15 February 2018

Sir/Madam

Notice is hereby given that a Meeting of the INFRASTRUCTURE AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE is to be held in the Council Chambers on the 2nd Floor of the Council Administration Building, 45 Roderick Street, Ipswich commencing at 8.30 am on Monday, 19 February 2018.

PRESENTATION

At the commencement of the meeting Bradley Freiberg, the Principal Transport Planner, will be providing a summary of the outcomes of the 2017 Strategic Traffic Council Program, including a snapshot of the traffic growth and trends observed on Ipswich’s strategic road network over the last five (5) years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBERS OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Bromage (Chairperson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Silver (Deputy Chairperson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Antoniolli (Mayor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Wendt (Deputy Mayor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Morrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Ireland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yours faithfully

ACTING CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
INFRASTRUCTURE AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
AGENDA
8.30am on **Monday**, 19 February 2018
Council Chambers
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</thead>
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<td>PRESENTATION</td>
<td>At the commencement of the meeting Bradley Freiberg, the Principal Transport Planner, will be providing a summary of the outcomes of the 2017 Strategic Traffic Council Program, including a snapshot of the traffic growth and trends observed on Ipswich’s strategic road network over the last five (5) years.</td>
<td>PTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2017 Strategic Traffic Count Program Summary of Results</td>
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<td>2</td>
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<td>PO(EM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Infrastructure Delivery Progress as at 5 February 2018</td>
<td>CFM</td>
</tr>
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** Item includes confidential papers
PRESENTATION

At the commencement of the meeting Bradley Freiberg, the Principal Transport Planner, will be providing a summary of the outcomes of the 2017 Strategic Traffic Council Program, including a snapshot of the traffic growth and trends observed on Ipswich’s strategic road network over the last five (5) years.

1. 2017 STRATEGIC TRAFF COUNT PROGRAM SUMMARY OF RESULTS

With reference to a report by the 7 February 2018 summarising the results of the 2017 Strategic Traffic Count Program.

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received and the contents noted.

2. NORMAN STREET BRIDGE STAGE 1 BUSINESS CASE, PROJECT UPDATE 1 DIVISIONS 4, 5, 6 AND 7

With reference to a report by the Transport Planner dated 25 January 2018 providing a project update on the status of the Business Case for Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge.

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received and the contents noted.

3. MEMORANUNDUM OF UNDERSTANDING – QUEENSLAND FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

With reference to a report by the Principal Officer (Emergency Management) dated 1 February 2018 concerning a proposed Memorandum of Understanding with Queensland Fire and Emergency Services (QFES).
A. That Council enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Queensland Fire and Emergency Services, based on the proposed Schedule of Aims and Objectives, as detailed in Attachment B to the report by the Principal Officer (Emergency Management) dated 1 February 2018.

B. That Council authorise the Chief Operating Officer (Works, Parks and Recreation) to negotiate and finalise the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding with Queensland Fire and Emergency Services, to be executed by Council and to do any other acts necessary to implement Council’s decision in accordance with section 13(3) of the Local Government Act 2009.

3. INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PROGRESS AS AT 5 FEBRUARY 2018

With reference to a report by the Commercial Finance Manager dated 5 February 2018 concerning the delivery of the 2017–2018 Infrastructure Services Capital Works Portfolio.

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received and the contents noted.

** Item includes confidential papers

and any other items as considered necessary.
7 February 2018

MEMORANDUM

TO: INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING MANAGER
FROM: TRANSPORT PLANNER
RE: 2017 STRATEGIC TRAFFIC COUNT PROGRAM
SUMMARY OF RESULTS

INTRODUCTION:

This is a report by the Transport Planner dated 7 February 2018 summarising the results of the 2017 Strategic Traffic Count Program.

BACKGROUND:

Each year since 2010 Council has carried out the Strategic Traffic Count Program that comprises the gathering of traffic data from the same locations across Council’s major road network. The program takes place in the months of October/November of every year at approximately 100 locations and the data captured delivers information on traffic growth rates across the city. This information is then used to advise Council’s transport planning, traffic operations, investment programming and development assessment activities.

The program does not include the collection of traffic data from state-controlled roads. However, it must be noted that the operation and performance of state-controlled roads can have a direct impact on the traffic volumes on surrounding local controlled roads.

2017 COUNT SITES:

Minor changes were made to the 2017 Strategic Traffic Count Program count site locations. Three count sites were removed as they are now classified as State-controlled Roads and six new count sites were added to the program (Refer Table 1 below). Consequently, the 2017 program comprised of 103 count site locations across the Ipswich local government area.
**TABLE 1**

2017 COUNT SITE LOCATION AMENDMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>SUBURB</th>
<th>LOCATION / SECTION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swanbank Road</td>
<td>Raceview</td>
<td>50m south of South Station Rd</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Road</td>
<td>Dinmore</td>
<td>Between Earl St and King St</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview Road</td>
<td>Riverview</td>
<td>200m West of Jessica St</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane Road</td>
<td>Riverview</td>
<td>Between St Peter Laver College and Stone St</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McEwan Street</td>
<td>Riverview</td>
<td>East of Station Rd</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Village Road</td>
<td>Redbank Plains</td>
<td>Between Rice Rd and Redbank Plains Rd</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Road</td>
<td>Karalee</td>
<td>Between Torrens St and Melbourne St</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampian Drive</td>
<td>Deebing Heights</td>
<td>Between the Centenary Hwy and Rawlings Rd</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampian Drive</td>
<td>Deebing Heights</td>
<td>Between the Centenary Hwy and Broomfield Rd</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2017 RESULTS:**

The Strategic Traffic Count Program for 2017 has been completed and the data analysed. A summary of the 2017 results for each count location is outlined in Attachment A. A comparison of the data collected through the program for the last five years is outlined in Attachment B.

**COMMENTARY:**

**Busiest Roads**

Based on the 2017 results, the top ten busiest Council controlled roads in Ipswich are outlined in Table 2 below. The top 9 roads are the same busiest roads as reported in 2015 and 2016 with some changes to the order. Pine Street has dropped out of the top ten this year (recording 16,536 vehicles per weekday), being replaced by Kingsmill Road/ Albion Street with 16,714 vehicles per weekday. The busiest Council road remains as Augusta Parkway as per previous years.

**TABLE 2**

TOP TEN BUSIEST COUNCIL CONTROLLED ROADS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>SUBURB</th>
<th>LOCATION / SECTION</th>
<th>DAILY VOLUME*</th>
<th>GROWTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Augusta Parkway</td>
<td>Augustine Heights, Brookwater</td>
<td>200m south of Technology Dr</td>
<td>31,380</td>
<td>31,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Springfield Greenbank Arterial</td>
<td>Springfield Central, Springfield Lakes</td>
<td>Main St &amp; Sinnathamby Blvd</td>
<td>23,040</td>
<td>24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sinnathamby Boulevard</td>
<td>Springfield Central</td>
<td>200m north of Main St</td>
<td>23,640</td>
<td>24,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Old Toowoomba Road</td>
<td>Leichhardt, One Mile</td>
<td>Lobb St &amp; Ernest St</td>
<td>23,930</td>
<td>23,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Redbank Plains Road</td>
<td>Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains</td>
<td>200m north of Barry Dr</td>
<td>20,220</td>
<td>22,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Springfield Parkway</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>SGA &amp; Bridgewater Dr</td>
<td>21,080</td>
<td>21,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Brisbane Street</td>
<td>West Ipswich</td>
<td>Keogh St &amp; Hooper St</td>
<td>20,240</td>
<td>20,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Queen Street</td>
<td>Goodna</td>
<td>Eric St &amp; Marie St</td>
<td>18,290</td>
<td>18,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Old Logan Road</td>
<td>Camira</td>
<td>200m south of Alice St</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kingsmill Road/ Albion Street</td>
<td>Brassall, Coalfalls</td>
<td>South of Bremer River</td>
<td>16,790</td>
<td>16,710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Average weekday traffic (rounded) and measured as vehicles per day

2
Largest Increase

Based on the 2017 results, the top five roads with the largest percentage increase in traffic from 2016 are outlined below in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>SUBURB</th>
<th>LOCATION / SECTION</th>
<th>DAILY VOLUME*</th>
<th>INCREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ripley Road</td>
<td>Ripley</td>
<td>North of Centenary Hwy</td>
<td>4,460</td>
<td>8,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ripley Road</td>
<td>Ripley</td>
<td>Centenary Hwy &amp; Providence Pde</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>6,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Briggs Road</td>
<td>Raceview</td>
<td>100m south of Colonial Dr</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>5,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Edwards Street</td>
<td>Flinders View, Raceview</td>
<td>50m east of Mary St</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>5,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grange Road</td>
<td>Eastern Heights, Silkstone</td>
<td>Idolwood St &amp; Dell St</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>5,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Average weekday traffic (rounded) and measured as vehicles per day

The largest increase in traffic over the last year (in terms of vehicle volume and percentage) was recorded on Ripley Road just north of the Centenary Highway with an additional 4,076 vehicles per weekday – a 91.4% increase. Ripley Road between the Centenary Highway and Providence Parade also recorded an additional 2,830 vehicles per weekday – an 85% increase. This is most likely the result of the continued development and construction works associated with the Ripley Valley Priority Development Area.

Briggs Road and Edwards Street also recorded notable increases in traffic in 2017, though this is likely due to the completion of the Briggs Road pavement rehabilitation project which saw to the decrease in traffic on these roads in 2016.

