

## **Scotia Gas Networks Limited**

Response to Consultation on Ofgem's minded to position for the determination of re-opener applications in respect of additional income associated with the Traffic Management Act (and Transport Scotland Act) under the first Gas Distribution Price Control Review



25<sup>th</sup> November 2013

# Scotia Gas Networks (SGN) response to Ofgem's minded to position for the determination of re-opener applications in respect of additional income associated with the Traffic Management Act (TMA) and Transport for Scotland Act (T(S)A) under the first gas distribution price control review

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on Ofgem's approach for assessing our reopener applications in respect of additional income associated with the Traffic Management Act (TMA) and Transport for Scotland Act (T(S)A) under the first gas distribution price control review.

Our response is structured to highlight the key issues we consider need to be resolved prior to Ofgem making any formal decision on the recovery of these costs. We firstly summarise these issues in an Executive Summary, and follow this with more detailed comments on the specific issues relating to our Scotland network application (under the T(S)A) and Southern network application (under the TMA).

#### Executive Summary

Ofgem has set out the reasons for allowance / disallowance of SGN's TMA/T(S)A claims in Scotland and Southern Gas Networks in their minded to position. There is clear acknowledgement both from Ofgem and their independent consultant that significant incremental costs have been incurred in the majority of claim areas. However, Ofgem believe there is a lack of supporting evidence to allow robust quantification all of the costs submitted by SGN.

We have set out in this response the evidence we have provided to Ofgem and have further quantified this where possible. We consider this response supports our claim and also clarifies where we have had to apply a level of judgement in reaching our conclusions. In the latter case, where Ofgem has felt our judgement is insufficient to allow them to quantify the T(S)A impact (particularly in the case of contractor premiums **Exercise**), in the interests of moving the claim forward we have decided not to dispute this further.

We have also decided not to challenge the mandatory cost of the Scottish Road Works Register of £0.5m which we were paying on a voluntary basis prior to T(S)A, or the cost to deliver clear benefits in streetworks (Core and Vac - £0.7m in Scotland and £0.7m in Southern) which Ofgem believe have wider business benefits outside this claim.

However, we do wish to challenge the legislative driver for the acknowledged increase in costs for reinstatement ( $\pounds$ 0.2m) which we consider can be attributed to the T(S)A rather than the New Roads and Street Works Act.

We consider the clarification of evidence already provided, together with additional evidence included with this response, will provide the justification and assistance required for Ofgem to revise their minded to position to a level all parties consider to be reasonable.

The specific areas we focus on in Scotland regarding the level of evidence provided for  $\pm 2.7$ m of our claim are:

- Traffic Management Schemes £1.7m
- Temporary Traffic Orders £0.1m
- Timing and Duration Conditions £0.7m and
- IT running costs £0.2m.

We welcome the appointment of Les Guest Associates to provide an independent view of the impact of the T(S)A. As set-out in the table below, we consider in key areas the level of evidence presented by SGN is robust. We also consider Les Guest Associates estimates of likely impact should be applied by Ofgem, and this would lead to a further £2.5m being allowed.

When including the £1.2m already provisionally awarded by Ofgem, this would result in an overall settlement for Scotland in the region of £3.7m and is demonstrated in the table below:

Scotland Claim

	Submitted By	Ofgem Minded	Updated SGN	
Claim Area (3m 10/11 prices)	SGN	to	Position	Comments
FPNs		0.1	0.1	Acknowledge Ofgem Comments
Back Office Management & Training		1.2	1.3	Acknowledge Ofgem Comments (with exception of IT costs)
Traffic Management Schemes		0.0	1.5	Likely impact (IGA) if evidence supports
Scottish Road Works Register (SRWR)		0.0	0.0	Acknowledge Ofgem Comments
Timing & Duration Conditions		0.0	0.6	Likely impact (IGA) if evidence supports
Parking Bay Suspensions		0.0	0.0	SGN not to dispute
Temporary Traffic Restriction Orders		0.0	0.1	Likely impact (IGA) if evidence supports
Additional Reinstatement Cost		0.0	0.2	SGN believe these costs are in scope (T(S)A driven not NRSWA
Traffic Separators		0.0	0.0	SGN not to dispute
Public Advance Noticing		0.0	0.0	SGN not to dispute
Contractors		0.0	0.0	SGN not to dispute
Core & Vac		0.0	0.0	SGN not to dispute
	9.8	1.2	3.7	

