

**From:** [Kumapley Seyram](#)  
**To:** [Brady Colin](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Programme Update - WLO funding study  
**Date:** 29 November 2018 14:33:17

---

FYI – see email from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] below

I'm not convinced its that inaccessible. I've asked Amanda to investigate (station coding issue?) and intend to query again tomorrow.

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 November 2018 14:15  
**To:** [REDACTED] Kumapley Seyram  
**Cc:** Veiga Aitor; Porter Chris; Cadwell Amanda; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Programme Update - WLO funding study  
Seyram

Please see my responses below in red.

I've uploaded all the outputs to an ftp site – details of how to access it below.

[REDACTED]  
You can access your FTP site from [REDACTED] with the following credentials:

username: [REDACTED]

password: [REDACTED]

Data stored on your FTP site will be purged on 06/12/2018 13:26. After this date data will be unrecoverable.

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 November 2018 12:04  
**To:** Kumapley Seyram  
**Cc:** Veiga Aitor ; Porter Chris ; Cadwell Amanda ; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Programme Update - WLO funding study  
Seyram

Your email missed [REDACTED] so I have added him, but taken [REDACTED] out (this is not relevant for them).

Regarding your point 1 below – this was my error, and we will update the pack before our 9.30 call tomorrow morning. (I picked the wrong scenario, but the features it exposes will I think be similar)

My understanding is that points 2 and 3 are features of Railplan, so I will let [REDACTED] comment on these.

---

**From:** Kumapley Seyram <[SeyramKumapley@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:SeyramKumapley@tfl.gov.uk)>  
**Sent:** 29 November 2018 10:02

**To:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Veiga Aitor [REDACTED] Porter Chris [REDACTED]; Cadwell Amanda [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Programme Update - WLO funding study

Hi [REDACTED],

We've just briefly looked over the slides and a few things look odd. I'm not sure if this is coming from the modelling or just a summary error but thought we should get some answers on this before we look at the slides in more detail. Our comments are for both the funding and modelling studies.

1. I see a 4tph variant – West Hampstead ->Hounslow has been used. Is this because it is Phase 1? Mike has previously confirmed that the preferred 4tph option is Hendon ->Hounslow. Would this be reflected in the funding study work? Otherwise, it seems like we're missing something in the presentation?
2. Why is the Staples Corner (Brent Cross West?) figure (slide 13) lower in the 8tph scenario than in the 4tph? In theory, the level of service at the station in both scenarios is the same but the 8tph figure is particularly low. Even if we were to assume Cricklewood boarders walk there (because they don't have a service in the 4tph option), it's still less! **As you say the level of service at Staples Corner in both scenarios is the same (4tph). The difference is that in the WLO 8tph scenario there is an additional 4tph via Neasden – Cricklewood – W Hampstead which competes for demand with the Staples Corner branch, providing 2 alternative routes to Central London (OOC and West Hampstead),**

1 alternative route between Neasden and South Acton and a direct route between Lionel Road and Hounslow (not available directly from Staples Corner).

3. The Harlesden Boarders are quite low. A max of 24 boarders across all scenarios and 3 boarders in the Brent Cross West ->Hounslow scenario This is a function of the station location, which is in a pretty inaccessible location with no interchange with the main NR/LUL Harlesden station.

Is there an explanation for the above queries? Can you share the emerging outputs from the runs that have been completed with us + Amanda so we can review this in good time?

Regards,  
Seyram

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 28 November 2018 22:42

**To:** Veiga Aitor

**Cc:** [REDACTED]; Kumapley Seyram; [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Programme Update - WLO funding study

Aitor

Please find attached a set of output (draft, for discussion, with some gaps to be completed) setting out the analysis we have undertaken on operating costs and revenue.

At the current time this uses the standard Railplan scenarios only – the development scenarios are not yet available.

The results overall are likely to be disappointing – using the standard method available, revenue has gone down and costs have gone up vs the previous WSP work. For this reason the concluding slides focus on the lower cost 4tph (Hounslow to West Hampstead) option rather than the 8tph scenario.

