

Outline Business Case (Stage 1 Commit to Invest)

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Project/Programme Name: | A40 Science Transit Phase 2 |
| Total Capital Budget: | £36.2 million |
| Divisions Affected: | Wolvercote & Summertown, Eynsham |
| Purpose of this report: | This paper requests approval to release funding of £3.191m to proceed with procuring Aecom as preliminary and detailed design consultant, and to undertake construction procurement. |
| Approval No: | To be entered by the capital finance team |

Sign-off & Approval

In preparing this report input must be obtained from the following:

| Responsible Owner | Name | Date |
|--|----------------|--|
| Author: Project Sponsor | Isaac Webb | |
| Deputy Director – Commercial | Chris McCarthy |  RE A40 Stage 1 Business Case to Infoc |
| Service Manager | Paul Fermer |  RE A40 Bus Lane Gate 1 Cabinet Paper |
| Major Infrastructure Delivery Principal Officer | Hugo Terry |  RE A40 Project Board Paper For Stag |
| Service Finance Business Partner or Senior Financial Adviser | Matthew Barlow |  RE A40 Project Board Paper For Stag |
| The Capital Finance Team | Bill Evershed |  RE A40 Bus Lane & P&R Business Case St |
| Locality Lead | Lisa Michelson |  RE A40 Project Board Paper For Stag |

Final approval as per the Financial Procedure Rules must be obtained from:

| Approval Level Required | Name | Date |
|---|-------------------------|--|
| No cost increase or cost increase under £500k - Director for E&E and Chief Finance Officer | Bev Hindle/Lorna Baxter |  Re A40 Bus Lane Gate 1 Cabinet Paper  RE A40 Bus Lane Gate 1 Cabinet Paper |
| Cost increase over £500k or fundamental change in scope – Cabinet or Leader of the Council of Behalf of Cabinet | Cabinet | |

1 Description & Objectives of the Proposal & Business Benefits

1.1. The A40 Science Transit 2 (ST2) project seeks to increase public transport capacity and reduce Oxford-bound car trips by delivering a series of improvements to the A40 highway between the western approach to Cuckoo Lane and Duke's Cut Canal Bridge. The investment will improve the transport network by increasing infrastructure, capacity, reliability and attractiveness of public transport, and reduce journey times along the A40 corridor from the Eynsham area.

1.2. The project scope includes:

- A 500 car capacity Park and Ride (P&R) adjacent to the A40 at Eynsham (with the potential to expand to 1,000 spaces). The preferred site is to the north of the A40 and to the west of Cuckoo Lane.
- An eastbound bus lane on the A40 from the proposed Eynsham Park and Ride to immediately west of the bridge over the Duke's Cut canal (500 metres west of the A34 overpass).
- Improvements to the A40 junctions to give priority to buses and mitigate impacts on general traffic.
- Westbound bus priority along short stretches of the A40 on the approaches to Cassington traffic lights and Eynsham Roundabout to reduce bus journey times.

1.3. The outcomes of the project are:

| Non-Financial Benefits (include intangibles) & Owners | Financial Benefits (include any savings & realisation times) & Owners | Targets / KPIs (Improvement in or contribution to) |
|---|---|---|
| Reduced public transport travel time. (OCC/Project Sponsor) | | Bus journeys have been modelled to take 8 minutes along the new bus lane. |
| Improved journey time reliability. Project Sponsor Substantial increases in revenue through increased patronage. It is expected this would be reinvested in service provision to capitalise on this. (Bus Operators) | | It is targeted that >90% of bus journeys will be able to complete the bus lane journey within the 8 minutes modelled. |
| | Income from P&R site. (OCC/Project Sponsor) | Forecasted income will be confirmed following the completion of the commercial work package |
| Environmental benefits - including reduced carbon | | Impact on the local economy will be |

| Non-Financial Benefits (include intangibles) & Owners | Financial Benefits (include any savings & realisation times) & Owners | Targets / KPIs (Improvement in or contribution to) |
|---|---|--|
| emissions, improved local air quality and reduced noise pollution attributable to modal switch to public transport. | | monitored by the LEP through the Growth Deal monitoring process. |

Note: the largest benefits will be realised outside of the specific project, this project will support and enable housing growth leading to an increase in the local population and labour pool, thereby supporting more efficient economic activity between Witney/Carterton and the Oxfordshire Knowledge Spine.

