

# HERTFORDSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY

28 JUNE 2013

## FINAL PRIORITY LIST OF SCHEMES

Author: Andy Summers, Hertfordshire County Council

### 1 Purpose of report

1.1 The purpose of this report is:

- To seek LTB agreement of the Final Priority List of candidate schemes for delivery 2015-19; and
- To formally recommend to the Accountable Body the Priority List for forwarding to the Department for Transport by end of July.

### 2 Summary

2.1 The Hertfordshire Local Transport Body is required to recommend the Final Priority List of major transport schemes for delivery in 2015-2019. HCC Cabinet, as the accountable body for the LTB, will then be asked to approve the Final Priority List.

2.2 The Final Priority List represents the consolidation of the *Initial* Priority List as previously recommended by the LTB in March 2013.

2.3 The *Initial* Priority List contained five major transport schemes and it was agreed that work on all five schemes should progress between April and July 2013 to identify spending profiles and clarify risks to delivery in 2015-2019.

2.4 The further technical work has now been completed, and confirmed that two of the schemes on the initial list, Watford Junction Interchange Redevelopment (Watford) and M1-Maylands Link NE Relief Road (Hemel Hempstead) will not be deliverable within the DfT's 2015-2019 funding window, and should therefore be not be included in this Final Priority List.

2.5 It is therefore proposed that the Final Priority List to forward to DfT by end of July is as follows:

- **A120 Bypass (Little Hadham), £28.6m**
- **A602 Improvements (Stevenage to/from Ware), £11.2m**
- **A1(M) Congestion Relief (Welwyn Garden City to/from Stevenage), £28.1m – £49.4m**

2.6 It should be noted that whilst currently scoring low against deliverability, the Watford Junction and M1-Maylands schemes scored well against the LTP3 objectives. Once the concerns raised about deliverability have been addressed, the projects should continue to be promoted, to ensure they can

be ready to secure funding from any future sources for which they might be eligible.

- 2.7 A funding profile (Appendix 2) for each of the three schemes on the Final Priority List has been submitted by the HCC Major Projects Unit as promoter and independently reviewed by the LTB Scrutiny (Appendix 2). These profiles will be forwarded to the Department for Transport to set out Hertfordshire's priority funding requirements for 2015-2019.
- 2.8 The DfT has indicated that Hertfordshire LTB's capital allocation for local major schemes for 2015-2019 would be £27.8m, and has advised planning for a third above or below this allocation. Contingency planning figures are therefore £19.5m to £36.1m. It is not yet known how much funding Hertfordshire might receive, so in view of this uncertainty, the LTB has proposed that the Final Priority List is not presented as a prioritised list to DfT at this stage.

### **3 Recommendations**

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Local Transport Body:
- Recommends the Final Priority List of schemes in Appendix 1, and Funding Profiles in Appendix 2, to the Accountable Body.

### **4. Background**

- 4.1 The Local Transport Body has met twice in 'shadow' form:
- Shadow Board Meeting (12<sup>th</sup> February) – to agree the draft Assurance Framework, the Short List of schemes, and the prioritisation criteria as agreed by Highways and Transport Panel.
  - Shadow Board Meeting (12<sup>th</sup> March) – to identify an *Initial* Priority List to recommend to the accountable body.
- 4.3 This LTB meeting is tasked with agreeing the Final Priority List. Appendix 1 sets out the recommendation of the LTB scheme promoter and scrutiny advisors that the LTB is asked to consider.
- 4.4 LTB Members should note that inclusion on the Final Priority List does not automatically result in award of funding for any schemes. Depending on the eventual allocation awarded to the Hertfordshire LTB by the DfT, each scheme will subsequently go through a full approval process, as set out in the Assurance Framework, before funding is awarded to it by the Local Transport Body (via HCC as the accountable body).
- 4.5 The final Hertfordshire programme of expenditure, combined with the programmes from other LTBs in England will allow the Department for Transport to understand the likely funding and delivery programme across England during the period 2015-19.

