## Risk Register

### R1: Scheme does not integrate with or comply with other transport/cycling and regeneration initiatives.
**Nature of Risk:** Strategic
**Category:** Design change to link with complementary schemes
**Implications:** RBWM have been involved at early stage ensuring issues highlighted in the initial stages. The scheme links existing routes, residential areas, and new developments to the town centre and railway station which are currently missing and therefore complements future initiatives in the area.
**Mitigation:** Ongoing integration with cycling action plan for Maidenhead linking in with existing and proposed routes
**Action to be Taken:** Review of current design to ensure it meets the Business Case Objectives
**Owner:** RBWM
**Consequences:** Minor
**Likelihood:** 20%
**Cost Estimate:** £20,000
**Weighted Cost:** £4,000
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R2: Scheme does not integrate with wider policy e.g. SEP
**Nature of Risk:** Strategic
**Category:** Reputational damage and potential future loss of funding for other schemes. Scheme does not get internal approval
**Implications:** The scheme has been identified within the SEP and assessed against SEP objectives
**Mitigation:** Continual review of current design to ensure it meets the Business Case Objectives
**Action to be Taken:** Member briefings to be arranged as part of project delivery plan. Regular updates to be provided.
**Owner:** RBWM
**Consequences:** Major
**Likelihood:** 10%
**Cost Estimate:** £50,000
**Weighted Cost:** £5,000
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R3: Change in RBWM political leadership results in withdrawal of support for scheme
**Nature of Risk:** Strategic
**Category:** Reputational damage and potential future loss of funding for other schemes
**Implications:** Regular briefings for lead members and via Cabinet Regeneration Sub-Committee. Next local election will take place in 2020, which will be post completion, but once works have commenced.
**Mitigation:** Member briefings to be arranged as part of project delivery plan. Regular updates to be provided.
**Action to be Taken:** Review of business case and cycling forecast
**Owner:** RBWM
**Consequences:** Moderate
**Likelihood:** 50%
**Cost Estimate:** £10,000
**Weighted Cost:** £5,000
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R4: Maidenhead developments not implemented as planned
**Nature of Risk:** Strategic
**Category:** Change in project numbers
**Implications:** Engage with Planning and Housing to ensure any changes or delays to delivery and identified
**Mitigation:** Seek design fee estimates and issue Purchase Orders
**Action to be Taken:** Review of business case and cycling forecast
**Owner:** RBWM
**Consequences:** Moderate
**Likelihood:** 50%
**Cost Estimate:** £15,000
**Weighted Cost:** £4,500
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R5: Delay in commissioning of design team
**Nature of Risk:** Design
**Category:** Delay in preparation of detailed design and construction
**Implications:** Ensure early commissioning of design team
**Mitigation:** Seek design fee estimates and issue Purchase Orders
**Action to be Taken:** Review of business case and cycling forecast
**Owner:** RBWM
**Consequences:** Project Manager
**Likelihood:** 30%
**Cost Estimate:** £15,000
**Weighted Cost:** £4,500
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R6: Incomplete or late delivery of outputs by design teams
**Nature of Risk:** Design
**Category:** Delays to overall programme and late starting work
**Implications:** Ongoing programme monitoring. Allow adequate time in design programme to undertake design changes if required
**Mitigation:** Regular update programme
**Action to be Taken:** Designer
**Owner:** Project Manager
**Consequences:** Minor
**Likelihood:** 25%
**Cost Estimate:** £20,000
**Weighted Cost:** £5,000
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R7: Utilities costs
**Nature of Risk:** Design
**Category:** Additional scheme costs
**Implications:** Apply for Cs3 and Cs4 as part of design process. Trial holes to be undertaken as part of design process. Significant contingencies have been allowed for diversions for service apparatus.