For our Southern submission, we consider there should be full settlement of the lane rental charges of £380k. We consider we have demonstrated these costs have been efficiently incurred in our claim and our subsequent responses to the supplementary questions raised by Ofgem. We consider we have demonstrated the efficient process we follow in order to determine the optimal course of action in respect of lane rental charges. We have highlighted the process that we have in place for the three distinct categories of work carried out in the highway. In addition, we have also stated in our supplementary questions that the lane rental charges incurred in our claim were as a result of unplanned work and that we have not incurred any charges on planned work.

A recent Transport for London (TfL) Scheme Monitoring Report confirms that planned works carried out has indeed reduced, but unplanned work remains unchanged. Therefore, as set out below, we consider this should lead to a further £380k being awarded in addition to the £350k already allowed, giving a total settlement of £730k and is demonstrated in the table below:

	Submitted By	Ofgem Minded	Updated SGN	
Claim Area (3m 10/11 prices)	SGN	to	Position	Comments
TMA Permits	0.0	0.0	0.0	Acknowledge Ofgem Comments
FPNs	0.0	0.0	0.0	Acknowledge Ofgem Comments
Ongoing Admin	0.2	0.2	0.2	Acknowledge Ofgem Comments
Lane Rental	0.8	0.0	0.4	Estimate impact based on supporting evidence
Overstay Charges	0.2	0.2	0.2	Acknowledge Ofgem Comments
Avoidance costs - Core & Vac	0.7	0.0	0.0	SGN not to dispute
	1.9	0.4	0.7	

Southern Claim

We welcome further dialogue with Ofgem to ensure that a reasonable level of costs we have efficiently incurred in relation to both the TMA and T(S)A can be recovered. Our specific detailed comments relating to both our Scotland and Southern networks reopener applications are detailed in the remainder of this response.

#### **Scotland Network**

This section outlines four key areas where we consider the evidence presented to Ofgem supports our claim. We would like to work with Ofgem to ensure this evidence is appropriately considered and provide further clarification where required. We also have included extracts from Les Guest Associates report to highlight the likely impact these areas have had on our Scotland Network.

#### IT Costs

In respect of IT costs, we note our original application was for £172k but that Ofgem is minded to award us zero.

The Les Guest Associates report concluded:

"It is not clear how much expenditure is due to changes required to interface with the SRWR and how much was driven by changes required for the T(S)A I am also not sure how relevant ETON5 is to Scotland. There will be some changes necessary for noticing / amendments / extension requests. However, SGN have not been able to substantiate these costs despite supplementary questions. Whilst I have the opinion that there should be an allowance, probably around 50% of the claim, I understand this needs to be demonstrated clearly to Ofgem with robust evidence."

We consider questions in relation to IT running costs were sufficiently answered during Ofgem's visit to SGN in July 2013, and via a subsequent supplementary question response (please refer to our response to T(S)A 13 - 2 August 2013). We have confirmed these costs relate to ongoing FTE time and have outlined the roles carried out (support staff costs who maintain the new IT systems and enhanced infrastructure). Therefore, there are no set-up costs included within this claim and for which Ofgem appears to be citing as the main driver for disallowing these costs.

Ofgem has queried reference to Eton5 which is a Southern system. This was only mentioned in our submission for reference, as our IT costs are captured at a corporate level and then allocated appropriately. Scotland do not receive any charges in respect of Eton5. This was also discussed and noted during Ofgem's visit to us in July 2013.

