M54 to M6 Link Road

TR010054

Volume 6

6.3 Environmental Statement Appendices

Appendix 4.3 Screening for Major Accidents and Disasters

Regulation 5(2)(a)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

January 2020

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

M54 to M6 Link Road

Development Consent Order 202[ ]

6.3 Environmental Statement Appendices

Appendix 4.3 Screening for Major Accidents and Disasters

Regulation Number	Regulation 5(2)(a)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010054
Application Document Reference	6.3
Author	M54 to M6 Link Road Project Team and Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
1	January 2020	DCO application

Table of contents

List of Tables

1. Appendix 4.3 Screening of Major Accidents and Disasters

1.1 Background

1.1.1 Assessment 5(4) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017 (amended 2018) (the EIA Regulations) stipulates that the "*expected significant effects arising from the vulnerability of a proposed development to major accidents or disasters that are relevant to that development*" are to be identified and assessed as part of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

1.1.2 Schedule 4(8) of the EIA Regulations also require that the Environmental Statement (ES) include:

"A description of the expected significant adverse effects of the development on the environment deriving from the vulnerability of the development to risks of major accidents and/or disasters which are relevant to the project concerned. …Where appropriate, this description should include measures envisaged to prevent or mitigate the significant adverse effects of such events on the environment and details of the preparedness for and proposed response to such emergencies".

1.1.3 It is considered likely that the original changes to the EIA Directive (Ref 1) that introduced the requirement to consider major accidents and disasters were made in order to bring certain other statutory requirements, mainly other EU Directives, within the overall 'wrapper' of EIA and the ES. This is implied both in the Directive itself and the domestic Regulations, which cite two specific Directives as examples of risk assessments to be brought within EIA; these are Directive 2012/18/EU of the European Parliament and of the European Council (the 'Seveso III Directive') which deals with major accident hazard registered sites - enacted in the UK by the Control of Major Accident Hazards Regulations (2015) and Council Directive 09/71/Euratom, which deals with nuclear sites. Neither of these Directives is relevant to the Scheme.

1.1.4 The identification of likely significant effects associated with major accidents and disasters enables projects to be developed in a manner that provides protection of the environment, for example by making allowances in the design of developments to build resilience to the effects of a flood event arising from future climate change.

1.2 Highways England guidance

1.2.1 The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) (Ref 2) provides guidance for the consideration of major accidents and disasters (hereafter referred to as 'major events'.

1.2.2 It states that assessments need to consider the vulnerability of a project to risks of major events, and any consequential changes in the predicted effects of that project on environmental factors.

1.3 Scope of the assessment

1.3.1 The scope of the major events assessment was presented within the EIA Scoping Report (Ref 3). The approach proposed acknowledged the potential for the topic of major events to be scoped out of the EIA, prior to publication of the ES. This was because the design development process would continue post-scoping to ensure that no genuine risk or serious possibility remains of an event interacting with the Scheme.

1.3.2 The Inspectorate provided their formal Scoping Opinion on 21 February 2019 (refer to Appendix 4.1 [TR010054/APP/6.3]) which stated:

"The ES should include a description and assessment (where relevant) of the likely significant effects resulting from accidents and disasters applicable to the Proposed Development. […] The description and assessment should consider the vulnerability of the Proposed Development to a potential accident or disaster, but the Inspectorate also advises it should also consider the Proposed Development's potential to cause an accident or disaster "

1.3.3 The Scoping Opinion noted that other EU legislation could be used to identify relevant information and to inform risk-based assessments, where appropriate. Additionally, the Inspectorate noted that any measures envisaged to prevent or mitigate significant adverse effects on the environment arising from major events should be described in the assessment, and information included on the preparedness for (and response to) such emergencies.

1.3.4 In order to frame the assessment scope, a major event has been defined as an acute or chronic accident or disaster, of human or natural origin, which occurs either as a consequence of, or which interacts with, the construction or operation of the Scheme, and which has substantial consequences for people or the environment.

1.3.5 This definition does not distinguish between a major accident and a major disaster as substantial overlap exists, but does recognise that an accident is necessarily of human origin, whereas a disaster can be of human or natural origin.

