

A684 Bedale, Aiskew, Leeming Bar Bypass

Best and Final Funding Bid

The Management Case

September 2011

Document control sheet

BPP 04 F8
version 7 Apr 2011

Project: A684 BALB
Client: North Yorkshire County Council
Document title: BAFFB Management Case
Ref. No:
Project No: B1663400

	Originated by		Checked by		Reviewed by		Approved by	
ORIGINAL	NAME Claire Taylor		NAME Richard McGarr		NAME Richard Jones		NAME Richard Jones	
DATE 5th September 2011	INITIALS CT	INITIALS RM	INITIALS RJ	INITIALS RJ	Document status			

REVISION	NAME		NAME		NAME		NAME	
DATE	INITIALS							
Document status								

REVISION	NAME		NAME		NAME		NAME	
DATE	INITIALS							
Document status								

REVISION	NAME		NAME		NAME		NAME	
DATE	INITIALS							
Document status								

Jacobs Engineering U.K. Limited

This document has been prepared by a division, subsidiary or affiliate of Jacobs Engineering U.K. Limited ("Jacobs") in its professional capacity as consultants in accordance with the terms and conditions of Jacobs' contract with the commissioning party (the "Client"). Regard should be had to those terms and conditions when considering and/or placing any reliance on this document. No part of this document may be copied or reproduced by any means without prior written permission from Jacobs. If you have received this document in error, please destroy all copies in your possession or control and notify Jacobs.

Any advice, opinions, or recommendations within this document (a) should be read and relied upon only in the context of the document as a whole; (b) do not, in any way, purport to include any manner of legal advice or opinion; (c) are based upon the information made available to Jacobs at the date of this document and on current UK standards, codes, technology and construction practices as at the date of this document. It should be noted and it is expressly stated that no independent verification of any of the documents or information supplied to Jacobs has been made. No liability is accepted by Jacobs for any use of this document, other than for the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided. Following final delivery of this document to the Client, Jacobs will have no further obligations or duty to advise the Client on any matters, including development affecting the information or advice provided in this document.

This document has been prepared for the exclusive use of the Client and unless otherwise agreed in writing by Jacobs, no other party may use, make use of or rely on the contents of this document. Should the Client wish to release this document to a third party, Jacobs may, at its discretion, agree to such release provided that (a) Jacobs' written agreement is obtained prior to such release; and (b) by release of the document to the third party, that third party does not acquire any rights, contractual or otherwise, whatsoever against Jacobs and Jacobs, accordingly, assume no duties, liabilities or obligations to that third party; and (c) Jacobs accepts no responsibility for any loss or damage incurred by the Client or for any conflict of Jacobs' interests arising out of the Client's release of this document to the third party.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Introduction	1
2	The Management Case – Governance & Project Planning	2
2.1	Introduction	2
2.2	Evidence of Similar Projects	2
2.3	Programme / Project Dependencies	3
2.4	Governance / Organisational Structure and Roles	3
2.5	Programme / Project Plan	7
2.6	Assurance and Approvals Plan	9
2.7	Contract Management	9
3	The Management Case – Monitoring & Evaluation	10
3.1	Introduction	10
3.2	Benefits Realisation Plan	10
3.3	Monitoring and Evaluation	11
3.4	Evaluation Timescales	11
3.5	Evaluation Strategy	13
3.6	Environmental Management Plan (EMP)	14
3.7	Evaluation Budget	16
4	The Management Case – Communication & Reporting	17
4.1	Introduction	17
4.2	Communications and Stakeholder Management	17
4.3	Programme / Project Reporting	18
5	The Management Case – Risk	19
5.1	Introduction	19
5.2	Key Issues for Implementation	19
5.3	Risk Management Strategy	20
6	Summary	23
	Appendix A – Project Organisation Structure	24

1

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This report presents the Management Case for the A684 Bedale, Aiskew, Leeming Bar Bypass (BALB) Best and Final Funding Bid (BAFFB).

In line with new departmental guidance the Management Case assesses whether a scheme is deliverable through consideration of the project plan, the governance structure, benefits realisation and stakeholder management.

The report will also set out the measures that will be used to evaluate and assess the contribution of the scheme to the benefits set out in the Strategic Case.

The Management Case is structured as follows:

- **Chapter 2** sets out the governance and project planning arrangements;
- **Chapter 3** looks at monitoring and evaluation while **Chapter 4** discusses the communication and reporting of the schemes outcomes;
- **Chapter 5** discusses risk, in particular key risks to implementation, while **Chapter 6** provides a summary of the Management Case.

2 The Management Case – Governance & Project Planning

2.1 Introduction

This section seeks to identify the procedures and project management put in place to deliver the proposals efficiently. This is set out under the following headings:

- Evidence of Similar Projects;
- Programme / Project Dependencies;
- Governance / Organisational Structure and Roles;
- Programme / Project Plan;
- Assurance & Approvals Plan; and
- Contract Management.

2.2 Evidence of Similar Projects

The following schemes have been delivered by NYCC in the past five years:

Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme: A £30.5 million package of works known as the Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme (SITS) which consisted of the following elements:

- A165 Scarborough Leeberton Diversion: 4.3 kilometres including 3no. structures and a subway;
- A165 Park & Ride;
- A64 Park & Ride;
- Extension and upgrade of the Urban Traffic Control (UTC) system in Scarborough; and
- Introduction of bus priority measures on the A64 and A165 approaches to Scarborough.