Largest Decrease

Based on the 2017 counts, the top five roads with the largest percentage decrease in traffic from 2016 are outlined in Table 4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>SUBURB</th>
<th>LOCATION / SECTION</th>
<th>DAILY VOLUME*</th>
<th>DECREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ripley Road</td>
<td>Ripley</td>
<td>100m south of Cunningham Hwy</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>-560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>King Edward Parade</td>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>200m east of Marsden Pde</td>
<td>9,130</td>
<td>-880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bremer Street</td>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>West of Olga St</td>
<td>11,560</td>
<td>-850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pine Street</td>
<td>North Ipswich</td>
<td>40m north of Ferguson St</td>
<td>17,650</td>
<td>-1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Whitehill Road</td>
<td>Eastern Heights</td>
<td>100m south of Phyllis St</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>-170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Average weekday traffic (rounded) and measured as vehicles per day

The largest decrease in traffic over the last year (in terms of percentage) was recorded on Ripley Road 100m south of the Cunningham Highway with a -9.9% decrease. This is likely due to the completion of road work further south on Ripley Road, allowing additional traffic to redistribute to the Centenary Highway.

King Edward Parade and Bremer Street also saw notable decreases in traffic over the last year (in terms of percentage) and this is likely due to the CBD redevelopment and closure of key retailers in the locality such as Woolworths.
The largest decrease in traffic over the last year (in terms of vehicle volume) was recorded on Pine St 40m north of Ferguson St with a reduction of 1,115 vehicles per weekday – a -6.3% decrease. This is likely the result of the intersection upgrade of Pine St/ Delacy St by the State and the addition of the through movement from Delacy St to Downs St, no longer forcing westbound traffic on Delacy St south along Pine St.

**By Area**

Figure 1 (over) illustrates the areas of Ipswich in which the traffic count sites have historically been grouped for data collection and analysis purposes. As in previous years, the traffic growth rates for each area of Ipswich are summarised in Table 5 below.

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>EXAMPLE SUBURBS</th>
<th>2017 TOTAL DAILY VOLUME*1</th>
<th>1 YEAR (between 2016 &amp; 2017)*2</th>
<th>5 YEAR (between 2013 &amp; 2017)*3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich Central</td>
<td>CBD, East Ipswich</td>
<td>120,880</td>
<td>-1,270</td>
<td>-1,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner East</td>
<td>Booval, Eastern Heights, Bundamba</td>
<td>122,430</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>8,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>Redbank, Redbank Plains, Goodna, Riverview, Collingwood Park</td>
<td>167,780</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>25,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Eastern</td>
<td>Springfield, Bellbird Park, Augustine Heights, Camira</td>
<td>265,420</td>
<td>11,610</td>
<td>58,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North &amp; West</td>
<td>North Ipswich, West Ipswich, Brassall</td>
<td>219,860</td>
<td>-2,000</td>
<td>21,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Ripley, Raceview, Finders View</td>
<td>109,060</td>
<td>13,220</td>
<td>20,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,005,430</td>
<td>40,310</td>
<td>124,580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average weekday traffic (rounded) and measured as vehicles per day
*1 Based on a comparison of 103 count sites
*2 Based on a comparison of 98 count sites which included the use of ad hoc counts where required
*3 Based on a comparison of 91 count sites which included the use of ad hoc counts where required

Overall, a total daily volume of approximately 1 million trips across the 103 count sites was recorded during the 2017 program. Ipswich also recorded a traffic increase of 4% over the past year and a 17% increase over the past five years.

Of note this year, the Southern Suburbs (Ripley, Raceview, Finders View etc.) had the highest one year growth rate of 14% with the Outer Eastern Suburbs (Springfield, Bellbird Park, Brookwater, Augustine Heights etc.) maintaining the highest five year growth rate at 31%.
Eastern and Outer Eastern Suburbs Traffic Redistribution

Analysis of the results from the 2017 program has identified that there has been a redistribution of traffic in the Eastern suburbs (Redbank, Redbank Plains, Collingwood Park etc.) and Outer Eastern suburbs (Springfield, Bellbird Park, Augustine Heights etc.) when compared to the previous year.

Figure 2 (over) illustrates an increase in east-west movement of traffic in 2016, primarily along Augusta Parkway (increase of approx. 4,800 vehicles per day 200m south of Technology Dr). Whereas in 2017, Augusta Parkway volumes remain relatively steady and the main increase in traffic volumes is instead seen in the area’s key north-south roads (e.g. along School Road, Keidges Road, Collingwood Drive, Redbank Plains Rd and Jones Rd).

While it is highly likely that the continued growth of greenfield development areas in Redbank Plains South and Bellbird Park are contributing to the traffic volume increase and distribution in the area, there are also many other possible reasons for the redistribution of traffic. For local trips, this includes the trip attraction of the new Redbank Plains Shopping Complex and new Bellbird Park State Secondary College and for regional trips to Brisbane it could be associated with the congestion being experienced on the Centenary Highway and Augusta Parkway, making the Ipswich Motorway a more attractive choice.
TRENDS AND COMPARISONS:

Looking more broadly, Figure 3 shows the total volume of traffic movements recorded at the same 82 count sites across Ipswich from 2011-2017. This graph demonstrates that Ipswich overall continues to experience relatively linear growth in traffic movements.

Figure 4 further analyses the citywide total traffic volumes and shows the percent change in traffic compared to 2013 volumes (5 year period) for each area of Ipswich. Similar to the previous two year’s data, this graph illustrates that traffic growth in the ‘Ipswich Central’ area remained largely unchanged over the past 5 years. The Outer Eastern suburbs continued its traffic growth trend, though the Eastern suburbs and Southern suburbs recorded a significant increase in growth in the past year compared to their trend in previous years. Interestingly, the Inner Eastern suburbs and Northern and Western suburbs showed a decline in traffic growth in the last year compared to their trend in previous years.
Figure 5 shows the percent change in vehicles counted per year for each area of Ipswich over a five year period. It illustrates that the Outer Eastern suburbs growth rate has slowed this year compared to the growing trend of previous years and that the Inner Eastern and Northern and Western suburbs also experienced their lowest growth rate in a given year when compared to the past five years.

This graph also shows that this year the Eastern suburbs and Southern suburbs have experienced the largest growth rate in a given year compared to all other suburbs over the past five years (12.5% and 11.7%).

**CONCLUSION:**

The 2017 Strategic Traffic Count Program has been completed and the results analysed. These results will be used to inform Council’s transport planning, traffic operations, investment programming and development assessment activities. Of note, the results have delivered a valuable snapshot into the performance of Ipswich’s existing road network.

The results have also identified that a number of two-lane roads within the city’s transport network continue to perform near or over their carrying capacity. These roads have already been identified for future investment by Council and prioritised for citywide investment within the 10 Year Transport Infrastructure Investment Plan (2017-2027).

Finally, the results outlined in this report provide further evidence of the current population growth and development occurring in Ipswich and the need to deliver on the objectives of the City of Ipswich Transport Plan (iGO) in order to maintain a safe and reliable transport network. In particular, the continued high growth trend in vehicle trips provides justification for the need for Ipswich residents to be provided access to viable and high quality public and active transport alternatives.
ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Attachment</th>
<th>Attachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment A</td>
<td>Attachment A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Strategic Traffic Count Program Data Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NOTE: best viewed at A3 size)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment B</td>
<td>Attachment B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Traffic Count Program Data Comparison 2013 – 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NOTE: best viewed at A3 size)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION:
That the report be received and the contents noted.

Jessica Cartlidge
TRANSPORT PLANNER
I concur with the recommendation contained in this report.

Tony Dileo
INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING MANAGER
I concur with the recommendation contained in this report.

