

---

## Contents

---

<b>Introduction</b> . . . . .	xi
<b>Chapter 1. The Uncertain Environment of Project Planning and Production Process</b> . . . . .	1
1.1. A risk society? . . . . .	1
1.2. Globalization and uncertainty . . . . .	3
1.3. The recent economic and financial crisis context. . . . .	4
1.3.1. Crisis and mobility practices . . . . .	4
1.3.2. A wait-and-see demand from households. . . . .	4
1.3.3. The volatility of business locations . . . . .	5
1.3.4. The impact of the crisis on the phasing of infrastructure projects . . . . .	6
1.3.5. Phasing and flexibility of urban projects . . . . .	7
1.3.6. For more flexibility, the project can precede the plan . . . . .	7
1.3.7. The use of private financing by public–private partnerships . . . . .	8
1.4. Environmental uncertainty . . . . .	16
1.5. The need for stakeholders in the decision-making process to have access to unlimited information. . . . .	17
1.6. The difficulty of making reliable forecasts for planning development projects . . . . .	22
1.7. Multi-scalar and multi-objective planning. . . . .	23
1.8. Participatory decision-making process and unpredictability . . . . .	25
1.9. The social, environmental, and economic performance of the companies that carry out the projects . . . . .	26
1.10. Conclusion . . . . .	27

<b>Chapter 2. How Can We Define Uncertainties and Risks?</b>	
<b>Risk from a Theoretical Point of View</b> . . . . .	29
2.1. Risks, uncertainties, hazards: disciplinary definitions . . . . .	29
2.1.1. The notions of risk, hazard, and vulnerability in geography. . . . .	29
2.1.2. The notions of risk, uncertainty, and hazard in project management . . . . .	31
2.1.3. The notions of risk and uncertainty in economics . . . . .	34
2.1.4. How does the public or private project owner use the concepts of risk and uncertainty? . . . . .	35
2.2. Territorialized risks . . . . .	35
2.3. Risk chains in time and space . . . . .	36
2.4. “Expert” risk and perceived risk . . . . .	37
2.5. Risk and opportunity . . . . .	38
2.6. Uncertainties, risks, and opportunities external to the project . . . . .	39
2.6.1. Characteristics of events that may impact a project or its social, natural, or economic environment (according to experts) . . . . .	40
2.6.2. Political risk and opportunity . . . . .	41
2.6.3. Risk and social opportunities . . . . .	42
2.6.4. The risk and opportunity related to the choices and behaviors of residents and the economic environment . . . . .	44
2.6.5. Risk and regulatory opportunity . . . . .	45
2.6.6. Archeological risk and heritage opportunity . . . . .	45
2.6.7. Environmental risk . . . . .	46
2.6.8. Technological risk . . . . .	47
2.6.9. Natural risk . . . . .	48
2.6.10. Market risk . . . . .	49
2.6.11. The risk of force majeure . . . . .	49
2.7. Internal project risks . . . . .	50
2.7.1. Construction risk . . . . .	50
2.7.2. The risk of delay . . . . .	50
2.7.3. Financial risk . . . . .	51
2.7.4. Commercial risk . . . . .	52
2.8. Conclusion . . . . .	52
<b>Chapter 3. Diachronic Approach to Taking Risks and Uncertainties into Account in Planning, Consultation, Evaluation, Financing, and Project Implementation Practices</b> . . . . .	55
3.1. Introduction. . . . .	55
3.2. From the 1970s to the end of the 1980s: only natural and technological risks were addressed by the texts . . . . .	56

3.2.1. The legal framework for environmental assessment and public participation excluded the concepts of risk and uncertainty . . . . .	56
3.2.2. Only the concepts of foreseeable natural risk and major accident risk were regulated during the 1980s. . . . .	61
3.2.3. Risk management still not very formalized as standards. . . . .	62
3.3. The 1990s: taking into account social uncertainty for major infrastructure projects (transport, energy, etc.) . . . . .	64
3.3.1. From the late 1980s to the early 1990s: the (para)public project owner managed social uncertainty by increasing public information by keeping control over the design and implementation of the project . . . . .	64
3.3.2. The 1992 Bianco circular and the 1995 Barnier law allowed the public to participate in the public debate but were not always applied . . . . .	67
3.4. 1997 to present: financial risk, risk to the project environment, social uncertainty, political risk, and traffic risk are gradually being integrated into the assessment process . . . . .	69
3.4.1. A progressive and formalized consideration of risks in the evaluation process of infrastructure, development, and urban planning projects . . . . .	69
3.4.2. The environmental assessment procedure is becoming more demanding and can be a source of risk for public and private project owners . . . . .	97
3.4.3. A decision-making process driven by texts that seek to limit social and political risks . . . . .	101
3.4.4. The socio-economic assessment process has integrated risks related to the technical and economic environment since 2005 . . . . .	107
3.5. Conclusion . . . . .	112
<b>Chapter 4. How do Risks Manifest Themselves in Projects? . . . . .</b>	<b>113</b>
4.1. Introduction. . . . .	113
4.2. Political risk . . . . .	115
4.2.1. High-speed lines . . . . .	115
4.2.2. Urban planning projects . . . . .	122
4.3. The environmental risk . . . . .	131
4.3.1. The Langon–Pau highway (A65): a risk for vulnerable natural species insufficiently anticipated . . . . .	131
4.3.2. The non-hazardous waste storage center in Nonant-Le-Pin (Eure): a risk of underground pollution and a health risk . . . . .	135
4.3.3. The Espace Confluent in Rezé (south of Nantes) or how to take advantage of a polluted urban wasteland . . . . .	142