A165 Reighton Bypass: A £6 million package of works which consisted of the following elements:

- A165 Reighton Bypass - 2.6 kilometres including 1no. structure; and
- Upgrade of the existing footpath to a combined footpath-cycle track.

Additionally, the following schemes have been delivered by NYCC in excess of five years ago:

- A61 Ripon Bypass Phase I & II;
- A658 Harrogate Southern Bypass Phase I & II; and
- A162 Sherburn in Elmet Bypass.

2.3 Programme / Project Dependencies

The scheme is no longer dependent on any other project.

When the MSBC was submitted, in December 2008, there was a reliance on the A1(M) widening going ahead; due to the programme slippage this is no longer a risk, as the works are on track for completion in 2012. The new Leeming grade separated junction, which will tie in to the proposed scheme, is now operational.

2.4 Governance / Organisational Structure and Roles

Governance

The responsibility for the delivery of the Project lies with the Business and Environmental Services (BES) Directorate of the County Council and in particular with the Highways & Transportation Business Unit. The project will be managed to reflect the governance requirements of the County Council. The Office of Government Commerce (OGC) PRINCE2 framework will be used to ensure the effective management of the Project. The main Processes, Components and Techniques of PRINCE2 will be mapped. This will ensure that all members of the Project Team are aware of the mechanics, methodology and objectives which are essential to delivering the project. This is accompanied by a suite of supporting documentation that will ensure that information is passed and processed in a commonly accepted format.

Governance and Staffing

The Project will be organised at four levels:

1. The Executive
2. Project Board
3. Project Manager
4. Project Teams

The project board and project organisation structure are as indicated in the table in **Appendix A**.

Table 2.1 below, illustrates the members and job titles of NYCC’s representatives as part of the project organisation structure.

Table 2.1: NYCC Job Titles

Member	Job Title
David Bowe	Corporate Director Business and Environmental Services (BES)
John Moore	Corporate Director of Financial & Central Services
Gareth Dadd	Executive Member (Highways & Planning Services)
Sian Hansom	Assistant Director Resources, Performance and Improvement
Trevor Clilverd	Finance Manager
Barrie Mason	Assistant Director Highways & Transportation
Elwyn Williams	Acting Head of Network Strategy
Mark Hugill	Senior Engineer Major Schemes
Simon Waller	Head of Commercial Services
David Handson	Commercial Services Officer
Julia Birkinshaw	Principal Ecologist
Gail Falkingham	Historic Environment Team Leader
Vicky Perkin	Head of Planning Services
Simon Evans	Legal Services Officer
Carol D’Andrade	Corporate Property Portfolio Manager

Table 2.2: Jacobs Job Titles

Member	Job Title
Ian Newiss	Executive Director of Operations
Andrew Finch	Divisional Director
Richard Jones	Technical Director Traffic & Transportation
Debbie Brown	Project Manager

The principle roles and responsibilities of the Project Management team are:

The Executive:

- Ultimately responsible for the project;
- Communication (internal & external);
- Appointment of the Project Manager;
- Chair the Project Board meetings;
- Approve the milestone reports and initiate follow on action as necessary;
- Monitor the scheme in line with the business and financial progress within the agreed tolerances;
- Review the as built scheme and review the project; and
- Liaison between the project manager, project teams, and the County Councillors and Management Board of the County Council.

The Project Board:

- Overall direction and management of the project;
- Liaison between the project management & staff and the Councillors & Senior Management, acting as corporate and programme policies;
- Overall responsibility for the risk management. (Although day to day management of individual risks will be delegated to the most appropriate person);
- The assurance that the project remains on course to deliver the required quality to meet the business plan;
- Identify and manage issues for the 'Gateway' review and support the 'Gateway' Review Team;
- The approval and funding for significant changes to the project;
- Responsible for publicity and dissemination of information about the project; and
- Dispute arbitration.

The Project Manager:

- The authority to run the project on a day to day basis;
- To ensure the project meets the standards set out in the in the project mandate, i.e. quality, costings & timescales;
- Manage the risks and develop contingency plans to be submitted to the project board, when required;
- Manage and direct the project team; and
- Prepare the end of project reports to be submitted to the Project Board.

Each role of the Project will have detailed Terms of Reference that will be agreed, signed off and reviewed at regular intervals. The Executive for the Project will be David Bowe, Corporate Director BES. In order to address the County Council's governance requirements he will need to liaise with the Corporate Director Finance & Central Services and the County Council Executive Members of BES. The Project Board will reflect the County Council's Capital Project Board (CPB). The CPB role is ensure that all capital projects are delivered in accordance with the County Council's Project Process. This is a 'Gateway' based process to be used for all capital projects. The CPB comprises: the Corporate Director BES, the Assistant Director Performance & Finance, the Finance Manager for BES and the Senior User Barrie Mason (Assistant Director) will also be a member of the Project Board for delivery of the BALB Scheme.

The role of the Project Board will be to authorise Plans and Reports (e.g. End Stage/Next Stage, Exception, Highlight), receive regular updates from the Project Manager, monitor project progress and delivery through scheduled meetings and ensure an orderly and structured close to the project. The Project Board will manage by exception and will take all key decisions based on their impact on the Business Case and Project Plan.

