maintenance. As relevant, specify the urgency / need for intervention taking into consideration work in the vicinity.*The following interfaces have been identified and will be considered in more detail at feasibility stage. *Related Road to Zero – SIP projects (committed or planned)**

*Speed management**

*Other significant project interfaces (external to R2Z-SIP)* Project interfaces with maintenance and renewals will be assessed and confirmed during the pre-implementation phase. |
| **Total estimated cost** | $ X M (for all phases) |
| **Annual cashflow forecast** (for funding being requested) | Funding is being sought in this application for pre-implementation, implementation and property (delete as appropriate)An annual cashflow forecast, at programme level estimates, is provided below for reference: (in $M)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NLTP | NLTP 21-24 | NLTP 24-27 | Total |
| Year | 21-22 | 22-23 | 23-24 | 24-25 | 25-26 | 26-27 |
| Pre-Imp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Imp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Property |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Admin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cashflow forecast assumptions:* X
* Funding is confirmed and pre-implementation phase starts July 2021.
* Cost estimate based on programme level estimate only. Cost estimates will be refined during the pre-implementation phase.
 |
| **Benefits** | **DSI saved/yr** | X | **DSI saved/****yr/$100M** | X |
| **BCR** | Primary treatment | Name eg Median barrier | X |
| Secondary treatment | Name eg Rural Roundabout | X |
| **Investment priority order** | [*Waka Kotahi Investment Prioritisation Method for 21-24*](https://www.nzta.govt.nz/planning-and-investment/planning/investment-decision-making-framework-review/investment-prioritisation-method/#:~:text=The%20Investment%20Prioritisation%20Method%20(IPM,effect%20to%20the%20GPS%202021.)This project is being delivered as part of the Road to Zero – Speed and Infrastructure Programme, which has an Investment Priority Order of 2 (GPS alignment Very High, Scheduling High and Efficiency Low, 2.1-2.3). |
| **Investment Assurance Criteria** | Five primary standard safety interventions are proposed as part of this application. The following tables assesses each against the Investment Assurance Criteria outlined in the Standard Safety Intervention Toolkit:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Location:**  | Full corridor |
| **Treatment Approach:**  | Safe System Transformation |
| **Primary Treatment:** | Median barrier |
| **SSI Investment Assurance Criteria** | **Actuals** |
| AADT 6000 or greater | Y/N | Traffic volume |  |
| Collective risk medium-high or greater or predictive collective risk medium-high or greater | Y/N | Collective risk |  |
| Speed limit 80km/h and above | Y/N | Speed limit |  |
| ONRC classification - all | Y/N | ONRC |  |

 |

**Next steps**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Next steps** | Following endorsement of scope and approval of funding, the R2Z-SIP programme will undertake the following (as outlined in process flow diagram below):1. Confirm the project scope to go to pre-implementation phase (feasibility design)
2. Feasibility design
3. Gateway review to proceed to detailed design
4. Detailed design
 |
| *Insert relevant project plan information here* |
| **Stakeholder and community engagement** | A review of key stakeholders will be initiated during the Feasibility Design stage and a Stakeholder and Communications Plan documented. |
| **Procurement approach** | *Outline the procurement approach for the pre-imp phase.**Local authority - [*A procurement strategy for Auckland Transport projects has been approved by NZTA in accordance with funding requirements.]Waka Kotahi - To align with the overall procurement framework strategy for the Speed and Infrastructure Programme. |
| **Consenting Strategy** | Any potential RMA consent requirements will be assessed during the feasibility stage of the pre-implementation phase.If required, a Consenting Strategy will be prepared by the relevant professional services provider (Consortia or other (Healthy Market). |
| **Property Strategy** | Any potential requirement for property will be assessed during the feasibility stage of the pre-implementation phase. If required, Waka Kotahi approved property consultants will be engaged, and a property strategy prepared in relation to any property acquisition requirements. |
| **Road safety audits (RSA)** | A concept design Road Safety Audit has not been undertaken at this stage of the project. This will be completed during the pre-implementation phase. |
| **Environment and social responsibility (ESR) screen** | An Environment and Social Responsibility Screen has not been undertaken at this stage of the project. This will be completed during the pre-implementation phase. |
| **Risk Management** | Risk management will be undertaken in accordance with the *Minimum standard Z/44 - Risk management practice guide*.The following project risks have been identified at this stage. These will be reviewed, modified and appended to during the pre-implementation feasibility stage and ongoing.All risk is allocated to Waka Kotahi. |
| *Description (cause and impact)* | *Likelihood of occurrence\** | *Consequence or impact\*\** | *Treatment / management* |
| Include currently known & from scoping workshop |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