**Mitigation:** Regularly update programme
**Action to be Taken:** Regularly update programme
**Owner:** Design
**Consequences:** Multiple
**Likelihood:** 30%
**Cost Estimate:** £500,000
**Weighted Cost:** £150,000
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R8: Design errors/omissions that could lead to designs being revised
**Nature of Risk:** Design
**Category:** Design and cost implication
**Implications:** Independent Design Reviews. Allow adequate time in programme to account for design checks and amendments
**Mitigation:** Adhere to designers QA processes
**Action to be Taken:** Review of business case and cycling forecast
**Owner:** Design
**Consequences:** Designers
**Likelihood:** 20%
**Cost Estimate:** £20,000
**Weighted Cost:** £4,000
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R9: Provision of ramp within West Street Development not feasible
**Nature of Risk:** Design
**Category:** Alternative options for crossing A4 required
**Implications:** Early liaison with development team to incorporate subway design
**Mitigation:** Commission detailed study at early stage and liaise with West Street developers
**Action to be Taken:** Commission detailed study at early stage and liaise with West Street developers
**Owner:** Project Manager
**Consequences:** Major
**Likelihood:** 20%
**Cost Estimate:** £50,000
**Weighted Cost:** £10,000
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R10: Objection to loss of trees
**Nature of Risk:** Design
**Category:** Increased design costs
**Implications:** Early consultation with stakeholders to input into design
**Mitigation:** Review of business case and cycling forecast
**Action to be Taken:** Review of business case and cycling forecast
**Owner:** Design
**Consequences:** Multiple
**Likelihood:** 50%
**Cost Estimate:** £2,000
**Weighted Cost:** £1,000
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R11: Kidwells Park Route
**Nature of Risk:** Design
**Category:** Alternative routes through park sought, reduction in journey time saving
**Implications:** Early engagement with Parks to ensure approval of outline design
**Mitigation:** Early engagement with Parks to ensure approval of outline design
**Action to be Taken:** Ensure required measures, particularly shared use path
**Owner:** Design
**Consequences:** Multiple
**Likelihood:** 20%
**Cost Estimate:** £70,000
**Weighted Cost:** £14,000
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R12: West Street Development
**Nature of Risk:** Design
**Category:** Proposed site layout does not integrate with subway
**Implications:** Engagement with HCD and Planning to ensure that Planning Consent fully integrated with MML solution
**Mitigation:** Integration with planning process and access to development plans at earliest opportunity
**Action to be Taken:** Early engagement with HCD and Planning to ensure that Planning Consent fully integrated with MML solution
**Owner:** Project Manager
**Consequences:** Major
**Likelihood:** 20%
**Cost Estimate:** £25,000
**Weighted Cost:** £5,000
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R13: St. Clouds Way Development
**Nature of Risk:** Design
**Category:** Section of route not complete
**Implications:** Programmes to be integrated and reviewed, consideration for temporary solution to allow cyclists to use route prior to completion of development
**Mitigation:** Integration with planning process and access to development plans at earliest opportunity
**Action to be Taken:** Early engagement with HCD and Planning to ensure that Planning Consent fully integrated with MML solution
**Owner:** Project Manager
**Consequences:** Major
**Likelihood:** 10%
**Cost Estimate:** £90,000
**Weighted Cost:** £9,000
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R14: High Street Store Frontage change
**Nature of Risk:** Design
**Category:** Amendments to pedestrian numbers and flows
**Implications:** Engage with Town Centre Manager to understand proposal for frontages and stores
**Mitigation:** Early engagement with Parks to ensure approval of outline design
**Action to be Taken:** Early engagement with Parks to ensure approval of outline design
**Owner:** Project Manager
**Consequences:** Multiple
**Likelihood:** 40%
**Cost Estimate:** £10,000
**Weighted Cost:** £4,000
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R15: Slating Forecourt Project Delay
**Nature of Risk:** Design
**Category:** Queen Street and Station Interventions not complete
**Implications:** Direct Liaison between project teams to ensure that programme not affected
**Mitigation:** Review of business case and cycling forecast
**Action to be Taken:** Review of business case and cycling forecast
**Owner:** Project Manager
**Consequences:** Multiple
**Likelihood:** 10%
**Cost Estimate:** £50,000
**Weighted Cost:** £5,000
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R16: Tender prices received from the contractors exceed budget estimate
**Nature of Risk:** Financial
**Category:** Requirement to find additional funding to cover cost overruns
**Implications:** The current cost estimate is based on an outline Bill of Quantities with appropriate allowances for optimism bias and risk
**Mitigation:** Review BSQ throughout design
**Action to be Taken:** Review BSQ throughout design
**Owner:** Project Manager
**Consequences:** Multiple
**Likelihood:** 5%
**Cost Estimate:** £1,800,000
**Weighted Cost:** £30,000
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R17: Delays in construction programme resulting in increased contract administration costs
**Nature of Risk:** Financial
**Category:** Client has to find additional funding to cover additional administration costs
**Implications:** Ensuring design, investigations, programme and procurement are robust, reducing likelihood of construction delays reduced.