The Project Manager will be responsible to the Project Board for the day-to-day delivery of the project on time, on budget and to the quality required by the client. In so doing, the Project Manager's primary responsibility will be in agreeing and monitoring the production of Work Packages by the Teams under his responsibility. The Project Manager will only be expected to communicate with the Project Board at scheduled meetings when raising a Project Issue, warning of an instance where Stage tolerance could be exceeded (presenting an Exception Report), producing a Highlight Report to flag up a particular incident or issue with strategic implication or when indicating that a Stage is about to be completed by submitting an End Stage Report.

The Project Team will comprise two levels:

- **Project Management Group:** will consist of representatives from Legal, Planning, Finance, Ecology, Archaeology, Corporate Property Landlord, Procurement and project delivery teams. These will be supported by representatives of the County Council's contracted design consultant. The Project Management Group will be responsible for the overall control of the project management to ensure the scheme is delivered to time and budget and to ensure all interim milestones are met.
- **Design Team:** will consist of representatives from project delivery and Finance teams and representatives from the County Council's contracted design consultant. The design team will be responsible for ensuring all elements of the project design meet the Clients quality requirements.

2.5 Programme / Project Plan

Following the election of the coalition Government the approvals process for Major Schemes has been reviewed, resulting in an updated Project Plan. This section sets out the revised process for scheme approval.

In October 2010 the new Government published the document ‘Investment in Local Major Transport Schemes’ which set out the case for the future of investment in major infrastructure on local transport networks. In this document the Government set out their intention to “spend over £1.5 billion on major local authority transport schemes in the period from 2011/12 to 2014/15”.

The document also detailed the process for prioritising the existing pipeline of Local Authority schemes (those that had previously received, or had bid for, Programme Entry approval) demonstrating that they would not all be fundable in the Spending Review period.

For the purpose of the prioritisation process, schemes were grouped into three pools:

- **The Supported Pool** – schemes that the Government are prepared to fund, subject to renegotiation of funding bids from Local Authorities.
- **The Development Pool** – schemes to be forward for further analysis before funding decisions are made at the end 2011.
- **The Pre-Qualification Pool** – schemes on which we will conduct a preliminary assessment before deciding which can join the Development Pool.

If the scheme gains Government approval, and subsequent funding, the following stages will commence:

To Construction Completion - Detailed design and construction of the scheme proposals to a timescale agreed by all parties; quality project management is critical during this stage.

To Completion of Road Safety Audit - This stage includes the completion of the Health and Safety File by the Contractor and monitoring of the final implemented scheme. The Road Safety Audits would be undertaken by an independent team of qualified consultants.

The risks to the programme mostly relate to the construction phase for which the Quantified Risk Assessment has been created. It is anticipated that approval of the BAFFB will be granted by DfT in December 2011 and scheme preparation in the form of detailed design will commence in November 2012 through to June 2013. The construction tender will be awarded by July 2014 and construction will begin in October 2014. The construction phase will take two years with the scheme opening in October 2016.

The programme has been developed for a timetable including 6 months for a Public Inquiry and the subsequent publication of the Inspector’s Report.

Time estimates are considered to be realistic for the complexity of the project. The resources identified for the project include experienced Council staff, a competent contractor to be chosen through a rigorous tender procedure and the Council’s partner consultant. The programme will be reassessed at award of the contract with the Contractor to ensure that the programme has the ownership of all parties involved.

It is anticipated that powers to acquire land will be sought through a Compulsory Purchase Order. In parallel with the Compulsory Purchase Order being submitted to the Secretary of State for confirmation, efforts will be made to acquire land by negotiation. Compulsory purchase powers will only be used to acquire land where negotiations fail and land cannot be acquired by agreement.

The project plan and the key milestones are outlined in **Table 2.3** below.

Table 2.3: Project Plan

Activity	Start	Finish
Submission of BAFFB to DfT	Sep 9 th 2011	
Provide clarification to DfT on BAFFB related queries	Sep 26 th 2011	Oct 10 th 2011
Approval of BAFFB from DfT	Dec-11	
Statutory Orders Published	Aug-12	
Public Inquiry Starts	Jun-13	
Confirmation of Orders	Apr-14	
Complete Procurement	Jul-14	
Submit Full Approval Application to DfT	Jun-14	
Work Starts on Site	Oct-14	
Work Completed	Oct-16	
Opening / Commencement of Operations	Oct-16	

2.6 Assurance and Approvals Plan

A Gateway Review 1 and 2 will be carried out between Programme Entry and Conditional Approval with Gateway 3 being carried out prior to Full Approval.

Independent assurance for the scheme is to be conducted using Council Colleagues. The Corporate Projects Officer (CPO) in the Financial Services Directorate has recently conducted an independent review of the delivery of the Council's £30.5m Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme, reporting directly to David Bowe and Sian Hansom. James has also been involved in risk assessment workshops for the BALB scheme to bring an independent view/challenge to the process. It is intended that the CPO or an officer nominated by the Corporate Director Finance and Central Services will meet with the BALB project Team on a quarterly basis to assess progress against the agreed programme and finance and report direct to David Bowe and Barrie Mason.