\* Rare (R) / Unlikely (U) / Possible (P) / Likely (L) / Almost certain (AC)

\*\* Insignificant (I) / Minor (Mn) / Moderate (Md) / Severe (S) / Extreme (E)

# 2. Endorsement and Approval Record

## Project Sponsor Endorsement

*Project Sponsor to complete*

|  |
| --- |
| **The Project Sponsor confirms this Funding Application meets the business requirements** |
| **Name & Role** |  |
| **Signature** |  | Date  | Click here to enter a date. |
| **Additional commentary** | *Provide additional information of value to the decision maker if necessary.* |

## INVESTMENT ASSURANCE

*DP&S to complete*

|  |
| --- |
| IQA Assessment |
| SSI Funding Application assessment summaryDP&S / PI | *Summary of your assessment of the business case.**Be solutions focused. Be specific and use examples where appropriate.* |
| Assessed by | *Name* | **Date** | Click here to enter a date. |
| Investment assurance assessment summaryI&F  | *Summary of your assessment of the investment proposed in this business case.**Be specific and use examples where appropriate.* |
| Assessed by | *Name* | **Date** | Click here to enter a date. |
| Proposed Recommendation | ***Recommend******Recommend with conditions (precedent / subsequent)******Not recommended****Delete all as relevant* |
| Proposed conditions (if applicable) | *We recommend that the Senior Manager OPPP includes the following conditions.**As a condition precedent…**As a condition subsequent…* *Conditions should reference an elsewhere noted issue, be specific, and be the responsibility of someone to sign off.* |
| Readiness / urgency/ dependencies / other factors to consider | *As relevant.*  |
| Reason for recommendation | *Provide a short summary of the activity and the benefits it is expected to achieve.**This needs to be written* ***for a public audience*** *and will be published on the NZ Transport Agency website. See* [*https://www.nzta.govt.nz/planning-and-investment/our-investments/investment-decisions/board-decisions/*](https://www.nzta.govt.nz/planning-and-investment/our-investments/investment-decisions/board-decisions/) *for examples.* |
| IAF Profile (IPM) | *Results Alignment = L / M / H / VH**Activity cost-benefit appraisal (from SSI toolkit) = BCR is x.x**Priority for funding* |
| Approval by exception | *Is approval by exception required? Has approval by exception been justified?* *If yes, explanations are necessary.* |
| Confirm NLTF funding availability | *The x activity is eligible to be funded from x work category and y activity class**Priority xx**Funding availability has been confirmed by x.**Ensure alignment with the requirements of both* [*activity class and work category*](https://www.nzta.govt.nz/planning-and-investment/planning-and-investment-knowledge-base/activity-classes-and-work-categories/) *Confirm* [*priority*](https://www.nzta.govt.nz/planning-and-investment/planning-and-investment-knowledge-base/2018-21-nltp-investment-assessment-framework-iaf/prioritisation-of-activities/)*Confirm funding availability with PMO / I&F and NLTP affordability.**Variation of costs between phases?* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Strategic Case and/or Programme Business Case** |
| **What strategic case and/or programme business case is this activity part of?**  | *Name the strategic and programme business cases this activity is part of – have these been endorsed by the agency? Does this activity meet PBC expectations?**Was the location (corridor / intersection) for this activity identified in the Agency’s 2018-21 Safe Networks Programme (SNP)?* *For the 2018-21 NLTP, it is expected that most, if not all SSI activities will be part of the SNP. If this activity is not in the SNP, how does it contribute to the solving the problems / delivering outcomes of strategic case/programme business case identified by the submitter?* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Detail of Activities Intervention**  |
| **Have a reasonable range of project options been analysed? Include consideration of their consistency with the safety treatment philosophy** | *Are the options investigated fit for purpose at an* ***activity/options*** *level?* *Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.* |
| **How clearly and fully specified is the proposed solution?**  | *Is the recommended option sound and fully detailed (location details provided, costs estimate provided, risks outlined, plan, etc.)?* *Is management plan relevant and complete? Is it fit for purpose, clear what is to happen next, how long it is expected to take and what the funding will be used for at each phase? If not, why not?**Is agreed contract / procurement strategy fit for purpose?**If critical information is missing, does this need to be made a condition of approval?**Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.* |
| **Is the proposed solution an effective way to respond to the problem and *deliver the expected benefits*?** | *Is the recommended option fit for purpose?* *Is the BCR<1? If yes, how has the submitter explained that the recommended option is necessary and effective in delivering the expected benefits and how the activity fits within the SNP and/or any other safety programme? Has the submitter also scrutinised the cost-effectiveness of the chosen option.**Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.* |
| **Can the solution be delivered as proposed (costs, risks, timeframes, governance, etc.)?** | *Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.* |
| **Risks and significance** | *Risks What are the key risks and opportunities identified for the proposed activity? Has appropriate mitigation/management been identified? If so, describe briefly; if not, include concerns.*[*Significance policy*](https://onramp.nzta.govt.nz/i-need-to/policies/corporate-policies/significance-policy/)*. SSI activities are not expected to breach significance – is there a risk of this activity as proposed, breaching significance? If so, what is the recommended outcome/ pathway?**Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.* |