1.3.6 Scoping concluded that the Scheme can be a: source of major events, for example if a bridge forming an integral component of the Scheme were to fail and collapse; and a receptor of major events, for example if a major flood event occurred which inundated the carriageway of the Scheme.

1.4 Assessment

1.4.1 The major events assessment methodology adopted includes the following four stages:

- **Stage 1 – Long List:** generation of a long list of possible major events. This has been compiled from the following data sources:
  - The UK Government's Risk Register of Civil Emergencies (2017) (Ref 4).
  - Information provided by the Inspectorate and statutory and non-statutory bodies within the EIA Scoping Opinion.

  - Professional judgement based on the form and nature of the Scheme and knowledge regarding the surrounding environment.
  - Review of the Scheme risk register and the design hazard assessment log.
- **Stage 2 – Screening:** screening of the long list of major events to determine those events that are relevant to the Scheme, or where the Scheme may have a realistic sensitivity to a particular event. Any major events that could not realistically occur, due to the type of development and the characteristics of the Scheme geographic location were omitted from the assessment at this stage.
- **Stage 3 – Scoping:** a scoping exercise was then undertaken to review the remaining relevant major events to see whether they require further evaluation or design mitigation (scoped in) or whether they would be appropriately mitigated/ managed such that consequential environmental effects would be insignificant (scoped out). Justification for scoping each major event in or out is reported herein. Where this exercise is unable to adequately justify the scoping out of a particular major event, such an event has been included on the Scheme-specific shortlist and taken through to Stage 4 (as applicable).
- **Stage 4 – Assessment:** where any major events cannot be scoped out at Stage 3, and where further design mitigation is unable to remove the potential for the major event to have potential significant environmental effects, the relevant ES chapters identify the potential consequences for receptors and give a qualitative evaluation of the potential significance of effects as a result of the major event.

Stage 1: Long List

1.4.2 A long list of major events was compiled, based on the following types of disaster and accident (refer to Table 1):

- Geological disasters
- Hydrological disasters
- Meteorological disasters
- Space disasters
- Transport accidents and disasters
- Engineering accidents and failures
- Industrial accidents
- Terrorism, crime and civil unrest
- War
- Disease

Stage 2: Screening

1.4.3 The screening review of the collated long list of major events indicated that a number of accidents and disasters have little or no applicability in the UK, for example famine and volcanic eruptions (see Table 1) and thus could be screened out of the assessment.

1.4.4 The screening review also indicated that a number of the events contained in the long list are already covered by other legislative or design requirements, which offer legal protection and provide minimum design standards and operational requirements, examples of which include:

- Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 (Ref 5)
- The Workplace (Health, Safety and Welfare) Regulations 1992 (Ref 6)
- The Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999 (Ref 7)
- Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015 (Ref 8)
- Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (Ref 9)
- Interim Advice Note 191/16 Safety Governance for Highways England (Ref 10)

1.4.5 The screening review also identified that it would be reasonable and proportionate to scope out construction workers, and similar operatives undertaking future maintenance activities on the Scheme, as a specific receptor in the assessment. This was on the grounds that worker health and wellbeing in the workplace would be safeguarded through existing legal protection through the above legislation, which would minimise the risk from major events to an acceptable level.

1.4.6 Table 1 outlines which major events are considered to be relevant to the Scheme.

Stage 3: Scoping

1.4.7 During Stage 3 scoping the methodology aims to categorise relevant major events into one of the following two types (refer to Table 1), based on its relationship to the Scheme:

- Type 1: events that could realistically occur, but for which the Scheme and its associated environmental resources and receptors are no more vulnerable than any other development type.
- Type 2: events that could occur, and to which the Scheme is particularly vulnerable, or which the construction and operation of the Scheme has a particular capacity to exacerbate.

1.4.8 Details are provided in Table 1 regarding design measures that have been included in the Scheme design to mitigate/manage effects associated with such potential major events, and/ or measures that would be included within applicable construction and/or operational phase management plans (noting that some actions may be legal requirements). By taking into account these measures, decisions can be made as to whether the major event requires further consideration (i.e. scoped in for Stage 4 assessment) or whether actions are adequate to avoid potential significant environmental effects.