#### **Traffic Management Schemes (TMS)**

In respect of TMS costs, we note our original application was for £1.68m, but that Ofgem is minded to award us zero.

On the matter of TMS, Les Guest Associates concluded:

"There will have been a small element of Traffic Management before the T(S)A was introduced, but this has become much more widespread as a result of T(S)A and pressure exerted by the Commissioner and Road Authorities. Experience across utilities in England have shown that this is an ever increasing cost of project management. The cost of external TM designs was on average around £400 for a small scheme / single street. From my experience, I would suggest 90% - 95% of the claim would have been appropriate, however I do acknowledge that SGN have not managed to substantiate this effectively, even by supplementary questions." We consider the lack of evidence centres around the processes in place to illustrate the costs claimed and the evidence of increased FTE's. We can confirm these costs have been collected through templates (examples were included in our original application, and with further examples provided in Appendix A of this response) and represent incremental costs only.

As Ofgem have stated, we have been unable to show costs pre T(S)A as the same level of disaggregation was not required at this time. However, because the templates we have collected relate to incremental costs incurred since the regulations were passed in October 2008, we consider these to be sufficiently robust (the templates are subject to both Finance and Operational audit within SGN). Additional templates are available if required by Ofgem but, due to the volume of templates, we have not attached all of these to this response.

We have also provided summarised workload and costs in this area from the templates in our supplementary questions, and these are split between internal and external resource (please refer to our response to supplementary questions T(S)A 16 - 2 August 2013, T(S)A 22 - 9 August 2013 and Further Actions 3.1 - 16 August 2013). Additionally, detailed drawings were provided that demonstrated the level of TMS required pre and post T(S)A. We will copies of these drawings will be sent to Ofgem separate from this response

Therefore, we consider accurate and sufficiently robust evidence has been provided to support the extent of the increase in volume and complexity of TMS charges we have incurred.

#### **Timing & Duration Conditions**

In respect of Timing and Duration Conditions, we note our original application was for £707k, but that Ofgem is minded to award us zero.

Both Ofgem and Les Guest Associates acknowledge in the open minded to consultation that costs associated with timing and duration conditions are fundamental to the principles of the T(S)A. Through the process of supplementary questions,, Ofgem explored whether SGN had demonstrated that unproductive time had been optimised (please refer to our response to supplementary questions T(S)A15, 17 & 26 2 August 2013).

We have previously explained this unproductive time largely occurs at the start and end of working days which is not conducive to 'filler' work. While we seek to ensure some of this time is used setting up traffic management on the pathway, a large proportion cannot be easily mitigated. Attached within Appendix B of this response is a summary of these costs from our templates, which demonstrates the process we have established to accurately record this activity.

#### Temporary Traffic Road Orders (TTROs)

In respect of TTROs, we note our original application was for £136k, but that Ofgem is minded to award us zero.

On the matter of TTROs, Les Guest Associates concluded:

"TTROs were introduced in the 1980's and could, and have, been required before the T(S)A. It is acknowledged that the number has increased in the past 5 years due to pressures put on authorities by the Commissioner. In my opinion, I believe that between 50% and 100% of these costs should be allowed."

We agree and support the view of Les Guests Associates and would encourage Ofgem to reconsider their minded to position in respect of TTRO costs. We are happy to provide invoice volumes by road authority if required by Ofgem.

#### **Additional Reinstatement Costs**

In respect of Additional Reinstatement Costs, we note our original application was for £158k, but that Ofgem is minded to award us zero.

Ofgem state within their minded to consultation that the change from a one year to a three year embargo in March 2008 will have caused this increase in cost, although it is not brought about by T(S)A. While technically there was no direct legal requirement under the T(S)A, due to an error in the wording of the T(S)A, this extension was not properly embedded within the T(S)A, and could not therefore be enforced.

