

## CPRE PEAK DISTRICT AND SOUTH YORKSHIRE BRANCH

### A57 LINK ROADS TR010034

#### NEW MODEL RUNS AND STATUS OF ORIGINAL MODELLING

response to

- (i) NATIONAL HIGHWAYS' RESPONSE TO ISH2 ITEM 6C & 6D - CARBON
- (ii) EXAMINING AUTHORITY'S WRITTEN QUESTIONS 2 - QUESTION 8.2

**DEADLINE 16th March 2022**

#### ***New model runs***

1. We commented on the ExA's question on cumulative carbon effects arising from ISH2 in REP5-029 paras 20-25. We understood that NH might undertake new model runs using the Decarbonisation Strategy. We have consistently said that:

i) the original option testing did not take into account Government policy since 2015 including the Decarbonisation Strategy (this seems to be agreed). The need for a new run justifies our position that alternatives need to be reconsidered in light of those policies.

ii) the detailed modelling and forecasts originally submitted to the DCO did not take into account the traffic reductions required in the most recent documents including the Decarbonisation Strategy and CCC 6<sup>th</sup> budget. In view of the way in which the assumptions used would determine the outcome of the tests we called for a robust and transparent process including a run with traffic predicted from the full Decarbonisation Strategy without the A57 scheme. This would form a realistic Do Minimum which could then be compared to a run with the scheme and a Business as Usual level of traffic. This is the real basis for comparison and we showed how this would work in our Deadline 4 submission.

The reason for this approach is that a package which supports both car use and sustainable travel at the same time will achieve less sustainable travel than one which focussed on sustainable travel alone. We have not seen any argument which contradicts this and it would be extraordinary if one were made since it would undermine the whole basis of the economic calculations of the scheme benefits. We have calculated and submitted at Deadline 4 the scale of the negative impact in the relevant areas using the data supplied (£110million).

We understand NH have now undertaken new model runs and are quoting new data using assumptions from the DfT Decarbonisation Strategy and a newer version of the assumptions on electrification (REP5-026). We have asked NH for the basic data from these runs which should be readily available. No special link analysis is being requested.

The data we are asking for is the equivalent highway and public transport matrices, changes in walking and cycling, automatic TUBA outputs, Economics Table and new BCRs and any GHG worksheets they have used for the new runs, we understand there are at least two. This should be completely standard and we can then see them in the context of the work we have done on the existing model data. This is essential if the new runs are being used to inform the DCO.

It is important for the DCO to see at the very least these summary statistics if the new modelling is to be used for two reasons. The first is the status of the old option assessment and subsequent modelling (see below). In addition, the data from the new model runs should enable the real comparison of the situation with and without the scheme. We are prepared to do this as soon as the information arrives.

It is essentially two different forecasting scenarios which should be tested:

- i) Increasing road capacity in a metropolitan area to allow the central forecast for traffic growth to occur
- ii) Implementing a package promoting sustainable options which creates mode shift and thus lower traffic levels to meet the Government policies for such areas.

It is the difference between the two scenarios which is the key to assessing strategic fit and value for money of the scheme. This type of scenario testing, which can use modelling to test and refine it, is well established, for example used by TfGM to develop its Transport Strategy<sup>1</sup>.

### ***Status of original modelling***

This a key question for the DCO which we have raised with NH. Are NH now saying that the original modelling needs to be withdrawn since, as we have consistently argued, it didn't take the latest Government policies into account?

---

<sup>1</sup> See the 10th July 2020 report "Transport Supporting Greater Manchester's Recovery", paragraph 6.5:

"This Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040 is a 'vision-led adaptive planning approach' to transport decision-making. It replaces the traditional transport planning approach of 'predict and provide' with one that aims to shape travel to support the type of city-region that people want to live and work in. Greater Manchester's transport vision – the 2040 Right Mix - entails zero net growth in motor vehicle traffic in Greater Manchester between 2017 and 2040 and a reduction in the car mode share of trips from 61% to no more than 50%. Scenario planning will be used to inform decisions on how the pathway to the 2040 Right Mix may need to be adjusted in a post-Covid-19 world, and on the robustness of interventions in the draft Delivery Plan to the new post-Covid-19 situation."