Charlie Dill
CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER (INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Finish Date</th>
<th>ADT (veh/h)</th>
<th>Daily % Change</th>
<th>Daily % Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>ADT (veh/h)</th>
<th>Daily % Change</th>
<th>Daily % Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>ADT (veh/h)</th>
<th>Daily % Change</th>
<th>Daily % Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Briggs Road</td>
<td>Raceview</td>
<td>East of Colonial Ct</td>
<td>3/11/2017</td>
<td>9/11/2017</td>
<td>5,024</td>
<td>5,915</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pisasale Drive</td>
<td>Yamanto</td>
<td>Between Warwick Rd and Kerners Rd</td>
<td>4,264</td>
<td>4,523</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ripley Road</td>
<td>Ripley</td>
<td>Between Centenary Hwy and Providence Pde</td>
<td>4,890</td>
<td>5,085</td>
<td>8.96%</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ripley Road</td>
<td>Ripley</td>
<td>North of Centenary Hwy</td>
<td>8,006</td>
<td>8,537</td>
<td>7.80%</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>7am</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>4pm</td>
<td>718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grampian Drive</td>
<td>Deebing Heights</td>
<td>Between Centenary Hwy and Rawlings Rd</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reif Street</td>
<td>Flinders View</td>
<td>Between Wallace St &amp; Plover St</td>
<td>7,690</td>
<td>8,284</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>7am</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ash Street</td>
<td>Yamanto</td>
<td>East of South Deebing Creek Rd</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>10,322</td>
<td>6.44%</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Old Toowoomba Road</td>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>Between Lobb St &amp; Ernest St</td>
<td>4/11/2017</td>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>21,428</td>
<td>23,405</td>
<td>9.58%</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Toongarra Road</td>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>Between Old Toowoomba Rd &amp; McNamara St</td>
<td>13,160</td>
<td>14,429</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Wulkuraka Connection Road</td>
<td>Blackstone</td>
<td>Between Redhill Rd &amp; Larsens Rd</td>
<td>6,485</td>
<td>7,525</td>
<td>9.35%</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kingsmill Road</td>
<td>Brassall</td>
<td>South of Bremer River</td>
<td>4/11/2017</td>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>15,365</td>
<td>16,714</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Waterworks Road</td>
<td>North Ipswich</td>
<td>40m south of Holmes St</td>
<td>12,643</td>
<td>13,705</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Junction Road</td>
<td>Karalee</td>
<td>East of Rea Rd</td>
<td>11,066</td>
<td>11,683</td>
<td>6.42%</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>7am</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>5pm</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Old Logan Road</td>
<td>Gailes</td>
<td>Between Waterford Rd &amp; Marshall St</td>
<td>6,111</td>
<td>6,824</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>7am</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>4pm</td>
<td>705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Springfield Parkway</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>Between Springfield Greenbank Arterial &amp; Bridgewater Dr</td>
<td>20,060</td>
<td>21,885</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>2196</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Springfield Greenbank Arterial</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>Central, Springfield Lakes</td>
<td>Between Main St &amp; Sinnathamby Blvd</td>
<td>22,725</td>
<td>24,506</td>
<td>6.23%</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>5pm</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sinnathamby Boulevard</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>At Mountain Creek</td>
<td>12,351</td>
<td>13,697</td>
<td>7.19%</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jones Road</td>
<td>Bellbird Park</td>
<td>Between Bellbird Dr &amp; Augusta Pkwy</td>
<td>6,315</td>
<td>6,974</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Old Logan Road</td>
<td>Camira</td>
<td>East of Springfield Parkway</td>
<td>13,247</td>
<td>14,509</td>
<td>5.11%</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Johnson Road</td>
<td>Carole Park</td>
<td>150m east of Cobalt St</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>13,931</td>
<td>9.36%</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>7am</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Collingwood Drive</td>
<td>Collingwood Park</td>
<td>350m north of Redbank Plains Rd</td>
<td>8,033</td>
<td>8,747</td>
<td>5.89%</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Smiths Road</td>
<td>Goodna</td>
<td>West of Albert St</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>7,254</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>School Road</td>
<td>Redbank Plains</td>
<td>North of Cashmere St</td>
<td>13,029</td>
<td>13,912</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Redbank Plains Road</td>
<td>Collingwood Park, Redbank Plains</td>
<td>At Six Mile Creek</td>
<td>12,876</td>
<td>14,127</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Smiths Road</td>
<td>Redbank</td>
<td>Approx. 500m east of Collingwood Dr</td>
<td>6,480</td>
<td>7,065</td>
<td>4.94%</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Kruger Parade</td>
<td>Collingwood Park, Redbank</td>
<td>50m south of Goodna Creek</td>
<td>10,125</td>
<td>10,810</td>
<td>7.77%</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Brisbane Road</td>
<td>Riverview</td>
<td>Between St Peter Claver College and Slone St</td>
<td>2,515</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>6.34%</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Gledson Street</td>
<td>Bundamba</td>
<td>Between Bundamba Creek</td>
<td>5,506</td>
<td>5,960</td>
<td>9.57%</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Grange Road</td>
<td>Eastern Heights</td>
<td>Between Idolwood St &amp; Dell St</td>
<td>4,839</td>
<td>5,079</td>
<td>4.61%</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>South Station Road</td>
<td>Silkstone</td>
<td>100m south of Trumpy St</td>
<td>5/10/2017</td>
<td>11/10/2017</td>
<td>10,284</td>
<td>10,988</td>
<td>3.59%</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Bergin Street</td>
<td>Booval</td>
<td>100m south of Clifton St</td>
<td>4,017</td>
<td>4,295</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Bergins Hill Road</td>
<td>Bundamba</td>
<td>North of Elms St</td>
<td>3,395</td>
<td>3,731</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Thorn Street</td>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>30m south of Short St</td>
<td>4/10/2017</td>
<td>10/10/2017</td>
<td>4,052</td>
<td>4,693</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Salisbury Road</td>
<td>Eastern Heights, Ipswich</td>
<td>100m west of Jackes St</td>
<td>11,313</td>
<td>12,577</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehill Road Eastern Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td>100m south of Phyllis St</td>
<td>2,498</td>
<td>2,665</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-167</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehill Road Flinders View</td>
<td></td>
<td>50m north of Thomas St</td>
<td>7,399</td>
<td>7,662</td>
<td>6,926</td>
<td>7,335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-238</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Street Brasall</td>
<td></td>
<td>300m east of Vogel Rd</td>
<td>3,723</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>3,685</td>
<td>3,467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-141</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Greenbank Arterial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Springfield Central, Springfield Lakes</td>
<td>24,506</td>
<td>23,043</td>
<td>20,122</td>
<td>19,181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,463</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbank Plains Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collingwood Park, Redbank Plains At Six Mile Creek</td>
<td>14,127</td>
<td>11,811</td>
<td>12,254</td>
<td>10,730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,316</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone Street Ipswich</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approx. 10m west of Foote Lane</td>
<td>11,943</td>
<td>12,066</td>
<td>12,330</td>
<td>12,127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-561</td>
<td>-9.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampion Drive Deebing Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between Centenary Hwy and Rawlings Rd</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gledson Street Bundamba, North Booval</td>
<td></td>
<td>40m west of Bundamba Creek</td>
<td>5,960</td>
<td>6,198</td>
<td>5,871</td>
<td>5,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-138</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Parkway</td>
<td></td>
<td>Springfield Central, Springfield Lakes</td>
<td>18,021</td>
<td>17,487</td>
<td>16,219</td>
<td>15,730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-533</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Logan Road Camira</td>
<td></td>
<td>200m north of Springfield Parkway</td>
<td>14,509</td>
<td>14,066</td>
<td>13,698</td>
<td>13,622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>444</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goodna, Redbank At Goodna Creek</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td>2,777</td>
<td>3,286</td>
<td>2,776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane Terrace Goodna, Redbank</td>
<td></td>
<td>At Goodna Creek</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td>2,777</td>
<td>3,286</td>
<td>2,776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane Street Ipswich</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between Waghorn St &amp; West St</td>
<td>8,479</td>
<td>9,017</td>
<td>9,106</td>
<td>8,916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-580</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camira Between Old Logan Rd &amp; Newman St</td>
<td>10,321</td>
<td>10,323</td>
<td>10,085</td>
<td>10,413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-242</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Booval South of Wearne St</td>
<td>6,547</td>
<td>6,843</td>
<td>6,674</td>
<td>6,923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-276</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toongarra Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leichhardt Between Old Toowoomba Rd &amp; McNamara St</td>
<td>14,429</td>
<td>14,571</td>
<td>14,282</td>
<td>13,797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-95</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Parkway</td>
<td></td>
<td>Springfield Central, Springfield Lakes</td>
<td>18,021</td>
<td>17,487</td>
<td>16,219</td>
<td>15,730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-533</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Ipswich Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Riverence 200m east of Duncan St</td>
<td>3,979</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>3,794</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>546</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roderick Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ipswich West of Ellenborough St</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auger Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Augustine Heights, Brookwater 200m south of Technology Dr</td>
<td>31,834</td>
<td>31,381</td>
<td>26,499</td>
<td>23,221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>453</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ipswich East of Milford St</td>
<td>8,157</td>
<td>7,970</td>
<td>8,074</td>
<td>7,882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goodna Between Eric St &amp; Marie St</td>
<td>18,972</td>
<td>18,288</td>
<td>19,252</td>
<td>19,515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>684</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pound Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>West Ipswich Between Moffatt St &amp; Keogh St</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>2,309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>531</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruger Parade</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collingwood Park, Redbank 50m south of Goodna Creek</td>
<td>10,810</td>
<td>10,681</td>
<td>11,145</td>
<td>13,046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterworks Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Ipswich 40m south of Holmes St</td>
<td>13,705</td>
<td>13,664</td>
<td>13,266</td>
<td>12,759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goodna West of Albert St</td>
<td>7,254</td>
<td>6,686</td>
<td>7,016</td>
<td>6,925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>569</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redbank Approx. 500m east of Collingwood Dr</td>
<td>7,065</td>
<td>6,685</td>
<td>6,838</td>
<td>6,727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>380</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinnathamby Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Springfield Central Approx. 200m north of Main St</td>
<td>24,423</td>
<td>23,639</td>
<td>19,492</td>
<td>16,765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>785</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinnathamby Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Springfield Central At Mountain Creek</td>
<td>13,697</td>
<td>11,714</td>
<td>9,813</td>
<td>8,576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roderick Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ipswich West of Ellenborough St</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Ipswich Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Riverence 200m east of Duncan St</td>
<td>3,979</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>3,794</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>546</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Parkway</td>
<td></td>
<td>Augustine Heights, Brookwater 200m south of Technology Dr</td>
<td>31,834</td>
<td>31,381</td>
<td>26,499</td>
<td>23,221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>453</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ipswich East of Milford St</td>
<td>8,157</td>
<td>7,970</td>
<td>8,074</td>
<td>7,882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goodna Between Eric St &amp; Marie St</td>
<td>18,972</td>
<td>18,288</td>
<td>19,252</td>
<td>19,515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>684</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pound Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>West Ipswich Between Moffatt St &amp; Keogh St</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>2,309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>531</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Ipswich Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Riverence 200m east of Duncan St</td>
<td>3,979</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>3,794</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>546</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Parkway</td>
<td></td>
<td>Augustine Heights, Brookwater 200m south of Technology Dr</td>
<td>31,834</td>
<td>31,381</td>
<td>26,499</td>
<td>23,221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>453</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25 January 2018

MEMORANDUM

TO: INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING MANAGER
FROM: TRANSPORT PLANNER
RE: NORMAN STREET BRIDGE STAGE 1 BUSINESS CASE
PROJECT UPDATE 1
DIVISIONS 4, 5, 6 AND 7

INTRODUCTION:

This is a report by the Transport Planner dated 25 January 2018 providing a project update on the status of the Business Case for Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge.

