MINUTES

ARCADIS Design & Consultancy for natural and built assets

Issue date	27/09/2016
Issue to	All
Issued by	Westley Owers (Arcadis)
Subject	MPW Stage 2 Proposal – Agency Traffic Meeting
Reference	AA008765
Client	SIMTA
Meeting date	7/09/2016
Time	12:30pm – 2:30pm
Location	Liverpool City Council, Liverpool
Attendees	See below.

Name	Abbreviation	Organisation	Role
Tim Dewey	TD	Transport for NSW (TFNSW)	Senior Transport Planner
Mark Ozinga	MO	Transport for NSW (TFNSW)	Principal Manager Land Use Planning and Development
Mark Birkinshaw	MB	Transport Ideas	Business partner RMS
Owen Hodgson	OH	Liverpool City Council (LCC)	Transport Planner
Charles Wiafe	CW	LCC	Transport & Traffic Manager, LCC
Ash Chand	AC	LCC	Executive Planner
Bruce Macnee	BM	LCC	Manager Strategic Planning
Kevin Lynch	KL	Campbelltown City Council (CCC)	Executive manager infrastructure
Ajay Arora	AA	CCC	Coordinator Traffic And Road Design
Nathan Cairney	NC	Tactical Group	Project Manager
Steve Ryan	SR	Tactical Group	Director
Tony Vaccaro	TV	Moorebank Intermodal Company (MIC)	Delivery Director
Paul Nguyen	PN	MIC	Project Engineer
Peter Rand	PR	Arcadis	Technical Director - Environment
Michael Yong	MY	Arcadis	Integrated Transport Planning Manager QLD
Westley Owers	WO	Arcadis	Principal Environmental Planner
Callan Stirzaker	CS	WSP-PB	Principal Engineer, Integrated Transport Planning

Minutes

PR (Arcadis) undertook the role of Chairperson for this meeting.

ITEM	COMMENTS
1.0	**Introductions**
	• PR (Arcadis) indicated that the purpose of this meeting was to present the modelling for the MPW Stage 2 Proposal and, in particular, address Condition 12 of the MPW Concept Plan Approval (SSD 5066). • All introduced themselves (name, organisation and role) (refer to list above).
2.0	**Precinct Background**
	• NC (Tactical Group) provided an overview of the Precinct Planning Approvals.
3.0	**Traffic presentation**
3.1	*Precinct traffic modelling*[1]
	• CS (WSP-PB) provided an overview of the modelling for the Precinct.
3.2	*MPW Stage 2 operational traffic modelling*
	• MY (Arcadis) provided a summary of the operational traffic modelling for the MPW Stage 2 Proposal.
4.0	**Questions**
Precinct modelling/ MPW Stage 2 modelling (general)	• CW (LCC) requested that a Precinct Model is prepared to assess the traffic impacts of both intermodal terminals (MPW/MPE) at full build, rather than providing separate impact assessments within separate applications. MO (RMS) supported this way forward. It was also suggested that the EIS for the MPW Stage 2 Proposal and Precinct Modelling (in particular 2026 modelling) should be submitted to agencies concurrently. • MY (Arcadis) indicated that the traffic modelling identifying all impacts of the MPW/MPE Projects is currently under preparation by Arcadis. Concurrently, PB are undertaking Precinct Modelling to assess the traffic impacts of both intermodal terminals for the ultimate full build scenario. • CS (WSP-PB) indicated that this modelling (the 2026 and 2036 models) would be completed over the next couple of months. This modelling includes a process of consolidation and alignment of assumptions for both sites. • WO (Arcadis) reiterated that both Concept Plan Approvals provide a cumulative traffic impact assessment and that these results are being refined by Parsons Brinckerhoff as part of the Precinct Model. Also it was identified that the MPW Stage 2 Proposal and Precinct Modelling would be provided separately, i.e. not submitted at the same time due to timeframe concerns, and particularly as a result of receiving

[1] Precinct Modelling or the Precinct Model refers to the 'full build' scenario modelling, under preparation by Parsons Brinckerhoff, which assesses the impacts of the Moorebank Precinct with 1.55million TEU per annum processing and 850,000 GFA of warehousing. This modelling assesses years 2026 and 2036.