## Funding Decision Record

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Resolution / Decision – Delegation – National Manager Programme and Standards, Transport Services***TS Approver to complete* |
|  | Endorsed |[ ]  Recommendation: |
|  | Deferred (Revise and resubmit) |[ ]   |
|  | Declined |[ ]   |
|  | Conditions |[ ]   |
|  |  |[ ]   |
|  | Conditions Met | Choose an item. |
|  | Name | Vanessa Browne |
|  | Position | National Manager Programme and Standards – Transport Services |
|  | Signature |  |
|  | Date | Click here to enter a date. |
|  | Actions taken |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Resolution / Decision – Delegation – Chief Financial Officer, Corporate Support***CS Approver to complete* |
|  | Endorsed / Approved  |[ ]  Recommendation: |
|  | Deferred (Revise and resubmit) |[ ]   |
|  | Declined |[ ]   |
|  | Conditions |[ ]   |
|  |  |[ ]   |
|  | Conditions Met | Choose an item. |
|  | Name | Howard Cattermole |
|  | Position | Chief Financial Officer, Corporate Support |
|  | Signature |  |
|  | Date | Click here to enter a date. |
|  | Actions taken |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Resolution / decision – Delegation – Board***Board Approver to complete* |
|  | Approved  |[ ]  Recommendation: |
|  | Deferred (Revise and resubmit) |[ ]   |
|  | Declined |[ ]   |
|  | Conditions |[ ]   |
|  |  |[ ]   |
|  | Conditions Met | Choose an item. |
|  | Name |  |
|  | Position | Board Secretariat |
|  | Signature |  |
|  | Date | Click here to enter a date. |
|  | Actions taken |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Accepted for consideration by Senior Manager – OPPP – TS***Process Coordinator to complete* |
|  | Paper number: |  |
|  | Meeting date: | Click here to enter a date. |
|  | Decision requirements met |[ ]  SAP updated |
|  |  |[ ]  TIO updated (including cashflow updated) and documents loaded |
|  |  |[ ]  Funding availability checked |
|  |  |[ ]  Included in current RLTP (if applicable) |
|  |  |[ ]  Included in current NLTP (if applicable) |
|  |  |[ ]  Included in current Business Plan (If non-NLTP project) |
|  |  |[ ]  Business case supported by Sponsor |
|  |  |[ ]  IQA complete, unconditional and saved in TIO |
|  | **Feedback with regard to recommendations** |
|  |  |
|  | **Name:** |  |
|  | **Position:** |  |
|  | **Signature** |  |
|  | **Actions taken** | Choose an item. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Decision- Actioned***Process* |
|  | Submitter Advised – OPPP TS Decision |[ ]   |
|  | Submitter Advised – CFO CS Decision |[ ]   |
|  | Submitter Advised – Board Decision  |[ ]   |
|  | TIO – funds released |[ ]   |