Table 1: Cost Breakdown for Arundel Options

	Costs (millions)				
Cost Description	Option A – offline dual bypass through National Park (pink/blue line)	Option B – offline dual bypass - longer to avoid National Park			
Basic Cost Inputs					
Options	£4.87	£4.87			
Development	£6.21	£7.25			
Land	£11.82	£13.64			
Construction	£104.16	£127.30			
Other	£23.76	£30.03			
TOTAL - no inflation, no programme risk	£150.82	£183.08			
TOTAL - including inflation	£213.00	£320.94			
Risk Estimates Increased environmental mitigation, unforeseen protected/invasive species find and/or archaeology	£6.91	00.40			
discovery.	20.91	£8.16			
Protestor action on site	£2.64	£3.25			
Additional requirements/delays resulting from interfaces with 3rd parties during construction phase e.g. Network Rail, LA, waterways, river etc, landowners, adjacent properties, site security/compound	£1.81	£2.30			
Exceptional Adverse Weather during construction causes delays and additional costs.	£1.79	£2.16			
Problems in sourcing labour, plant and material resources for construction works	£1.41	£1.74			
TOTAL - risk cost estimates	£14.56	£17.61			
Values adjusted for centrally managed risks and adjusted to present value costs					
Estimate @ outturn, including programme risk and HA scheme specific risk centrally managed	£227.26	£276.49			
Deflation to 2010 values	£188.00	£228.60			
Present Value Costs	£159.30	£192.70			

- The purpose, scope and approach used for the A27 Corridor Feasibility Study are set out in a Scope Document issued by the Department of Transport and the Highways Agency. This required the study to be consistent as far as possible with other feasibility studies being undertaken which also take a proportionate approach and follow the DfT's Transport Analysis Guidance (January 2014).
- The transport modelling to determine the benefits and the cost calculations were done at a high level in order to inform the decision-making process and determine whether there are any scheme options that represent value for money.
- No detailed topographic data or designs were developed to inform the cost estimates, and existing modelling tools, which were amended to improve their local validation to the areas under investigation, were applied to this study.

Table 2: Cost Breakdown for Worthing and Lancing Options

	Costs (millions)							
Cost Description	Option A - tunnels at Worthing and Lancing	Option F - online dualling improvements at Worthing and Lancing	Option G – online localised widening and junction improvements	Arundel Bypass (A) + Online dualling improvements at Worthing and Lancing (F)				
Basic Cost Inputs								
Options	£12.10	£7.26		£12.13				
Development	£49.71	£3.94		£10.15				
Land	£14.27	£5.96	A high level cost	£17.78				
Construction	£783.73	£53.92	estimate for this option	£158.09				
Other	£169.48	£6.61	was developed using	£30.36				
TOTAL - no inflation, no programme risk	£1,029.29	£77.69	inputs from outline	£228.51				
TOTAL - including inflation	£1,507.06	£108.09	costings developed	£321.09				
			during a previous study					
Risk Estimates			and were not further					
Increased environmental mitigation, unforeseen protected/invasive species find and/or archaeology discovery.	£27.80	£3.38	developed to the same level as Options A and F	£10.29				
Protestor action on site	£26.01	£1.40	due to time constraints. The previous study drawn on was the	£4.04				
Additional requirements/delays resulting from interfaces with 3rd parties during construction phase e.g. Network Rail, LA, waterways, river etc, landowners, adjacent properties, site security/compound	£25.85	£0.94		£2.75				
Exceptional Adverse Weather during construction causes delays and additional costs.	£18.99	£0.75	Worthing and Adur Strategic Transport	£2.54				
Problems in sourcing labour, plant and material resources for construction works	£14.74	£0.72	Model – Strategy Development Report	£2.12				
TOTAL - risk cost estimates	£113.39	£7.18	(March 2010)	£21.74				
Values adjusted for centrally managed risks and adjusted to present value costs								
Estimate @ outturn, including programme risk and HA scheme specific risk centrally managed	£1,604.44	£115.74		£343.00				
Deflation to 2010 values	£1,314.20	£96.50	£50.00	£284.50				
Present Value Costs	£1,098.70	£82.90	£48.60	£242.30				

