

Item Number	Date Matter raised	Theme	Document Reference (click arrow to select from list)	Table/Appendix and/or Sub Para number	Matters Identified by Members	Action Required	Action Type	Comment provided by:	Response from team	Section Amended (New para nos and Table nos used in this column)	SMP2 Review	Comment provided by:	Date comment provided
1	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document and Appendices	All	figure' - capital or no capital? Some other spelling/punctuation errors throughout documents.	Please review document for consistency and spell and punctuation check.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Document amended		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
2	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Figure 1.2	I found this diagram confusing. It is focussed on land use plans rather than flood and coastal risk management.	Please review and simplify if possible.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Reviewed and simplified		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
3	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document and Appendices	All	Hold The Line, No Active Intervention, Managed Realignment, Advance The Line (HTL, NAI, MR, ATL).	Please be consistent with capitals.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Documents amended (Hold The Line HTL, No Active Intervention NAI and Managed Realignment MR).		Amendments noted – I assume p.5 will also be amended if not already done. Satisfied.	Emma Fisher	13-Sep-10
4	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 4, Para 2	...add in 'a' strategy study or scheme.	Please amend text.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended.	Now on pg. 5	Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
5	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 13	Relevant policy documents.	It would be useful to include an example from each document, demonstrating how they are useful to The Wash SMP.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Added some more text	Now on pg. 15	Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
6	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 13	Refers to SEA and AA.	A reference to the relevant Appendix would be useful here.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended.	Pg. 16	Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
7	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 14	...'relevant appendices'.	Again, a reference to the relevant Appendix would be useful here.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
8	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	page 15	Inlet (embayment)?	Please add some clarification as to why embayment is in brackets, e.g. also referred to as an....	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
9	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 16	...'this high foreshore'. Is mudflat and saltmarsh considered to be high ground? In Section 2.1.6, the land is referred to as low-lying.	Please review and amend. It may be better to use the term "shallow" rather than "high"?	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended - changed to 'relatively high', as the foreshore is higher than the low lying ground landward of the defences.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
10	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	page 17	Main paragraph - a large volume of text.	Could this text be broken up, for example, bullet the ways in which the intertidal zone responds.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended - bullet points used to break up paragraph as suggested.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10

Item Number	Date Matter raised	Theme	Document Reference (click arrow to select from list)	Table/Appendix and/or Sub Para number	Matters Identified by Members	Action Required	Action Type	Comment provided by:	Response from team	Section Amended (New para nos and Table nos used in this column)	SMP2 Review	Comment provided by:	Date comment provided
11	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 18	Shingle ridges develop out of the reach of waves....	Be careful of over simplifying coastal processes here; shingle ridges can develop under wave conditions, and are then only out of the reach of waves under normal conditions.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
12	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 19, Section 2.1.3	Add period after Cretaceous and Tertiary.	Please review and amend.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
13	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 21, Figure 2.2	What is being compared?	Please indicate what change the orange polygon is showing, - accretion or erosion?	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended - added key to orange polygon in figure title		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
14	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 25, Figure 2.4	If wave action is shown as a physical processes, tidal action should be also. Does water movement and water transport aim to show tidal currents, and net residual transport? Please could you clarify what is meant by controls? If they are showing embankments, should they not be shown in black as human intervention? It looks like only training structures are included here, but both training structures and embankments are examples of human intervention.	Please review legend, and labelling in this figure to make it more clear to the reader what is being shown here. This figure is used in several appendices, which will also need to be updated accordingly.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Map re-worked. Now on page 26		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	13-Sep-10