2 Results of feasibility study and Updated Project Scope

2.1. In 2014 a study was undertaken to examine the route strategy for the A40 between Witney & Oxford which considered various transport options along the A40 corridor including the dualling of the A40, light & heavy rail options and a guided busway.

2.2. The options were assessed in terms of their cost, estimated journey time and using the Department for Transport's Options Assessment Framework and Early Assessment and Sifting Tool. The overall assessment can be summarised as:

| Option | Cost | Journey Time | OAF | EAST |
|------------------|-------|--------------|-----|------|
| Dual Carriageway | £120m | 35 mins | -3 | 69% |
| Bus Lane | £65m | 43 mins | +23 | 82% |
| Guided Busway | £165m | 46 mins | +8 | 71% |
| Heavy Rail | £285m | 42 mins | +2 | 66% |
| Light Rail | £240m | 42 mins | +1 | 70% |

2.3 On the basis of this study and the bus lane being awarded the highest scores for the OAF (approved at 21 July 2015 Cabinet) and the EAST (part of Options Appraisal Report for approval by DfT, the recommended strategy for LGF funding (including required local contribution) was to proceed with the Bus Lane including the following items of scope:

- An eastbound bus lane on the A40 between Eynsham Roundabout and the Duke's Cut, Wolvercote;
- Westbound bus priority on the approaches to Cassington traffic signals and Eynsham Roundabout;
- A 500 car capacity Park and Ride located adjacent to the A40 in Eynsham (with the potential to expand to 1,000 spaces in line with the Oxford Transport Strategy proposals);
- Junction improvements to the junctions of A40 with Elm Place, Cuckoo Lane and Witney Road in Eynsham together with the accesses to the Eynsham Service area and Evenlode public house Bus priority lane on the approach to Swinford Toll Bridge

2.4. In November 2015 following Business Case 0b approval at Cabinet on 21 July 2015, consultants AMEC Foster Wheeler were commissioned to conduct feasibility design work into the bus lanes, junction improvement work and P&R facility and to provide an initial cost estimate for the works.

2.5. AMEC's study has concluded that the proposed benefits are deliverable through the proposed design and can be delivered within the forecasted timescales and budget.

2.6. Feasibility design has shown that carriageway width restrictions at Cassington Halt Bridge and Cassington New Bridge would mean that the bus lane would not be able to continue across these structures while retaining the adjacent full width footway/cycleway. A bus gate option, where the bus lane was suspended at these structures and buses re-joined the main carriageway, was shown to negatively impact bus and private vehicle journey times and, more seriously, cause a potential safety issue. The provision of two new bridges to carry pedestrian and cycle traffic was costed and found to be a better value solution within the project design.

2.7. Since the Business Case 0b approval the following scope changes have been approved at the A40 Project Board as a result of feasibility stage investigations:

- To descope of the bus priority on the approach to the Swinford Toll Bridge. It was decided not to proceed with this proposal as the designer's assessment concluded it included significant engineering and land ownership challenges, which meant that the cost would not be likely to justify the benefit.
- The closure of Horsemere Lane, Cassington. At present one way traffic turning left can exit Horsemere Lane to the A40. Following discussion with highways and legal officers it was decided that the closure would enhance the design by removing the need for a junction with the bus lane, in turn reducing through-traffic in Cassington, and a potential conflict with cyclists. It is estimated this will cost £10,000 for the Traffic Regulation Order and works.
- A further study into the bridge constraints. Feasibility discovered that the bridge decks between the parapets at Cassington New Bridge and Cassington Halt Railway Bridge were not wide enough to accommodate the widened carriageway and a shared foot/cycle path. A new study provided designs for two new foot/cycle bridges as these points at a total cost estimate of £4m.

These changes improve the project benefits.

2.8. Public consultation on the P&R and bus lane commenced on the feasibility design on the 1 December 2016, and finished on the 12 January 2017, and feedback from the consultation will inform preliminary design. The consultation report is due to be drafted by mid-February 2017, although comments have already been fed back to the project team to inform design details.

