

3002666.114

12 March 2021

EPSDD
Level 2, 480 Northbourne Avenue
Dickson ACT 2602

Dear Ali,

RE: Peer Review of Molonglo 3 East – Transport Reporting Review

Thank you for the opportunity to provide peer review and feedback on the work undertaken by WSP in their Molonglo 3 East Planning and Infrastructure Study.

The reports developed by WSP during the Molonglo 3 East Planning and Infrastructure Study have been supplied to SMEC for peer review. Two reports have been supplied:

- Phase 1 Planning and Infrastructure Outcomes Report
- Transport Modelling Report

SMEC reviewed the transport modelling chapters of the Phase 1 Planning and Infrastructure Report and made the following observations:

- The report provides a clear and in depth discussion of the options and the transport network arrangements for each
- The report presents the modelling outcomes (taken from the Transport Modelling Report) without any additional comment or conclusions
- SMEC did not identify any issues or shortcomings in the report that should be revised.

We also conducted a review of the Transport Modelling Report and identified the issues shown in Table 1. SMEC's perceived severity of these issues has been identified, along with suggested solutions.



SMEC

Oracle Building, Suite 2, Level 1
243 Northbourne Avenue
Lyneham, Canberra, ACT 2602, Australia
(PO Box 1043 Dickson ACT 2602)
T +61 2 6234 1900 **F** +61 2 6234 1966 **E** canberra@smec.com
www.smec.com

SMEC Australia Pty Ltd **ABN** 47 065 475 149
SMEC International Pty Ltd **ABN** 32 065 440 619
SMEC Services Pty Ltd **ABN** 79 066 504 792
SMEC Holdings Pty Ltd **ABN** 84 057 274 049

Table 1: Comments on Transport Modelling Report

| Issue | Discussion | Severity | Solution |
|---|--|----------|---|
| The project options are not described very clearly in this report. | <p>The descriptions of attributes for each option are separated over multiple sub-sections. It would be clearer if all attributes of each option were described together, and ideally an exhaustive list for each. A diagram showing each item (especially road closures) would also be helpful.</p> <p>There are two consecutive dot points on pp.6 under Project Option 1, first stating Bindubi Street Extension has been reduced from 70 to 60 km/h, then stating it is 40 km/h, without identifying different sections.</p> | Minor | Revise report |
| Figures 2.4 & 2.5 are difficult to interpret by someone not intimately familiar with the project. | Perhaps colour coding of each complete item/corridor, rather than using numbers placed in multiple locations. | Minor | Revise diagrams |
| The existing Molonglo CSTM road network has not been adjusted to match the proposed layout shown in Figures 2.4 & 2.5 | The proposed road network topology appears to be very similar to the existing model, however the cost of travel and therefore route choice in the CSTM is a function of distance. Some roads would have very different lengths if realigned to match the proposed layout, for example the Southern Collector would be about 900 metres longer, which at 60 km/h is a significant travel time difference. The options are consistent so comparison between options is unaffected, however. | Medium | Explain how the existing CSTM road layout corresponds to the options layouts being tested, and whether the difference in lengths and connection points is acceptable. |
| Volume labels are missing from a section of John Gorton Drive in Option 2 V/C diagrams (Figures 4.3 and 4.4) | Comparison of the line thicknesses and colours suggests that the volumes are similar in both options, perhaps lower in Option 2. The differences are also adequately shown in Section 4.5. | Minor | Update diagram if necessary |

Overall, the report was difficult to understand for someone not already familiar with the project and it does not function well as a standalone report, but would be acceptable as an attachment to the Outcomes Report.

General observations

In addition to the specific observations made in Table 1, SMEC considers that the conclusions drawn from the model outputs are appropriate, based on the included results diagrams.

Conclusions

SMEC has conducted a review of the Phase 1 Planning and Infrastructure Outcomes Report and Transport Modelling Report developed by WSP for the Molonglo 3 East Planning and Infrastructure Study. A number of minor issues were found in the Transport Modelling Report, along with the observation that the report required more detail if it is to be presented as a standalone report. No serious issues were found in the report and SMEC believes that the outcomes can be accepted by EPSDD and TCCS to support the findings of the study.

Yours sincerely,

A grey rectangular box redacting the signature of the sender.

Associate Planner – Transport Planning, Logistics & Analytics – SMEC Australia