4.6 The Final Priority List represents HCC's understanding of the schemes at this point in time. It may be the case that delivery circumstances for individual schemes change as the business cases are developed further, or additional funding opportunities might arise in the future that we currently do not know about. Therefore, the Assurance Framework contains a provision for the LTB to review the Priority List should the need arise and advise DfT accordingly.

## 5 Final Priority List of major schemes

5.1 The Priority List in Appendix 1 has been developed through the process outlined in Table 1:

**Table 1: Process to arrive at Final Priority List of schemes in Appendix 1**

Stage / List	Description	Approval Process	
		Local Transport Body	Accountable Body
Pre-qualification List	A review of all source documentation for transport schemes in Hertfordshire.	Local Transport Body 12 <sup>th</sup> February 2013	Highways and Transport Panel Information Note
Long List	Pre-qualification list reviewed to remove duplicate schemes, completed schemes, "dead" schemes and non-eligible schemes (according to the LTB definition of major transport schemes). All (12) remaining schemes were by default, taken forward to the long list.	Local Transport Body 12 <sup>th</sup> February 2013	Highways and Transport Panel Information Note
Short List	Sift long list in accordance with the DfT's Early Appraisal Sifting Tool (EAST) to create the short list which contains schemes which can feasibly be implemented 2015-19.	Local Transport Body 12 <sup>th</sup> February 2013	Highways and Transport Panel, 5 <sup>th</sup> February 2013
Initial Priority List	More detailed appraisal of schemes on short list using EAST and prioritisation criteria (Appendix 2) to identify an initial list of priority schemes for the 2015-19 period.	Local Transport Body 12 <sup>th</sup> March 2013	Highways and Transport Panel, 19 <sup>th</sup> March 2013 Cabinet, 22 <sup>nd</sup> April 2013
Final Priority List	Further technical work undertaken to determine deliverability of schemes on Initial Priority List  Production of funding profiles for each of the schemes determined to be deliverable 2015-2019.	Local Transport Body 28 <sup>th</sup> June 2013	Highways and Waste Management Panel, 4 <sup>th</sup> July 2013 Cabinet, 15 <sup>th</sup> July 2013

5.2 A short consultation exercise with the 'virtual' LTB Advisory Group took place in March 2013. The Scheme Overview documents were shared with officers at the relevant district councils for 'fact-checking' in February, and the LTB Advisory Group was consulted on the initial prioritisation process for a short period in early March 2013. The key points made by the Advisory Group through this process were considered by the LTB in developing the Initial Priority List. It should be noted that the all schemes on the List have previously been subject to some form of public consultation through the

consultation on the strategic document (i.e. LTP3, LTP3 daughter document, or Urban Transport Plan) in which they are currently promoted.

- 5.3 LTB Members should be reminded that in addition to the Priority List, the LTB also holds a Contingency List, which identifies the Major Schemes which the LTB has agreed are strategic objectives but for which funding is currently being sought through other processes. For information, the table in Appendix 1 provides an update on the latest status of these schemes.

## **6 Scrutiny**

- 6.1 The scrutiny process for LTB schemes is being overseen by the Transport Planning and Data team within the HCC Highways Operations and Strategy Unit. Their role is to ensure that the technical work undertaken by the scheme promoters has been developed in accordance with the Assurance Framework.
- 6.2 HCC's transport planning framework consultants, Arup and AECOM have been appointed to undertake scrutiny of key documents prior to submission to the DfT.
- 6.3 Ongoing technical scrutiny of the schemes is being undertaken via a workshop based approach. This includes a review of key documentation such as the spending profiles, appraisal methodology report and business cases and where practicable supporting documentation such as risk registers, and allows the scheme promoters to be questioned about different aspects of the documentation.
- 6.4 This process provides a high level review of key outputs and identify areas for more detailed examination and areas where the documentation needs enhancement / further work.
- 6.5 This approach has already been undertaken in relation to the spend profiles for the three priority schemes. Each scheme was reviewed and issues were raised in relation to adequacy of input data, design / technical criteria, methodology, scheme assumptions and compliance with guidance. The comments have been used to refine the spend profiles and supporting information and where ongoing issues have been raised these will be developed into a risk assessment schedule.