BACKGROUND:

At its Ordinary Meeting on 26 July 2016, Council endorsed the preparation of a Business Case for Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge and that during the preparation of the Business Case, update reports be submitted to Council at key milestones [refer to Item 2 tabled at City Infrastructure and Emergency Management Committee Meeting No. 2016(04)] (Refer Attachment A).

PROCESS:

The Queensland Government’s Project Assurance Framework (PAF) process for the preparation of a Business Case is outlined in detail in Table 1 (over) and consists of the following steps:

1) Strategic Business Case;
2) Preliminary Business Case; and
3) Detailed Business Case.
As identified, Step 1 of the PAF process is the development of the Strategic Business Case. The Strategic Business Case begins with the identification/definition of a problem or opportunity and ends with a number of initiatives to be considered for further development and analysis. The development of the Strategic Business Case is supported by an Investment Logic Map which is used to identify a wide range of initiatives, potentially ranging from non-asset solutions to major asset capital solutions. The purpose of the Strategic Business Case is to ensure that a wide range of initiatives are considered and assessed by Council through the PAF process instead of immediately concluding that an asset solution is required.

The project team have now completed the Strategic Business Case (Refer Attachment B) and this was presented to the Project Steering Group in December 2017.

The project team have now started Step 2 of the PAF process, being the Preliminary Business Case. The purpose of the Preliminary Business Case is to assess the identified initiatives and recommend an option to be considered for detailed assessment in the Detailed Business Case. The Preliminary Business Case is to be supported by technical assessments (e.g. traffic modelling, economic analysis, social impact assessments, environmental assessments etc.) and a stakeholder Multi-Criteria Analysis Options Assessment and Risk Management workshop. The Preliminary Business Case is expected to take approximately six months to complete.

The Norman Street Bridge Stage 1 Strategic Business Case has now been completed and the project team have commenced preparation of the Preliminary Business Case.
ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Attachment</th>
<th>Attachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment A - Report from the City Infrastructure and Emergency Management Committee 2016(04) regarding the Norman Street Bridge Stage 1 Business Case Preparation</td>
<td>Attachment A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment B - Project Steering Group Submission No. 1 – Strategic Business Case</td>
<td>Attachment B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION:

That the report be received and the contents noted.

Jessica Cartlidge
TRANSPORT PLANNER

I concur with the recommendations contained in this report.

Tony Dileo
INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING MANAGER

I concur with the recommendations contained in this report.

Charlie Dill
CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER (INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES)
ITEM 2  
8 July 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO: INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING MANAGER

FROM: PRINCIPAL TRANSPORT PLANNER

RE: NORMAN STREET BRIDGE STAGE 1

BUSINESS CASE PREPARATION

DIVISIONS 4, 5, 6 & 7

INTRODUCTION:

This is a report by the Principal Transport Planner dated 8 July 2016 concerning the preparation of a Business Case for Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge.

BACKGROUND:

Council’s transport and land use planning framework includes a proposed new bridge crossing of the Bremer River linking North Ipswich and East Ipswich in the vicinity of Norman Street. For planning purposes, the project is called the “Norman Street Bridge”. It is forecast that the Norman Street Bridge will be required within the next eight years. Notwithstanding, the delivery of the project will be contingent on full funding becoming available.

Stage 1 Works

Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge includes:

- The new bridge;
- Roadworks on the approach to the bridge along Lawrence Street and Norman Street (between Downs Street and Chermside Road);
- Capacity and safety works along:
  - Jacaranda Street (East Ipswich);
  - Wattle Street (North Booval);
  - Dudleigh Street (Booval);
  - Brisbane Road (Newtown, East Ipswich and Booval); and
  - Brisbane Road / Chermside Road / Glebe Road / Queen Victoria Parade (“5 Ways”)
• Adjustments, embellishments, amenity and supplementary works to Cribb Park, the Bremer River open space corridor, local streets (e.g. Lennon Lane, Kendall Street) and some community facilities (schools, churches, club houses etc).

**Strategic Delivery Process**

The strategic delivery process for Norman Street Bridge is outlined in Figure 1.

*FIGURE 1*

**NORMAN STREET BRIDGE (STAGE 1)**

**STRATEGIC DELIVERY PROCESS**

The project is still in its *planning phase* with the following activities undertaken:

- Identification (1960s – 1990s - 2008);
- Feasibility Study (2012);
- Community engagement process (2013);
- Community feedback investigations (2014); and

The outcomes of these activities have been formally reported to, and/or endorsed by, Council via the standing committee governance process.

It is now proposed to develop a Business Case for Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge to assist with securing funding from the Australian and/or Queensland Government and thus progress the project to the *delivery phase*. $500,000 has been allocated in the 2016-2017 budget to commence the business case process with further allocations required in future years to complete the process.
INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP:

It is proposed that Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge be delivered through the investment partnership with the Australian and Queensland Government with a proportional funding arrangement as outlined in Figure 2.

FIGURE 2
NORMAN STREET BRIDGE (STAGE 1)
POSSIBLE PROPORTIONAL FUNDING ARRANGEMENT

This funding arrangement is similar to that used for the delivery of the Gold Coast Light Rail Project and the Moreton Bay Rail Link Project where the respective local government for each project contributed 10% of the project value. This proportional split is considered fair and reasonable for the value and benefits of the Norman Street Bridge project.

This also aligns with the Australian Government’s recently released “Smart Cities” policy framework where investment partnerships across all levels of government (and the private sector) are seen as a sustainable future funding model for large infrastructure projects that have regional, local and multiple benefits to the community.

In essence, if the value of Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge is in the vicinity of $200 million, Council’s contribution would therefore be $20 million. Given the duration of the delivery phase is likely to be about three years, Council’s contribution will be split over a number of financial years. Council has already invested $2.7 million into the project relating to the feasibility study, community engagement and corridor preservation.

It should be noted that various configuration, financing, funding, procurement and delivery options will be identified and investigated as part of the business case development process with a recommended delivery arrangement and more accurate cost estimate as the outputs.
GOVERNMENT ADVICE:

**Australian Government**
The Australian Government advises that for them to consider the Norman Street Bridge for investment under their *Infrastructure Australia* framework, Council first needs to obtain the support of the Queensland Government and then approach the Australian Government in partnership.

**Queensland Government**
Council officers have been in discussion with the Queensland Government’s Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) who have advised that a business case will be required for the Queensland Government to formally consider providing their support and any funding assistance for the delivery of Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge. TMR advised that it would be worthwhile waiting until the establishment of *Building Queensland*.

BUILDING QUEENSLAND:

In December 2015, the Queensland Government formally established Building Queensland (BQ) as an independent statutory body to provide expert advice to the Queensland Government and their agencies on the development of major infrastructure proposals (that is, projects with a value > $50 million). This includes assistance with project business cases, evaluation, procurement and delivery processes as well as research and data analysis activities. Further information on BQ is available from their website (www.buildingqueensland.qld.gov.au).

Council officers have established an initial relationship with BQ and met with their Group Director responsible for early stage project development. Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge is expected to require a Queensland Government monetary contribution of more than $50 million. As such, BQ will need to be involved in the development of the business case. This report outlines the process and governance that Council needs to follow when developing a Business Case for Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge to satisfy BQ.

PROCESS:

BQ advises that the Queensland Government’s *Project Assurance Framework* (PAF) should be followed for the development of a business case for Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge.

The PAF process for the preparation of a business case for a major project is outlined in detail in Table 1 (over) and consists of the following steps:

(i) Strategic;
(ii) Preliminary; and
(iii) Detailed.

This process could take up to three years to complete depending on resourcing, technical complexities, decision making processes and funding availability to undertake Step 3 (Detailed Business Case). It should be noted that BQ has advised that Step 3 will cost in the
order of $2.5 million to complete. It is hoped that the Queensland Government will provide 
funding assistance to Council to undertake Step 3.

A ‘major decision gateway’ is located at the end of Step 2 (Preliminary Business Case) where 
a decision to proceed to Step 3 (Detailed Business Case) will be required by the project’s 
Steering Group (refer to the Governance Framework section below and over).

**TABLE 1**  
**PROJECT ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK**  
**BUSINESS CASE STEPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Preliminary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Detailed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define:</td>
<td>Identify and evaluate a long list of options (and sub-options)</td>
<td>Recommend a shortlist of option(s) (and sub-option(s))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Problem (opportunity)</td>
<td>- Benefits</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strategic Response</td>
<td>- Stakeholders</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Business Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Estimate Output:</strong></td>
<td>order of cost (completed)</td>
<td>PSO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Definition:</strong></td>
<td>concept (completed)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order of Cost:</strong></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration:</strong></td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2 and Step 3 will consist of the following outputs:

- Need and benefits identification;
- Configuration, staging, financing, funding, procurement & delivery options assessment;
- Preferred option identification;
- Demand modelling;
- Reference design;
- Cost estimate;
- Economic analysis;
- Affordability analysis;
- Risk assessment and mitigation;
- Benefit / cost ratio; and
- Net present value
GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK:

BQ has advised that it would be prudent to establish a governance framework for the development of the Business Case to ensure appropriate reporting and decision making arrangements are clearly articulated and understood upfront.