3. Estimated Cost & Proposed Funding Plan

3.1 Cost estimates following Feasibility Stage are as follows:

| | A | B | C = A + B | D | E | F = C + D + E |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|---------------|
| | December 2016 Cost estimate | Risk Allocation¹ | Stage 1 Business Case Baseline | Risk Contingency QRA² | Project Contingency³ | TOTAL |
| Feasibility | 0.292 | | 0.292 | | | 0.292 |
| Preliminary Design | 0.239 | 0.1 | 0.339 | 0.144 | | 0.483 |
| Detailed Design & Planning | 1.696 | 0.4 | 2.096 | 0.575 | | 2.671 |
| Procurement | 0.037 | | 0.037 | | | 0.037 |
| Land & Legal | 3.995 | | 3.995 | | | 3.995 |
| Construction | 18.463 | 2.388 | 20.851 | 3.214 | | 24.065 |
| Project Close & Benefits Realisation | 0.634 | | 0.634 | | 4.023 | 4.657 |
| TOTAL | 25.356 | 2.888 | 28.244 | 3.933 | 4.023 | 36.200 |

Note:

The budget for the three activities in bold are being sought for release to the project to complete detailed design.

¹ Risk Allocation is the December 2016 Risk Register's Quantified Risk Analysis P50 score (£3.933m) to be released by the Project Sponsor and apportioned subjectively across each lifecycle stage.

² Risk Contingency (P80-P50) will be managed by the Service Manager.

³ Project Contingency will be controlled by the Director and S151 Officer.

3.2 The project has just completed the early lifecycle stages and therefore due to the lack of confidence in the construction cost, due of the lack of detail at this stage of the project, there is currently a high contingency proportion allowance of 28%. This is within good practice expectations of in the order of 30%.

3.3 At this stage of the project the contingency is included in the BCR assessment as it incorporates optimism bias which would be expected to be included. Only once there is greater confidence in the construction costs at the end of the design stage would the contingency value be considered for exclusion from any BCR calculations. BC2 will also confirm where contingency is to be funded and where the risk or benefit from project over or underspend will be reside.

3.4 The funding for this project is mostly to come from the Government's Local Growth Fund. This document is attached at Appendix F. In July 2014 the project was awarded a provisional allocation of £35 million dependent upon:

- i. the submission of an acceptable Business Case being submitted to the Department for Transport (this being based upon the 5-case Business Case model approved by HM Treasury and the WebTAG procedures for major transport scheme appraisal); and
- ii. £1.2m matching developer contribution.
- iii. £2.0m investment by bus operators in upgraded vehicles (assumed)
- iv. £1.8m contribution of other projects to overall A40 Strategy.

3.5. The project is a "retained" major scheme meaning that the final decision for releasing the funding will be that of the Department for Transport rather than the County Council, Growth Board or LEP.

3.6. Initial work on developing options for the A40 project and the long term strategy has been funded from the E&E capital budgets. This source will also fund the preliminary and detailed design work following this Stage 1 business case. DfT have agreed that they will split equally the preliminary and detailed designs costs prior to the DfT's final decision in September 2018. However, until this funding agreement is signed there is a need for the County Council to continue to finance the capital costs of the preliminary and detailed design up to the point that the DfT decision is made and LGF funds become available. If the full funding is not made available, the County will need to refund the DfT the design costs. This is a significant but necessary risk to the Authority, if the project is not awarded funding then costs will need to met through the county councils revenue budget.

3.7. OCCs match funding commitment is planned to be provided from held developer funds, a necessary element of the overall budget,

3.8. The £36.2m total budget for the project will comprise the following:

| | |
|---|--------|
| Local Growth Fund Grant | £35 m |
| Developer Contributions (held) ¹ | £1.2 m |

3.9. The project cost plan includes 43% combined risk and contingency at the end of Feasibility stage, which is considered appropriate for a project of this complexity at this stage of the lifecycle.

3.10. The Quantified Risk Analysis of the current risk register estimated a risk budget at P50 of £3,933m.

3.12. The land value cost estimate has been prudently estimated at the upper end of the range and if the value is reduced it may provide funding to implement a junction

¹ W100 (£0.0944m) developer funding held from developments in Witney
ES15 (£0.257m) developer funding held from developments in Eynsham

that supports the A40 bus lane at the southern end of the proposed Loop Farm link road.

3.12. The project intends to the use Midland Highways Alliance Professional Services Partnership 2 framework, to appoint Aecom as the Principal Designer (Senior Supplier).