15	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 27, Para 1, Sentence 3	Use of extreme and No Active Intervention Scenario in the same sentence to define the condition.	Please clarify.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended - word 'extreme' has been removed.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	13-Sep-10
16	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 27, Para 1, Sentence 4	Unfinished sentence?	Please complete...shoreline management has on (what?)	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
17	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 28, Section 2.1.7	Combined, these two effects are likely to lead to...	Amend to..."Combined, these two effects are causing global sea levels to rise."	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
18	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 28, Section 2.1.7	Although a reference is made to the sea level rise rates in Table 2.1, no reference to the Defra Guidance is included here.	Please add reference to Defra Guidance here.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
19	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 28, Section 2.1.7, Para 3	What values?	Please clarify what values are being referred to here.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10

Item Number	Date Matter raised	Theme	Document Reference (click arrow to select from list)	Table/Appendix and/or Sub Para number	Matters Identified by Members	Action Required	Action Type	Comment provided by:	Response from team	Section Amended (New para nos and Table nos used in this column)	SMP2 Review	Comment provided by:	Date comment provided
20	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 29, Page 41	Food security/Food security issues	Please define what this is/they are.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text added to make link with high quality agri		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
21	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 43	Unclear what a seabank is.	Please define in text.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended. Changed to earth embankment (and throughout the documents).		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
22	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 53, Section 2.3.3	Small predicted changes in sea level.	Sea level rise predictions in Epoch 2 are double those in Epoch 1, are they really small?	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
23	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Sections 2, 3 and 4	Between Section, 2, 3 and 4, there is a lot of information, and repetition of information in places. [EF] There seems to be quite a lot of repetition between sections 3 and 4 in particular. [SJ]	Could this be refined to provide a more concise front end document? [EF] The LA should review these sections and consider whether the messages could be made clearer by making them more succinct. [SJ]	Consider document change.	Emma Fisher Steve Jenkinson	propose to keep overall document structure as it is. But will review if it is possible to make Section 3 more concise, with more reference to Section 4 for specifics.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher Steve Jenkinson	13-Sep-10
24	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 74	The references on the mapping are not consistent, which makes it difficult to pin-point the common marker.	Include the isolated properties in all maps.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Isolated properties now included on all maps		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	13-Sep-10
25	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	Page 79	A policy map for PDZ1 is not included in the SMP. Should the SMP include a Policy Map for PDZ1 also? The policy mapping is inconsistent - each have different legends and different amounts of information.	Please add if missing. If possible use the same legend and amount of information on each Policy Statement.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Conscious decision, recommend to leave as is (see also Review tab)		The lack of mapping leaves something of a gap and is inconsistent with other SMPs. However, accept this has been considered and concluded upon by CSG. Satisfied.	Emma Fisher	13-Sep-10
26	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix A	page A11, Section A2.3.1	Although text is included to define the playing field, it still remains unclear as to what it is. Is a playing field the same thing as a PDZ?	Please add further definition. Suggest just stick to the term PDZ, if it means the same thing as a 'playing field'.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Introduced PDZ in Appendix A, using text from main document.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
27	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix A	Page A12, Section A2.3.2	It is not clear what a policy package is, and the reference to Figure A2.4 does not make it clearer.	Please add some text to further clarify what is meant by a policy package.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text added to clarify		Satisfied, assuming changes have been or will be made in the document.	Emma Fisher	13-Sep-10
28	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix B	Section B.1	This is written in future tense.	Should this be written in past tense, since the stakeholder strategy has taken place as the SMP was being developed?	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text Amended		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