## **7 Next Steps**

- 7.1 The Final Priority List and funding profiles for each scheme will be submitted to the Department for Transport by the end of July. The DfT will consider all priority lists from across England, before determining the final allocations to award Local Transport Bodies. It is not currently known when the final allocation will be announced. Once the final Hertfordshire allocation is known, the LTB will be able to recommend its finalised spending programme for 2015 to 2019.
- 7.2 In order for each individual scheme to be approved by the LTB, a full business case for the selected schemes would be submitted by the promoter to the LTB approval process at a later date. The LTB will also continue to monitor the

Priority List, and advise the Accountable Body if any review of the list needs to take place.

7.3 In March, the LTB agreed that a Forward Plan will be developed to identify the approach to developing future major schemes for future funding opportunities. The September LTB meeting will review a draft Forward Plan for the following periods:

- September 2013 to March 2015
- April 2015 to March 2019
- April 2019 onwards

## **8. Financial Implications**

8.1 The County Council is currently the promoter for the three prioritised schemes. The promoter is seeking capital funding for the period 2015-19 from the Local Transport Body.

8.2 The County Council (as the Local Transport Authority) is the accountable body for the major scheme funding allocated to the LTB. It is proposed that the capital funding for each scheme, once individually approved, would be administered on behalf of the LTB through the County Council's existing finance processes, in accordance with the DfT's guidance.

8.3 The submission of the prioritised programme of schemes in July to DfT does not commit the LTB and the County Council to delivering these schemes. Funding for each scheme on the Priority List will be subject to the development and submission of a full business case to the LTB and subsequent approval by HCC Cabinet. The funding approval process is set out in the Assurance Framework.

8.4 The work required for the initial scheme prioritisation process, from February 2013 to July 2013, has been fully funded by Hertfordshire County Council, with a commitment from the LEP to partially fund the A1(M) scheme strategy and provisional indication of part funding from the Highways Agency. Final decisions regarding the funding contribution of HCC (and other) partners to subsequent scheme business case development and scrutiny post July 2013 will be determined at a later date by the HCC, according to the specific arrangements and pre-2015 funding required for each scheme that is prioritised and the further guidance expected from DfT on the requirements for full business case scrutiny.

8.5 The LTB has not been allocated any funding to cover the costs of administration or communication for its operations. HCC is currently hosting the activities of the LTB.

## APPENDIX 1: PROMOTER / SCRUTINY RECOMMENDED PRIORITY LIST OF SCHEMES

### Final Priority List of Major Schemes 2015-2019 (as at March 2013)

The LTB Promoter / Scrutiny units recommended the following Priority List of schemes should be forwarded to the Department for Transport for consideration for funding 2015-2019:

- **A120 Bypass (Little Hadham)**
- **A602 Improvements (Stevenage to/from Ware)**
- **A1(M) Congestion Relief (Welwyn Garden City to/from Stevenage)**

Further technical work undertaken between March and June 2013 has identified that the **Watford Junction Interchange Redevelopment (Watford)** and **M1-Maylands Link NE Relief Road (Hemel Hempstead)** schemes will not be deliverable within the 2015 to 2019 timescale, and therefore should not be included on the Final Priority List for 2015-2019.

However, it should be noted that whilst currently scoring low against deliverability, the Watford Junction and Maylands schemes scored well against the LTP3 objectives. Once the concerns raised about deliverability have been addressed, HCC has indicated that the projects should continue to be promoted, to ensure they can be ready to secure funding from any future sources for which they might be eligible.