3.13. Summary of capital budget requirement:

| | <i>Stage 0b</i> £000 | <i>Stage 1</i> £000 |
|---|-------------------------|------------------------|
| A: Cost of feasibility design (previously released at stage 0b) | 500 | 292 |
| B: Estimated cost of preliminary, detailed design, risk, procurement (requested to be released at stage 1) | 2,700 | 3,191 |
| C: Estimated construction cost (to be requested to be committed at stage 2) | 23,000 | 28,694 |
| D: Risk Contingency / Project Contingency | 12,645 | 3,933 / 4,023 |
| Total | 38,845 | 36,200 |

Note: The Risk Contingency of £3,933m is to be released as part of Gateway 1 (£0.719m) and Gateway 2 (£3.214m)

3.14. The estimated annual expenditure profile for the project is as follows:

| Year | Prior Years | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021 onwards | Risk Allocation | Risk Contingency | Project Contingency |
|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|
| £000 | 103 | 193 | 1,911 | 8,147 | 8,247 | 6,170 | 586 | 2,888 | 3,933 | 4,023 |

3.15. Operational Revenue Implications:

The construction of the P&R and bus lane will increase the overall highway asset and maintenance liability, but will also be an opportunity to bring forward planned maintenance into the project's scope and avoid additional delays on the highway network. An accurate whole-life cost forecast has been included as part of the scope for the Detailed Design stage. During the stage there will regular meetings with colleagues in Asset Management to ensure the design and materials are the most appropriate to minimise ongoing maintenance costs and with Network Management to minimise ongoing management costs.

There is the potential for some commercial development on the P&R site and ideally income should be sufficient to fund the on-going maintenance and operational costs of the facility. This is thought unlikely to be achieved though without charging for parking. These commercial opportunities will also seek to attract potential users to

the P&R site to support the bus services. Detailed estimates will be provided in future business cases once commercial opportunities have been refined. However, as a guide for expected operating costs, the accounts for the two P&R sites operated by OCC show that total operating and maintenance costs for 2015/16 were:

| P&R Site | Operating Expenditure | Operating Income | Net Income /Expenditure | Maintenance costs |
|-------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Water Eaton | £254,097 | £154,105 | £99,991 | £10,929 |
| Thornhill | £448,242 | £594,254 | £-146,012 | £18,537 |

It is to be expected that the bus services both using the P&R and the bus lane would operate on a commercial basis without the need for subsidy. This is the case with the current services operating along the A40 corridor.

4 Project Delivery Timetable & Procurement Plan

4.1. Design stage delivery timescales have changed since the previous report due to the decision to combine procurement for the preliminary and detailed design.

4.2. The overall completion date for the project has not changed.

| Activity | Start Date | Finish Date | Milestone/decision point & scheduled technical gateways |
|---|--------------|-------------|---|
| Feasibility design phase | 24/11/15 | 28/02/17 | Achieved |
| Public consultation | 01/12/16 | 19/01/17 | Achieved |
| Stage 1 Business Case to Cabinet | 21/02/17 | 21/02/17 | |
| Procure preliminary and detailed design consultants | 01/01/17 | 06/03/17 | |
| WebTag Business Case | April 2016 | July 2018 | DFT Business Case |
| Planning application consideration | October 2017 | May 2018 | For elements of scope where this is required |
| Preliminary & detailed design | 07/03/17 | 14/04/18 | Gateways 2 & 3 |
| Time Risk | 17/4/2018 | 25/05/2018 | Six weeks' time-risk |
| Procurement of construction contractor | 28/05/18 | 25/08/18 | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--|
| Stage 2 Business Case to Cabinet | September 2018 | September 2018 | |
| Construction Phase | September 2018 | September 2020 | |
| Open to bus operators | October 2020 | n/a | |

5 Risks, Constraints, Dependencies and Exclusions

5.1. At the current time the significant strategic risk for the county council is that it is required to commit its own resources to progress the design with no guarantee that funding will be forthcoming either for reimbursement of sunk costs nor to fund future stages of the project. This risk principally comes from three sources:

- i. The project costs and benefits, which will be submitted as part of the Department for Transport outline business case in April 2017, does not meet their threshold for funding.
- ii. The final project costs, which will only be known once procurement of the main works contractor has provided a target cost, is higher than estimated, weakening the business case or leaving a funding gap which cannot be met.
- iii. The current funding stream, 'Retained' Major Schemes, is closed and the project is not transferred to another fund, if any is created. In this event a paper will be submitted to Cabinet outlining the options available.