29	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix B	Section B.2	It would be useful for the reader to have an introduction to the CSG, Elected Members Forum (EMF), Key Stakeholder Forum (KSF) closer to the beginning of the document.	Suggest moving the descriptions into Section B.1	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10

Item Number	Date Matter raised	Theme	Document Reference (click arrow to select from list)	Table/Appendix and/or Sub Para number	Matters Identified by Members	Action Required	Action Type	Comment provided by:	Response from team	Section Amended (New para nos and Table nos used in this column)	SMP2 Review	Comment provided by:	Date comment provided
30	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix C	Page C9, last para, last sentence	Spelling/grammar.	Please edit.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
31	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix C	Whole report	It is not clear where Futurecoast has been referenced in the body of text in Appendix C.	Please could this be clarified in the text?	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	covered by item 13 of Review tab		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	13-Sep-10
32	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix E	Page E49	Legends on maps are blurred.	Can resolution of imagery be improved?	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Figures will be provided to EA as separate high resolution JPEGs.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
33	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix E	Table E3.2, E3.3, E.3.4 and E3.5	These tables seem to repeat the information that is already included in Pages E53 to E55.	Remove repeated text to provide a more concise document.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	We have checked but think the tables provide a good summary and propose to leave as is.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
34	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix E	Page E64	No Active Intervention up to a limit - is this not the same as managed realignment?	Please review and amend if appropriate.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	No amendments made - NAI to a limit is not the same as MR. MR involves adaptation of the area and controlling how the defences are breached, whereas NAI up to a limit is doing nothing until the critical point is reached		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
35	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix E	Page E80	The objective scoring process is described, but it is not possible to ascertain from the content of Appendix E, how each score has been derived.	Further clarification required on how scoring has been awarded would help understanding here. Further definition of how the scoring should be included.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Disagree with this - I think the text against each score provides a good overview of how each score was derived. We have put in a bit about scores being based on tangible features/assets where possible.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	13-Sep-10
36	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix E	Page E94 onwards	Without location references on the schematic maps, it is impossible for the reader to know what and where the maps are showing.	Please add some identifying location names/features onto the maps.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Disagree with this - the maps are schematic, so are only supposed to be representing the general landscape in PDZ1. Adding names/features will take away from this being a schematic.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
37	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix E	Page E105	Use of 'natural' sea level rise. How does one differentiate between 'natural' and man-made sea level rise in the context of sea level rise in the Wash?	Please remove word natural, and use global or relative sea level rise.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
38	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix E	Section E.1.3 & Glossary on pE3	Explanation of Policy Scenarios indicates that a "scenario" does not relate to external factors such as climate change. This is not in accordance with the SMP Guidance - it would seem that a policy scenario is used in exactly the same context as a 'policy package'. In other SMP2s, policy scenarios can have a length of coastline that has the same policy for a number of frontages across all three epochs. I don't think you are helping readers here by introducing another term and creating potential confusion.	Please review after consultation and consider if changes are appropriate - eg in the glossary.	Document change required.	Andy Parsons	Linked to comment 27 above.		Satisfied: I note that in A.2.3.1 it confirms that packages are referred to as scenarios in the guidance. & also noted that although not shown in track changes the Appendix E text at E.3.2.2 has been modified to explain.	Andy Parsons	26-May-10
39	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix F	Page F40	The Lincolnshire coast is not listed as a source for sediment, but is so in Appendix C, Page C44.	Please check and amend text accordingly.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
40	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix F	Page F46 onwards	Legends on maps are blurred.	Can resolution of imagery be improved?	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Figures will be provided to EA as separate high resolution JPEGs.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10