Based on feedback provided by BQ, the proposed governance framework for the preparation of the Business Case for Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge is outlined in Attachment A and discussed below.

Ultimate Decision Making
Ultimately, the decision to accept, reject or seek clarification on the Detailed Business Case (and its outputs and outcomes) will be made through the formal governance arrangements of each entity. In the case of Council, this will be via the standing committee process and then a Council ordinary meeting/s. For the Queensland Government, this will be via the relevant Minister/s.

Steering Group
Strategic financial and technical considerations and recommendations will be made by a Steering Group consisting of six members (three senior representatives from Council and three senior representatives from the Queensland Government) with a senior representative of BQ as an ‘observer’. It is proposed that Council be represented on the Steering Group by the Chief Operating Officer (Infrastructure Services), the Infrastructure Planning Manager and another senior manager such as the Chief Financial Officer. It is likely that the Steering Group will only need to meet on four or five occasions during the project cycle (i.e. inception and in the lead up to key project milestones including the ‘major decision gateway’).

Project Team
The preparation of the Business Case will be undertaken by a Project Team led by a Project Director with a Project Manager (who will be responsible for the day to day delivery of the business case project plan), project liaison officers from the Queensland Government’s road and infrastructure / urban planning portfolios and an advisor from BQ.

Project Support
The Project Team will be supported by technical experts in the fields of engineering, demand modelling, finance, economics, legal and probity as well as project coordination and administration duties.

Further Arrangements
Further governance arrangements relating to the Steering Group’s charter, meeting schedule and reporting timelines will be established by the Project Director accordingly as the project plan is developed.
Consultation
It is proposed that the Chief Executive Officer, the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor and the Chairperson of the City Infrastructure & Emergency Management Committee be regularly consulted by the Project Director during the business case development process, particularly in the lead up to key project milestones.

Update Reporting
‘Status’ updates on the preparation of the Business Case will be provided to Council via the standing committee when required.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS:
The preparation of a Business Case for Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge will require the establishment and implementation of project management elements by the Project Director. These elements include human and financial resourcing, a master schedule, a detailed project plan, the procurement of external expertise and communication with the Queensland Government, BQ and other key stakeholders.

CONCLUSION:
It is proposed to commence the preparation of a Business Case for Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge in 2016-2017. The project will:

- Follow the Queensland Government’s Project Assurance Framework (PAF) consisting of the three steps – (1) Strategic; (2) Preliminary; and (3) Detailed;
- Take up to three years to complete (depending on resourcing, technical complexities and decision making processes);
- Cost in the order of $3 million (noting $500,000 has been allocated in the 2016-2017 budget to undertake PAF Steps 1 & 2);
- Include a governance process involving Council, the Queensland Government and Building Queensland consisting of a Steering Group and Project Team.
- Require the establishment and implementation of project management requirements.

ATTACHMENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Attachment</th>
<th>Attachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Street Bridge Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Case Development Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. That the Chief Executive Officer prepare a Business Case for Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge in accordance with the process and governance framework outlined in the report by the Principal Transport Planner dated 8 July 2016 including the establishment of appropriate project management requirements.

B. That the Chief Executive Officer submit update reports to Council at key milestones during the preparation of the Business Case for Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge as outlined in Recommendation A (above).

C. That the Chief Executive Officer submit the Detailed Business Case for Stage 1 of the Norman Street Bridge to Council for their consideration and endorsement before it is finalised.

Nick Prasser
PRINCIPAL TRANSPORT PLANNER

I concur with the recommendations contained in this report.

Tony Dileo
INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING MANAGER

I concur with the recommendations contained in this report.

Charlie Dill
CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER (INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES)
Project Steering Group Submission No 1
Strategic Business Case
Addressing Congestion, Cross River Connectivity
and Network Resilience in the Ipswich City Centre
12 December 2017
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1. **Purpose**

The purpose of this submission is to:

a) Confirm the Project Steering Group (PSG) Charter. Refer to Attachment A.

b) Present to the PSG for endorsement the findings of the Strategic Business Case to address congestion, cross river connectivity and network resilience in the Ipswich City Centre. Refer to Attachment B.

2. **Background**

The Ipswich City Centre was identified in the South-East Queensland Regional Plan (SEQRP) (2005 – 2026) as a Principal regional activity centre (and also in the current 2017 plan). In 2008, the Ipswich Regional Centre Strategy (IRCS) was developed in partnership with the Queensland Government to guide the economic and civic revitalisation of the Ipswich City Centre.

Detailed planning provisions within the Ipswich Planning Scheme furthered the intent for revitalisation with overall development outcomes for the City Centre providing increased non-residential and residential development potential, an enhanced public realm and streetscape with improved legibility and encouraging walking and cycling. The reduction of non-essential traffic through the CBD to minimise conflict between local and through traffic was specifically identified.

The Queensland Government has advised ICC that for them to consider investment in a project to reduce the non-essential traffic through the CBD, a business case must be prepared. Building Queensland has advised ICC that its Business Case Development Framework (BCDF) should be followed for the development of the business case, commencing with a Strategic Business Case (SBC).

For further background information, refer to Attachment C.

3. **Governance**

A PSG has been formed comprising of representatives from ICC, the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) and the Department of Infrastructure Local Government and Planning (DILGP). The objective of the PSG will be to provide leadership, direction and governance through the business case development.

4. **Problem Definition**

4.1 **Background**

An Investment Logic Mapping (ILM) workshop was held on 26 October 2017 at the Ipswich Civic Centre. Stakeholders involved in the ILM workshop were representatives from ICC and TMR, Jacobs (technical advisors) and Corview (independent facilitator).
4.2 Problem Definition

Four discrete problems were identified at the workshop. Refer to Figure 7-1.

1. Congestion in the Ipswich City Centre, a SEQ Principal regional activity centre, is restricting successful revitalisation and economic development.
2. The single Ipswich City Centre Bremer River crossing is compromising connectivity, population growth, and broader economic growth.
3. Limited capacity and service life of the existing Ipswich City Centre/North Ipswich cross-river link (David Trumpy bridge and approaches) compromises the augmentation needed for traffic growth and mode shift.
4. Lack of network redundancy during incidents or major events (such as floods) lead to network failure.

5. Benefits Sought

The benefits expected from addressing the problems are summarised below. Refer to Figure 7-1.

1. Improved multi modal transport delivery.
2. Enhanced connectivity and network resilience.
3. Increased CBD amenity and appeal.
4. Achieve SEQ Regional Plan outcomes for Ipswich as a Principal regional activity centre including increased economic activity in the CBD.
5. Improved travel time and reliability and improve road safety.
6. Supporting Ipswich’s sport and entertainment precinct and cultural facilities.

6. Service Need

The Service Need identified was to address congestion, inadequate cross river connectivity and lack of network resilience in the Ipswich City Centre for revitalisation, economic development and realisation of Ipswich’s full potential as a Principal regional activity centre.

6.1 Strategic Response

The strategic responses to address at least part of the service need are listed below. Refer to Figure 7-1.

1. Transport policy/planning to maximise the capacity and use of the existing transport network, particularly via passenger and active modes.
2. Optimise/fully leverage existing cross-river capacity.
3. Increase cross-river capacity.
6.2 Potential Initiatives

Potential initiatives identified were mapped against the options categories identified in the State Infrastructure Plan 2016 (SIP) and are detailed in Table 6-1. Also refer to Figure 8-1.

Table 6-1: Mapping the Initiatives Against the SIP Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIP PRIORITY</th>
<th>INITIATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reform (non-asset initiative)</td>
<td>Change Initiative&lt;br&gt;• Heavy vehicle restrictions in CBD&lt;br&gt;• Lane reallocation for modal prioritisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better use (improving service performance)</td>
<td>Change Initiative&lt;br&gt;• Lane reallocation for modal prioritisation&lt;br&gt;• Tidal traffic flow on David Trumpy Bridge&lt;br&gt;• Fully utilise capacity of the existing (non-inner city) river crossings&lt;br&gt;• Network intersection optimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing (asset light solutions)</td>
<td>Asset Initiative&lt;br&gt;• Increase capacity with additional lanes through increasing setbacks for future development in the CBD&lt;br&gt;• Widen/augment existing David Trumpy Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New infrastructure (new asset)</td>
<td>Asset Initiative&lt;br&gt;• New all modes Inner-City Bremer River bridge crossing&lt;br&gt;• New Inner-City Bremer River pedestrian, cycle and/or bus bridge crossing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Investment Logic Map

Figure 7-1 shows how the ILM responds to the service need of addressing congestion, inadequate cross river connectivity and lack of network resilience in the Ipswich City Centre.
Figure 7-1: Investment Logic Map
8. Initiatives Map

Figure 8-1 shows the potential initiatives to address the service need of addressing congestion, inadequate cross river connectivity and lack of network resilience in the Ipswich City Centre.
9. **Further Works**

It is proposed that the following potential initiatives be further investigated in the Preliminary Business Case (PBC).

- Heavy vehicle restrictions in CBD
- Lane reallocation for modal prioritisation
- Tidal traffic flow on David Trumpy Bridge
- Fully utilise capacity of the existing (non-inner city) river crossings
- Network intersection optimisation
- Increase capacity with additional lanes through increasing setbacks for future development in the CBD
- Widen/augment existing David Trumpy Bridge
- New all modes Inner-City Bremer River bridge crossing
- New Inner-City Bremer River pedestrian, cycle and/or bus bridge crossing

10. **Preliminary Business Case Risk Assessment**

Key strategic risks were identified in Table 10-1 leading into the Preliminary Business Case (PBC), which ICC will seek to mitigate.