A Road Authorities & Utilities Committee (Scotland) (RAUC(S)) working group was set up after the enactment of T(S)A to consider changes introduced. As a result of this, the Code of Practice for the Co-ordination of Road Works and Works for Road Purposes and Related Matters were re-written. When re-writing these, it was recognised by RAUC(S), and with the agreement of all constituent utilities, that the original intentions of the T(S)A ( which was now enforceable), should be incorporated into the Code and thereby achieving the original intent of revised legislation. This included the change from one year to three years. Our streetwork manager was closely involved in re-writing these codes.

We therefore suggest request Ofgem should reconsider their minded to position on this aspect of our claim.

#### Contractors and other related costs

In respect of contractor and other related costs, we note our original application, but that Ofgem is minded to award us zero.



We can also confirm there was no duplication of contractor costs as part of our original reopener application to Ofgem, and we apologise if this was not previously made clear.

#### Southern Network

#### Lane Rental Charges

In respect of Lane Rental costs, we note our original application was for £780k, but that Ofgem is minded to award us zero.

We have incurred £0.38m of Transport for London (TfL) rental charges during the financial year 2012/13. The main concern expressed by Ofgem is how we have demonstrated we have minimised the financial effect, primarily on planned work where we have most flexibility.

We have previously provided our embedded structural changes and processes that have been implemented at relevant depots. These include:

- Carrying out work outside core lane rental hours;
- Using new technology to increase production;
- Hiring of specialist kit and operators for work in the highway;
- Improving management controls to monitor on site activities; and
- Working 24/7 until work is complete.

We provided this information to Ofgem in response to supplementary question 4 on 16 August 2013.

We would like to re-iterate that, since the introduction of the TfL rental, our average emergency duration (i.e. the time we spend excavating and reinstating a site) has reduced by 2.5 days. This has, however, come at a cost of £0.36m due to a need to restructure our teams to focus on lane rental activity.

Ofgem has disallowed all lane rental costs incurred of £0.38m. We can confirm that all of these charges have been incurred on unplanned work (i.e. repairs/emergency activities), and which, unlike planned work, is very difficult to delay or alter. On planned work, we have incurred no lane rental charges during the claim period.

This has been acknowledged by TfL within their recent Scheme Monitoring Report published on 18 June 2013 (a copy of this report is attached as an Appendix.C). This report states that planned works carried out by utilities have fallen by 36% since the introduction of the lane rental scheme, suggesting that these works have been moved to take place outside traffic sensitive times. Unplanned work has remained at the same level as in previous years, highlighting that emergencies have to be attended and repaired as soon as possible and very often cannot be deferred due to public safety.

We would request Ofgem reconsider the evidence we have provided and with a view to allowing the lane rental charges of £380k which have been efficiently incurred by SGN.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on Ofgem's approach for assessing our reopener application. We trust our response will be useful in allowing Ofgem to reconsider their minded to position in respect of our application for additional costs incurred as a result of the T(S)A and TMA.

Should you have any further questions on this response please contact either myself paul.mitchell@sgn.co.uk or Mary Rodgers mary.rodgers@sgn.co.uk