### Contingency List: Schemes with ongoing LTB strategic level support

Further major schemes with LTB strategic support that are not currently requesting LTB funding at this stage for 2015-2019:

Scheme Name	Total Cost	Notes
Croxley Rail Link (Watford Metropolitan Line Extension)	£116.8m	Funding currently not required from LTB as scheme progressing through existing DfT major scheme funding process. The Project has been approved for funding via DfT Major Schemes. Also funded via future revenue from farebox; and third party contributions with completion expected in 2016.  The LTB has stated its strategic level support for this scheme.
Abbey Line Watford to St Albans Improvement	£30m	The Abbey Line Project Board has recently concluded that it is not possible to deliver a more frequent service for the same cost as the current service. Therefore, the DfT has decided to step back from the plan to transfer the line to HCC as well as the decision to convert the line to light rail at this point in time.  The LTB has already stated its strategic level support for this scheme, and HCC will explore future funding options for the scheme.
Hatfield Station Interchange	£11m	Funding currently not required from LTB as scheme progressing through existing funding process. The scheme is funded via

		LTP, S106 and Network Rail, with completion expected in 2015. The LTB has stated its strategic level support for this scheme.
--	--	--

## APPENDIX 2: LTB SUBMISSION TO DfT – PRIORITY LIST OF SCHEMES: FUNDING PROFILES

It is proposed that the following information in Table A2.1 will be forwarded to DfT by end of July 2013.

**Table A2.1: Summary Table – Spending Profiles**

All prices are indicative and subject to the assumptions presented in Table A2.2.

Scheme Name	Description	Pre-2015 <sup>1</sup> preparatory costs (£mn's)	Funding Profile Estimates: 2015/16 to 2018 / 19 <sup>2</sup>				2015/16- 2018 /19 Total (£mn's)	Indicative Value for Money
			2015 / 16 (£mn's)	2016 / 17 (£mn's)	2017 / 18 (£mn's)	2018 / 19 (£mn's)		
<b>A120 Little Hadham Bypass</b>	Single-carriageway bypass of Little Hadham on A120 with climbing / overtaking lanes	0.64	0.30	1.52	14.19	12.57	<b>28.58</b>	<b>High/Very High</b> (Benefit: Cost ratio of 4.96)
<b>A602 Stevenage to Ware Improvements</b>	A series of junction and alignment improvements on the A602 strategic route	0.24	0.12	0.59	5.55	4.92	<b>11.2</b>	<b>High</b> (Benefit: Cost ratio of 2.32)
<b>A1(M) Improvements Option 1</b>	Managed Motorway	1.4	Low Estimate	Annual split to be determined at a later stage			<b>34.1</b>	<b>High</b>  (all schemes would generally be required to have a benefit: cost ratio
		2.0	High Estimate	Annual split to be determined at a later stage			<b>49.4</b>	
<b>A1(M)</b>	Conversion to All purpose dual three lane	1.2	Low Estimate	Annual split to be determined at a later stage			<b>28.1</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Preparatory costs pre-April 2015 would not be funded by the DfT allocation. Some of these costs would already be allocated to existing work programmes.

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that scheme costs are estimates only at this stage based on the current information available. Final scheme costs would be established following the development of a full business case for each scheme. Assumptions used for the funding profiles are outlined in Table A2.2

<b>Improvements Option 2</b>	carriageway	1.5	High Estimate	Annual split to be determined at a later stage	<b>36.5</b>	of at least 2 to proceed)
----------------------------------	-------------	-----	---------------	--	-------------	---------------------------

**Table A2.2: Funding Profile Cost Assumptions**

The following table sets out the assumptions on which the funding profile estimated costs are based on:

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Price Base Assumption</b>	<b>Other Cost Assumptions</b>	<b>Risk Costs / Optimism Bias</b>
<b>A120 Bypass (Little Hadham)</b>	The cost estimate has been based on a 2013 Quarter 2 price base. The spending profile shown includes annual inflation of 3% between 2013 and the completion of construction.	The cost estimate has been developed using key quantities for the major items and percentage allowances for other smaller valued items or where information is not available. Land and compensation estimates have been developed by a Land Consultant based on the likely land take.	Risks to the costs and programme of the project have been assessed and a risk register developed. A risk allowance has then been generated from a Quantitative Risk Assessment using the 80 percentile value.  To calculate the BCR of 4.96, an allowance for Optimism Bias of 30% has been made on top of the project costs presented in the table including the risk allowance. This has been reduced from the 44% which is standard for this stage of scheme development using an assessment spreadsheet.
<b>A602 Improvements (Stevenage to/from Ware)</b>	The cost estimates are based on a 2013 Quarter 2 price base. The spending profile shown includes annual inflation of 3% between 2013 and the completion of construction.	The cost estimate has been developed using key quantities for the major items and percentage allowances for other smaller valued items or where information is not available. Land and compensation estimates have been developed by a Land Consultant based on the likely land take.	To calculate the BCR of 2.32, an allowance for Optimism Bias of 44% has been made on top of the project costs. This is standard for this stage of scheme development and includes the risk allowance as a Quantitative Risk Assessment has not yet been carried out
<b>A1(M) Congestion Relief (Welwyn Garden City to/from Stevenage)</b>	The cost estimates are based on a 2012 price base and include annual inflation of 2.5% between 2013 and the completion of construction.	Any designs and estimates are not fully detailed, they will need to be developed, revised and refined during the detailed design phase.  Broad costs have been used based on published information for Highways Agency Managed Motorway (MM) projects using information on overall cost and length of the scheme. A cost range for both the MM and conversion to all purpose dual three lane carriageway options have been produced.	Broad costs based on published costs for Highways Agency D3M standard motorway projects using information on overall cost and length of the scheme and assumptions on applying these to the A1(M)'s D2M standard. Assumptions regarding application of D3M standard motorway costs to the A1(M)'s D2M standard may change as more information becomes available, resulting in a change in estimated costs. The latest cost rates need to be obtained from and discussed with the HA in order to derive a central

	<p>The costs for MM projects give a minimum cost of approximately £7m/km (in 2012 prices) for a number of the schemes quoted for an existing D3M (three lane) standard motorway. A reduction proportionate to reduced widths on the A1(M)'s D2M (two lane) standard has been applied but with £0.5m allowance added for fixed costs. This gives a suggested minimum cost of £5.7m/km. The high cost estimate equivalent is £8.25m/km.</p> <p>Costs for the conversion to all-purpose standards have been allied to the MM costs but with deduction for reduced gantries and technology. The low and high cost rate estimates are £4.70m/km and £6.81m/km respectively.</p> <p>Some of the MM projects have a cost range that is higher than the lower estimates by 40 to 50%. Accordingly, we have given cost range information based on the lower estimates; and a higher rate based on the lower rate +45%.</p> <p>An RPI annual rate of 2.5% has been assumed over all the scheme years 2013 to 2019. Further refinement of costs would need to follow a more detailed feasibility study. Costs for scheme preparation have been set at approximately 7.5% of the scheme cost on the basis that no Public Inquiry is required and detailed design is undertaken by the Contractor.</p>	<p>estimate and consider the optimism bias around this.</p>
--	---	---

## **Overview of schemes**

A full *Scheme Overview document* was presented for each scheme as part of the 12<sup>th</sup> March LTB meeting papers. These documents provided a full background on each of the schemes, and should be referred to for full details of each scheme.

The following paragraphs provide an updated summary on each scheme, including any further key updates arising from the technical work on funding profiles that has taken place between April and June 2013, and key points from the latest scrutiny and risk analysis. For any scheme that is taken forward, a full risk management programme will be developed to seek to mitigate these risks.

It should be noted that for all schemes, there would need to be preparatory spend before 2015/16 to ensure the schemes were in a position to draw down the DfT funding. This funding is not part of the DfT allocation, and some of this spend (to be defined) would be undertaken through existing budgets.

The technical work to date has compiled some generic risks for all three schemes. These were:

1. Change of government results in the withdrawal of the LTB process resulting in no funds to complete the scheme.
2. Local political changes alter priorities for the County and the scheme is no longer seen as acceptable.

### **A120 Bypass (Little Hadham)**

The scheme is a 3.9 km single carriageway bypass of Little Hadham, with climbing / overtaking lanes. The scheme is comparatively well advanced compared to the other two schemes, and therefore the costs can be considered to be more robust.

