

West Gate Tunnel Project - Response to Requests for Information

This document is an initial response to requests for information raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA. Several requests for information were also made directly to WDA external to the submissions and these are set out in Section 2 of the Table.

#	Request	Response
Section One		
Submission 158 - Maddocks Lawyers, for Maribyrnong City Council		
1.	Modelling of the port connections in the 2031 project case on the assumption that Coode Rd remains open	No modelling has been carried out or is proposed to be carried out in response to this request on the basis that Coode Road is committed to be closed.
2.	Level of service assessments and vehicle counts of specific turning movements providing westerly access and egress to and from Appleton Dock Road and Dock Link Road, with discrete analysis of left turn movements from slip lanes and right turns reliant on signals (in both the 2031 no project case and the 2031 project case)	This request relates to IAC request 2, a response to which will be provided.
3.	Modelling which shows performance of the Dock Link Road ramp option levels of service (with and without closure of Coode Road)	No modelling has been carried out. Please see chapter 3 (Table 3-4) of the EES which looked at this option.
4.	Clarification of any differences between local air quality modelling baseline data compared with the data relied on from the EPA's Footscray meteorological data	Analysis of the local air quality monitoring data is underway and will be provided once available.
5.	Further assessment of impacts of noise increase to Yarraville Gardens and the Maribyrnong river edge	See expert report of Matthew Stead at Table 1(D) & Table 4(I) See also Technical Report H - Figure 34 Predicted Operational Traffic Noise Levels design year (2031)
6.	Clarification of whether any peak hour noise modelling was carried out or can be provided, for comparison with the EES approach of adopting an 18 hour average	See expert report of Matthew Stead at Table 5 See also Technical Report H - Appendix C which provides existing noise levels. The typical peak hour noise level is 2 to 4 dB higher than the average L10,18hr.
7.	Explanation of why the noise model does not address the impacts to the Yarraville Glory Soccer Club	See expert report of Matthew Stead at Table 4(K)

West Gate Tunnel Project - Response to Requests for Information

This document is an initial response to requests for information raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA. Several requests for information were also made directly to WDA external to the submissions and these are set out in Section 2 of the Table.

#	Request	Response
Section One		
8.	Whether the proponent is aware of any consideration being given to the extension of the Paramount Road corridor and connection proposed by the City of Maribyrnong or DEDJTR, or has a technical response to this	See expert report of John Kiriakidis at section 2.3 (page 139)
9.	Whether there has been consultation with Work Safe Victoria regarding the proximity of the WGT project to the Coode Island Major Hazard Facility and any outcomes from that consultation.	There has been previous consultation with Work Safe Victoria where there has been consideration of the Coode Island Major Hazard Facility on the project.
Submission 176 - Bus Association Victoria (BusVic)		
10.	A Bus Service Plan from DEDJTR referred to in the TIA (Table 3.1) – would like a copy to understand the assumptions used in the TIA	This information can be made available subject to making arrangements for WDA to meet- with BusVic to provide an information session on how the document was utilised in the TIA
11.	The VLC - Transport Modelling for West Gate Tunnel Project Base Case Model Development for 2014 EES Model - Version 3.1.0 Project 15-010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like clarified how the seating number is being used in the model, what impact this has on modelling outputs (including running times) and how adopting the legal load limits for route buses will affect modelling outputs for public transport (both route bus services and train replacement services) 	See expert report of Tim Veitch at section 6.3.1.13
12.	Melbourne Wide Model Validation Report Version 3.1.0 Transport Modelling for West Gate Tunnel Project May 2017 - Section 2.1.5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The modelling uses 2011-12 figures for bus boardings to draw conclusions for 2016-17 patronage analysis Would like clarified how (and if) these figures have been adjusted to represent recent bus patronage numbers which have increased significantly during that period. 	<p>The Model wide validation was based on 2011 conditions due to the extensive data available for that year, including ABS census, household travel surveys (VISTA 07-10), VicRoads screenline traffic counts, and PTV public transport patronage estimates.</p> <p>The figures in Section 2.1.5. of this report draws conclusions by comparing the 2011 model against 2011 bus patronage estimates supplied by PTV.</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - Response to Requests for Information

This document is an initial response to requests for information raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA. Several requests for information were also made directly to WDA external to the submissions and these are set out in Section 2 of the Table.