In terms of an assurance from outside of the authority, The City of York Council (CYC) has been previously approached to provide this role along with the CPO, again reporting direct to David Bowe, Should the bid be successful the Council will approach CYC to provide this role. We have also offered to reciprocate this arrangement for the major schemes currently being progressed by the City of York.

2.7 Contract Management

Contract Management will be the responsibility of the Contract Services Unit at NYCC.

3 The Management Case – Monitoring & Evaluation

3.1 Introduction

This section looks at how the benefits of the scheme will be realised and also at the ongoing monitoring proposals. This is presented under the following headings:

- Benefits Realisation Plan;
- Monitoring and Evaluation;
- Evaluation Timescales;
- Evaluation Strategy;
- Environmental Management Plan; and
- Evaluation Budget.

3.2 Benefits Realisation Plan

It is essential for monitoring and evaluation to be undertaken after the scheme is constructed. It will provide both qualitative and quantitative assessments of the implementation of the scheme and its impacts. It will relate closely to targets and proposals for Monitoring and Evaluation set in the LTP2.

The following is proposed to assess the impact of the scheme in terms of anticipated benefits:

- Traffic forecasts for future years were undertaken to develop matrices and for the cost benefit analysis. Traffic surveys will be undertaken annually as part of the North Yorkshire County Council Monitoring programme;
- Journey time surveys were undertaken in 2004 and 2011 during the development of the traffic model for the scheme. Journey time surveys will also be undertaken after opening to assess the impact of the scheme. Bus journey times and reliability will also be assessed;
- Personal Injury Accidents will continue to be monitored by the North Yorkshire Police and NYCC's road safety team;
- Environmental effects (noise and air quality) and mitigation measures will continue be monitored; and
- Facilitation and Delivery of Renaissance Market Town improvements.

A 'before and after' study will commence prior to the construction phase with after surveys' one year after opening. Detailed requirements for monitoring and evaluation will be discussed and agreed prior to construction of the scheme and would take account of any 'external' factors that could affect traffic flows such as land use changes. Data collection would be co-ordinated and integrated with the data being collected to monitor the Local Transport Plan (and other) performance indicators and with wider traffic monitoring programmes.

3.3 Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and Evaluation is about objectively monitoring and assessing the outcomes of a decision. An evaluation, therefore, is an independent quantitative and qualitative assessment of the processes of implementing a scheme and its impacts. Evaluating major schemes is a mandatory requirement and helps the Department for Transport (DfT) meet its commitment to assess the impacts of its policies, and provide authorities with valuable evidence to inform future decision-making.

This response outlines the proposed Monitoring and Evaluation approach for the A684 Bedale, Aiskew, Leeming Bar Bypass (BALB). To inform the production of this strategy reference has been made to the DfT guidance document entitled 'The Evaluation of Major Local Authority Transport Schemes: A Guide'.

3.4 Evaluation Timescales

DfT guidance requires baseline data to be collected before any preliminary works begin on site; this is due to the fact that traffic disruption may affect travel behaviour and attitudes towards the scheme.

When building the traffic model a number of journey time surveys were conducted in order to validate the model. Journey times were measured in three travel sections on the network with numerous identified timing points.

Various environmental and ecological surveys have been conducted, prior to programme entry, in order to establish baseline conditions along the existing carriageway. These are detailed below:

Air Quality – twenty six sample receptors were located on each road where significant traffic changes are predicted to occur following the introduction of BALB.

Noise – baseline noise surveys were undertaken in October 2009. Measured noise levels were taken at properties in close proximity to the proposed scheme where existing noise levels are potentially not dominated by road noise. These noise measurements will provide a basis for future comparison at these properties.

Water – baseline data has been collected on hydrology and surface water quality, groundwater and flood risk. Sources include The Environment Agency, specialist websites including www.magic.gov.uk and British Geographical Surveys.

Cultural Heritage – the cultural heritage baseline was established through a primarily desk based survey. Additionally a staged programme of archaeological **evaluation** has been undertaken which comprised an archaeological earthwork survey, a geophysical survey, a geoarchaeological survey and trial trenching. The earthwork survey was undertaken by Jacobs and the remainder were conducted by Archaeological Services Durham University.

Nature Conservation – baseline information for nature conservation was gathered through desk based survey and consultation with Statutory Nature Conservation Organisations (SNCO's) and Non-SNCO's. Field surveys were also undertaken. Monitoring is aimed at ensuring that further protected species have not moved into the

area prior to construction and to determine the success of mitigation measures post construction.

Landscape – a desktop study was undertaken to gather information and inform the baseline studies and assessment criteria. Consultation was then undertaken with statutory consultees and stakeholders. Site visits took place in April, July and September 2009 to confirm information obtained from the desktop survey, to check site features and to establish the potential landscape and visual receptors for assessment. Surveys were undertaken from the public highway, public rights of way and open spaces, and other publicly accessible locations. Photographs were also taken from key viewpoints. Additionally a baseline tree survey has been undertaken.