**Mitigation:** Review scheme costs regularly
**Action to be Taken:** Review scheme costs regularly
**Owner:** Project Manager
**Consequences:** Multiple
**Likelihood:** 35%
**Cost Estimate:** £30,000
**Weighted Cost:** £10,500
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R18: Stakeholder Objections
**Nature of Risk:** Pre-construction
**Category:** Delay in approval may delay overall project
**Implications:** Hold early discussions with key partners (e.g., cycle forum, access advisory forum)
**Mitigation:** Public consultation on proposed scheme. Potential re-design to include stakeholder concerns
**Action to be Taken:** Public consultation on proposed scheme. Potential re-design to include stakeholder concerns
**Owner:** Project Manager
**Consequences:** Multiple
**Likelihood:** 50%
**Cost Estimate:** £15,000
**Weighted Cost:** £7,500
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All

### R19: Procurement
**Nature of Risk:** Pre-construction
**Category:** Scheme delay and cost increases if procurement process not confirmed
**Implications:** Programme procurement into delivery based on Business Case details. Ensure RBWM delegation and sign-off process understood
**Mitigation:** Confirm the procurement method to be used.
**Action to be Taken:** Confirm the procurement method to be used.
**Owner:** RBWM
**Consequences:** Moderate
**Likelihood:** 10%
**Cost Estimate:** £50,000
**Weighted Cost:** £5,000
**All, Subway or Crossing:** All
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Risk Type</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R20</td>
<td>Subway construction complications</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Delay to construction due to complications in build process and traffic diversions</td>
<td>Approved TM plan and permitting to allow for works to be scheduled</td>
<td>ECI to fully understand phasing and complexities of works. Procurement process to identify suitably qualified contractor.</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>£700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R21</td>
<td>Long lead times for permanent service diversions, particularly associated with Subway option</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Delay in programme</td>
<td>Early liaison with utilities companies to ensure stats get diverted before the construction programme begins</td>
<td>Obtain C3 Statutory undertakers. Works to be programmed early so they do not impact on scheme delivery</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R22</td>
<td>Changes to design (after construction has commenced)</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Increased costs and delays to the programme as a result of design changes</td>
<td>The detailed design for the contract tender documents will provide as much detail as possible on the site conditions and methods of construction; so as to avoid questions about &quot;buildability&quot;</td>
<td>Minimise design changes post tender stage.</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R23</td>
<td>Unknown services struck during construction works incurring delays to programme</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Delays to scheme, increased congestion throughout the town centre</td>
<td>Digging of trial holes and CAT scans</td>
<td>Full review of all required service diversions and schedule to be prepared.</td>
<td>Contractors / Designers</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R24</td>
<td>Health and Safety accident on/off site; near miss triggering a Health and Safety Executive investigation - or closure of site.</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Delays to the scheme, reputational damage and potential legal action for breaches of the law. Costs responsibility of contractor depending on breach.</td>
<td>Health and safety is an important part of the PQQ and tender evaluation process. Clear and effective H&amp;S information part of tender documents. Programme to allow enough time for contractor to plan works effectively and safely.</td>
<td>Ensure that the contract documents ask the right questions in order to ascertain the health and safety performance of the various contractors. Ensure H&amp;S fully considered within tender documents/design.</td>
<td>Contractors / Designers</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R25</td>
<td>Emergency works to stats apparatus within scheme area.</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Increased costs and time delays. Changes to programme to accommodate emergency works</td>
<td>Establish good communication strategy with major stats companies (particularly gas and water) to allow early warning of works and possible revisions to own work programme.</td>
<td>Regular communication with Street Works Team</td>
<td>Contractors / Designers</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Risk Contingency: £471,500**