Item Number	Date Matter raised	Theme	Document Reference (click arrow to select from list)	Table/Appendix and/or Sub Para number	Matters Identified by Members	Action Required	Action Type	Comment provided by:	Response from team	Section Amended (New para nos and Table nos used in this column)	SMP2 Review	Comment provided by:	Date comment provided
41	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix F	Tables	Without lines on the Key Geomorphological Components tables, it is unclear as to which major controls each feature is referring to.	Please add lines to tables.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Text amended - lines have been added to all tables.		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
42	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix H	Page H16	Table formatting.	Please amend.	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Not clear what the comment refers to, the tables look fine in our version.		Issued with a pdf of document, which affected the table formatting. The word document is fine.	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
43	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix J	Page J4	It is not clear what the small boxed arrows mean.	Please could you add a note, or key to explain?	Document change required.	Emma Fisher	Amended		Satisfied	Emma Fisher	26-May-10
44	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	Page 2, 1st para	"SMP policies are not therefore driven by flood risk management economics."	Suggest removing this sentence, or inserting word "just".	Document change required.	Andy Parsons	Text amended.		Satisfied	Andy Parsons	26-May-10
45	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	Fig 1.3	SMP shoreline shown, but no indication the document also relates to the flood risk to the hinterland and the processes in the Wash too.	It would be helpful to enable the reader to appreciate the extent of coastal/ tidal flood risks, so I suggest adding the indicative flood risk map as an overlay on Fig 1.3.	Document change required.	Andy Parsons	This is very sensitive and was discussed explicitly with partner organisations. See item 1 from Review tab.		The lack of flood risk mapping is unusual and is inconsistent with other SMPs. However, I accept this has been considered by CSG and that they have concluded preferable to not include. Satisfied	Andy Parsons	13-Sep-10
46	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	p7	"The exact location of the two 'open coast boundaries' is (see figure 1.3): " What is said and explanation below is fine, but it would clarify approach if the words "for setting shoreline management policy", were added after "(see figure 1.3)."	Consider revision.	Suggested Doc Change	Andy Parsons	Text amended.		Satisfied	Andy Parsons	26-May-10
47	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	S2.2.2, 2nd para	"... and the land is typically around or below mean sea level. - to the general reader this may not fully convey the importance of shoreline management to reduce the risk of flooding.	Suggest revise text in 2.2.2 & other PDZ descriptions to put more emphasis on the risk of coastal flooding.	Suggested Doc Change	Andy Parsons	Text amended.		Satisfied	Andy Parsons	26-May-10
48	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix B	Page B16	Colours used in figures.	Flood and Coastal Risk Management (FCRM) and Tourism appear to be the same colours.	Can the LA please clarify?	Jim Hutchison	Amended		Satisfied	Jim Hutchison	13-Sep-10
49	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix D	D2.2, Page D3	A map showing all the key locations would be useful, but I couldn't see one. Also, should the CFMP boundary stated in this section?	Can the LA please explain which figure shows these boundaries and key locations?	Can the LA please clarify?	Jim Hutchison	Amended, map inserted on pg D4	Figure D2.1	Satisfied	Jim Hutchison	13-Sep-10
50	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix E	Fig E3.6 and others	The maps in this section, e.g. Fig E3.6.	Reading the key is very difficult.	Can we make the map clearer. Perhaps move the key to the top left side of the figure.	Jim Hutchison	Same as comment 32 above. Figures will be provided to EA as separate high resolution JPEGs.		Satisfied subject to action being done	Jim Hutchison	13-Sep-10
51	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix F	F27 - Fig 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 3.2.8, 3.2.14, etc.	Failed or nearly failed lengths? Add some text to maps and on other maps clarify the key as not readable.	Can the LA clarify and reconsider quality of maps as these will be held on a website.	consider amending maps and add some text for clarity	Jim Hutchison	Same as comment 40 above. Figures will be provided to EA as separate high resolution JPEGs.		Satisfied subject to action being done	Jim Hutchison	13-Sep-10

Item Number	Date Matter raised	Theme	Document Reference (click arrow to select from list)	Table/Appendix and/or Sub Para number	Matters Identified by Members	Action Required	Action Type	Comment provided by:	Response from team	Section Amended (New para nos and Table nos used in this column)	SMP2 Review	Comment provided by:	Date comment provided
52	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix F	f5.9.2	Typo 3rd sentence, epochs 2 and 2 should be 2 and 3.	Please amend.	Change text	Jim Hutchison	Text amended.		Satisfied	Jim Hutchison	13-Sep-10