Public consultation has also taken place, prior to programme entry, and the details of this are below:

- The consultation period, which ran from 18th September to 18th December 2009, attracted considerable interest and a large number of responses from members of the public and key stakeholders.
- The consultation was undertaken in various ways including public exhibitions, one-to-one business surveys, individual meetings with key organisations including the Chamber of Commerce and the Highways Agency, a consultation mail-out and an online virtual exhibition.
- In excess of 1400 responses were received over the 13 week consultation period which included questionnaires, letters and entries in a comments book made available at the public exhibitions.
- 93.2% of the respondents offered their support for the bypass with 5.6% against the proposal and the remainder 'undecided'. Analysis of business respondents indicated that 83.6% of this group support the scheme proposal.

In terms of comparison, post implementation, the following future timescales will be used for evaluation:

- **Settling Down Period** – between 6 to 12 months after initial opening when significant changes in demand are underway as the public becomes aware of the existence of the new facility.
- **After Short Term** - The period during which awareness of the scheme has stabilised, but when short term behavioural responses (e.g. changes of route, direct changes of mode and changes in timing of peak journeys) predominate. This is typically extends over one to three years after opening.
- **After Medium Term** - The period during which all of the longer term transport responses (e.g. changes of work location) and shorter term land-use/demographic responses are likely to occur. This typically extends over three to seven years after opening.
- **After Long Term** - The period during which the scheme is fully established and most of its impacts have had sufficient time to work through. Long term impacts are particularly associated with development location, business.

3.5 Evaluation Strategy

The DfT guidance document recommends that the evaluation strategy be focussed on:

- The problems and objectives that drove the need for the scheme (detailed in the MSBC); and
- The benefits recorded within the Value for Money and Appraisal Summary Table parts of the Business Case.

Problems and Objectives

It is important to monitor and evaluate the impact of a scheme against the problems and objectives which drove its development. Based on the approach outlined below it is proposed that this will be undertaken and reported in the settling down, short, medium and long term evaluation reports. This will provide information on any significant trends associated with the scheme.

The objectives and problems were identified in the initial stages of the development of the scheme and have been used to inform its progression. These are summarised below; for more detail regarding the scheme problems and objectives reference should be made to Chapter 2 of the MSBC Report (December 2008).

Current Problems

- Heavy traffic flows;
- Safety hazards for NMU's as a result of the volume of traffic;
- Severance in the three communities – Bedale, Aiskew and Leeming Bar;
- HGV's make up 6% of traffic on the route;
- Substandard alignment for the volume and nature of the traffic;
- Traffic congestion at critical junctions; and
- Significant delays at the two level crossings over the Wensleydale Railway.

Future Problems

- Traffic growth of up to 61% on the already over capacity carriageway by 2031;
- Increased delay at critical junctions;
- There is no proposed access improvements, to Bedale, Aiskew and Leeming Bar, as part of the A1 Dishforth to Barton upgrade to motorway standard works which will further exacerbate capacity problems on the A684 junctions;
- Little scope for future development as a result of a saturated network;
- Wensleydale Railway has plans to expand and increase services; this will result in more frequent closures of the level crossings and increased congestion on the A684; and
- Lessened quality of life for those residing in close proximity to the existing carriageway.

Objectives

- Reducing traffic congestion on the A684 through Bedale, Aiskew and Leeming Bar;
- To provide a stimulus for diversification and regeneration of the local economy;
- To reduce environmental and road safety problems;
- Improve access to Leeming Bar Industrial Estate; and
- Improve access from the A1.

AST and Value for Money Benefits

In order to evaluate the performance of the scheme in the context of the value for money benefits, it is proposed to monitor and evaluate the findings reported within the Appraisal Summary Table (AST). It is proposed to undertake and report on this in the settling down, short, medium and long term timescales identified above.

3.6 Environmental Management Plan (EMP)

An outline EMP has been developed to facilitate and manage the environmental aspects and impacts of the proposed Bypass throughout the construction process. It demonstrates how all activities associated with the construction works would be undertaken so as not to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

The outline EMP is contained at Chapter 15 of the A684 Bedale, Aiskew and Leeming Bar Bypass Environmental Statement (Jacobs, 2010).

Overall Purpose of the EMP

The outline EMP takes account of the proposed mitigation measures and transposes them into actions that are applicable to the construction phase of the project. Guidance and instruction provided by the EMP aim to reduce the risk of adverse effects to both the environment and those involved in the project. The overall purpose of the outline EMP is therefore to:

- Facilitate environmental management by providing an overview of the key environmental issues and actions;
- Set out how to minimise environmental impacts and disturbance of sensitive receptors as a result, directly or indirectly, of activities associated with the project; and,
- Provide a document that will become an integral part of the contractor's environmental management procedures in relation to the project.

Identification of Environmental Aspects and Impacts

The project's environmental aspects are those elements of the project's activities that interact with the environment and include those that the organisation can control and/or have influence over. There may be one or more environmental impact associated with each environmental aspect. An environmental impact is defined as any change to the environment, whether adverse or beneficial, wholly or partially resulting from the project's activities.

The process of identifying the project environmental aspects and impacts has been based upon the project's Environmental Impact Assessment. The assessment of 'significance', carried out for the assessment of each topic has been used to ensure that the EMP is suitably focused on the most significant environmental aspects and impacts.

Significant environmental impacts will require either management, improvement by the setting of objectives and targets, or monitoring by the project.

The environmental aspects and impacts register should be updated as appropriate during the project's life and at least every six months as a minimum.