5.2. If the project does not receive DfT funding, any development costs incurred will become a revenue expense.

5.3. As well as the financial risk that this could pose, there would be a small reputational risk to the council from the failure to deliver a long desired and needed proposal.

5.4. The principal mitigation against this is the continual visibility of the business case development (using the Treasury 5-case business case model), therefore the design has focused on value-adding interventions within the project's scope to maximise the benefits and minimise the costs to the project. If risks materialise which reduce the strength of business case below the threshold, the project will return to Cabinet to propose how to reduce the county council's cost exposure or propose where to source alternative funds to continue progressing the project.

5.5 A full project risk register is shown at appendix G, The extended project team were invited to a risk workshop where risks were brainstormed by risk category. This provided the risk register with a wide range of risks from across the council. The identified risks will now continue to be managed to reduce the likelihood of occurrence and impact should the risks materialise.

Quantified Risk Assessment

5.6. Quantified Cost Risk Analysis (QCRA) has been completed on the project's risk register for the known risks using the P50 value. In addition to this a Project Contingency has been added that is representative for a project at the end of feasibility. This contingency may form part of the risk budget in construction less any unknown risk incurred during the design stage.

5.7. A Time Risk Assessment has been factored into the project's schedule to enable the project to manage the impact on reportable milestones from those risks within the risk register. The next lifecycle phase is 14 months and will take the project up to completion of detailed design for the 14 April 2018. Although a full programme has not been received from Aecom at this stage, the initial feedback has been that they will make resource available to meet the milestones in 4.2. In addition, the project team will retain 6 weeks' time risk to manage any risks which arise locally. This has been calculated using a

General Risk Management Methodology

5.8. To reduce the chance of risks maturing and therefore potential cost over-run, a robust framework will be implemented:

- On-going Value Engineering to ensure that costs contribute to the achievement of benefits that support the DfT Business Case
- Rigorous record keeping and project documentation to manage change control and prevent scope creep
- Robust risk management, identifying risks and risk owners to ensure that mitigation measures are fully and robustly developed and implemented from the start
- Early engagement of construction contractors in the development of the design with further investigations to eliminate unknowns
- Implementing a robust procurement strategy with a sensible balance of risk to ensure confidence in the out-turn price without incurring excessive contractor's risk allowances.

5.9. The key risks are as follows:

| Key Risk | Actions Planned/Taken | Owner |
|--|---|-----------------|
| DfT funding approval not given. This would mean costs up to £3,191m incurred (£) in development would not be reimbursed by the DfT. The DfT has agreed to fund £986k of the Detailed Design Stage costs. | If this risk increases following the draft Business Case preparation, a paper will be escalated advising of the risks. SDG appointed to lead on DfT Business Case submission, to ensure compliance with quality standards. Atkins appointed for Economic Appraisal Report. Full business case scheduled to be ready by July 2017. | Project Sponsor |

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------|
| Modelling a modal shift from private cars to buses in overestimated, reducing project benefits | Approach to modelling agreed by consultants with OCC officers. This approach will be reviewed and approved by DfT. | Project Sponsor |
| Planning issues delay the completion of the P&R site beyond the opening of the bus lane | Park & Ride and bus lane are complementary. One without the other at opening will reduce the attraction for private car users. | Project Sponsor |
| Construction is required to be accelerated to minimise disruption | Engage with contractor early to ensure traffic management has a minimum impact on delivery | Project Sponsor |
| Additional diversions are required to divert utilities into the verge instead of the carriageway | Early engagement with utility companies to understand requirements and design out the need to relocate. | Project Sponsor |
| Reduced support for scheme due to political changes in Witney | Potential briefing of new MP for Witney who had improved road connectivity as a central part of his election campaign | Director of E&E |

6 Communication & Consultation

6.1. Part of stakeholder management will be achieved through ensuring an effective communication system which will:

- Continue the co-ordinated approach of formal communication channels and procedures for engaging key stakeholders and external partners through stakeholder and public consultation, to ensure a record of all correspondence and effective communication throughout the project period.
- Keep local councillors and Cabinet Members informed on project progress.
- Engage those Oxfordshire County Council officers who are directly involved in the project, as well as provide an opportunity for others across the council to be kept up-to-date on the progress of the project.
- Inform the general public on the progress of the project and the achievement of key milestones, including the use of press releases and the website.
- Establish a reporting mechanism/template, using DfT guidance (when available) to communicate the progress, expenditure and monitoring of the project to the DfT on an annual basis.
- Create a project brand to be used consistently on all communication material to enhance awareness and recognition of the project.