#	Request	Response
Section One		
		<p>They have not been adjusted to reflect 2016-17 patronage for model validation purposes, as the model is built to reflect 2011 conditions.</p> <p>This model was then improved within the local area and updated to reflect 2014 conditions. Although requests were made by the project team, 2014 bus patronage data was not available from PTV during the development of this model.</p>
13.	<p>Melbourne Wide Model Validation Report Version 3.1.0 Transport Modelling for West Gate Tunnel Project May 2017 – Section 4.3</p> <p>Would like clarified how the significant variation between actual and modelled data, in particular during the peak period, impact the outputs of the model, in particular the travel time assumptions and impacts of congestion on route bus services</p>	<p>In the Model, buses and some trams are assumed to operate as on-road vehicles and therefore their travel speeds (and times) are affect by changes in traffic congestion.</p> <p>The variation between observed bus patronage and modelled (using a strategic four-step model) is consistent with other major infrastructure project and State Government guidelines.</p>
14.	<p>GHD Report "Western Distributor Authority West Gate Tunnel Transport Impact Assessment, May 2017" - Section 6.1 and 6.7</p> <p>State that the time for a public transport journey by bus will increase by 10% under the "No project" scenario. Would like clarified the source of this projected increase</p>	<p>This is an output of the VLC model</p>
Submission 185 - Russel Nisbet, Executive Director for Digital Harbour (Holdings) Pty Ltd (DDH)		
15.	<p>What form of noise abatement/treatment will be employed to mitigate noise generated by the increased traffic volumes anticipated on the widened Wurundjeri Way, particularly how it may impact residential apartments on the corner of Wurundjeri Way and Dudley Street</p>	<p>See Chapter 27 and expert report of Matthew Stead at Table 4F. Mitigation will be provided as required to meet the project noise objective of 63dBA L10(18 hour) for Category A and B buildings. Noise mitigation is not expected to be provided as this location is already exposed to high noise levels and the expected increase is less than one dB(A) which is expected to be indiscernible</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - Response to Requests for Information

This document is an initial response to requests for information raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA. Several requests for information were also made directly to WDA external to the submissions and these are set out in Section 2 of the Table.

#	Request	Response
Section One		
16.	What mitigation measures are proposed to deal with the likely noise levels generated by truck traffic climbing and descending the inclined roadway over Dudley Street? (refer to Impacts on Traffic Movements (risk TR35))	See Chapter 27 and expert report of Matthew Stead at Table 4F. Mitigation will be provided as required to meet the project noise objective of 63dBA L10(18 hour) for Category A and B buildings. Noise mitigation is not expected to be provided as this location is already exposed to high noise levels and the expected increase is less than one dB(A) which is expected to be indiscernible
17.	What impact will the proposed construction area and construction works have on the existing landscaping at the base of 990 La Trobe Street (adjacent to Wurundjeri Way) and the traffic movement at the intersection into and out of the DH precinct below 990 La Trobe Street?	See EES Map Book – Proposed Landscape Plans (Sheet 26 of 28) , which shows the proposed landscape treatment at 990 La Trobe Street. The matters raised will also be addressed in accordance with EPRs EP6 (requiring preparation of a landscape plan) EPR BP2 (requiring the restoration or relocation of access points as agreed with the landowner) and EPR TP3 (requiring preparation of traffic management plans).
18.	What is the projected increase in traffic volumes along Wurundjeri Way through the intersection below 990 La Trobe Street?	See EES Technical Report A <i>Transport</i> , Part 2, Appendix D, which provides detailed two-way directional traffic volumes along roads, including along Wurundjeri Way
19.	What measures will be implemented to mitigate any impact on traffic movement into and out of the DH precinct and for the other users of the Stadium access road?	This matter will be addressed in accordance with EPR BP2 and Traffic Management Plans developed in accordance with EPR TP3

West Gate Tunnel Project - Response to Requests for Information

This document is an initial response to requests for information raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA. Several requests for information were also made directly to WDA external to the submissions and these are set out in Section 2 of the Table.