- The purpose, scope and approach used for the A27 Corridor Feasibility Study are set out in a Scope Document issued by the Department of Transport and the Highways Agency. This required the study to be consistent as far as possible with other feasibility studies being undertaken which also take a proportionate approach and follow the DfT's Transport Analysis Guidance (January 2014).
- o The transport modelling to determine the benefits and the cost calculations were done at a high level in order to inform the decision-making process and determine whether there are any scheme options that represent value for money.
- o No detailed topographic data or designs were developed to inform the cost estimates, and existing modelling tools, which were amended to improve their local validation to the areas under investigation, were applied to this study.

Table 3: Cost Breakdown for East of Lewes Options

			Costs (millions)		
Cost Description	A) Dual carriageway bypass east of Lewes	B) Single carriageway bypass east of Lewes	C) Bypass at Wilmington	D) Bypass at Selmeston	E) New road link at Folkington to East of Lewes
Basic Cost Inputs					
Options	£4.87	£4.87	£0.89	£0.52	£0.52
Development	£13.81	£11.17	£3.71	£1.60	£1.46
Land	£19.46	£17.40	£3.63	£1.67	£1.57
Construction	£232.60	£175.92	£49.43	£24.90	£24.81
Other	£50.59	£38.39	£10.15	£6.07	£4.65
TOTAL - no inflation, no programme risk	£321.33	£247.75	£67.81	£34.76	£33.02
TOTAL - including inflation	£464.70	£352.57	£96.43	£49.28	£46.81
Risk Estimates					
Increased environmental mitigation, unforeseen protected/invasive species find and/or archaeology discovery.	£14.39	£11.10	£2.99	£1.62	£1.36
Protestor action on site	£6.00	£4.50	£1.23	£0.63	£0.64
Additional requirements/delays resulting from interfaces with 3rd parties during construction phase e.g. Network Rail, LA, waterways, river etc, landowners, adjacent properties, site security/compound	£3.49	£2.70	£0.75	£0.41	£0.41
Exceptional Adverse Weather during construction causes delays and additional costs.	£3.20	£2.40	£0.66	£0.34	£0.36
Problems in sourcing labour, plant and material resources for construction works	£2.92	£2.12	£0.64	£0.32	£0.34
TOTAL - risk cost estimates	£30.00	£22.81	£6.27	£3.33	£3.10
Values adjusted for centrally managed risks and adjusted to present value costs					
Estimate @ outturn, including programme risk and HA scheme specific risk centrally managed	£495.29	£376.26	£103.01	£52.72	£50.03
Deflation to 2010 values	£405.30	£310.20	£85.30	£43.70	£41.50
Present Value Costs	£337.70	£261.50	£72.50	£37.20	£35.30

- o The purpose, scope and approach used for the A27 Corridor Feasibility Study are set out in a Scope Document issued by the Department of Transport and the Highways Agency. This required the study to be consistent as far as possible with other feasibility studies being undertaken which also take a proportionate approach and follow the DfT's Transport Analysis Guidance (January 2014).
- o The transport modelling to determine the benefits and the cost calculations were done at a high level in order to inform the decision-making process and determine whether there are any scheme options that represent value for money.
- o No detailed topographic data or designs were developed to inform the cost estimates, and existing modelling tools, which were amended to improve their local validation to the areas under investigation, were applied to this study.