Yours sincerely

Paul Mitchell Regulation Manager

## <u>Appendix A</u>

## Further Template Examples

DEPARTMENT/DEPOT							ITAL T(S)A				MONTH	November	
			_		500	tland Operati T	Ulis						
VERIFIED BY:		Name				Signature					YEAR	2012	Can
			<u>Sec</u>	tion 115 cc	osts					<u>Fixed</u>	Penalty	Notices	Loca char
Project No. /	Local Authority	Di	rect labour h	iours	Contra	ctor Costs	Additional Reinstatement Costs	Additional Staff Costs		FPN Additional Admin		FPN Charges	Other or costs
Additional Costs Description	notice reference	x1 → x1½	x1½ → x2	x1 → x2	Schedule number	Value	£	Pay No	No Hours	Pay No	No Hours	£	£
SCT32894 Everton Rd - Road Closure and Diversion		0		0		£2,000.00	£1,000.00					£0.00	
SCT32853 - Kerrylamont Ave - Road Closure and Diversion						£4,000.00	£2,000.00						
SCT30588 - Tallant Road - 2 way temp traffic lights						£3,000.00	£2,000.00						
											her Admin Charges		
		Lost	Productiv	ity Due to	Working I	Restrictions				Pay No	No Hours 12	£ Charges	
											12		
<u>Total</u>		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>		£9,000.00	£5,000.00		<u>0</u>		<u>12</u>	£0.00	<u>£0.00</u>
c	ther Adm	inistratio	n / Manag	gers Costs					Or	ie-off co	sts		
Name	Pay No		ction	Hours					Descrip				Cost
Andrew Leyden Team Manager /		T(S)A Co-	Coordinator				TTRO - 5 Day R for Linthaugh Ri	Road Closur	re charge (Everton	from Glasy Pd Closure	gow City a and Div	Council ercion)	36
Resource Manager							TM set up for T	allant Road	<u>(Eventon</u>		s and Div	ersiony	200
							Specialist signs			gh Road pr	oject		75
Mana		. A secolar	۲	RAUC Meet			TTRO - 5 Day F			from Glas	gow City	Council	36
Iviaria	ger Costs		ngton	CAUC Meet	ungs		for Kerrylamont TM set up for T						250 150
			sgow				Specialist signs	ordered fo	r Kerrylar	nont Ave p	roject		80
		Coat	bridge				TTRO - charge t						36
			burgh ermline				TTRO - charge t				Collows Du		36
			ndee				TM set up and :	signs for Ta			ranant Ru	Jau	300
							Hire of Traffic Li	ghts					50
								Operation Name	nal Staf	<b>f attendi</b> Ρaγ		meeting: Hours	<u>s</u> Cost
								varrie		Fay	INU	8	
												10 10	
Managers Co	1004102		th Traffic esigns	Managem 37.0	ent Desig	ns				1004	102	37	
Total				<u>37.0</u>			Total					65	£12,506.0

DEPARTMENT/DEPOT		IVI				Edinburgh	TAL T(S)A	COST	5		MONTH	Decembe	r
VERIFIED BY:		Name									YEAR	2012	
VERIFIED BT:		Name	Sectio	on 115 c	nets	Signature				Fixed F		Notices	
Project No. /	Local Authority	Dire	ect labour hou			actor Costs	Additional Reinstatement	Additiona Cos		FPN Ad	Iditional	FPN Charges	Other one-c costs
Additional Costs Description	notice reference	x1 → x1½	x1½ → x2	x1 → x2	Schedule number	Value	Costs £	Pay No	No Hours	Pay No	No Hours	£	£
Premium Time (Sat) Premium Time (Sun)					11BB1 11BB2				24 24				
Site Meeting SCT33376					11882			1002262	1.5				
Site Meeting SCT33316 Site Meeting SCT 21941								1002262 1002262	1.5 1.5				
Site Meeting								1003327	2				
Saturday / Sunday as Requested By Local Autority					11BAR1	£1,575.00							
Saturday / Sunday as Requested By Local Autority					11BAR6	£630.00							
Saturday / Sunday as Requested By Local Autority					11BA1R	£386.00							
Saturday / Sunday as Requested By Local Autority					11BAR1	£1,575.00							
Saturday / Sunday as Requested By Local Autority					11BAR6	£630.00							
Saturday / Sunday as Requested By Local Autority					11BA1R	£386.00							
Saturday / Sunday as Requested By Local Autority					11BB2	£1,070.00							
										Ot	ner Adr	nin	
											Charge	s	
		Lost P	roductivit	y Due to	o Working	Restrictions				Pay No	No Hours	£ Charges	
<u>Total</u>		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	Ō		£6,252.00	£0.00		<u>54.5</u>		<u>0</u>	£0.00	£0.00
0	ther Admi	inistration	n / Manage	ers Cost	s				One	-off cos	ts		
Name	Pay No	Fur	nction	Hours					Descripti	on			Cost
Andrew Lavden	,		o-Ordinator										
Team Manager / Resource Manager													
Nesource Manager													
Manag	er Costs	Associat	ed with R/	UC Me	etings	1							
													1
								oerationa	u Staff :	<b>attendin</b> Pay		neeting: Hours	Cost
										1003	260	0.5	
										1000 1002		0.5	
Managers Co	sts Assoc	iated wit	h Traffic M	lanagen	nent Desig	gns				1003		2	
										1003 1000		16	
										1000	316	1	
										1000		2	
										1003	327	2	
										1003	327	2	
				1								1	