Objectives and Targets

In order to drive continual improvement in the environmental performance within the project, a series of environmental objectives and targets will be developed. These objectives and targets will be based upon the identified project legal and other requirements, the project's significant environmental aspects and impacts, best available techniques where economically viable, cost-effective and judged appropriate, project financial constraints, operational and business requirements, and the views of interested parties.

The objectives and targets developed will be focused on the most important environmental elements of the project. Project-specific objectives and targets may include:

- Minimise emissions of pollutants to air, especially of substances associated with climate change (e.g. CO₂ from energy use and commercial transport to and from the site), and take all appropriate measures to avoid any resultant nuisance;
- Prevent, contain or limit, as far as reasonably practicable, any adverse impacts arising from the presence of contaminated land or material encountered during the construction activities, and prevent new land contamination;
- Minimise impacts on the ecological resources located on site;
- Prevent significant noise or vibration impacts on local sensitive receptors;
- Minimise visual impact and loss of amenity on the surrounding area;
- Prevent significant impacts on surface water or groundwater quality, with particular reference to the watercourses and canals in the area;
- Minimise water consumption arising from on site activities;
- Monitor sort and recycle construction waste (linked to the implementation of a Site Waste Management Plan);
- All materials used by the Works will be utilised as efficiently as possible. The sustainability of materials will, wherever possible, be a driving factor in procurement decisions (e.g. sourcing timber from a sustainably managed source).

Environmental Management

The Project Management Team should aim to minimise and, if reasonably practicable, eliminate all risks including environmental, planning, health, safety, commercial and operational risks associated with the Project. The Project Management Team, therefore,

should put in place procedures to ensure environmental aspects and impacts are identified and addressed throughout the construction of the proposed Bypass.

Consequently, all construction works in relation to the project should be undertaken in accordance with the requirements set out in the Environmental Aspects and Impacts Register. This register provides those undertaking works on the project with guidance on mitigation measures designed to prevent adverse impacts from general and specific working inclusive of the following:

- A description of work activities that pose a particular risk to environmental receptors on site or within proximity of the site; A summary of the key potential adverse environmental impacts of undertaking work activities required for construction of the project;
- Management techniques that shall be adopted and adhered to which will reduce the risk of an environmental incident occurring; and
- Reference to further information which provide support, advice and instruction on work activities and how they are undertaken in the most environmentally sensitive manner.

3.7 Evaluation Budget

Guidance suggests that there is no firm, general rule as to how much should be spent on evaluation beyond the principle that this should be addressed while the scheme is being planned to establish the scope of the work that will be required.

North Yorkshire County Council has allocated £200,000 to be spent on scheme evaluation, in line with DfT guidance which recommends that the evaluation budget ranges between 0.5% and 1% of the scheme capital budget.

NYCC has also committed a substantial amount of upfront funding to progress and develop the scheme at its own risk. Whilst a large proportion of information has already been collected, additional baseline data will be collected post programme entry.

4

The Management Case – Communication & Reporting

4.1 Introduction

This section sets out how evaluation and monitoring will be reported on and fed back to stakeholders and the public. This is presented under the following headings:

- Communications and Stakeholder Management; and
- Programme / Project Reporting.

4.2 Communications and Stakeholder Management

Statutory organisations, non-statutory organisations, other stakeholders and members of the public were consulted as part of the scheme development process. A list of the statutory consultees is below:

- The Department for Transport;
- Highways Agency;
- Yorkshire Forward;
- Natural England;
- Environment Agency;
- Ministry of Defence (Defence Estates);
- English Heritage;
- Network Rail
- Hambleton District Council; and
- North Yorkshire Police.

Our communications and engagement programme has been very successful and we intend to build on that. We regard feedback and continuous interaction with our stakeholders as very important and ‘long silences’ are unacceptable.

Therefore, as good practice calls for, we have both a Communications and Engagement Strategy and a Statement of Community Involvement. These set out plans to engage stakeholders throughout the project; that is, beyond planning submission, through the decision process and on to construction and operation. Thus, stakeholders will be appropriately included in the information and feedback process for the whole of the project’s life.

For example, all stakeholders were engaged, following the successful validation of the planning application. As well as direct personal contacts all existing contact methods remain open for use (letters, emails, telephone calls) and especially our dedicated BALB website portal. Here stakeholders can both seek information and raise concerns or queries which are immediately addressed.

Depending on the outcome of the funding bid decision, and any related requirements, we will consult with directly affected stakeholders and individuals as appropriate. We will continue

to ensure that plans reflect the needs of local people and their views and say how we have done that.

Effective communication is a key element of our communications and engagement strategy.

We will be informing stakeholders and the public of the application outcomes by a mix of media advertising and direct information to individuals, organisations and local networks.

Similar principles will apply to the construction and operation phases where we will maintain and build on existing relationships. Those affected will be kept informed about key decisions, timescales for construction, progress and facilities to raise comments. We will actively seek their views about the best ways of working with contractors and expect contractors to adhere to an agreed code of practice. This will help to reduce frustrations over potentially disruptive activities. In addition to our BALB portal, there will be regular press releases and press articles, we will provide activity timetables, complaints systems, monitoring and evaluation methods. Above all we will work closely with local people and stakeholders for the best solutions and outcomes.