ITEM	COMMENTS
	an update to the LMARI AIMSUM models in June 2016 (i.e. after modelling had already commenced). • CW (LLC) also indicated that the MPW Stage 2 modelling does not provide an assessment of the future development on the MPE site (particularly MPE Stage 2 Proposal). • WO (Arcadis) and SR (Tactical Group) indicated that an assessment (including cumulative assessment) of the MPW Stage 2 Proposal and MPE Stage 2 Proposal would be provided on submission of MPE Stage 2 Proposal (end of 2016). The traffic modelling would also provide an assessment of both stages of development. • CW (LCC) requested that the Precinct Model be provided to update traffic numbers/impacts for the Precinct so LCC can update the community. MB (Transport Ideas) supported this comment. • SR (Tactical Group) indicated that this information would be available in the coming months, as part of the Precinct Model and, that it could be distributed to the public.
Peak (AM & PM) hour traffic assessment	• CW (LCC) suggested that the modelling needs to consider an accurate background numbers for the AM and PM peaks. • CS (WSP- PB) indicated that the Precinct Modelling also considers, in addition to the AM/PM peak periods, an inter-peak period and potential traffic impacts from the Precinct. • MY (Arcadis) indicated that Arcadis are exploring various network mitigation strategies including vehicle-actuation at signals, improved signal phasing arrangements, and “yellow-boxes” at priority intersections. “Peak spreading” of traffic demand is also being considered recognising that travel patterns do shift in response to acute congestion in the peak periods. • OH (LCC) asked whether the peak spread within the MPW Stage 2 modelling is accurate. • MY (Arcadis) replied that peak spreading is an observable phenomenon in acutely congested networks as commuters change their departure times to avoid extensive travel time delays. If accepted, the peak spreading would only be applied to the background traffic growth between 2026 and 2029. Precinct traffic will remain unchanged.
MPW Stage 2 Proposal model (general)	• MY (Arcadis) indicated that the basis of the traffic impact assessment and mitigation have been predicated on the philosophy of no worsening of the “Do Nothing” scenario. MY asked whether if this was an acceptable assessment approach by Roads and Maritime. • MO (RMS) agreed with this approach (in principle) for the MPW Stage 2 Proposal, however wanted to consider it in the context of all upgrades for the Precinct.
Voluntary Planning Agreement	• TV (MIC) stated that a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) is going to be prepared and signed off by the end of the year to address all stages of the MPW/MPE Projects (i.e. the Moorebank Precinct). The VPA would be prepared based on outcomes of the Precinct Modelling to identify required upgrades for each stage of development of the Precinct. • MO (Roads and Maritime) asked which approval was the VPA going to be tied to.

ITEM	COMMENTS
	• TV (MIC) indicated that this has yet to be confirmed and that discussions would be undertaken with Roads and Maritime Services/Department of Planning and Environment (DP&E) relating to this VPA by the end of 2016.
Cambridge Avenue upgrade	• KL (CCC) suggested that modelling could be updated to consider Cambridge Avenue as an access for the MPW Stage 2 Proposal and the Precinct, subject to consideration of upgrading Cambridge Avenue. CW (LCC) supported this comment. • MB (Transport Ideas) said the Proposal would not affect traffic on Cambridge Avenue, and said that a previous conversation with Ian Hunt (Chief Executive Officer, MIC) indicated that an upgrade of Cambridge Avenue could be considered. It was noted further that Cambridge Avenue has additional traffic capacity however cannot be used in its current form due to the narrow causeway (over the Georges River). • KL (CCC) noted that one road in and one road out makes the development vulnerable and the use of Cambridge Avenue could improve the operation of the Project. • SR (Tactical Group) supported the use of Cambridge Avenue however indicated that currently it was outside of the scope of the MPW Stage 2 Proposal/Precinct as Roads and Maritime have not confirmed that this would be upgraded.
Freight distribution and LMARI modelling	• CW (LCC) suggested that further freight modelling needs to be undertaken by Roads and Maritime Services. • MO (Roads and Maritime) indicated that they would defer sign-off of the freight modelling until the Precinct Model was prepared. • CW (LCC) indicated that SIMTA should also consider impacts on travel times as a result of the MPW Stage 2 Proposal. • MY (Arcadis) said that impacts on travel times are being examined by the MPW Stage 2 Proposal and the Precinct Model. • MB (Transport Ideas) asked whether the Precinct Model consider the most recent LMARI (June 2016) model. • CS (WSP-PB) indicated that it does and that the MPW Stage 2 Proposal modelling considers an older modelling (March 2016 model) which is more relevant to a 2019 opening time.
M5 Upgrade	• TD (TfNSW) asked whether an M5 Upgrade is relevant to the Precinct or only the MPW Stage 2 Proposal. • MY (Arcadis)/ SR (Tactical) Group / NC (Tactical Group) indicated that it is relevant to all stages, however for the purposes of this consultation, discussion has only been provided on the upgrade to the M5 Motorway which is relevant to the MPW Stage 2 Proposal (i.e. this is the purpose of this meeting). Further upgrades would be considered as part of the Precinct Model.
Intersections LoS	• MB (Transport Ideas) asked is the identified approach, within the MPW Stage 2 model, of ensuring intersections meet or better the Level of Service (LoS) due to background traffic, acceptable. • MY (Arcadis) indicated that this is considered acceptable as this approach identifies road network upgrades that specifically mitigate the impact of Precinct traffic.