				RETU			FAL T(S)A	CUSIS	)				
DEPARTMENT/DEPOT		HILLINGTON			Scotl	and Operat	ions				MONTH	I JULY	
VERIFIED BY:		Name				Signature	Alex Rae				YEAR	2012	
			<u>Sectio</u>	on 115 co	osts					Fixed F	enalty?	Notices	
Project No. /	Local Authority	Direct	: labour hou	s	Contracto	r Costs	Additional Reinstatement Costs	Addition Cos		FPN Ad Adr		FPN Charges	Other one-c costs
Additional Costs Description	notice reference	x1 → x1½	x1½ → x2	x1 → x2	Schedule number	Value	£	Pay No	No Hours	Pay No	No Hours	£	£
BARSHAW DRIVE, PAISLEY	13952220					£6,148							
	10711007												
ROAD/BURNS AVENUE,KILMARNOCK CHESTNUT	1374499/ 1374511					£12,841							
PLACE, KILMARNOCK	1369861					£26,389							
GLASGOW ROAD, PAISLEY PATERSON STREET,AYR	1327883 1326927					£815 £18,547							
ST MARNOCK													
STREET,KILMARNOCK	N/A					£576							
											<u>her Adı</u> Charge		
		Lost Pr	oductivit	/ Due to	Working Re	strictions				Pay No	No	£	
										-	Hours	Charges	
<u>Total</u>		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>		£65,316	<u>£0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>	<u>£0</u>	<u>£0</u>
(	Other Adm	ninistration	/ Manage	rs Costs	;				One	e-off cos	ts		
Name	Pay No	Func		Hours					Descript	ion			Cost
		T(S)A Co-C	oordinator				TTRO TRAFFIC MANA		SIGNS				£40 £94
							TTRO						£91
							TRAFFIC MANA	AGEMENT	SIGNS				£39 £72
							TEMPORARY F		AN CROS	SSING WIT	'H TRAFF	FIC LIGHTS	£4,90 £1,23
Mana	ger Costs	Associate	d with RA	UC Mee	tings		TTRO	-OEMENT	010140				£47
		Hilling	ton		_		TRAFFIC MAN/	AGEMENT	SIGNS				£82
		Glaso Coatbi	ridge										
		Edinb Dunferi											
		Dunc											
								peration: Name	al Staff	Pay	No	meetings Hours	Cost
										1002	452	2	
										1002		1	
Managers Co					ent Designs					1002		1	
	1002605 1002605	TM LE TM LE	EAD	2.0 6.0						1000		2	
	1002605	TM LE	EAD	10.0								-	
	1002605 1002605	TM LE TM LE	EAD	1.0 10.0									
	1002605	TM LE		1.0									
Total				20.0			Total					40	P40.00
<u>Total</u>				<u>30.0</u>			<u>Total</u>					<u>10</u>	£10,80