#	Request	Response
Section One		
20.	What are the projected increases for south bound traffic volumes at the southern end of Wurundjeri Way where it intersects with Flinders Street?	See EES Technical Report A <i>Transport</i> , Part 1, Table 143-145, Figure 187 and 188
21.	What steps are being taken to disperse this additional traffic given that the current intersection arrangement is already congested and gridlocked at peak times?	<p>The project will redistribute traffic in this area.</p> <p>In addition, the project will undertake works at this intersection, to provide a longer left turn lane from Wurundjeri Way into Flinders Street to remove turning vehicles from through traffic lanes. The Flinders Street approach to the intersection will also be altered slightly, changing the lane arrangement to make the intersection operate more efficiently.</p> <p>Traffic modelling shows that the Wurundjeri Way/Flinders Street intersection will operate at a level of service C, and D in the 5-6pm.</p>
22.	With reference to Chapter 27 and the fourth paragraph within item 27.2.1: provide clarity about the impact on existing building occupants within the DH precinct, any future construction activities on the DH site and on the traffic flows from the DH precinct and other users of the Stadium access road that will be detrimentally affected by the proposed construction works and the extended construction hours	This matter will be addressed in accordance with EPR BP2 and Traffic Management Plans developed in accordance with EPR TP3
23.	Clarify the intended duration for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wurundjeri Way road widening works • The construction compound north of Dudley Street, including the proposed access routes 	See EES Vol 1, section 5.7.3 EES Vol 4, 25.5 (figure 25-5)
24.	Provide further details on the mitigation options for locations relative to the DH precinct where it is predicted the relevant noise objective would be exceeded. Refer to pages 28 and 29 of Chapter 27 and the reference to Wurundjeri Way and provide clarity regarding whether the information applies to the proposed road widening works for Wurundjeri Way.	<p>This information is already contained in EES – Chapter 27.2.</p> <p>Mitigation options to achieve the construction noise objectives are a matter for determination in the Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP) to be prepared and implemented as per</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - Response to Requests for Information

This document is an initial response to requests for information raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA. Several requests for information were also made directly to WDA external to the submissions and these are set out in Section 2 of the Table.

#	Request	Response
Section One		
		EPR NVP3
25.	With reference to page 43, Chapter 27, which refers to noise levels affecting residential towers within Digital Harbour of up to 70 dB(A) L10(18hr) from the Wurundjeri Way Extension <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide details regarding the extent of sound barriers / sound proofing /noise containment structures proposed for the bridge over Dudley Street and the ramped zone of Wurundjeri Way south of Dudley Street given the immediately proximate location of proposed buildings within the DH precinct. 	As per Chapter 27 and expert report of Matthew Stead at Table 4F. Mitigation will be provided as required to meet the project noise objective of 63dBA L10(18 hour) for Category A and B buildings. Noise mitigation is not expected to be provided as this location is already exposed to high noise levels and the expected increase is less than one dB(A) which is expected to be indiscernible
26.	Provide details regarding the proposed re-alignment of the 66kV power supply along Wurundjeri Way including the extent, duration and impact on surrounding access (fifth bullet point on page 55, Chapter 27).	This matter will be addressed in accordance with EPR BP6 during detailed design in consultation with and in accordance with the requirements of the asset owners to ensure continuity of services.
27.	Please confirm that the proposed alignment for the widened Wurundjeri Way at the intersection with Dudley Street will not detrimentally affect the built form of any approved planning permits within the DH precinct (final paragraph on page 17, Chapter 28)	This statement is confirmed as at the date of the preparation of the EES
28.	With reference to Area P5 on page 44, Chapter 28: Provide details regarding the anticipated changed access conditions including intended duration and proposed mitigation strategies for all affected occupants noting in particular that the Stadium access road is shared by multiple user groups	This matter will be addressed in accordance with the Construction Traffic Management Plans developed in accordance with EPR TP3
29.	Provide details regarding the particular noise impacts that may be experienced by the building at 990 Latrobe Street (refer P5: Docklands comments page 46, Chapter 28). Provide further details regarding alternative mitigation measures.	See expert report of Matthew Stead at Table 4(L)
30.	Provide further details regarding the statement on page 10, Chapter 30 which says: Specific EPRs would require the Project Co to manage the project's impacts on future development plans for West Melbourne (in consultation with the City of Melbourne) and Digital Harbour (in consultation with the landowner/developer).	See the following specific EPRs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPR LPP3 EPR LPP4
Submission 192 - Hyde St Residents Group		

West Gate Tunnel Project - Response to Requests for Information

This document is an initial response to requests for information raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA. Several requests for information were also made directly to WDA external to the submissions and these are set out in Section 2 of the Table.