1.4.9 The analysis provided in Table 1 indicates that no major events need to be taken forward to Stage 4 assessment, given that all major events that could realistically occur are either:

- Already mitigated as far as reasonably practicable, or
- The Scheme would be no more vulnerable than the existing adjacent road.

1.4.10 Nevertheless, Table 1 indicates that a number of major events are considered within some of the technical assessments presented within this Environmental Statement e.g. flood risks are considered in Chapter 13: Road Drainage and Water Environment [TR010054/APP/6.1].

Table 1: Major accidents and emergencies screening and scoping

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3			Stage 4	Location of assessment within Environmental Statement
Type of Event	**Relevant to Scheme**	**Type 1 or 2**	**Relevant Receptors**	**Mitigation and/ or management actions**	**Requires assessment?**	
Geological and ground related disasters						
Avalanches	No - Avalanches not relevant in context of Scheme.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Landslides	Yes	2	• Water resources and ecological receptors • Nearby properties • People, drivers and workers	This is considered by the geotechnical team as a fundamental part of the Scheme design. Appropriate design of the Scheme to applicable standards means that receptors would not be of greater risk as a result of the Scheme.	No	n/a
Earthquakes	No - The Scheme is not located in a geologically active area.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Sinkholes	Yes	2	• Water resources and ecological receptors • Nearby properties • People, drivers and workers	Considered by geotechnical team as a fundamental part of the Scheme design. Appropriate design of the Scheme to applicable standards means that receptors would not be of greater risk as a result of the Scheme. The nature of the geology beneath the Scheme is such that sinkholes are unlikely to occur.	No	n/a

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3			Stage 4	Location of assessment within Environmental Statement
Type of Event	**Relevant to Scheme**	**Type 1 or 2**	**Relevant Receptors**	**Mitigation and/ or management actions**	**Requires assessment?**	
Ground stability	Yes	2	• Aquatic environment and ecological receptors • Nearby properties • People, drivers and workers	Considered by geotechnical team as a fundamental part of the Scheme design. Appropriate design of the Scheme to applicable standards means that receptors would not be at greater risk as a result of the Scheme.	No	n/a
Volcanic eruption	No - The Scheme is not located in the vicinity of a volcano. Highly unlikely that a volcanic eruption or ash cloud could significantly impact on any aspect of the Scheme.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Landfill accidents (gas, migration, leachate leakage, asbestos)	Yes	2	• Aquatic environment and ecological receptors • Nearby properties • People, drivers and workers	There are two historic landfills within the study area, however these are not within the Scheme boundary. Through the appropriate design of the Scheme and the adoption of the construction methods as detailed in the Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) ([TR010054/APP/6.11]), potential effects associated with gas migration, leachate leakage and asbestos would be	No	n/a

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3			Stage 4	Location of assessment within Environmental Statement
Type of Event	**Relevant to Scheme**	**Type 1 or 2**	**Relevant Receptors**	**Mitigation and/ or management actions**	**Requires assessment?**	
				appropriately managed such that significant effects would be avoided (noted that some actions are needed for legal compliance). The measures detailed within the OEMP would be developed into a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) by the selected construction contractor which would be implemented for the duration of the Scheme construction phase.		
Hydrological disasters						
Groundwater Contamination events within SPZs	No - The Scheme is not within a Source Protection Zone.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Limnic eruptions	No - Not applicable given that there are no deep-water lakes near to the Scheme.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Flooding	Yes	2	• Aquatic environment and ecological receptors • Nearby properties • People, drivers and workers	The Scheme would cross an area of flood risk south of M6 Junction 11 adjacent to Latherford Brook. The Scheme drainage design includes an allowance for the effects of climate change, with attenuation provided for up to and including 100 years plus 40% climate change allowance, through sustainable urban drainage	Yes	Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment Appendix 13.1 [TR010054/APP/6.3] Chapter 14: Climate