It is proposed that stakeholder and community consultation should continue post construction and be used to inform the evaluation process and as an assessment of scheme performance. This will be undertaken in the form of questionnaires in the settling down period, short, medium and long term. The findings of the evaluation process will be reported to other key stakeholders including:

- North Yorkshire County Council;
- Local politicians and Members of Parliament; and
- The Department for Transport.

This process will provide accountability and insight into how the scheme was managed. The AST monitoring will aid in determining how the benefits were distributed and the overall evaluation will allow for the unintended effects of the scheme to be realised.

4.3 Programme / Project Reporting

Reports on the evaluation process will be produced and issued to key stakeholders in the settling down period, short, medium and long term. These reports will conclude with a comparative assessment of the value for money of the scheme compared to that identified in the MSBC submitted to the DfT in December 2008 and the BAFFB..

5 The Management Case – Risk

5.1 Introduction

This section looks at the issue of risk and how management of that risk has been planned. This is presented under the following headings:

- **Key Issues for Implementation; and**
- **Risk Management Strategy.**

5.2 Key Issues for Implementation

The main risk to achieving the targeted construction start date arises from the statutory processes and DfT funding approvals. The primary mitigation of this risk lies in proceeding with design development and preparation of procurement documentation in advance of receipt of statutory powers and DfT approvals such that NYCC are in the position to seek tenders immediately these powers and approvals have been obtained.

Aside from DfT approval timescales a number of other risks to the programme have been identified and are listed below. The majority of these would also directly impact costs:

a) **Inflation in the Construction Industry**

If this occurs NYCC will be liable to cover all of the cost increases that occur after agreement of funding from DfT. In order to mitigate against this risk, cost estimates have been thoroughly checked and all possible uncertainties resolved prior to submission of the best and final offer agreed at Programme Entry stage. The Council recognise potential contingency need which has been incorporated into the risk assessment.

b) **Objections at Planning Application / CPO / SRO Stage**

Should objections be received, resulting in the scheme not gaining approval, it would result in significant abortive costs. In order to mitigate against this risk there has been early engagement and regular contact with statutory consultees and landowners affected by the proposals in order to mitigate problems and conflicts where possible.

c) **Modifications to Planning Orders Due to MSA / Truck Stop Public Inquiry**

Modifications to Planning Orders as a result of the MSA / Truck Stop Public Inquiry could lead to a delay in programme and subsequent increase in scheme costs. In order to mitigate against this the County Council will seek to agree modifications and early intervention of changes following the outcome of the MSA / Truck Stop Inquiry. NYCC would also seek financial contributions from the Developer to cover any increases in costs due to modifications required to BALB as a result of the MSA proposals.

d) **Delay in Progressing Scheme Due to NYCC / Consultant**

Delay as a result of either NYCC or its appointed consultant would result in cost increases due to further inflation costs. In order to mitigate against this risk project teams are to be established to ensure that there is sufficient capacity to drive the scheme forward, respond to key decisions and provide information as and when required. NYCC recognise this potential contingency need and it has been incorporated into the risk assessment.

e) Delay in Announcement of Inspector’s Report on CPO and SRO Public Inquiry

Delay in the announcement of the Inspector’s Report on CPO’s and SRO’s would result in delay in delivery of the scheme and subsequent increased costs. Although NYCC has no control over inspector decisions and Government announcements the County Council recognise the potential for delay and contingency has been incorporated into the risk assessment.

f) Unforeseen Complication During the Construction Stage

Any complication during the construction stage could lead to an increase in target cost. The industry average demonstrates an approximate 15% increase in outturn cost compared to target cost determined at the tender stage. This need for potential contingency is recognised by NYCC.

Cost itself is a key issue in the implementation of the scheme. The achievement of a high degree of cost certainty through the construction phase is linked to the degree of risk placed on the contractor through the construction contract. The extent of risk transfer will be limited by acceptability or otherwise by the market and the premium cost that may be placed on the contract being offered.

Experience suggests the main cause of increases between tender and final account are due to encountering unforeseen physical conditions, modifications to the original designs as a consequence of construction difficulties and variations to originally specified requirements. The cost of the consequential effects of these events often far exceed the direct costs particularly as a result of the difficulty of incorporating any effective means of incentivising the contractor to minimise these costs.

Clearly only the employer can control variations amending the original scope of the project but a significant proportion of the other risks can be placed with the contractor via the transfer of liability for the design i.e. through a design and build form of contract. It should be appreciated that the transfer of design liability can be affected at any point through the schemes development. The latter in the development programme such a transfer occurs the more prescriptive the employers’ requirements are likely to be and, if this is the case, the less time will be required for tenderers to prepare their tenders.

5.3 Risk Management Strategy

A Project Risk Register has been created from a stakeholders Risk Management Workshop which was held on 9th October 2008. This built on work already carried out by the County Councils previous incumbent consultant in identifying key risk associated with the scheme.

The Risk Management Workshop provided details of the major risks highlighted during the planning and delivery of the scheme. Key risks will be owned and updated on a regular basis by the Project Controller and the impact on the delivery programme assessed. Each Team Leader will also be required to maintain a Risk Register as this will enable each risk’s impact on Work Package and Stage tolerance to be monitored and raised with the Project Manager when necessary. Awareness of the major risks will allow the Project Manager to update the main Risk Register effectively, discuss mitigation strategies with Team Leaders and raise major risk-specific issues to the Project Board.

