

Date / Time		15 August 2017 at 2:00pm
Attendees		Steve Hunt (SH) – Ratio; John Kiriakidis (JK) – GTA; Agnelo Duarte (AD) – VicRoads
Item	Description	Discussion
1	Opening Comment	Option 5 in SH evidence is "the West Gate Tunnel Project minus the Dynon Road link" as described on Page 3-33 of the EES Summary Report.
2	Key Issues	
2.1	Need for Direct Dynon Road Connection from West Gate Tunnel Project	<p>To appreciate impacts of the project on the Melbourne CBD in the options testing, SH requests additional modelling results (e.g. daily volume plots as per Figures 141, 160 & 161 of EES Technical Report A) for Options 1-3 in the EES Summary Report. JK and AD agree this would be helpful to the IAC in reviewing the impacts of the assessed access options.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Agreed</p> <p>SH queries the extent of modelling options for the project and whether an option without the Dynon Road link (i.e. Option 5 per SH evidence) was modelled. SH requests an Option 5 model run to better inform impacts on the network. JK and AD agree this model run would assist in an appreciation of network impacts as it relates to issues raised by Hunt. JK and AD have no objection to this model run and a technical note being prepared which shows equivalent outputs as per Figure 141, 160 & 161 of Technical Appendix A.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Partially Agreed (technical note to be considered)</p> <p>SH noted that additional clarification is required regarding the derivation of the projected volumes, having regard to the assumed "capacity constraint" that has been modelled in the VLC report (i.e. +18-22k daily from project on Dynon Road, but only +9k increase on Dynon road west of Dryburgh Street.) JK & AD noted understanding that difference is due to Wurundjeri Way network changes and a change in existing traffic patterns.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">SH to review</p> <p>SH noted if the modelling estimate for Dynon Road (+9k per day) is correct, this demand is "moderate and manageable" in the North Melbourne and West Melbourne areas as stated in paragraph 3.5.7 of the Hunt evidence. JK and AD agree.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Agreed (subject to 'caveat' noted)</p> <p>If the Dynon Road link was removed, JK noted that limited alternate opportunities exist. These include CityLink and Footscray Road, the West Gate Tunnel and Footscray Road and CityLink and Racecourse Road, all of which have limited capacity.</p> <p>SH is unable to determine "alternate opportunities" without modelled outputs for "Option 5" being available.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Partially Agreed</p> <p>SH questioned the consistency of the Dynon Road link with the overall project objectives, other than connecting jobs and services. JK noted that the connection serves a broader purpose including requirements to match increased travel demand generated by future population and economic growth trends and a requirement to enhance connectivity between economic clusters.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Partially Agreed</p>
2.2	Wurundjeri Road	<p>SH & JK agreed that the Wurundjeri Way extension provides an overall positive benefit to the network, noting the extension contributes to the reduction in traffic volumes on King Street and Spencer Street.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Agreed</p> <p>SH noted comment that the removal of Dynon Street link would place extra pressure on Dudley Street. SH deemed it insufficient justification for the Dynon Street link. JK & AD confirm that the need for the Dynon Road link is broader than simply a capacity issue with Dudley Street.</p> <p>SH considers that the implications on Dudley Street, Footscray Road and other routes of the removal of the Dynon Road link can only be understood with reference to modelling for "Option 5"</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Note only</p>

melbourne
sydney
brisbane
canberra
adelaide
perth

Level 25, 55 Collins Street
MELBOURNE VIC 3000
PO Box 24055
MELBOURNE VIC 3000
t// +613 9851 9600

Item	Description	Discussion
		<p>SH recommends sensitivity testing of Wurundjeri Way with a 4-lane cross-section consistent with its existing configuration. JK considers the sensitivity modelling unnecessary based on projected demand, a need to service local demand in Docklands and the nature of uses within the Docklands precinct and in particular a major sporting stadium with highly concentrated transport demands. AD considered the sensitivity test unnecessary on the basis of the proposed extension and network role. SH disagrees and recommends that modelling be completed noting other urban design benefits of reduced width. IAC to consider.</p> <p>SH also considers that the operation of Wurundjeri Way without the Dynon Road link needs to be considered in association with modelling for "Option 5"</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Disagreed</p> <p>SH queried the potential that the widening of Wurundjeri Way would induce demand (JK disagrees this outcome is likely given that one link on the broader network will not meaningfully effect this phenomenon).</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Disagreed</p>
2.3	Footscray Road	<p>SH requests clarification of basis for strategic modelling for this road section i.e. number of lanes. JK notes his understanding that modelling is based on the existing cross-section width arrangement. SH agreed to review the Map Book plans.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Note Only</p> <p>SH considers carriageway width could be narrowed and would reduce scope for induced demand on the road. JK disagrees that narrowing is required and considers that retention of existing configuration should be maintained for flexibility and the benefit of future Port access. SH notes that may be the case but disagrees it is necessary or has been proven in EES. SH requests sensitivity modelling be provided to test reduced width. JK disagrees it is required. AD noted VicRoads does not support reduction in carriageway width and that modelling is not required.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Disagreed</p>
2.4	Kensington Area	<p>SH considers that project may increase traffic through Kensington (northbound only) via Sims Road and Kensington Road, as an alternate to staying on arterial roads. SH notes it's a circuitous route but cannot comment confidently on its potential impact. JK disagrees it is likely to be used as a rat-run but agrees that a technical note should be considered to inform the impact on Kensington Road and the broader network.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Partially Agreed (technical note to be considered)</p>
3	Closing Comments	<p>SH requested that the conclave meetings be circulated to all experts, as there is overlap between experts (e.g. SH & ML). JK proposes to circulate all conclave minutes subject to appropriate IAC clearance.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Agreed</p> <p>SH noted that he may be benefited from meeting with VLC. SH to advise JK if it assists to clarify matters (e.g. Dynon Road) and JK will seek to organise / convene a meeting. SH happy to accept clarification of modelling assumptions provided in Veitch evidence at this stage, subject to specific clarification as to the derived daily volume change estimates for Dynon Road in the Project v No Project Scenario as shown in Fig 160 of Technical Appendix A.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Note</p>

Reviewed and agreed:

Steve Hunt – Ratio



John Kiriakidis – GTA



Agnelo Duarte – VicRoads

