TPTS+
ComMA

PROJECT MANAGER

No	Section	Comment	Reply
End	**End**	**End**	**End**

No	Section	Comment (received Date)	Reply (Date)
End	**End**	**End**	**End**

TPTS+
ComMA

TPG

No	Section	Comment	Reply
v1.1	All	Hi Lucy I have reviewed everything except the ASTs. The other documents are fine, the comments are so minor that I have not captured them. They are fit for purpose as they are. Alison	No action required
V1.3	Results	I am unable to reconcile the GHG figures in the AST with the figures in Table 10-3 of the ComMA.	ComMA updated with AST GHG values (TAG method). V1.4.
End	**End**	**End**	**End**

No	Section	Comment (received Date)	
End	**End**	**End**	**End**

TPTS+
ComMA

Economics

No	Section	Comment	Reply - All items actioned into V1.3
v1.1	Various	“7.2.1- The latest Highway interventions costs for the TPTS Only and the Optimised Package were provided by Highways England in May 2019, with outturn costs of £9.00bn and £11.88bn” – This does not reflect the latest outturn cost. Could you please ensure the latest assessment is included here?	This chapter summarises our previous works on the Optimised package (2 years ago) before testing the sub-packages, therefore the costs, Scheme opening years and PVB, BCR are not the latest ones. The updated costs, Opening year, PVB and BCR is reported in chapter 10. I will make it clearer in this section.
		“7.2.7 …. The costs were provided by the Highways team for the 60-year appraisal periods….” – Just to double-check was OPEX applied for a 60-year period post-opening?	Yes you are correct, OPEX applied for 60 years post-Opening year.
		“7.2.7 …. It was then discounted to 2010 values using the WebTAG discounting method (i.e. 3.5% pa).” - I assume this means 3.5% for the first 30 years and then 3%? If yes, please make it clearer.	Yes, 3.5% for the first 30 years then 3%. I will make it clearer in the report.
		“7.7 WIDER IMPACT BENEFITS – STATIC CLUSTERING ” - I assume all wider economic impacts have been assessed using WITA1.2, is that correct?	Yes, they have been assessed using WITA 1.2 as agreed when we did the work with Jeremy Clark on the HE Economy model.
		“7.7.7 Table 7-14 below provides summary of WITA level 2 benefits, with and without 20% adjustment factors.” - Has the same 20% reduction been applied to the sub-packages 1/2/3?	Yes, they all have been applied 20% adjustment factors.
		“9.3.8. The analysis is robust enough to achieve this, but once a package is selected, there is scope to further refine the schemes and improve the VfM.” A bit confusing as I thought the sub- packages are phased approaches towards the optimised package (not alternatives to it)?	Yes the sub-packages are phased approach toward the optimised package, but during our modelling tests with the individual packages we noticed that in order to maximise the benefits we needed to include M60 J24-J25 to packages 2 and 3, which was not included in the original package selection. I will make it more clear in the COMMA.
		“Table 10-1 TUBA and WITA Summary - Proposed Packages (2041 Opening Year)” – Mixing £k’s with £m’s on the same table. Please use either/ or consistently.	Thanks for spotting this out, will update the tables.
		“Table 10-3 TUBA Summary of Packages with Updated Opening Years (£000s)” – Please include the breakdown of the WITA benefits on this table.	Yes, will update the COMMA to include breakdown of WITA benefit.
		“10.8 OPTIMISED PACKAGE WITH TOLL” – This section needs to make more explicit the key caveats/ uncertainties of this analysis;	Yes, will update COMMA to reflect this. At a high-level, some caveats/uncertainties are around lack of modelling by income bands therefore users willingness to pay cannot be modelled; and freights only subject to route choice and not VDM responses as a result of toll.
		“10.8.3. “ - I assume the toll values for car/ LGV/ HGV were translated from 2020 prices to a consistent price base for the economic appraisal in line with other assumptions? If yes, please specify here.	Yes, toll values were converted to 2010 prices for consistency with the economic appraisal, I will update COMMA.
		“10.8.8.” - Please clarify here what assessment specific assumptions have been considered (e.g. short/ medium/ long term inflation etc.);	For the assessment, we assumed general inflation of 2.5% p.a over the 60 year appraisal periods, then deflated and discounted to 2010 prices and values.
		“11.2.2” - What are the differences/ assumptions on SOW/ OFT dates between P2.5/ P50/ P97.5 (assuming they do consider different SOW/ OFT dates for each estimate)?	From the Highway Commercial EO, I can see that the start of work data are the same for all the estimates but there are some variances in the OFT date. For the P2.5 and Pmean, the difference is negligible but the P97.5 pushes the end date by around 1 year.

V1.3	Results	Do we have indicative ASTs for the incremental BCRs (table 26 of the business case)? Have cc'd Nhan/ Lucy / Rehan/ Nasar for confirmation. The GHG figures between ASTs and '1-551_1-988 TPTS+ TFR and EAR v1.3 June 2020' do not match. All ASTs and the latest EAR need to be re-checked and updated accordingly. Also, can I please double-check that we are asking for full commitment in principle for the optimised package? If we don't have the policy pack yet, would it be possible to confirm the exact wording of the request? Do we have indicative ASTs for the incremental BCRs (table 26 of the business case)? Have cc'd Nhan/ Lucy / Rehan/ Nasar for confirmation. Also, can I please double-check that we are asking for full commitment in principle for the optimised package? If we don't have the policy pack yet, would it be possible to confirm the exact wording of the request?	Updated in V1.4
End	**End**	**End**	**End**

No	**Section**	**Comment (received Date)**	
End	**End**	**End**	**End**