A full Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) has been carried out using Highways Agency Risk Management software (HARM) to identify and quantify risks associated with the scheme. This Quantified Risk has been added to the basic scheme cost to form the Quantified Costs Estimate for the scheme.

The Council, to mitigate against risk and ensure cost certainty has invested significant 'up front' preparatory funds to advance the scheme. Risks to the programme are being mitigated against by the following means:-

- Early liaison with statutory consultees to reduce opposition to the scheme;
- Updated ecological surveys to monitor and manage wildlife along the route, which if left unchecked may delay proceeding;
- Additional archaeological surveys (intrusive and non-intrusive) to identify areas of potential archaeological significance and appropriate mitigation measures;
- Advance ground investigation works (trial pits and bore holes) to identify any risks associated with ground conditions and local geology (e.g. perched water tables);
- Advance consultation with local landowners on land access; and
- Early preparation of Side Road Orders and Compulsory Purchase Orders.

A Risk Register is maintained and managed by the Project Design Team. The risks contained in the register are reviewed monthly and updated as necessary.

Key risks are reported to the Project Manager, to both the Project Board and the Senior User where appropriate.

The risks identified for the A684 BALB are managed through the following hierarchy:

Project Specific Risks – Project Specific Risks have been identified through a number of workshops attended by representatives of the County Council and our appointed design consultants. The risk register is reviewed on a monthly basis by the Project Management Group to ensure that the risks are still valid and to ensure that new risks are added as they are identified

Highways & Transportation (H&T) Risks – A684 BALB is identified as a specific project on the H&T risk register and responsibility for the management of this particular risk lies with the Assistant Director Highways & Transportation.

Business & Environmental Services (BES) Directorate Risks – The H&T Business Unit is part of the BES Directorate. The A684 BALB is identified on the Directorate Risk Register under the general risk heading of Capital Projects. The overall responsibility for the management of all risks on this register lies with the BES Director.

Corporate Risk Register – All Directorate risk registers feed into the key risks identified on the Corporate Risk Register; the responsibility for these risks lies with Management Board and the Corporate Risk Management Group.

Governance Arrangements - The County Council's Risk Management Section is responsible for the regular review and management of all of the County's risk registers. The reviews are generally carried out at six monthly intervals through workshops chaired by representatives of the Risk Management Section and attended by the appropriate

managers. It is possible to escalate key risks through the hierarchy detailed above as part of the regular reviews. Full details are provided in the County Council's Corporate Risk Management Strategy and Policy document.

6**Summary**

This report presents the Management Case for the A684 Bedale, Aiskew, Leeming Bar Bypass (BALB) Best and Final Funding Bid (BAFFB).

The project plan and governance structure have been set out, as has the strategy for monitoring and evaluation of the scheme. Risks to the implementation of the programme have also been considered.

Appendix A – Project Organisation Structure



NYCC ROLE	PRINCE2 ROLE	MEMBERSHIP	ROLE	FREQUENCY	REPORTING
	EXECUTIVE / SENIOR RESPONSIBLE OWNER	NYCC: Corporate Director BES Corporate Director Financial & Central Services Executive Members	To ensure the project is focussed on achieving set objective and delivering a project that will achieve projected benefits; to achieve value for money and a cost conscious approach.	Quarterly; Chaired by Corporate Director BES	Programme Finance Highlight Report Exception Report
BALB PROJECT BOARD	PROJECT BOARD	NYCC: Corporate Director BES Assistant Director Highways & Transportation Assistant Director RPI Finance Manager Head of Commercial Services	Responsible for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overall direction and management of project ▪ Communication (internal & external) ▪ Authorisation of plans, stage starts/finishes ▪ Resources ▪ Dispute arbitration 	Quarterly. Chaired by Corporate Director BES	Programme Finance Highlight Report Exception Report
PROJECT MANAGER	PROJECT MANAGER	Acting Head of Network Strategy	To run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Project Board. Responsible for ensuring the project produces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Product of required quality ▪ To time ▪ To budget ▪ The benefits identified in Business Case 		Programme Finance Highlight Report Exception Report
	PROJECT TEAMS	PROJECT MANAGEMENT GROUP NYCC: Senior Engineer Major Schemes , Commercial Services Officer, Project Team Leader, Corporate Priority Portfolio Manager, Historic Environment Team Leader JEUK: Director of Operations , Divisional Director, Technical Director T&T ,Project Manager, Project Control	Overall control of project management to ensure the scheme is delivered to time and budget and to ensure all interim milestones are met.	Monthly. Chaired by Project Manager	Programme Finance Highlight Report Exception Report Stage reports Outputs
		DESIGN TEAM NYCC: Senior Engineer Major Schemes, Project Team Leader JEUK: Divisional Director, Technical Director T&T	All aspects of scheme design and contract preparation.	Weekly. Chaired by Project Team Leader	
CLIENT SPONSOR	SENIOR USER	NYCC: Assistant Director Highways & Transportation	Responsible for liaison with the Project Manager, monitoring of the solution so it meets the needs of the Business Case. SU commits resources.		
DESIGNER	SENIOR SUPPLIER	JEUK: Director of Operations	Represents the interests of the design consultant and is accountable for the quality of the final product.		