#	Request	Response
Section One		
31.	<p>Property acquisition: Requests that the location of the properties referred to below and the basis for the assessment for acquisition to be provided</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are seven businesses identified in Chapter 14 for acquisition as the Hyde St ramps would impact these properties. To our knowledge, with the exception of the Substation, the Hyde St residents are the closest properties to the construction site. 	<p>Chapter 14.3 of the EES sets out the results of the business impact assessment, including the impacts on the seven businesses related to property acquisition required for the project.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on residential properties is assessed in Chapter 14.1 (land use) and 14.2 (social).</p> <p>See also the report of Natalie Lawlor at section 3</p>
Submission 203 - Andrew Webster		
32.	Why does the summary report say there will be monitoring along the freeway and at key intersections, yet the Technical report (Appendix A TP2 Technical Report A Volume 2) only mentions selected streets - Which one is it?	This matter is addressed by EPR TP2
33.	If the monitoring demonstrates there is a negative impact on local roads what is going to be done to improve the situation?	This matter will be addressed by EPRs TP2 (requiring development and implementation of traffic monitoring and management works during and up to two years after construction, TP6 (requiring independent road safety audits after each stage of detailed design and after construction) and TP7 (requiring establishment of a Traffic Management Liaison Group which is to be provided with Traffic Management Plans to discuss associated issues)
34.	Page 48 Summary Report "East-west movements in North Melbourne are forecast to increase by up to 3,000 vehicles a day on roads including Arden Street and Victoria Street, while traffic on Queensberry Street is forecast to increase by 1,500 vehicles a day." Has the project studied these access road to the north and eastern suburbs and the impact on them? How does the project propose to prevent these access roads from becoming bottlenecks?	This request relates to IAC requests 7, a response to which will be provided.
35.	<p>Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considering the increased traffic using Douglas Parade because of the project, how 	The final detailed design of the intersection will be designed in accordance with Australian Standards

West Gate Tunnel Project - Response to Requests for Information

This document is an initial response to requests for information raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA. Several requests for information were also made directly to WDA external to the submissions and these are set out in Section 2 of the Table.

#	Request	Response
Section One		
	<p>can coming around a blind corner below Scienceworks and being faced with traffic lights be deemed to be safe practice?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What studies have been undertaken to ensure the safety of vehicles, bike riders and pedestrians at this new intersection? 	<p>and National Guidance.</p> <p>See also the expert report of John Kiriakidis at section 10 - 4.12</p>
36.	If the Project receives safety complaints from users, is there a requirement on Transurban to address the complaints and to take proactive measures to alleviate the problem?	This matter is addressed by EPRs TP6 and TP7
37.	What does the project propose to do if the intersection at Booker St and Simcock Ave becomes a safety concern?	This matter is addressed by EPRs TP2, TP6 and TP7
38.	<p>Vehicle emissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In this day of global warming awareness, how can the government promote a project that is going to increase vehicle emissions? Why are we not undertaking projects that reduce emission, rather than go against State and National Policy? 	See Part A Submission - Overview
39.	<p>Alternate options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why has public transport not been considered instead of the tunnel? Why has the Port rail shuttle project been put on hold? 	See Part A Submission - Overview
40.	Why has there not been a comprehensive fauna assessment of what is using the trees slated for removal by the project?	See the expert report of Cameron Miller at section 7.6.5
41.	How can AECOM be sure that the removal of the trees is not having a significant impact on native fauna, and potentially be housing endangered and vulnerable fauna if they have not conducted a thorough survey?	See the expert report of Cameron Miller at section 7.6.5
42.	There seems to be inconsistencies in the tree removal figures. Section 6 of Technical report F Tree Assessment Data itemizes 2721 (approximate) trees, but the Summary report (page 25) indicates that 2,502 trees that will be damaged or removed. What is the explanation for the difference?	See the expert report of Cameron Miller at section 7.6.4
43.	Where is the information informing us of what impacts the removal of the remnant coastal	EES Vol 2, Chapter 12.5, Technical Report F