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3			Stage 4	Location of assessment within Environmental Statement
Type of Event	**Relevant to Scheme**	**Type 1 or 2**	**Relevant Receptors**	**Mitigation and/ or management actions**	**Requires assessment?**	
				system (SuDs). The assessment of flood risk takes into account an allowance for climate change (+50%). It is considered that these measures would appropriately manage potential flood risks associated with the Scheme.		
Tsunami/ storm surge	No - Not applicable, given that the Scheme is not located in a coastal location.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Meteorological disasters						
Blizzard	Yes	1	People, drivers and workers	Could cause road users to be trapped on the road. Risk is no different from any other road/road users in the UK and specific measures not considered to be required for the Scheme.	No	n/a
Cyclonic storm	Yes	1	People, drivers and workers	Major storms are a risk for any location in the UK. Risk is no different from any other road/road users in the UK and specific measures not considered to be required for the Scheme.	No	n/a
Drought	Yes	1	• Aquatic environment and ecological receptors	Scheme not considered to be vulnerable to drought. Risk is no different from any other road/road users in the UK and specific measures not considered to be required for the Scheme.	No	n/a

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3			Stage 4	Location of assessment within Environmental Statement
Type of Event	**Relevant to Scheme**	**Type 1 or 2**	**Relevant Receptors**	**Mitigation and/ or management actions**	**Requires assessment?**	
			• People, drivers and workers			
Thunderstorm	Yes	1	• People, drivers and workers	New bridges and structures would be elevated and as such at risk from lightning strikes. However, the risks are no different from any other road/ road users in the UK.	No	n/a
Hailstorm	Yes	1	• People, drivers and workers	Scheme not considered vulnerable to hailstorms. Risk is no different from any other road/ road users in the UK and specific measures not considered to be required for the Scheme.	No	n/a
Heat wave	Yes	1	• Aquatic environment and ecological receptors • People, drivers and workers	Scheme no more vulnerable to heat wave conditions than any other road. Tunnels are also not proposed, so no consideration of sensitivity of tunnels to heatwave conditions is required.	No	n/a
Tornado	Yes	1	• Aquatic environment and ecological receptors • Nearby properties • People, drivers and workers	Risk is no different from any other road/road users in the UK and specific measures not considered to be required for the Scheme.	No	n/a
Wildfire	Yes	1	• Aquatic environment and	The Scheme is not surrounded by significant areas of scrub, grassland or	No	n/a

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3			Stage 4	Location of assessment within Environmental Statement
Type of Event	**Relevant to Scheme**	**Type 1 or 2**	**Relevant Receptors**	**Mitigation and/ or management actions**	**Requires assessment?**	
			ecological receptors • Nearby properties • People, drivers and workers	heather. Risk is no greater than for the existing road and specific measures are not considered to be required for the Scheme. It is anticipated that the reduced car accident rate would reduce the risk of an accident causing a fire.		
Air quality event	Yes	2	• Aquatic environment and ecological receptors • People, drivers and workers	Vehicle emissions can contribute to poor air quality. It is not considered necessary to undertake any more assessment than is already included in the assessment provided in Chapter 5: Air Quality [TR010022/APP/6.1].	No	Chapter 5: Air quality
Space disasters						
Impact events and airburst	Yes	1	-	The Scheme is not considered to be any more vulnerable than any existing road.	No	n/a
Solar flare	Yes	1	Road users	Solar flares can interrupt radio and other electronic communications. Significant communication and electronic systems are not proposed as part of the Scheme. Therefore, the Scheme is at no more risk than the existing road.	No	n/a
Transport accidents/ disasters						
Road accident	Yes	2	• Aquatic environment and ecological receptors	The assessment of Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Chapter 13 of the ES [TR010022/APP/6.1]) has included consideration for major road traffic	No	Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3			Stage 4	Location of assessment within Environmental Statement
Type of Event	**Relevant to Scheme**	**Type 1 or 2**	**Relevant Receptors**	**Mitigation and/ or management actions**	**Requires assessment?**	
			• People, drivers and workers	accidents and associated spillages. The road is not considered to be at a higher risk of accidents or spillages than any existing road.		
Rail accident	No	-	• Aquatic environment and ecological receptors • People, drivers and workers	The Scheme is not located in the vicinity of a railway line.	No	n/a
Aircraft disaster	No	-	-	There are no RAF bases or airports in the vicinity of the Scheme. Risk is no different from any other road/road users in the UK and specific measures not considered to be required for the Scheme.	No	n/a
Maritime disaster	No - The Scheme is not located in an area susceptible to maritime disasters.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Engineering accidents/ failures						
Bridge failure	Yes	2	• Aquatic environment and ecological receptors	New bridges would be required at each junction, Hilton Lane and for an accommodation bridge east of Brookfield Farm. Appropriate bridge design to current design standards is a fundamental component of the Scheme design. No	No	n/a