The scrutiny report has highlighted that the scheme would require co-ordination with the Environment Agency to ensure that flood alleviation issues were addressed, and it was noted that a small delay in the programme early on might have a big delay on construction start, given the environmental sensitivities and need to undergo CPO process.

Key scheme-specific risks identified through the development of the spending profile were as follows:

1. Outputs from the revised traffic modelling work show that benefits aren't as high as expected and scheme has a reduced Benefit:Cost Ratio (BCR) which reduces economic viability.
2. Change in local opinions towards the scheme resulting in it meeting with strong local objections.
3. The Environment Agency do not support flood alleviation scheme and it is removed from project, resulting in a lack of public support and/or funding.
4. Traffic growth is higher than forecast and traffic levels require a dual carriageway rather than single carriageway at or soon after opening the bypass.
5. There is a risk that the governance with the Environment Agency will not be agreed and that this could result in delays to the programme or affect the deliverability of the scheme within the LTB funding period. HCC are meeting

- with the Environment Agency to agree the governance and manage issues arising to mitigate this risk.
6. Delays in political approval result in delays to the overall scheme programme, preventing it being completed within the LTB funding period.
  7. Changes in legislation and policy guidance, including DMRB and WebTAG<sup>3</sup>, result in need to re-design causing delays to the programme and additional design costs.
  8. Scheme fails at Public Inquiry or requires significant redesign, delaying the programme.
  9. Inflation is higher than assumed resulting in increased out turn costs.
  10. Environmental Impact Assessment identifies archaeological or other environmental constraints that were not identified by the preliminary surveys/desk studies.
  11. Land costs are higher than currently indicated resulting in increased out turn costs.
  12. CPO procedures / Inquiry takes longer than anticipated, delaying the programme.

### **A602 Improvements (Stevenage to/from Ware)**

This scheme is a series of improvements on the A602 between Stevenage and Ware, including the following measures:

- A10 / A602 roundabout junction improvements;
- Westmill Road realignment of substandard radius;
- Stony Hills Junction realignment and provision of southbound right turn lane;
- Sacombe Pound Junction – improvements to junction and provision of northbound right turn lane;
- Ware Road realignment of substandard radius and provision of right turn lanes at Whempstead Road and Heath Mount School;
- Bragbury End roundabout junction improvements

The latest version of the scheme does not include the bypass of Hooks Cross (as originally suggested in the Scheme Overview Document published in March) as it has been determined that this element of the scheme would not be deliverable within the 2015-2019 timeframe.

The scrutiny has highlighted that the main benefits of the scheme as currently designed would be to address local issues along the route. Link-based delay would not be significantly reduced, as the scheme would not be designed to increase link capacity itself, but rather improve poor alignment and delays caused by right turning vehicles blocking the road.

Key scheme-specific risks identified through the development of the spending profile were as follows:

1. Scheme development and associated analysis shows that benefits aren't as high as expected and scheme has a reduced BCR which reduces economic viability.
2. Public Consultation reveals a lack of support for the scheme.
3. Traffic growth is lower than forecast and benefits are not as high as expected.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Acronyms: Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), Web Transport Analysis Guidance (WebTAG) [Department for Transport guidance for analysis of transport schemes]*

4. Delays in political approval result in delays to the overall scheme programme, preventing it being completed within the LTB funding period.
5. Changes in legislation and policy guidance, including DMRB and WebTAG, result in need to re-design causing delays to the programme and additional design costs.
6. Future modifications to designs may increase scheme costs or lead to programme delays (if additional land take is required)
7. Inflation is higher than assumed resulting in increased out turn costs.
8. Environmental Impact Assessment identifies archaeological or other environmental constraints that were not identified by the preliminary surveys/desk studies.
9. Costs are higher than currently indicated resulting in increased out turn costs.
10. CPO procedures / Inquiry take longer than anticipated, delaying the programme.