West Gate Tunnel Project - Response to Requests for Information

This document is an initial response to requests for information raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA. Several requests for information were also made directly to WDA external to the submissions and these are set out in Section 2 of the Table.

#	Request	Response
Section One		
	saltmarsh may have on the saltmarsh in the Stony Creek Backwash and downstream in Kororoit Creek? What monitoring of the vegetation quality downstream will be undertaken, and who pays for any damages?	Ecology, section 6.4.1 See also Table 8-1, EES Chapter 8, which states it is a responsibility of Project Co. 'To take any necessary corrective action required to address issues raised in the audit reports of the IREA or independent Environmental Auditor (as the case may be), to the satisfaction of the State and IREA or independent Environmental Auditor as appropriate'.
44.	In this day and age of climate change and environmental awareness how replacing mature trees with immature or feedstock be justified?	See the expert report of Deiter Lim at section 4.3
45.	Is the project going to adhere to the standards set by the Greening the West project? If not, why not?	This matter is addressed by EPR EP6, which requires that the Landscape Plan must be developed in consultation with the relevant council with regard to local policies and strategies including as applicable the Greening the West Strategic Plan
46.	Who will be doing the maintenance of the planted trees, and who is paying for it?	This will depend on the ultimate facility owner for each asset and will be determined during detailed design.
47.	Who is going to maintain these new parklands, and what financial compensation will they receive to do so?	This will depend on the ultimate facility owner for each asset and will be determined during detailed design.
48.	During construction, will sports clubs that use Donald Mclean Reserve and Crofts Reserve still have access to these facilities. If not are they being provided with alternatives?	This matter is addressed in Technical Report L <i>Social</i> , section 6.3.5 This matter is also addressed by EPR LPP2
Submission 222 - David Martin		
49.	Would an existing condition survey be undertaken to our property?	This matter is addressed by EPR GMP3
50.	How do Project Co intend to monitor any change in conditions caused by construction of the	This matter is addressed by EPR GMP5

West Gate Tunnel Project - Response to Requests for Information

This document is an initial response to requests for information raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA. Several requests for information were also made directly to WDA external to the submissions and these are set out in Section 2 of the Table.

#	Request	Response
Section One		
	tunnel?	
51.	What is the proposed construction methodology for cross tunnels?	This matter is addressed in EES Vol 3, chapter 20 - page 69
52.	Will there be any emergency access or services infrastructure in the vicinity of Schild Street?	This matter is addressed in EES Vol 1, section 5.5.5
Submission 289 - Brooklyn Residents Action Group		
53.	Landscaping / Urban Design – seeks clarification on the proposed landscaping of Lynch Reserve	This matter is addressed by EPR EP6, which requires the preparation and implementation of a Landscape Plan
54.	Ecology – seeks clarification of what 34% of reserve area means in terms of area lost from Lynch Reserve	See EES Map book (Horizontal alignment plans-sheet 8 of 31)
Submission 312 - Michael Ingram (member of the Kensington Association)		
55.	Traffic – requests traffic data/volumes for the Kensington area be provided (notes that this has previously been requested but not provided by the project team)	See expert report of Tim Veitch at section 6.3.2.2 and Figures 12 and 13 which shows change in daily (AWDT) modelled traffic and truck volumes
Submission 326 - Spotswood South Kingsville Residents Group Incorporated		
56.	Ecology – request for shadow diagrams to assess shadows cast from elevated structures. Request relates to Donald McLean Reserve and the New St/Altona North park in particular	This request relates to IAC request 37, a response to which will be provided. See also Technical report F Ecology, Appendix F for assessment of areas of permanent shade or shading for more than 50% of time at areas of ecological sensitivity.
57.	Air quality – requests that data from the monitoring station on DM Reserve be immediately provided to the public (note - submissions 340,346,351 and 399 make similar requests)	Analysis of the local air quality monitoring data is underway and will provided once available.
Submission 344 - Kensington Association, Submission 354 - Frances Araneda		
58.	Traffic – argues that the Kensington Association is not able to provide a full submission as the EES does not contain any information describing the traffic impacts upon Kensington.	See expert report of Tim Veitch at section 6.3.2.2 and Figures 12 and 13 which shows change in daily (AWDT) modelled traffic and truck volumes
Submission 352 - Don't Destroy Millers Road		
59.	Social – requests further information to be provided to the community on the impact on Lynch Reserve (specifically, the detail of the construction compound – noise, if this compound will be bound to EPA requirements, construction hours)	See Table 5.4 in EES Chapter 5.7.3 and EPR NVP3, which requires the preparation and implementation of a Construction Noise and