ITEM	COMMENTS
	Network improvements to mitigate the deterioration in LoS due to background traffic is the responsibility of the relevant road agency. WO (Arcadis) added that the modelling is considered suitable in that it proposes upgrades to the specific intersections affected by the MPW Stage 2 Proposal. It is considered outside of the scope of the modelling, and planning approvals, to resolve existing LoS issues within the network which are not considered to be substantially impacted by the MPW Stage 2 Proposal.
3 shifts for operational staff	• MO (Roads and Maritime) asked whether there were any example of facilities operating at a 3-shift scenario, as proposed in year 2029 for the MPW Stage 2 Proposal. Please provide examples in the EIS to confirm this scenario. • SR (Tactical Group) indicated that this shift scenario is based on real life examples. • MO (Roads and Maritime) asked that an example of a 3-shift IMT/warehouse operation (or other validation of the likelihood of 3 shifts occurring) be provided within the modelling reporting.
Proposed MPW Stage 2 site access	• MB (Transport Ideas) asked why only one intersection is provided and suggest that traffic could be more accurately dispersed with the use of a number of intersections from the MPW Stage 2 site. • WO (Arcadis) /SR (Tactical Group) indicated that the MPW Stage 2 Proposal includes a rail siding to accommodate regional trains (1.8km in length) and that vehicles would not be able to cross these siding without impacting on safety and operations of the IMT. Further, the rail siding has been designed to accommodate a transition of trains to the Rail link to reduce impacts on the Southern Sydney Freight Line (SSFL). This rail siding length does not allow for this intersection to be in another location. Also the inclusion of only one access to the MPW Stage 2 site provides an opportunity to decommission a number of existing intersections and reduce conflicts between operational vehicles and background traffic on Moorebank Avenue (south of Anzac Road). • MY (Arcadis) indicated that two access points are provided (i.e. main access via an upgraded Moorebank Avenue/Anzac Road intersection and Bapaume Road -left-out only). The main access point makes use of the existing Moorebank Avenue/Anzac Road intersection being located 450 metres away from the M5 interchange. • MB (Transport Ideas) also asked whether an overpass between MPW and MPE sites could be built to improve site connectivity. • SR (Tactical Group) indicated that consideration has been given to this however it was not considered reasonable and feasible in the context of the Precinct development.
Moorebank Avenue widening	• CW (LCC) asked whether there is an option to widen Moorebank Avenue between the M5 Motorway and the proposed MPW Stage 2 site intersection. • MY (Arcadis) indicated that this is being examined in the modelling for the MPW Stage 2 Proposal. This would also be considered in the Precinct Modelling.
SIMTA as a joint venture	• MB (Transport Ideas), asked that as Aurizon is no longer part of the joint venture (with Qube) for the development of the Moorebank Precinct, whether there would be any changes to the development of the precinct.

ITEM	COMMENTS
	• TV (MIC)/SR (Tactical Group) indicated that there would be no change to the development of the Precinct. Qube (under SIMTA) and MIC would be responsible for the development of the Precinct.
5.0	**Next steps and reporting**
5.1	*Addressing conditions minutes/response*
	• NC (Tactical Group)/ WO (Arcadis) indicated that all comments provided in this meeting would be summarised within meeting minutes (issued to all for comment) and also the EIS/Traffic reporting for the MPW Stage 2 Proposal. • PR (Arcadis) noted that the documentation to be provided would clarify what is going to be addressed through the EIS (MPW Stage 2 Proposal model) and what is going to be addressed subsequent to the EIS.
5.2	*EIS Lodgement timeframe*
	• NC (Tactical Group) indicated that the EIS (MPW Stage 2 Proposal) is to be provided to DP&E by the end of September 2016, with a view to public exhibition being undertaken soon after. • MO (RMS) requested that the Precinct Model be submitted at the same time as the EIS (MPW Stage 2 Proposal).