### **A1(M) Congestion Relief (Welwyn Garden City to/from Stevenage)**

Following further work, the scheme is currently presented as two options to add capacity between Junctions 6 and 7:

#### ***Option A: Managed Motorway***

This option proposes increasing the overall capacity of each carriageway by adding an additional running lane. Key measures would be:

- Movement of the carriageway slightly into the central reserve area to facilitate the lane width requirements without reducing the verge width.
- Provision of emergency refuge areas. The space required for the laybys may be an issue in terms of keeping within existing highway land.
- Provision of gantry mounted signal technology together with vehicle detection systems at regular intervals 800-1000m (assumed) plus at junctions.
- Use of the hard shoulder as a running lane (if not permanent “All Lanes Running”).

#### ***Option B: Conversion to All Purpose Dual Three Lane Carriageways***

This option, requiring a change in the status of the road, has been investigated as a lower cost alternative to Managed Motorways (MM). Similar carriageway arrangements would be made as for Option A to provide the additional lane capacity in each direction for dual 3 lane capacity and laybys would need to be introduced at 2.5km frequency in each direction.

Whilst it is assumed that the road would continue to be a trunk road for the purposes of operational and maintenance continuity under one organisation, this option would require a process of ‘despecialisation’, to down-grade its status as a motorway, and hence reduce the overall costs of a final scheme.

The scrutiny report has highlighted that the development of this scheme is not quite as far advanced as the other two schemes, and therefore there are two options for the scheme which could be taken forward, and estimated costs are presented as a range, but require further development as part of a full business case to increase their robustness. It has been identified that if additional land were required for the laybys, there may be additional delays to the programme. In addition, there is a

Highways Agency pinch point scheme at Junction 6 and it is understood this will be implemented in 2014/15. There are lower cost pinch point style interventions that could be implemented elsewhere on the A1(M) although these would not add additional capacity.

Assumptions and caveats for the A1(M) scheme options include:

- Further refinement of costs would need to follow a more detailed feasibility study.
- Despecialisation would require a Highways Act Order and it is our understanding from the HA that this is a straightforward process of approximately six months, and in principle they could support such a proposal. We have not assumed this would impact on timescales and the process could take place in parallel with other activities.
- It is assumed that no Compulsory Purchase Order or Public Inquiry is required and detailed design is undertaken by the Contractor (D&B contract).
- Environmental Statement required.
- Lengthy options and feasibility period not required.
- Existing pavement & hard-shoulder do not need replacement.
- Widening into central reserve required + central reserve barrier + hard shoulder re-cant at super-elevation areas.
- Road lighting requirement assumed (not lit currently).

Key scheme-specific risks were identified through the development of the spending profile. As well as being at an early stage of development, other risks include:

1. Delays in the political approvals process delaying the project timetable.
2. Local objections to scheme during public consultation processes delay construction programme.
3. Unforeseen utilities or ground conditions on site leading to delays.
4. Delays in Government approval delay progress between project stages
5. Cost inflation is higher than forecast over the programme period resulting in increased costs.
6. Tender prices are higher than expected as contractors are overloaded with work.
7. No suitable contractor tenders for the project.
8. Changes in legislations and policy guidance, including DMRB and WebTAG, during the project programme result in need to redesign, delaying the programme.
9. Revisions of the scheme during the design stages result in a longer construction period than originally envisaged.
10. Information gathered during the scheme development stage may lead to revision of the subsequent timetable, for example if ground conditions are different to expected.
11. CPOs are required, increasing costs and timescales.
12. Traffic growth is lower than forecast decreasing the benefits of the scheme.
13. Delays regarding agreement on governance, with the scheme needing to be delivered jointly and / or led by the HA given it is an HA road.
14. Given the early stage of development of the scheme, the timescales for producing a full business case may lengthen, especially if significant work is required, for example on scheme design and modelling.
15. Costs are currently approximate and based on standard unit rates for a D3L road which may not be fully applicable.

16. The scheme's high cost is not matched by the final LTB allocation from DfT, creating a potential funding gap.