West Gate Tunnel Project - Response to Requests for Information

This document is an initial response to requests for information raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA. Several requests for information were also made directly to WDA external to the submissions and these are set out in Section 2 of the Table.

#	Request	Response
Section One		
		Vibration Management Plan in accordance with the limits, hours and methodologies outlined in the Noise and Vibration EPRs
Submission 368 - EPA (and other submitters)		
60.	Air quality – recommends that air quality monitoring data be provided on an accessible website	Analysis of the local air quality monitoring data is underway and will provided once available-
Submission 378 - Hobsons Bay City Council		
61.	Traffic – Council seeks clarifications on what measures are proposed on Blackshaws and Hudsons Road and how their effectiveness has been evaluated.	See EES Technical Report A Transport, Part 1, section 7.8.1
62.	Shared Use Paths – seeks details on the Kororoit Creek trail and consistency with Stages 2 and 3 (to be constructed by Council)	See EES Map Book (Horizontal Alignment plans), Sheet 6 and 7
63.	Social – requests further details on the impact on sport clubs and other user groups	See expert report of Pallavi Mandke at section 5.2
64.	Social – seeks further details on the proposed multi-purpose club rooms at Donald McLean reserve	-New joint facilities are to be provided in the form of refurbished site offices consistent with Hobsons Bay City Council Donald McLean Reserve Masterplan
65.	Surface water – requests that functional schemes be provided to Council to consider ongoing responsibilities and mitigation	This will depend on the ultimate facility owner for each asset and will be determined during detailed design
66.	Power – requests further information on the design, location and impact of pylons and monopoles	EES Vol 1, 5.4.11 identifies existing 220kV lattice towers to be removed and replaced or relocated. These are also shown on the EES Map Book. This matter is to be addressed by EPR BP6
Submission 422 - Senator Janet Rice		
67.	Transport – requests that the peer reviews of the transport model be publically released	This review is Cabinet in Confidence and is not

West Gate Tunnel Project - Response to Requests for Information

This document is an initial response to requests for information raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA. Several requests for information were also made directly to WDA external to the submissions and these are set out in Section 2 of the Table.

#	Request	Response
Section One		
		available to be provided
Submission 467 - Jessica Marnich		
68.	Community consultation - would like to know how community feedback and consultations have been incorporated into the project plans and designs	EES - Section 3.5 of each EES technical report. Chapter 7, Attachment III Stakeholder and community engagement report
69.	Noise - information as to whether noise modelling has taken into account degenerative loss of hearing	No, not relevant to assessment of project
70.	Landscape - shadowing diagrams for the southern side of the Project corridor to show shadowing impact for summer and winter	This request relates to IAC request 37, a response to which will be provided.
#	Request	Response
Section Two		
Hobsons Bay City Council		
1.	Request for provision of micro-sim traffic modelling	Response provided 28 July offering an information session on the model and how it was utilised in the TIA.
2.	Request for provision of noise model	Model provided on 28 July 2017
Melbourne City Council		
3.	CAD drawing set of design	Provided to City of Melbourne on 28 July 2017
4.	Request for Provision of VLC "Review of Travel Forecasting Methodologies" report.	Requested by City of Melbourne on 9 August 2017 and response to be provided.