53	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Report and Appendix F	Appendix F2.1.1 and Page 27 Main Report	Better cross referencing could be made throughout the report. One example is in the main report Page 27, where there is a cross reference to a residual life assessment in Appendix F - I assume its F2.2.1? - but making such connections would enhance the readability of the report.	Please amend.	improve cross referencing in the reports	Jim Hutchison	Text amended. References made to specific appendix sections (where appropriate) throughout the SMP document.		Satisfied	Jim Hutchison	13-Sep-10
54.1	21-Dec-09	Q&P	SEA Report	Tables 5.1 - 5.4 and Annex I Tables 1 - 5.	Colour coding at first appears to be very supportive to understanding but is hampered by lack of notation ... many of the colours are unexplained. Specific omissions required to make the SEA compliant are described in items 2, 3 and 4. below.	Explain all of the colours used as well as the colours relating to assessment criteria as they occur through later tables.	Essential	Liz Galloway	To be confirmed to what extent this is covered by work on items in Review tab.		QRG Review continues on next line in column F		
54.2	13-Sep-10				Colour coding of assessment levels (right hand column) have now been explained satisfactorily by repetition of the key at the beginning of the table. There remain lateral bands which in some cases relate to assessment criteria from Table 1 on page 8. However, there are a number of other colours, e.g. magenta, purple, sand, which are not explained.	Please advise where these colours are referenced, if not then these tables need an explanation of what the other colours mean.	Essential	Liz Galloway	These colours relate to the SEA objective and not the significance of any impact. They are to show a divide between objectives. It is noted that this is not clear and confusing as some of the colours are the same as those in the significance criteria. This colouration will be taken out of the SoEP in order to avoid confusion when presenting the final effects.	Satisfied	Liz Galloway	06-Oct-10	
55	21-Dec-09	Q&P	General	Draft plan p25, p79, p82, p85, Summary p23, p24, p25, Appendix p17, p29, p30, p31, p32, p33, p46, Appendix E p49-52, p67-78, Appendix F Fig 3.2.4, p46, p49, p52, p55, p72, p75, p78, and so on...	Elements of text 'blurred', at best it makes it difficult to read and worst unreadable.	Please identify cause (is it the PDF process?) and rectify.	Document to be amended.	Graham Lymbery	Figures will be provided to EA as separate high resolution JPEGs.		Satisfied	Graham Lymbery	13-Sep-10
56	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix H	Table H7	Text has flown out of table and some text appears to be lost because there is insufficient space in the boxes.	Please identify the cause and rectify.	Document to be amended.	Graham Lymbery	Text amended.		Satisfied	Graham Lymbery	13-Sep-10
57	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix H	p3, p5	The statement is made that all figures in this section are accurate to three significant figures, this could be read as the section that the statement is made in or in reference to table H8	Please clarify in the text.	Document to be amended.	Graham Lymbery	Text amended.		Satisfied	Graham Lymbery	13-Sep-10
58	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Document	General	... intent of management... - in my view the phrase is awkward and unnecessary. I suspect the purpose is to convey the uncertainty associated with delivery of the policy options but whilst it is important to get this message across it can be explained by other means. For example, I would have taken the opportunity to comment upon the uncertainty relating to funding at the end of the first paragraph where funding is noted	Could the LA clarify the purpose of this term?	Comment and consider document amendment.	Steve Jenkinson	This term is used throughout and very consciously. Not to convey uncertainty or funding issues but to emphasise SMPs are not just about picking the best of 4 policies, but about developing a plan for balanced sustainability, and then to policies to suit. We think this is fully in line with the guidance.		Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10
59	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix D	Table D5	The first heading is "Features not Associated with the Wash as a Whole" - is this right, should the "not" be there?	Could the LA please clarify?	Amend document as necessary.	Steve Jenkinson	Text amended.		Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10
60	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	p6 Fig 1.3	Inclusion of the map is really good but why doesn't it highlight the four rivers discussed in the preceding sentence? Could also usefully add the names of the adjacent SMPs at the coastal boundaries, and Boston and Kings Lynn as key towns in the area.	This is the first map in the whole document - please consider improving the level of information that it contains.	Amend document.	Steve Jenkinson	Map re-worked. Now on page 7	Figure 1.3	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10
61	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	p18 2nd para.	Notes that shingle ridges usually develop out of the reach of waves, but also that they tend to roll back due to wave and wind action.	Potentially confusing, would benefit from re-wording.	Amend document.	Steve Jenkinson	Text amended.		Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10

Item Number	Date Matter raised	Theme	Document Reference (click arrow to select from list)	Table/Appendix and/or Sub Para number	Matters Identified by Members	Action Required	Action Type	Comment provided by:	Response from team	Section Amended (New para nos and Table nos used in this column)	SMP2 Review	Comment provided by:	Date comment provided