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3			Stage 4	Location of assessment within Environmental Statement
Type of Event	**Relevant to Scheme**	**Type 1 or 2**	**Relevant Receptors**	**Mitigation and/ or management actions**	**Requires assessment?**	
			• People, drivers and workers	further mitigation requirements are considered to be needed.		
Property or bridge demolition accident	Yes	2	People, drivers and workers	The Scheme would involve the demolition of two bridges at M6 Junction 11. The works at Junction 11 would also require the demolition of a stable/ storage building to the west of the junction. No other demolitions are anticipated to be required to construct the Scheme. Risks during demolition have been taken into account with advice from Highway England's appointed buildability advisors (considered as part of design hazard assessment). Asbestos surveys would be carried out prior to demolition activities, whilst the works would need to be undertaken in accordance with legislative requirements and an Asbestos Management Plan (part of the CEMP – refer to the OEMP [TR010054/APP/6.11]).	No	n/a
Tunnel failure/ fire	No - There are no tunnels in the vicinity of the Scheme and tunnels do not form part of the Scheme.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3			Stage 4	Location of assessment within Environmental Statement
Type of Event	**Relevant to Scheme**	**Type 1 or 2**	**Relevant Receptors**	**Mitigation and/ or management actions**	**Requires assessment?**	
Dam failure	No – no dams are located in proximity to the Scheme.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Flood defence failure	No – no flood defences are located in proximity to the Scheme.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mast and tower collapse	No - no masts or towers are proposed as part of the Scheme, and no such infrastructure currently exists within a 'topple' distance from the Scheme.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Building failure or fire	Yes	1	People, drivers and workers	Buildings in close proximity of the Scheme are low-rise and predominantly residential. Notwithstanding this, the risk of fires affecting the Scheme is no greater than risks for existing highways.	No	n/a
Utilities failure	Yes	2	People, drivers and workers	Numerous utilities are located in the vicinity of the Scheme, which are the responsibility of relevant utility companies. Utilities diversion are outlined	No	Chapter 2: The Scheme and technical discipline chapters, Chapter 5

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3			Stage 4	Location of assessment within Environmental Statement
Type of Event	**Relevant to Scheme**	**Type 1 or 2**	**Relevant Receptors**	**Mitigation and/ or management actions**	**Requires assessment?**	
				in Chapter 2: The Scheme [TR010022/APP/6.1]. Environmental impacts associated with utilities diversion works are considered as part of the overall assessment of the Scheme. The potential for construction related incidents is covered by safe working practices and CDM regulations.		to 15 of the ES [TR010054/APP/6.1].
Industrial accidents						
Defence industry and unexploded ordnance (UXO) risk	Yes	2	Aquatic environment and ecological receptors People, drivers and workers	A Detailed Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) shows that the M54 carriageway west of Junction 1 is classified as having a very high risk of encountering UXO's due to its close proximity to a historic Royal Ordnance Factory (ROF). Records indicate that the now abandoned ROF near Featherstone was used as a filling factory for munitions of bombs, shells and cartridges. Investigations have been completed in this area, although there is limited work required in this location. The remainder of the Scheme is classified as a low UXO risk.	No	Appendix 9.1 Ground Investigation Report [TR010054/APP/6.3]
Energy industry (fossil fuel)	Yes	2	Aquatic environment and ecological receptors People, drivers and workers	The risk of ground contamination resulting from Scheme has been assessed as part of the geotechnical investigations and hydrological studies undertaken to inform	No	Chapter 9: Geology and Soils, Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3			Stage 4	Location of assessment within Environmental Statement
Type of Event	**Relevant to Scheme**	**Type 1 or 2**	**Relevant Receptors**	**Mitigation and/ or management actions**	**Requires assessment?**	
				the design and Environmental Impact Assessment.		Water Environment [TR010022/APP/6.1]
Nuclear power	No - No facilities nearby, whilst the Scheme is at no more risk than the existing road. No further mitigation requirements are considered to be needed.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Oil and gas refinery	No - No facilities nearby, whilst the Scheme is at no more risk than the existing road. No further mitigation requirements are considered to be needed.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Food industry	No - No facilities nearby, whilst the Scheme is at no more risk than the existing road. No further mitigation	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3			Stage 4	Location of assessment within Environmental Statement
Type of Event	**Relevant to Scheme**	**Type 1 or 2**	**Relevant Receptors**	**Mitigation and/ or management actions**	**Requires assessment?**	
	requirements are considered to be needed.					
Chemical industry	No - No facilities nearby, whilst the Scheme is at no more risk than the existing road. No further mitigation requirements are considered to be needed.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Manufacturing industry	No - No facilities nearby, whilst the Scheme is at no more risk than the existing road. No further mitigation requirements are considered to be needed.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mining and quarrying industry	Yes	2	People, drivers and workers	Quarrying operations are currently active outside of the Scheme boundary which have been considered as part of the EIA. Geotechnical investigations undertaken as part of the design development and Environmental Impact Assessment	No	Chapter 9: Geology and Soils