4.4. Social risk. . . . .	145
4.4.1. The Lyon–Turin HSL: a very active cross-border opposition . . . . .	145
4.4.2. Île Seguin in Boulogne-Billancourt (Île-de-France): years of recourse before mediation . . . . .	153
4.5. Institutional risk . . . . .	159
4.6. Archeological risk and heritage enhancement . . . . .	162
4.7. Interface risks . . . . .	164
4.8. Financial risk. . . . .	166
4.8.1. The Perpignan–Figueras HSL: a lack of profitability. . . . .	166
4.8.2. The Grand Paris Express: from additional charges to additional charges... . . . .	172
4.8.3. Île Seguin in Boulogne-Billancourt (Île-de-France): the high cost of bearing the cost of land assets . . . . .	176
4.9. Are there recurrences in terms of the succession of risks and uncertainties from one project to another? . . . . .	178
4.9.1. Transport infrastructure projects . . . . .	178
4.9.2. Development and urban planning projects . . . . .	180
4.10. Conclusion: behind the risk, the actors . . . . .	181
<b>Chapter 5. Addressing or Taking Advantage of Risks Allows Actors to Build Power Relationships . . . . .</b>	<b>183</b>
5.1. Introduction. . . . .	183
5.2. Mastering and using areas of uncertainty in the Sociology of Organizations . . . . .	184
5.2.1. From the 2000s onward, research has shown that conflict can be seen as an opportunity and can reveal new uncertainties . . . . .	184
5.2.2. The role of power relationships. . . . .	185
5.2.3. The relationship between risk, uncertainty, and the interplay of actors. . . . .	186
5.3. Addressing risk and areas of uncertainty to establish power relationships . . . . .	188
5.3.1. Formalized anticipation of uncertainties and risks seems to have become a key practice. . . . .	188
5.3.2. The method for socio-economically evaluating major transport projects is still more territorialized. . . . .	189
5.3.3. The integrated study-concertation procedure is marked by benchmarks that can facilitate the decision-making process of transport infrastructure for the project owner. . . . .	190
5.3.4. The contractualization of infrastructure and development projects implies the financial responsibility of the parties and, therefore, encourages them to treat and control risks. . . . .	192

---

5.3.5. When the project precedes the plan: to adapt to market fluctuations or residents' demands. . . . .	194
5.3.6. Participatory planning of development and urban planning operations. . . . .	197
5.4. Taking advantage of risk to have a source of power. . . . .	199
5.4.1. The creation and use of areas of uncertainty by actors to build power relations . . . . .	200
5.4.2. Actors implementing unpredictable behavior to create doubt and uncertainty among other actors . . . . .	211
5.5. Conclusion . . . . .	220
<b>Chapter 6. The Paradoxes of Project Planning and Management . .</b>	<b>223</b>
6.1. Introduction. . . . .	223
6.2. Flexible planning and project management offers opportunities but generates new risks . . . . .	224
6.2.1. Flexibility of the decision-making, planning and project management process . . . . .	224
6.2.2. The plasticity of the project and the production of new risks: the example of Météor . . . . .	228
6.2.3. Flexibility and risks . . . . .	233
6.3. An inflation of rules that creates additional risks. . . . .	233
6.3.1. A more precise legal framework for evaluation, consultation, financing, and contractualization . . . . .	233
6.3.2. More rules and obligations for the private project owner and developer . . . . .	234
6.3.3. More rules and more opportunities for appeals . . . . .	235
6.3.4. Risks related to controversies for non-compliance with rules: risk of litigation (sometimes in a chain), risk of delay or termination of the project, risk of additional costs . . . . .	238
6.3.5. The example of the consequences of the great national debate on the environment on the achievement of the A 65 Langon–Pau highway: litigation, delay, and additional costs . . . . .	240
6.4. The paradoxes of theoretical reference planning models in relation to contemporary decision-making, planning, and project design practices . . .	245
6.4.1. Reference planning models and their limitations . . . . .	245
6.4.2. Positioning of contemporary planning and project design modalities in relation to theoretical models . . . . .	252
6.5. Conclusion . . . . .	260

<b>Conclusion: Ways Forward for Action</b> . . . . .	261
<b>Appendix: The Identification, Evaluation, Prioritization and Treatment of Risk by the Project Owner, Developer or Promoter</b> . . . . .	269
<b>Glossary of Terms</b> . . . . .	273
<b>References</b> . . . . .	277
<b>Index</b> . . . . .	287