		MC	NTHLY	RETU	RN OF IN	CREME	NTAL T(S)	A COST	rs				
DEPARTMENT/DEPOT						Edinburg					MONTH		Feb
VERIFIED BY:		Name	D.McFadzer	, ,		Signature	D.Mcfadzen				YEAR	2013	
				n 115 co	sts		Dimendazen			Fixed F	Penalty	Notices	
Project No. /	Local Authority	Dire	ect labour hou	ırs	Contract	or Costs	Additional Reinstatement Costs	Addition Cos		FPN Ad Adr		FPN Charges	Other one-of costs
Additional Costs Description	notice reference	x1 → x1½	x1½ → x2	x1 → x2	Schedule number	Value	£	Pay No	No Hours	Pay No	No Hours	£	£
Premium Time (Sat)	1306031				11BB1								
Premium Time (Sun) Weekend x4, 7.75hrs Shift	1306031	80 102			11BB2 11AAR1								
And 2hrs Per Day		31			11BB1								
		32			11BB2								
SCT33316		102 31			11AA2R 11BB1								
		31			11BB2								
										Ot	her Adr	nin	
											Charge	s	
		LantDu		Due te	)ő(aulsinas E						No £		
		Lost Pr	oauctivity	Due to	Working F	cestriction	<u>15</u>			Pay No	Hours		
<u>Total</u>		<u>521</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>		£0.00	£0.00		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>	£0.00	£0.00
Ot	ner Admin	istration	/ Manager	s Costs					One	off cos	ts		
Name	Pay No	Eur	oction	Hours					Descripti	an			Cost
Name	Fayinu	1 11	ICTION	TIOUIS					Descripti	UII			CUSI
Manag	er Costs A	ssociate	d with RAU	JC Meet	inas								
manag			u marro a		ango								
										_			
							O	peration	al Staff				
								<b>peration</b> :	al Staff	Pay	No	Hours	<b>s</b> Cost
									al Staff	Pay 1003	No 1260	Hours 1	
									al Staff	Pay 1003 1000	No 3260 1733	Hours 1 2	
Managers Cos	ts Associ	ated with	Traffic Ma	nagem	ent Design	18			al Staff	Pay 1003 1000 1002	No 3260 1733 1262	Hours 1 2 25	Cost
Managers Cos	ts Associ	ated with	Traffic Ma	inagem	ent Desigr				al Staff	Pay 1003 1000	No 3260 1733 1262	Hours 1 2	Cost
Managers Cos	ts Associ	ated with	Traffic Ma	nagem	ent Desigr	IS			al Staff	Pay 1003 1000 1002	No 3260 1733 1262	Hours 1 2 25	Cost
Managers Cos	ts Associ	ated with	Traffic Ma	Inagem	ent Desigr	IS			al Staff	Pay 1003 1000 1002	No 3260 1733 1262	Hours 1 2 25	Cost
Managers Cos	ts Associ	ated with	Traffic Ma	nagem	ent Desigr	ns			al Staff	Pay 1003 1000 1002	No 3260 1733 1262	Hours 1 2 25	Cost
Managers Cos	ts Associ	ated with	Traffic Ma	inagem	ent Desigr	ns			al Staff	Pay 1003 1000 1002	No 3260 1733 1262	Hours 1 2 25	Cost
Managers Cos	ts Associ	ated with	Traffic Ma	inagem	ent Desigr	IS			al Staff	Pay 1003 1000 1002	No 3260 1733 1262	Hours 1 2 25	Cost
Managers Cos	ts Associ	ated with	Traffic Ma	magem	ent Desigr	IS I			al Staff	Pay 1003 1000 1002	No 3260 1733 1262	Hours 1 2 25	Cost
Managers Cos	ts Associ	ated with	Traffic Ma	magem	ent Desigr				al Staff	Pay 1003 1000 1002	No 3260 1733 1262	Hours 1 2 25	Cost
Managers Cos	ts Associ	ated with	Traffic Ma	inagem	ent Desigr				al Staff	Pay 1003 1000 1002	No 3260 1733 1262	Hours 1 2 25	Cost
Managers Cos	ts Associ	ated with	Traffic Ma	nagem	ent Desigr	15			al Staff	Pay 1003 1000 1002	No 3260 1733 1262	Hours 1 2 25	

## Appendix B

## Further Analysis of Timing & Duration Conditions

Appendix. B redacted as commercially confidential.

## Appendix C

Transport for London Scheme Monitor Report attached separately with this submission.