6.2. A public consultation on the initial design of both the P&R and A40 bus lane started in early December and will run until January. The results from this are attached below. Prior engagement with key stakeholders in the development of the designs also took place, with workshops also held in Aug-Sep 16.

7 Programme/ Project Governance

7.1. This project will be run in accordance with the methodology specified within the Association for Project Management tailored to meet the corporate governance and decision making processes of Oxfordshire County Council. The governance of the project will be overseen by Oxfordshire County Council's Capital and Asset Programme Board (CAPB).

7.2. The management and quality control of the project comes through a system of 6 Gateway checks in the lifecycle (project initiation, feasibility, preliminary design, final design, procurement and construction) and a 4-stage approval process for the developing business case (Concept Development/Commit to Investigate, Project Development/Commit to Invest, Project Delivery/Commit to Spend, and Project Closure/Client Acceptance).

7.3. The final control for approval of funding has been retained by the Department for Transport. This requires that the project produces a full WebTAG compliant 5-stage business case before funding is released.

7.4. A design team has been secured, and will be appointed with resources made available as programmed. The main critical path relates to the DfT business case approval process. The outline project structure is in Appendix I.

7.5. The core Project team will comprise of:

- Senior Responsible Owner (SRO): Paul Fermer, Service Manager – Major Infrastructure Development
- Project Sponsor: Isaac Webb
- Project Manager: Mark Hopping
- Project Assurance: Will be managed by the Gateway Process
- Locality Officer: Odele Payne
- Senior Supplier (Design): The design services will be provided by Aecom through Oxfordshire County Council's Midland Highways Alliance framework
- Senior Supplier (Construction): The Senior Supplier for construction will be appointed in summer 2018

7.6. The extended Project team has coordinated includes the following key internal stakeholders to provide input into the design.

- Dariusz Seroczynski, Network Management
- Anthony Kirkwood, Road Safety
- Tim Atkinson, Traffic Signals
- Charlie Benner, Asset Management - Structures
- David Taylor, Senior Transport Planner
- Hugh Coddington, Archaeology

- Hugh Potter, Countryside Records Manager
- Tamsin Atley - Environment
- Victoria Fletcher, Environment
- Dan Weeks, Rights of Way
- Paul Harris, Transport Planner
- David Early, Transport Planner
- Nick Mottram - Environment
- David Periam - Planning
- Robert Freshwater – Locality Strategy
- James Dance, Asset Management - Highways
- Jeremy Hollard, Contracts
- James Blockley, Countryside Access
- Laura Grant
- David Bullock, Asset Management
- Gordon Hunt, Asset Management - Drainage
- Nigel Cunning, Property

8 Supporting Documents

Appendix A - Consultation Report



2017 02 21 -
CABINET - A40 P&R E

Appendix B - Detailed scheme list

Not applicable as project will be delivered in a single tranche.

Appendix C - Service & Equalities Impact Assessment

[X:\Major Infrastructure Delivery \(MID\)\2. Scheme Implementation file Shortcuts\A40 Science Transit 2\Project Management\PMP\Governance\A40 ST2 - Service Community Impact Assessments \(SCIA\) for BC1 161216.docx](X:\Major Infrastructure Delivery (MID)\2. Scheme Implementation file Shortcuts\A40 Science Transit 2\Project Management\PMP\Governance\A40 ST2 - Service Community Impact Assessments (SCIA) for BC1 161216.docx)

Appendix D - The Updated Cost Model

<P:\4. Improvement Schemes\YY- Major Project Cost Forecasting tool\Cost Forecaster A40 SCIENCE TRANSIT.xlsm>

Appendix E - Resource Appraisal

<P:\4. Improvement Schemes\YY- Major Project Cost Forecasting tool\Cost Forecaster A40 SCIENCE TRANSIT.xlsm>

Appendix F - External Funding Confirmations



27_Oxfordshire_Gro
wth_Deal.pdf

Appendix G - Project Risk Register

[..\Risk\COPY of MID Risk Register April 16 A40 161215.xls](#)

Appendix H - Communication Plan



2016.12
Communications Plan.

Appendix I - Project Governance Framework