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3			Stage 4	Location of assessment within Environmental Statement
Type of Event	**Relevant to Scheme**	**Type 1 or 2**	**Relevant Receptors**	**Mitigation and/ or management actions**	**Requires assessment?**	
				processes have considered historic mining activity within the vicinity of the Scheme.		
Crime/ war/ civil unrest						
Bomb/ vehicle attack on people	Yes - There are no tunnels or features that would make the Scheme more of a terrorist attack target than the existing road. No further mitigation requirements are considered to be needed.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Bomb/ vehicle attack on infrastructure	Yes - There are no tunnels or features that would make the Scheme more of a terrorist attack target than the existing road. No further mitigation requirements are considered to be needed.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3			Stage 4	Location of assessment within Environmental Statement
Type of Event	**Relevant to Scheme**	**Type 1 or 2**	**Relevant Receptors**	**Mitigation and/ or management actions**	**Requires assessment?**	
Mass shooting	No - The Scheme is unlikely to be more of a target than the existing road to this type of incident due to low number if exposed targets. No further mitigation requirements are considered to be needed.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Chemical/ gas attack	No - The Scheme is unlikely to be more of a target than the existing road to this type of incident due to low number of exposed targets. No further mitigation requirements are considered to be needed.	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Rioting	No - The Scheme is unlikely to be more of a target	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3			Stage 4	Location of assessment within Environmental Statement
Type of Event	**Relevant to Scheme**	**Type 1 or 2**	**Relevant Receptors**	**Mitigation and/ or management actions**	**Requires assessment?**	
	than the existing road to this type of incident. No further mitigation requirements are considered to be needed.					
Cyber attack	Yes	2	People, drivers and workers	No significant roadside technology is proposed, and as such the Scheme would be no more vulnerable than the existing road. Highways England is accountable to the Secretary of State for Transport for ensuring the resilience of their strategic road network to national security risks, including from terrorism, cyberattack, natural hazards and other risks outlined in the National Risk Assessment.	No	n/a

1.5 References

Ref 1 EU Directive 2014/52/EU

Ref 2 Highways England (2019) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring.

Ref 3 Highways England (2019) M54 to M6/M6 Toll Link Road PCF Stage 3 EIA Scoping Report. Available online at: https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR010054/TR010054-000025-54M6-Scoping%20Report.pdf

Ref 4 Cabinet Office (2017) National Risk Register of Civil Emergencies. Available online at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/644968/UK_National_Risk_Register_2017.pdf

Ref 5 HMSO (1974) Health and Safety at work etc. Act 1974.

Ref 6 HMSO (1992) The Workplace (Health, Safety and Welfare) Regulations 1992.

Ref 7 HMSO (1999) Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999

Ref 8 HMSO (2015) Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015

Ref 9 Highways England (1993 to date2019) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11. Available online at: http://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/ha/standards/dmrb/vol11/index.htm

Ref 10 Highways England (2016) Interim Advice Note 191/16: Safety Governance for Highways England.