**Table 10-1: Strategic Risks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK</th>
<th>MITIGATION STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation does not comply with the requirements of Building Queensland’s Business Case Development Framework</td>
<td>• Use BQ’s BCDF and the available guidance and templates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder expectations are not managed well during the PBC</td>
<td>• The Stakeholder Engagement Plan should be updated and reapproved by the Senior Responsible Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options are not affordable</td>
<td>• Options to be refined in light of the investigations to reduce risk and cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social impacts are not clearly identified and accounted for in the decision making process.</td>
<td>• Social impact assessment to be undertaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quantify/monetise as many social impacts as possible for inclusion in the cost benefit analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact risk assessment to be undertaken on social impacts that cannot be monetised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **Recommendations**

It is recommended that the PSG confirm the PSG Charter in Attachment A.
It is also recommended that the PSG endorse the Strategic Business Case in Attachment B and that the following initiatives be investigated in the early stages of the Preliminary Business Case to determine their viability for further consideration.

- Heavy vehicle restrictions in CBD
- Lane reallocation for modal prioritisation
- Tidal traffic flow on David Trumpy Bridge
- Fully utilise capacity of the existing (non-inner city) river crossings
- Network intersection optimisation
- Increase capacity with additional lanes through increasing setbacks for future development in the CBD
- Widen/augment existing David Trumpy Bridge
- New all modes Inner-City Bremer River bridge crossing
- New Inner-City Bremer River pedestrian, cycle and/or bus bridge crossing
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1. **Purpose of the document**

The purpose of the document is to detail a Project Steering Group (PSG) charter for the Strategic Business Case (SBC) and Preliminary Business Case (PBC) under Building Queensland’s Business Case Development Framework (BCDF).

2. **Project Background**

The Ipswich City Centre has been identified in the South-East Queensland Regional Plan (SEQRP) (2005 – 2026) as a Principal regional activity centre (and also in the current 2017 plan). In 2008, the Ipswich Regional Centre Strategy (IRCS) was developed in partnership with the Queensland Government to guide the economic and civic revitalisation of the Ipswich City Centre.

Detailed planning provisions within the Ipswich Planning Scheme furthered the intent for revitalisation with overall development outcomes for the City Centre providing increased non-residential and residential development potential, an enhanced public realm and streetscape with improved legibility and encouraging walking and cycling. The reduction of non-essential traffic through the CBD to minimise conflict between local and through traffic was specifically identified.

The Queensland Government has advised ICC that for them to consider investment in a project to reduce the non-essential traffic through the CBD, a business case must be prepared. Building Queensland has advised Ipswich City Council (ICC) that its BCDF should be followed for the development of the business case, commencing with a SBC.

3. **Objectives of the Strategic Business Case**

The SBC aims to ensure the service need is substantiated and effectively articulated and that the benefits sought are achieved through the proposed initiatives. Completing a quality and robust SBC supports the integrity of the Preliminary and Detailed Business Cases ensuring that any investment decision addresses the underlying ‘root causes’ of the problem.

4. **Objective of the Project Steering Group**

The objective of the PSG is to provide leadership, direction and governance to ensure that gating requirements are met, key interdependencies and synergies are appropriately managed and that the project delivers on government priorities and agreed community outcomes.

5. **Role of the Project Steering Group**

The PSG will provide strategic oversight through the SBC and PBC phases. The PSG will critically evaluate and identify as necessary, significant risks and opportunities, review the performance of the project and provide advice, feedback and support to the project team. The PSG’s role is not to approve recommendations from the project team, but to note or endorse the recommendations.
To fulfil these responsibilities, the PSG will:

- Provide leadership and direction to the project team.
- Take a whole of ICC view and identify target outcomes at key stages of planning, prioritising, programming and delivery to achieve a whole of project solution.
- Ensure there are effective relationships with federal, state and local governments, stakeholders and suppliers.
- Ensure that stakeholder needs and expectations are appropriately addressed.
- Consider and endorse major changes to the scope and significant variations and priorities and target outcomes, including a legacy of transport and social /economic/ environmental benefits to the local community.
- Monitor and evaluate the delivery of the project.
- Review the status of strategic risks and opportunities and unblock high-level risks and opportunities, as necessary.
- Facilitate and ensure there is a total team approach by PSG members to issues management and communication, knowledge and information management and effective operations.
- Ensure project governance is effective and that processes are conducted in an honest, transparent and ethical manner.
- Ensure asset transfer processes, including data and documentation requirements, occur in a timely manner throughout the life of the project.

6. **Membership**

The membership of the PSG includes representatives who have direct accountability for the planning, programming and delivery of major infrastructure projects. The PSG membership can be increased during the project phases as required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPSWICH CITY COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Dill, Chief Operating Officer, Infrastructure Services, ICC</td>
<td>Member and Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Adams, City Planner, Planning and Development, ICC</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ward, Manager, Project Planning and Corridor Management, TMR</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Nightingale, Director, Infrastructure, Innovation &amp; Practice, DILGP</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A minimum of three members must be in attendance to form a quorum. A PSG member may nominate a proxy for the meeting who will have the full delegation, responsibilities and
accountabilities of the member including confirming or endorsing recommendations. Proxies may attend in the absence of a member, with notification to the Chair. It is the responsibility of the PSG member to fully brief the nominated proxy in advance of the meeting.

7. **Role of the Secretariat**

The Project Director, Tony Dileo, will also undertake the role of secretary to the PSG, with the support of the project team.

The role of the Secretariat is to ensure meetings are well organised and address the role accountabilities of the PSG.

Meeting agendas will be structured to provide regular and appropriate attention to the project.

The secretariat holds primary responsibility for ensuring that meeting preparations, proceedings, and follow-up actions, including documentation processes and procedures run efficiently and effectively. It ensures papers and presentations are complete and in line with the format for presentations. The secretariat enables the operation of the PSG by:

- Ensuring the governance and meeting calendar enables the PSG to fulfil its purpose and role.
- Identifying and providing structure to regularly report to the PSG to ensure advice from key stakeholders and matters for comment and review are highlighted.
- Advising presenters on the requirements for PSG presentations to achieve the expected outcomes.
- Advice to the PSG with regard to strategic leverage that may be exercised from a governance perspective.
- Undertake administrative duties to enable the PSG to function effectively and efficiently.

The agenda and working papers of the meeting will be distributed to PSG members at least three working days prior to each meeting.

The minutes will be recorded by the secretariat and will clearly record decisions and actions by responsible officer and the due date. The minutes will be circulated to team members within five working days after the meeting.

Alterations and comments may be provided to the secretariat immediately, or at the next meeting prior to the minutes being confirmed. An agenda item will confirm or amend the minutes of the previous meeting and report on the status of the actions arising from the meeting.
8. **Key Support Roles**

The Secretariat has a key advice and support role in facilitating the accuracy, reliability and formatting of reports for the assessment and provision of commentary and recommendations.

9. **Meeting Frequency**

Meetings will be held at the times to be determined. Revised meeting schedules may be issued by the secretariat for approval by the PSG.

10. **Review of the Charter**

A review of the PSG’s charter and operations will be undertaken at the completion of the Strategic Business Case.
Attachment B  Strategic Business Case
Strategic Business Case

Addressing Congestion, Cross River Connectivity and Network Resilience in the Ipswich City Centre

November 2017

www.ipswich.qld.gov.au
## CONTENTS

1. Introduction................................................................................................................................................................ 4
2. Problem Definition: Investment Logic Mapping........................................................................................................ 5
   2.1 Background.............................................................................................................................................................. 5
   2.2 Stakeholders........................................................................................................................................................... 5
   2.3 Problem Definition.................................................................................................................................................. 5
   2.4 Benefits Sought....................................................................................................................................................... 6
   2.5 Statement of Service Need....................................................................................................................................... 7
   2.6 Strategic Response................................................................................................................................................... 8
   2.7 Potential Initiatives.................................................................................................................................................. 8
   2.8 Mapping the Initiatives to the State Infrastructure Plan Priority Model.............................................................. 9
3. Investment Logic Map............................................................................................................................................... 9
4. Initiatives Map.......................................................................................................................................................... 11
5. Further Works and Governance Proposal............................................................................................................. 12
6. Preliminary Business Case Risk Assessment ..................................................................................................... 13
7. Recommendations..................................................................................................................................................... 13

Attachment 1 - Previous ICC Studies
Attachment 2 - Preliminary Business Case Program
1. **Introduction**

The City of Ipswich is one of the fastest growing Local Government Areas (LGA) in Australia with its population forecast to more than double over the coming decades. Ipswich City Council (ICC) has recently released the City of Ipswich Transport Plan called ‘iGO’ to guide future policy and investment decisions for Ipswich’s sustainable transport future.

The Ipswich City Centre has been identified in the South-East Queensland Regional Plan (SEQRP) (2005 – 2026) as a Principal regional activity centre (and also in the current 2017 plan). For the land use, transport and infrastructure outcomes of the regional plan to gain traction, SEQRP requires a number of successful Principal regional activity centres to accommodate key concentrations of employment, provide higher order business, retail, education, health, cultural and entertainment services with higher density living opportunities.

In 2008, the Ipswich Regional Centre Strategy (IRCS) was developed in partnership with the Queensland Government to guide the economic and civic revitalisation of the Ipswich City Centre. The IRCS identified 158 actions and 17 ‘catalytic’ projects to be undertaken to allow the Ipswich City Centre to redevelop into a vibrant and prosperous Principal regional activity centre for SEQ.