In this scenario:

- Annual operating costs are estimated at £13.8m per annum (base year prices, from the TfL analysis). We see some scope for cost reduction against this number, but this is offset partially by missing station operating costs. We have presented a better (currently indicative) alternative costs scenario at £1.5m per annum lower.
- Annual revenue is estimated from the Railplan 2031 outputs (without additional development), giving annual net revenue at £6.7m (this is based on a standard TfL business case method). However, we see various factors that indicate the demand forecast may be low, so show a sensitivity test with 25% higher revenue.
- Even if we use the most favourable numbers above (for cost and revenue), revenue does not exceed cost until circa 2041.

I would be grateful if we could discuss before these outputs are circulated. This pack is only 75% complete, and I'm going to ask the Railplan team to help check the demand outputs.

We also have opportunity from the development scenario outputs – this may be significant. I also believe there is a large range of uncertainty surrounding the demand outputs, as indicated by the benchmarking against the existing London Overground network (I suggest we do a bit more refinement of this).

Sorry this email is late in the day – it has been a very busy week already.

Finally, Seyram – did you get any feedback on the subject of testing alternative fares structures? This is currently not included, and as discussed previously I think we would struggle to consider this fully within time / budget, but we can give this or other areas some attention depending on perceived priorities.

Thanks

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Veiga Aitor [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 28 November 2018 13:23

**To:** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Programme Update - WLO funding study

David,

Thanks for the update, around when today can we expect to see the findings?

Kind regards,

Aitor

**Aitor Veiga | Corporate Finance**

Transport for London  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor | North Wing | 55 Broadway | London SW1H 0BD  
Telephone: [REDACTED]  
Mobile: [REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 27 November 2018 20:47  
**To:** Veiga Aitor  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]; Kumapley Seyram  
**Subject:** RE: Programme Update - WLO funding study

Aitor

We are now due to issue updated reporting of the capital cost funding tomorrow. In addition, I will also update you tomorrow on the operating costs / revenue analysis.

I hope this slight delay does not cause too much inconvenience, and I look forward to discussing further.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

---

From: Veiga Aitor [REDACTED] >

Sent: 27 November 2018 16:10

To: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Kumapley Seyram

<[SeyramKumapley@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:SeyramKumapley@tfl.gov.uk)>

Subject: RE: Programme Update - WLO funding study

David,

Can we get an update on the below?

Kind regards,

Aitor

**Aitor Veiga | Corporate Finance**

Transport for London

6<sup>th</sup> Floor | North Wing | 55 Broadway | London SW1H 0BD

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [veiga.aitor@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:veiga.aitor@tfl.gov.uk)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 November 2018 13:52  
**To:** Veiga Aitor  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] Kumapley Seyram  
**Subject:** RE: Programme Update - WLO funding study

Aitor

Sorry for the slight delay responding to this. The update is as follows:

- We will issue updated reporting on the capital cost funding by 27<sup>th</sup> November. This will be complete from our perspective, pending any comment from TfL.
- I will email an update on the operating costs funding tomorrow; we have recently captured the results from the latest Railplan outputs, but we still await the development scenario modelling.

Regards

[REDACTED]

---

From: Veiga Aitor [REDACTED]

Sent: 15 November 2018 18:47

To: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Kumapley Seyram

<[SeyramKumapley@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:SeyramKumapley@tfl.gov.uk)>

Subject: Programme Update - WLO funding study

[REDACTED]

Hope all is going well. I was wondering if Motts could provide a programme update on the WLO funding study, it would help us plan how to fit its outputs into the other work going on.

Thanks.

Kind regards,

Aitor

**Aitor Veiga | Corporate Finance**

Transport for London

6<sup>th</sup> Floor | North Wing | 55 Broadway | London SW1H 0BD

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [REDACTED]

\*\*\*\*\*

The contents of this e-mail and any attached files are confidential. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately at [postmaster@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:postmaster@tfl.gov.uk) and remove it from your system. If received in error, please do not use, disseminate, forward, print or copy this email or its content. Transport for London excludes any warranty and any liability as to the quality or accuracy of the contents of this email and any attached files.

Transport for London is a statutory corporation whose principal office is at 55 Broadway, London, SW1H 0DB. Further information about Transport for London's subsidiary companies can be found on the following link: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/>

Although TfL have scanned this email (including attachments) for viruses, recipients are advised to carry out their own virus check before opening any attachments, as TfL accepts no liability for any loss, or damage which may be caused by viruses.

\*\*\*\*\*

Click [here](#) to report this email as SPAM.