

Officer Decision/Mayoral Decision No.: ODN58-2018	
DECISION TITLE: Transport Governance	
NAME OF OFFICER/MAYOR EXERCISING DELEGATED POWERS: Transport Director	
DATE OF OFFICER/MAYORAL DECISION: 3 September 2018	

Responsible Director/Mayor:	Chris Twigg
Report Author and contact details:	Chris Twigg, Transport
Is it a key decision?	No
Is this a public report? If a key decision, it will be a public report and will be published on the CA website.	No
KEY DECISIONS ONLY	N/A
Insert forward plan ref number	
Date when Mayor intend to make decision.	
Date report published on the website	
Implementation Date	
Does the report have any annex that contains exempt information?	

Decision taken	<p><i>Please provide the exact details of the decision taken.</i></p> <p>The Monitoring Officer agreed to:</p> <p>award a contract to Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) providing client consultancy support for the cost of £22,000 for services including procuring and project managing the Queen Adelaide Road Study by WSP. Where additional consultancy support is sought, this will be approved as required on a case by case basis.</p>
----------------	---

<p>Authorisation (<i>delete as appropriate</i>)</p>	<p>This decision has been taken under: General authorisation (<i>those decisions delegated to officers as per the Constitution</i>):</p> <p>1. Transport Director</p>
<p>Background Information</p>	<p><i>Give details of background information Give more information about the proposed decision</i></p> <p>Due to the large transport programme being delivered within the Combined Authority, there is a need to increase the organisation's in-house capacity and capability. The new organisational structure was approved at the June 2018 Board and the recruitment of Senior Directors is underway.</p> <p>As part of this work, Ely Area scheme falls under our remit. The CA have agreed to commission a road study for Queen Adelaide / Ely area to assess the effective and necessary road solution to complement the Ely Area Rail improvements being undertaken by Network Rail (NR).</p> <p><u>The selection of CCC</u></p> <p>The CCC have been stakeholders on the project and have been involved in the development of the scheme prior to the initiation of the CA. Therefore, their expertise, knowledge and history of the scheme, along with them being the preferred delivery partner on a number of our schemes, means that they were chosen to continue taking this work forward. In addition to this, as the Highways Authority, it was thought that they are best to help support the development of the road solution alongside WSP. They were also chosen as the best partners to work with NR to ensure an integrated road and rail solution, as they are also stakeholders in the rail solution and these two projects need to closely align. As NR were not willing to deliver the road solution element of the scheme, they were considered to be the best alternative to do so and work closely with them to achieve the desired solution for the best social, economic and environmental outcomes for the area and wider region.</p> <p><u>Value for Money Test</u></p> <p>CCC have provided a detailed breakdown cost of their charges for the work for an 18 month period whilst the road study is being undertaken.</p>
<p>Alternative options considered.</p>	<p><i>List alternative options considered and rejected and the reasons for rejection. Do not leave this section blank or put 'None'. There is always an alternative even if it is to do nothing.</i></p> <p>. Do nothing. This was rejected as it would directly affect the</p>

	<p>Combined Authority's ability to deliver its transport aspirations.</p> <p>Seek quotations. This was rejected due to the urgency to progress the work.</p> <p>Use alternative organisations. Multiple posts are being recruited and other organisations are being considered for these posts. At present, no service level agreements have been in place to use alternative delivery partners such as PCC. This was identified as not suitable in this case due to the requirement for local knowledge and awareness of the previous history of the scheme.</p> <p>Use recruitment agencies. Secondments from established engineering/programme management consultancies offered greater flexibility and agreements can be extended to ad-hoc support. This provides the Combined Authority with much greater flexibility. However, this was identified as not suitable in this case due to the requirement for local knowledge and awareness of the previous history of the scheme.</p>
Financial Implications	<p><i>Please include the total costs and how the project will be funded. Please include budget codes for your directorate</i></p> <p>£22,000</p>
Consultation	<p><i>List any relevant consultation undertaken in relation to the decision. For example portfolio holders, other Chief Officers.</i></p> <p>The following have been consulted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris Twigg, Interim Transport Director • Noel O'Neill, Finance • Kim Sawyer; Monitoring Officer • CPCA Section 151 Officers
Declarations / Conflicts of Interests (only if the decision falls under the 'Express Authorisation' category)	<p><i>List the names of any member who has been consulted on and declared an interest in relation to the decision.</i></p> <p>None</p>
Supporting documentation	<p><i>List any supporting documentation available in relation to this decision (all of this information must be retained for public inspection for a period of at least 4 years – there is no provision for the release of exempt/confidential information).</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queen Adelaide PID outlining the work to be undertaken by the CCC
--	---

Officer/Mayor signature	Kim Sawyer	Date 3/9/18
<p><i>Once signed please file in the electronic file Documents/Governance/ office decision notice and enter details in the register.</i></p> <p><i>If a public report, pass to Democratic Services and we will arrange publication.</i></p>		