62	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	p21 Fig 2.2	No key.	Please add a key.	Amend document.	Steve Jenkinson	Text amended - key has been added into the figure title.		Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10
63	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	p29 2nd para.	The section discussing an extreme advance the line option is interesting, but seems slightly woolly on the reasons for not exploring further at this stage. What is it about the scale of impacts and current insights that means it should not be considered further at this stage?	Helpful to provide something more definitive here.	Amend document.	Steve Jenkinson	Will look into clarifying the text, but note this text was developed in close consultation with partner authorities and is sensitive.		Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10
64	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	p29 Fig 2.5	It would be worth adding further text to introduce the Sea Level Rise (SLR) plots and explain their relevance given that they are all round the country.	Suggest extra text.	Amend document.	Steve Jenkinson	Text amended.		Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10
65	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	p30 Table 2.1	I would avoid using 3a and 3b terms unless its use is explained, as this may confuse.	I suggest keeping a heading of Epoch 3.	Amend document.	Steve Jenkinson	Table amended as suggested.		Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10
66	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	p31	The use of PDZs is a fundamental part of the approach to policy option consideration, and in my view warrants a bit more to explain the ways in which they are uniform and self contained.	Some further explanation would be helpful here.	Amend document.	Steve Jenkinson	Will add text to clarify.		See Main Review	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10
67	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	pp37 on, Figs 2.7 to 2.13 etc	The cross sections are quite effective, but there does not appear to be a simple location plan.	It would be helpful to add a location plan for the cross-sections.	Amend document.	Steve Jenkinson	Map added. Pg 39	Fig 2.8	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10
68	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	Sect 2.4 pp58 on	PDZ1 issues in bold, but not so in the other PDZs, suggesting PDZ1 is more important?	Suggest consistency of presentation.	Amend document.	Steve Jenkinson	Text amended - issues in PDZs 2, 3 and 4 also highlighted in bold as for PDZ1.		Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10
69	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	Sects 2.3, 2.4	These sections should in my view be supported by some plans to help put the discussion into context. I see the Summary Document has plans for the individual PDZs.	Please consider adding plans for each of the PDZs.	Amend document.	Steve Jenkinson	Amended		Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10
70	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	Sect 2.4 p59	Point 5 comments that the standard policy options don't suffice. This would benefit from re-phrasing to perhaps explain that their application at different locations needs to be clarified?	Suggest re-wording.	Amend document.	Steve Jenkinson	Text amended - "It is difficult to apply the standard policy options to this complicated situation".		Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10
71	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	Sect 4.2 p73	Is this the first mention of flood risk level codes? If so the interaction with the policy options needs slightly more explanation.	Suggest further text to clarify.	Amend document.	Steve Jenkinson	Text amended - "Codes in brackets refer to flood risk levels (consistent with Catchment Flood Management Plans, see section 2.4.1).		See Main Review	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10
72	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	Policy mapping	The text is not clear.	The clarity of the text on the map should be improved.	Amend document.	Steve Jenkinson	Figures will be provided to EA as separate high resolution JPEGs.		Text still not clear on current draft but on basis of response I assume this will now be addressed. Satisfied.	Steve Jenkinson	13-Sep-10
73	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix H	Sect H3.1	This section includes references to PDZ1a and PDZ1b, as well as zones 1 to 3.	A key plan to show these would be helpful.	Amend document.	Steve Jenkinson	Map re-worked. Pg. H6	Fig 3.1	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10
74	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Appendix A	Figs A2.2, A2.3	These are a helpfully presented diagrams.	None.	N/A	Steve Jenkinson	No action.		Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10
75	21-Dec-09	Q&P	Main Doc	1.4 Text Box 1.1	I think these are objectives as opposed to principles. Also no. 1 should clarify that "value" is not just an economic value, but covers wider range of issues.	Please consider amending.	Suggest document change.	Steve Jenkinson	Based on the role that these have played in the process, we don't think they should be renamed 'objectives' (aside from semantics). 'Value' is certainly intended to cover a wide range of issues. However, the wording of the principles has been subject to lengthy discussions so any change would have to be revisited. We suggest not to go there.		Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	26-May-10