

<b>Date / Time</b>	<b>14 August 2017 at 2:30pm</b>
<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Marco Lucioni (ML) – Cardno; John Kiriakidis (JK) – GTA; Agnelo Duarte (AD) – VicRoads</b>

<b>Item</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
1	Key Issues	
1.1	Dynon Road / Dryburgh Road Intersection	<p>ML considers the project insufficiently considers operational performance / impact in the 2031 Project Case with the reliance on traffic engineering tools such 'constrained/spread peak' and an isolated consideration of net change in 2031 No Project / Project Case, which effectively segregates the implications of traffic volume growth to 2031, noting his view that a greater 'municipal responsibility' sits with this proponent given the nature of the proponent and project significance. ML also noted existing observed queue length of 300m on western approach during the morning peak which extends to the proposed Dynon Road link. JK noted that the modelling indicates that the intersection operation meets project objectives and he therefore considers the works at the intersection to be acceptable.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Disagreed</b></p> <p>ML considers that the assessment of project impacts should have extended beyond Dynon Rd / Dryburgh St into the broader local precinct, in particular given 2031 project case volumes are available for this local area (ie: Figure 161 Technical Report A). In particular, the intersection of Spencer Street / Hawke Street needs consideration. JK considers the study scope is acceptable.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Disagreed</b></p> <p>ML considers that the design could be more sensitive / empathetic to the E-Gate Moonee Ponds Creek frontage. JK considers that this concern relates principally to environmental impacts and expects that these, particularly visual impacts of the project would be addressed by others i.e. urban design experts. JK also noted that Technical Design Report 2 (TP1) provides a framework to optimise design (operational) performance and that this will be able to consider any operational design concerns. ML agreed that this framework would provide benefit, assuming that it offers opportunity to review alignment of structure over Moonee Ponds Creek</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Partially Agreed</b></p> <p>ML noted the City of Melbourne vision for the extension of Spencer Street light rail along Dynon Road to Footscray railway station and that the Dynon Road connection might introduce new infrastructure costs and traffic capacity challenges for its potential delivery in the future, but did not consider the project would preclude that extension. JK agreed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Agreed</b></p> <p>ML questioned whether North/West Melbourne have any pre-identified strategic need for new Freeway connections, including the Dynon Road link and that it is insufficient that the Dynon Road link be introduced merely to address operational performance issues for the project. JK &amp; AD noted that modelling indicates that link is required for the overall network performance and is therefore strategically needed. AD noted that three links are required and that the removal of one jeopardises the overall benefit of the project. It was considered that a technical report should be issued which explores the impact of the removal of the Dynon Road link, whilst retaining Footscray Road and Wurundjeri Way.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Disagreed (other than agreement to provide technical note)</b></p>
1.2	Wurundjeri Way / Dudley Street & Wurundjeri Way / Flinders Street Intersections and Active Travel Link Through E-Gate	<p>ML considers the project includes insufficient infrastructure / mitigation works at these intersections. ML noted saturation (DoS of 1.0+) on all legs of Wurundjeri Way/Dudley St in the AM peak 2031 Project case, including significant queue on the western approach. ML noted significant queue on the north leg of the Wurundjeri Way / Flinders St under 2031 project case. ML noted his analysis results did not assess the upper limit of the EES forecast volume range, which would result in further deterioration. JK noted he was satisfied with the level of service outcomes at the intersections noting City of Melbourne preferences to limit capacity upgrades at these junctions into the Melbourne CBD.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Disagreed</b></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>ML considers that there is opportunity to lower the Wurundjeri Way extension and that its height and associated on/off ramps to the Dynon Rd connection may hinder Melbourne City Council vision for connections between E-Gate and West Melbourne. ML states that project should not preclude provision of future connections, including a shared path link from West Melbourne through E-Gate to Footscray Road. JK agreed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Agreed</b></p>
1.3	Maribymong River Crossing	<p>ML considers that alternate road design solutions exist, which would lessen environmental impacts, such as the reduction of river piers and improved river frontage amenity for existing properties. ML presented two preliminary options, refer V171019-T-SK001 &amp; loop ramp option V171019-T-SK002. ML stated the loop ramp radius compliance with AustRoads Guide to Road Design Part 4C JK disagreed and considered the proposed design were more appropriate given that they provide a more direct alignment to/from the Port, do not rely on third party land, and lessen overlap between intersections. AD noted VicRoads would not support loop ramps at this location for safety reasons.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Disagreed</b></p>
1.4	Footscray Road Northern Service Road and Main Carriageway	<p>ML noted opportunity for a reduction in the number of lanes in the northern service road from 3 to 2 and the eastbound carriageway from 4 to 3, given introduction of port connections at MacKenzie Rd &amp; Appleton Dock Rd which both address port movements with origins in the west. JK disagreed that the reductions should be adopted given potential adverse impacts at signalised intersections and provision for future transport growth in the Port. AD noted VicRoads had already reduced carriageway widths and was not supportive of lane reductions on Footscray Road in lane numbers.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Disagreed</b></p>
1.5	Veloway	<p>ML noted that the 4.0m width between handrails does not meet requirements of AustRoads Guide to Road Design Part 6A and should be 5.0m. JK noted that a 4.0m facility is serviceable however agrees that a width of 5.0m should be considered as part of the project optimisation phase.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Partially Agreed</b></p> <p>ML raised emergency access concerns and likelihood for cyclists to bypass Veloway via existing at-grade route due perceptions of travel time and physical exertion at start/end of working day.</p> <p>ML presented an alternate design (drawing V171019-T-SK004) that responds to above concerns incorporating at-grade components on south side of Footscray Rd and a signalised connection to future development of the old Fruit &amp; Vegetable Market site. JK considers that the alternate design is less desirable, less effectively addresses the needs for different cyclist competencies and the proposed design represents the best 'on-balance' solution.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Disagreed</b></p>

Reviewed and agreed:

Marco Lucioni – Cardno

John Kiriakidis – GTA

Agnelo Duarte – VicRoads



