

9 Risks and Responses

There are risks associated with any project of the scale of that proposed for the City Centre section flood protection improvements. The risks known at this stage are identified below along with responses to address these.

9.1 Planning Consents

There is a risk that the consents and designation required under the RMA are not approved by the delegated hearings panel. This may necessitate extra expense and time for an appeal to the Environment Court. If unsuccessful at appeal the project would be unable to proceed on the basis it is promulgated.

There is also a potential risk of conditions applied to a consent being untenable or directing a change in the scope of the work. This may necessitate changes to budgets or the on-going management of the project area for example.

To mitigate these planning approval risks, the project design (including development of an integrated project master plan as set out in section 8 Governance) is proposed to be developed in collaboration with stakeholders. It is also proposed that the technical inputs to the project will be provided by experts and that this will set a high quality platform for applications to the consent authorities.

9.2 Land Acquisition

There is land to be acquired to undertake the flood protection project. The process of land being acquired is guided by statute. Although a relatively linear process, there is risk that land required is delayed in its acquisition and this changes the project deliverables programme.

There is also the risk of the process becoming protracted which may adversely impact on the affected landowners and impact on GWRC's reputation.

The mitigation measure for the land acquisition risk is to remain in clear communications with affected landowners so that the risk of misunderstandings does not contribute to the issue. It will also be important that processes of the Public Works Act are followed as this in itself provides clarity as to the steps and support for landowners affected.

9.3 Integration with Other Agencies

As noted previously there are opportunities and, to some extent, expectations from HCC about the benefits of integrating Making Places with the flood protection works. These are reasonable expectations. However, there is the risk that the practicalities of project integration cannot be realised due to incompatibility between flood protection standards and the public amenity benefits sought by HCC. There is also the risk that even if the public benefits of both projects can be interwoven, that HCC does not commit to funding an appropriate and fair share of these costs.

The mitigation to this risk will be the process advocated in section 8 Governance whereby a nine month process seeks to establish the potential for an integrated project and seeks confirmation of the support for this from constituent agencies.

9.4 Construction Impacts

There will always be effects from construction of the scale proposed with the project. The process construction can generate issues in terms of noise, vibration and other disturbances. These are relatively well known effects given the work undertaken recently in the Boulcott area. The mitigation will be to apply the learnings from the recent Boulcott works and ensure that management plans and community liaison for the effects are in place prior to construction.

9.5 Costs and Programme

There is a risk that the costs of the project change from that budgeted or that the programme changes due to unforeseen issues. The proposal to undertake a master plan process will already extend the programme by some nine months. This may also generate changes to costs. The longer the project is delayed the greater the risk of a flood that will cause significant damage to the Hutt area. A mitigation to the costs and programme changes will be to undertake the master plan so that the costs of an integrated project are known. This will establish a clear basis for the work.

If this master plan is unable to be agreed by all the agencies, the work that is done will not have all been wasted as some will remain relevant to the flood protection works. Good project management will also address risks of costs and programme changes.

9.6 Personnel Changes

A project which has a long delivery time (some 10 years as proposed) has the risk that the people that start the process from all the agencies or parties involved will move on. There is a risk that with people changing that the understanding of the project is lost to some extent, or that key messages lose their clarity. The mitigation to this risk is to ensure that senior people involved in the project have intermediate level people working with them to ensure some continuity as far as possible. It is also important that communications and decisions are well recorded so new people can easily access the knowledge and understanding generated to that point.

9.7 Reputation

As a large scale public project it is inevitable that issues will arise. The risk is that those issues escalate to generate damage to GWRC or other agency reputation with stakeholders and the public. The mitigation to this risk is to ensure that the

communications with stakeholders remain open regardless of the issues encountered. Public information and communication is also required. On all levels the communications should be expedient, contextual and clear. A communications plan will be developed at the outset of the project to ensure that the appropriate basis for communications are in place.

9.8 Local Government

There are likely to be changes to local government in the Wellington region within the time frame of the project. The nature of those changes is not clear at this time. The risk is that with change in government that there is slippage in decision making or the commitments that affect the project delivery.

The mitigation to this risk is that the Project Steering Group remains as a conduit to whichever form of local government results and that, preferably with whatever structure ensues, that the relevant technical officer input is maintained. It will also mitigate the risk if there is an expedient process to determine the concept for the project and the requisite decisions are also expediently made so changes in government occur after the project is underway.

10 Concluding Actions

The summary actions that are proposed from the Scoping Report are set out in the table to the right. The actions are relatively simplistic, but aim to guide the immediate period from the conclusion of this Scoping Report towards activating a design process that examines and defines the nature of an integrated project design for the subject area. A more detailed project plan will need to be developed for this process as noted.

	SUMMARY ACTION	WHO	WHEN
A.	Hutt Valley Flood Management Subcommittee to accept the Scoping Report and endorse the actions	HVFMS	June 2013
B.	Report from HVFMS to HCC and GWRC recommending the approach proposed in Scoping Report of establishing a Project Definition phase in the project programme	HVFMS and GWRC (FP)	To GWRC and HCC agendas June/July 2013
C.	Assuming adoption by GWRC and HCC, then GWRC (FP) to develop a project plan including brief for design team, programme, key meeting dates, engagement plan, contact points and make up of Project Steering Group etc, and agree project plan with stakeholders and HVFMS	GWRC (FP) and HCC, NZTA	July
D.	Commission design team to prepare Project Concept Plan and commence work accordingly to project plan	GWRC (FP), HVFMS, Design Team and Project Steering Group	July – March 2014
E.	Report Project Concept Plan outcome to HVFMS and report HVFMS recommendations to HCC, GWRC and NZTA to confirm basis for on-going implementation or reverting to flood protection project	GWRC (FP) and HCC, NZTA, Design Team and Project Steering Group	March – June 2014
F.	Commence developed design and planning on basis of the above outcome	Dependant on action E	July 2014