In June 2011, ICC endorsed the framework and objectives of the Ipswich City Centre Orbital Road System as a fundamental component of the city’s transport network planning and a guide for making future transport planning, land use planning, development assessment, infrastructure investment and site access decisions.

Detailed planning provisions within the Ipswich Planning Scheme furthered the intent for revitalisation with overall development outcomes for the City Centre providing increased non-residential and residential development potential, an enhanced public realm and streetscape with improved legibility and encouraging walking and cycling. The reduction of non-essential traffic through the CBD to minimise conflict between local and through traffic was specifically identified.

In 2014, ICC completed a traffic study for cross connectivity of the Bremer River. The Queensland Government has advised ICC that for them to consider investment in a project to reduce the non-essential traffic through the CBD, a business case must be prepared. Building Queensland has advised ICC that its Business Case Development Framework (BCDF) should be followed for the development of the business case, commencing with a Strategic Business Case (SBC).

Refer to Attachment 1 for a list of previous studies by ICC and TMR.

2. **Governance**

A Project Steering Group (PSG) has been formed comprising of representatives from ICC, the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) and the Department of Infrastructure Local...
Government and Planning (DILGP). The objective of the PSG will be to provide leadership, direction and governance through the business case development.

3. **Problem Definition: Investment Logic Mapping**

3.1 **Background**

An Investment Logic Mapping (ILM) workshop was held on 26 October 2017 at the Ipswich Civic Centre. The ILM workshop planning, preparation, facilitation and reporting followed the Business Queensland Investment Logic Mapping Guide.

3.2 **Stakeholders**

Table 3-1 lists the stakeholders involved in the ILM workshop and the development of this SBC. ICC, as the Business Owner, invited key participants from each of the stakeholders to the ILM workshop.

Table 3-1: ILM Workshop Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDERS</th>
<th>REASON FOR INVOLVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich City Council</td>
<td>• Address State Infrastructure Plan and South-east Queensland Regional Plan issues relevant to ICC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advise on local community, cultural, social and environmental impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advise on regional and local economic, employment &amp; population growth pressures and priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Represent ICC’s infrastructure and network planning priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advise on ICC’s land use planning (Ipswich Planning Scheme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transport and Main Roads</td>
<td>• Address State Infrastructure Plan issues relevant to the Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Represent the Department’s strategic &amp; infrastructure planning priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contribute State Government planning assessment and PAF process expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advise on condition of river crossing assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>• Advise on State Infrastructure Plan priorities relevant to the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advise on technical and pricing matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lead the Strategic and Preliminary Business Cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corview</td>
<td>• Independent ILM facilitation and Building Queensland Business Case Development Framework advice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 **Problem Definition**

Stakeholders considered key drivers for change and refined these into four discrete problems that underpin the service need to be addressed. Each of the problems were then analysed from the perspectives of cause and effect. Refer to Table 3-2.
Table 3-2 : Problem Definition, Cause and Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBLEM</th>
<th>CAUSE</th>
<th>EFFECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Congestion in the Ipswich City Centre, a SEQ Principal regional activity centre, is restricting successful revitalisation and economic development | • Non-essential through traffic is directed into the City Centre  
• Increase in traffic volumes due to population and economic growth  
• Increased activity as a result of the future Ipswich Mall redevelopment  
• Key intersections are over capacity | • Restricted growth (including economic) and revitalisation of the Ipswich City Centre (Principal regional activity centre)  
• Increased congestion  
• Streetscape and pedestrian improvements cannot commence  
• Public transport services experience delays and the required mode shifts are not achieved |
| 2. The single Ipswich City Centre Bremer River crossing is compromising connectivity, population growth, and broader economic growth | • Only one inner City crossing over the Bremer River, with a further two crossings in the western suburbs | • Restricted access between the northern and southern parts of the Ipswich City Centre  
• Poorly connected current and planned Citywide open space network either side of the Bremer River  
• No initial link as part of the broader Ipswich City Centre orbital road network  
• No support for the growth and revitalisation of the Ipswich City Centre (as identified in the IRC5)  
• Impact to public transport promotion and mode shift  
• Constraint on the delivery of the Principal Cycle Network  
• Restricted residential development |
| 3. Limited capacity and service life of the existing Ipswich City Centre/North Ipswich cross-river link (David Trumpy bridge and approaches) compromises the augmentation needed for traffic growth and mode shift | • Aging infrastructure  
• Does not meet current design standards  
• Restrictions to widening the existing bridge | • Restricted active and public transport connections for both commuters and recreational users with limited separation from general traffic  
• Does not cater for traffic growth  
• Continuing maintenance costs  
• Significant challenges to augmentation  
• Constrained development potential within North Ipswich |
| 4. Lack of network redundancy during incidents or major events (such as floods) lead to network failure | • Major floods or accidents on the David Trumpy bridge (or its approaches) restrict cross river connectivity through north and south Ipswich  
• Lack of alternative routes for trips to/from/through North Ipswich | • Reduced resilience and redundancy of the transport network and increased network delays during times of emergency, natural disaster (such as a flood) or incidents (road closures)  
• Reduced emergency services and community accessibility to emergency facilities such as hospitals from north of the Bremer River during bridge closure periods. |

3.4 Benefits Sought

Following definition of the problems, the participants then identified the benefits expected from addressing the service need and key performance indicators (KPI’s) for assessing whether the desired benefits are achieved. The benefits sought and outcomes to be achieved are summarised in Table 3-3. The KPIs seek to measure the outcomes for each benefit sought.
### Table 3-3 : Benefits Sought

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFITS SOUGHT</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Improved multi modal transport delivery | • Improved public transport and active transport services, supporting the shift to sustainable modes identified in iGO (the City of Ipswich Transport Plan)  
• Improved active transport connections for both commuters and recreational users  
• Active transport movements separated from general traffic movements  
• Achieved the State and Local Government’s objective to deliver the Principal Cycle Network |
| 2. Enhanced connectivity and network resilience | • Improved resilience of the transport network and increased network redundancy for day to day operation, and during times of emergency, natural disaster (such as a flood) |
| 3. Increased CBD amenity and appeal | • Supported revitalisation of the Ipswich City Centre (as identified in the IRCS)  
• Linked key elements of the current and planned Citywide open space network currently divided by the Bremer River  
• Streetscape and pedestrian improvements |
| 4. Achieve SEQ Regional Plan outcomes for Ipswich as a Principal regional activity centre including increased economic activity in the CBD | • Significantly reduced the volume of non-essential through traffic from the City Centre core and supported the successful economic development and revitalisation of the Ipswich City Centre  
• Potential to develop into a major economic hub featuring a diverse mix of economic activities such as commercial and professional services, health and tertiary education complemented by higher order retail and a civic heart  
• Increased density and variety of housing, particularly in North Ipswich |
| 5. Improve travel time and reliability and improve road safety | • Facilitated the key initial link within the broader Ipswich City Centre orbital road network, which provided travel time savings and road safety improvements  
• Improved access between the southern and northern parts of the Ipswich City Centre |
| 6. Supporting Ipswich’s sport and entertainment precinct and cultural facilities | • Improved access between the southern and northern parts of the Ipswich City Centre  
• Improved active transport connections for both commuters and recreational users  
• Improved linkage of key elements of the current and planned Citywide open space network currently divided by the Bremer River |

### 3.5 Statement of Service Need

For the people of Ipswich and its surrounding regional areas, CBD congestion, inadequate transport network connectivity, ageing infrastructure and a lack of network resilience are inhibiting the investment and revitalisation needed to underpin population and economic growth, civic renewal, multi-mode transport development and the Centre’s function as a Principal regional activity centre.

The Service Need is to address congestion, inadequate cross river connectivity and lack of network resilience in the Ipswich City Centre for revitalisation, economic development and realisation of Ipswich’s full potential as a Principal regional activity centre.
3.6 Strategic Response

Workshop participants then considered potential strategic responses which could address at least part of the service need and deliver some of the identified KPIs in the context of both the considerable strategic and planning investment by ICC and the State Government to date and ICC’s ongoing commitment to the service need, including use of Building Queensland’s Business Case Development Framework.

The strategic responses relevant to each of the Benefits sought are summarised in Table 3-4.

### Table 3-4: Strategic Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC RESPONSE</th>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transport policy/planning to maximise the capacity and use of the existing</td>
<td>• Improvements to multi modal transport delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transport network, particularly via passenger and active modes</td>
<td>• Contributes partially to the SEQ Regional Plan outcomes for Ipswich as Principal regional activity centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvements to travel time and reliability and road safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supports Ipswich’s sport and entertainment precinct and cultural facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Optimise/fully leverage existing cross-river capacity</td>
<td>• Improvements to multi modal transport delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contributes partially to the SEQ Regional Plan outcomes for Ipswich as Principal regional activity centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvements to travel time and reliability and road safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supports Ipswich’s sport and entertainment precinct and cultural facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increase cross-river capacity</td>
<td>• Maximises improvements to multi modal transport delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhanced connectivity and network resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvements to CBD amenity and appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Achieves the SEQ Regional Plan outcomes for Ipswich as a Principal regional activity centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maximises the improvement to travel time and reliability and road safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fully supports Ipswich’s sport and entertainment precinct and cultural facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Potential Initiatives

Participants then identified a comprehensive set of potential initiatives that could solve at least some of the problems and deliver some of the KPIs. Broadly, the initiatives can be categorised as involving:

- Regulatory and traffic management change;
- Better use of existing infrastructure and capacity use initiatives through smart infrastructure;
- Augmenting and improving service performance of existing assets; and
- New infrastructure.

