Project:	Greenwich and Woolwich Foot Tunnels
Accountable body:	London Borough of Greenwich
Project contact:	**text redacted**
CLG contact:	**text redacted**
Amount and profile:	£11.535m. Proposed spend: • 09 £576,755, • 09/10 £5,767,550, • 10/11 £5,190,795.
Milestones:	Key dates are summarised as follows: • Commence inspections investigations and assessments – April 2008; • Commence design and preparation of tender documents – May 2008; • Prepare draft OJEC notice – April 2008; • Issue questionnaires to interested contractors – July 2008; • Prequalify contractors – September 2008; • Issue tender documents – November 2008; • Tender documents returned – January 2009; • Tender report – February 2009; • Appoint contractor – April 2009; • Commence works on site – July 2009; • Complete works and handover – July 2011.
Project-specific conditions (incl. 3rd party funding commitment, environmental mitigation, etc.):	• Prerequisites to drawdowns: o Consolidated set of milestones reflecting the revised project completion date. o Evidence of tri-lateral agreements and agreement enabling LB Greenwich to act as project lead on behalf of Newham, Tower Hamlets. o Planning permission obtained from GOL. o Confirmation of risks associated with early completions, including proposals to mitigate such risks. o Confirmation of maintenance service programme in place following completion • Detailed construction programme to be provided at the time of contract award for each of the main components of the project, together with reconfirmation of LBG's commitment to provide or

	procure additional funding to meet any increases in cost that have arisen on that component since signature of the funding agreement and any costs arising beyond Mar-2011.

Community Infrastructure Fund 2 – Scheme Proforma

Name & location	London Borough of Greenwich
Description:	Refurbishment of Green and Woolwich foot tunnels including replace lift equipment – lifts, pumps and lighting system. Provision of a new CCTV monitoring room near to Greenwich tunnel to monitor both tunnels. Detailed survey to inspect for corrosion and safety of steel and metal reinforcements.
CIF & other funding:	DfT/DCLG £11.535m
Environmental issues:	Listed building consent to be procured at outline design stage. Preliminary overview of environmental issues to be followed up prior to grant finalisation.
1. Value for money:	
Claimed NATA BCR of 6.27 (Greenwich) and 2.67 (Woolwich) PVB £50.7m (Greenwich) £21.6m (Woolwich) PVC £8.1m each (on simple split of total) (Bid suggested costs were very similar)	
Discussion of modelling issues: A large spreadsheet estimates benefits from journey ambience, health benefits and time savings. The health benefits (about 10% of total) are significantly overstated as they relate to all users, not the difference between do-min and do-something. There also appears to be some confusion in the spreadsheet concerning assumptions about whether the tunnels close in 2024 in the do minimum. In general the benefits seem to be calculated as if they remain open, but the costs show a closure cost with no further operating costs. Maintaining the tunnels after 2024 would reduce the relative present value costs of the scheme (increase bcr). Alternatively, altering the benefits calculation to recognise closure after 2024 would also tend to increase the bcr, although uncertainty about how the time benefits calculation makes this unclear. Given the uncertainty about some of the calculations (and inevitably about unit benefits themselves) our conclusion is that the Greenwich tunnel appears to offer high vfm, while the Woolwich one is less certain. Further analysis would be necessary to determine whether it is medium or high.	
Other adverse effects	It could be considered that replacing old lifts and renovating the tunnel would adversely affect the authenticity of these grade 2 listed buildings, although they are much run down. Potential for water pollution, though mitigation will be designed in.
Other beneficial effects	There would be a large adverse heritage benefit if the alternative was closure. Reduced energy and CO2
Discussion of non monetised effects: Difficult balance between affecting authenticity and improvement, and eventual closure in do minimum.	
Conclusion on vfm: Greenwich considered high, Woolwich could be medium or high.	
2. Deliverability and Risk	
LBG have agreed to bring project programme forward to allow for March 2011	

funding, but this may come with risks and need to be quantified. Tunnel refurbishment is described as aesthetic however; the main risk to this project is the discovery of extensive damage and corrosion to the steel and metal work structures within the shafts particularly where ground water corrosion has taken place. The management of future water ingress will also be an issue for consideration. Additional risks include possible extensive corrosion to the ribs supporting the domes to both tunnels. Promoters advise that the preferred options for repairs will mitigate against any cost / time overruns. Listed Building consent has not been approved, and will not be sought until at least outline designs have been completed.
3. Overall Conclusion
There are some doubts about the way the benefits have been calculated by the promoter although it is unlikely that further remodelling will change the vfm assessment. The Greenwich tunnel has a high vfm while the Woolwich has medium. This bid presents fair benefits for pedestrians and cyclists. New lifts will meet DDA requirements and will provide improved access and reliability for disabled persons
4. Recommendation and reasoning
Recommend. This is a key project that makes a contribution to environmental and sustainable development. Significant benefits for pedestrians and cyclists. This project provides a free alternative to public transport, and is a useful route when public transport is unusable. Supports and promotes pedestrians and cyclists thereby reducing reliance on the use of cars or public transport. Project supports 3,400 potential new developments.