Arundel Investment Case (referring to Figure 5-1 in the Stage 3 Report)

Option	Description	Travel Time	VOC Fuel	VOC Non- fuel	Indirect Tax Revenues	Greenhouse Gases	Accident Savings	PVB** (TUBA)	PVB (TUBA) - Business Users
Option A	Offline dual bypass through National Park	296,683	-3,714	-646	1,947	1,947	1,947	294,270	127,960
Option B	Offline dual bypass - longer to avoid National Park	295,846	-5,477	-2,192	2,885	2,885	2,885	291,062	126,852

CORE	ADJUSTED***
PVB	PVB
322,429	335,225
320,139	332,825

ges
5min
)1,122
2,049

Worthing Investment Case (referring to Figure 6-1 in the Stage 3 Report)

Option	Description	Travel Time	VOC Fuel	VOC Non- fuel	Indirect Tax Revenues	Greenhouse Gases	Accident Savings	PVB (TUBA)	PVB (TUBA) - Business Users
Option A	tunnels at Worthing and Lancing	1,004,259	-5,432	-7,868	2,745	2,745	2,745	993,704	429,048
Option F	online dualling improvements a Worthing and Lancing	533,073	10,198	6,290	-5,554	-5,554	-5,554	544,007	232,962
Option G	online localised widening and junction improvements	286,419	6,638	3,745	-3,583	-3,583	-3,583	293,219	124,181
	rpass (A) + online dualling improvements at and Lancing (F)	916,723	9,295	9,644	-5,032	-5,032	-5,032	930,630	399,706

PVB	PVB
1,001,256	1,044,161
540,795	564,091
291,041	303,459
927,726	967,697

Net journey time changes							
0 to 2min	2 to 5min	> 5min					
159,607	238,888	605,766					
120,787	336,437	75,849					
167,669	118,750	0					
172,828	360,538	383,358					

East of Lewes Investment Case (referring to Figure 7-2 in the Stage 3 Report)

Option	Description	Travel Time	VOC Fuel	VOC Non- fuel	Indirect Tax Revenues	Greenhouse Gases	Accident Savings	PVB (TUBA)	PVB (TUBA) - Business Users
Option A	Dual Carriageway bypass east of Lewes	401,370	834	-1,172	-564	-564	-564	400,468	218,122
Option B	Single Carriageway bypass east of Lewes	364,153	5,296	1,787	-2,926	-2,926	-2,926	368,310	200,068
Option C	Bypass at Wilmington	166,734	4,471	2,530	-2,434	-2,434	-2,434	171,301	94,941
Option D	Bypass at Selmeston****	0	0	0	0	0	5,000	0	0
Option E	New road link at Folkington to East of Lewes	103,154	5,385	3,640	-2,899	-2,899	-2,899	109,280	59,441

PVB	PVB
430,816	452,628
381,748	401,755
191,728	201,222
0	0
128,880	134,824
120,000	104,024

Net journey time changes								
0 to 2min	2 to 5min	> 5min						
22,240	86,586	292,545						
26,194	79,415	258,545						
55,006	79,504	32,226						
0	0	0						
57,064	19,654	26,435						

- The purpose, scope and approach used for the A27 Corridor Feasibility Study are set out in a Scope Document issued by the Department of Transport and the Highways Agency₁. This required the study to be consistent as far as possible with other feasibility studies being undertaken which also take a proportionate approach and follow the DfT's Transport Analysis Guidance (January 2014).
- o The transport modelling to determine the benefits was done at a high level in order to inform the decision-making process and determine whether there are any scheme options that represent value for money.
- Existing modelling tools (as described in section 4.3 of the Stage 3 Report) were amended to improve their local validation to the areas under investigation before being used for the assessment of benefits.

^{*} All values in £000, discounted to 2010

^{**} PVB = Present Value Benefits

^{***} Adjusted PVB is calculated by adding 10% of the Business User Benefits as per the Value for Money Assessment: Advice Note for Local Transport Decision Makers (December 2013)¹ and described in Section 4.4. of the published Stage 3 report.

^{****} A bypass at Selmeston would not improve journey times due to its short length. The benefits due to safety improvements were estimated through an assessment of the accident record.

¹ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/267296/vfm-advice-local-decision-makers.pdf