Based upon the knowledge of the workshop stakeholders, several other potential initiatives identified were not ultimately included in the Initiatives Map as they would require very significant
Government policy / regulatory change for which there is no discernible known community or political support for, including:

- Prohibiting development in North Ipswich
- Road space rationing (alternate day travel)
- Congestion charging
- Converting the existing railway bridge to a light transit connection

3.8 Mapping the Initiatives to the State Infrastructure Plan Priority Model

Finally, workshop participants mapped the potential initiatives identified against the options categories identified in the State Infrastructure Plan 2016 (SIP). These are detailed in Table 3-5.

Table 3-5: Mapping the Initiatives Against the SIP Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIP PRIORITY</th>
<th>INITIATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reform (non-asset initiative)</td>
<td>Change Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Heavy vehicle restrictions in CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lane reallocation for modal prioritisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better use (improving service performance)</td>
<td>Change Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lane reallocation for modal prioritisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tidal traffic flow on David Trumpy Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fully utilise capacity of the existing (non-inner city) river crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Network intersection optimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing (asset lite solutions)</td>
<td>Asset Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase capacity with additional lanes through increasing setbacks for future development in the CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Widen/augment existing David Trumpy Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New infrastructure (new asset)</td>
<td>Asset Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New all modes Inner-City Bremer River bridge crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New Inner-City Bremer River pedestrian, cycle and/or bus bridge crossing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Investment Logic Map

Figure 4-1 shows how the ILM responds to the service need of addressing congestion, inadequate cross river connectivity and lack of network resilience in the Ipswich City Centre.
### Figure 4-1: Investment Logic Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBLEM</th>
<th>BENEFIT</th>
<th>STRATEGIC RESPONSE</th>
<th>INITIATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Congestion in the CBD: Congestion in the Ipswich City Centre, a SEQ principal regional activity centre, is restricting successful revitalisation and economic development. - 10%</td>
<td>1. Improved multi-modal transport delivery [14%]</td>
<td>1. Heavy vehicle restrictions in CBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increased CBD amenity and appeal - [10%]</td>
<td>KPI 1: Increase in route options available KPI 2: Reduced delays during major events/accidents KPI 3: Alternative major flood access to hospital from North Ipswich &amp; regions KPI 4: Connected evacuation and access network plan to North Ipswich</td>
<td>2. Lane reallocation for modal prioritisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cross river connectivity The single Ipswich City Centre Brisbane River crossing is preventing connectivity, population growth and broader economic growth - [30%]</td>
<td>3. Increased CBD amenity and appeal - [10%]</td>
<td>3. Tram traffic flow on David Trumper Bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inadequate existing crossing: Limited capacity and service life of the existing Ipswich City Centre Ipswich City Link (David Trumper Bridge and approaches) compromises the augmentation needed for traffic growth and economic growth. - [50%]</td>
<td>4. Achieve SEQ Regional Plan outcomes for Ipswich as a Regional activity centre including increased economic activity in the CBD. - [20%]</td>
<td>4. Fully utilise capacity of the existing (non-inner city) river crossings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Network redundancy: Lack of network redundancy during incidents or major events (such as floods) lead to network failure - [10%]</td>
<td>5. Improve travel time and reliability and road safety - [20%]</td>
<td>5. Network intersection optimisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supporting Ipswich's sport and entertainment precinct and cultural facilities - [10%]</td>
<td>KPI 1: Travel time &amp; through the CBD KPI 2: Reduced number of pedestrian incidents</td>
<td>6. Increase lane capacity through increasing setbacks for future development in the CBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Increase cross river capacity</td>
<td>7. Urban renewal - David Trumper Bridge</td>
<td>7. Waterway augmentation project for the CBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Increase all modes Inner City Cross River Bridge crossing</td>
<td>8. New all modes Inner City Cross River Bridge crossing</td>
<td>8. New all Inner City Cross River Bridge crossing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Achieve SEQ Regional Plan outcomes for Ipswich as a Regional activity centre including increased economic activity in the CBD. - [20%]</td>
<td>9. New inner City Bridge with cycle and bus link crossing</td>
<td>9. New inner City Bridge with cycle and bus link crossing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Initiatives Map**

*Figure 5-1* shows the potential initiatives to address the service need of addressing congestion, inadequate cross river connectivity and lack of network resilience in Ipswich City Centre.

![Initiatives Map Diagram](image)
6. **Further Works**

It is proposed that potential initiatives relevant to all the SIP Priority categories identified in the ILM Initiatives Map be further investigated in the Preliminary Business Case. These include:

- **Reform (non-asset solution)**
  - Heavy vehicle restrictions in CBD
  - Lane reallocation for modal prioritisation

- **Better Use (improving service performance)**
  - Lane reallocation for modal prioritisation
  - Tidal traffic flow on David Trumpy Bridge
  - Fully utilise capacity of the existing (non-inner city) river crossings
  - Network intersection optimisation

- **Improve Existing (asset light solution)**
  - Increase capacity with additional lanes through increasing setbacks for future development in the CBD
  - Widen/augment existing David Trumpy Bridge

- **New Infrastructure (new asset)**
  - New all modes Inner-City Bremer River bridge crossing
  - New Inner-City Bremer River pedestrian, cycle and/or bus bridge crossing

7. **Preliminary Business Case Risk Assessment**

Key strategic risks have been identified (Table 7-1) leading into the Preliminary Business Case (PBC), which ICC will seek to mitigate.

**Table 7-1 : Strategic Risks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK</th>
<th>LIKELIHOOD</th>
<th>CONSEQUENCE</th>
<th>MITIGATION STRATEGY</th>
<th>RISK MANAGER</th>
<th>RISK OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation does not comply with the requirements of Building Queensland’s Business Case Development Framework</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Use BQ’s BCDF and the available guidance and templates, Provide assurance by following the Control Point checklists</td>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>ICC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder expectations are not managed well during the PBC</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The Stakeholder Engagement Plan should be updated and reapproved by the Senior Responsible Officer</td>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>ICC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. **Recommendations**

It is recommended that the following initiatives that span the reform, better use, improve existing and new infrastructure categories of the State Infrastructure Plan be investigated in the early stages of the Preliminary Business Case to determine their viability for further consideration:

- Heavy vehicle restrictions in CBD
- Lane reallocation for modal prioritisation
- Tidal traffic flow on David Trumpy Bridge
- Fully utilise capacity of the existing (non-inner city) river crossings
- Network intersection optimisation
- Increase capacity with additional lanes through increasing setbacks for future development in the CBD
- Widen/augment existing David Trumpy Bridge
- New all modes Inner-City Bremer River bridge crossing
- New Inner-City Bremer River pedestrian, cycle and/or bus bridge crossing

A program is shown in **Attachment 2** for the work required in the Preliminary Business Case which includes scheduled meetings with the Project Steering Group.
Attachment 1 – Previous ICC and TMR Studies

- Ipswich Transportation Study, ICC, 19 67
- Ipswich Improvement Impact Study, ICC, 19 76
- Ipswich City Road Network Study, ICC, 19 86
- Ipswich Strategic Road Plan, ICC, 19 89
- Ipswich City Centre Planning Study, ICC, 19 9 5
- North Ipswich Road Network Study, ICC, 19 9 9
- Booval Major Road Network Investigation, ICC, 19 9 9
- Ipswich Planning Scheme, ICC, 2006
- Ipswich Regional Centre Strategy, ICC, 2008
- Ipswich Regional Centre Strategy, Network Options Testing, ICC, 2009
- Priority Infrastructure Plan, ICC, 2010
- Ipswich City Centre Orbital Road System, ICC, 2011
- Norman Street Bridge and Jacaranda Street Extension Study and Community Engagement, ICC, 2013
- Ipswich Area Transport Study, TMR, 2013
- Ipswich Orbital Road Study, TMR, 2015
- Bremer River Crossing Option Assessment Study, ICC, 2015
- iGO - City of Ipswich Transport Plan, ICC, 2016
- Brisbane Road Corridor Preservation Study, TMR, 2016
## Attachment 2 – Preliminary Business Case Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Task Name</th>
<th>Duration/Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PROJECT MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>160 days Till 3/19/17</td>
<td>Till 5/6/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>STRATEGIC BUSINESS CASE</td>
<td>45 days Till 10/15/17</td>
<td>Mon 4/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>TECHNICAL ANALYSIS</td>
<td>180 days Till 10/19/13</td>
<td>Till 3/14/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY BUSINESS CASE</td>
<td>151 days Till 10/19/13</td>
<td>Till 2/4/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.1 Project Options</td>
<td>16 days Thu 10/18/17</td>
<td>Fri 1/12/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.2 Risk Management</td>
<td>24 days Thu 10/18/17</td>
<td>Fri 1/19/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.3 Control Point 1</td>
<td>5 days Fri 11/3/17</td>
<td>Fri 1/19/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.4 Strategic Considerations</td>
<td>45 days Wed 11/7/17</td>
<td>Wed 2/19/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.5 Legal and Regulatory Comparisons</td>
<td>40 days Wed 11/7/17</td>
<td>Wed 2/18/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.6 Market Considerations</td>
<td>40 days Wed 11/7/17</td>
<td>Wed 2/18/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>4.7 Public Interest Consideration</td>
<td>40 days Wed 11/7/17</td>
<td>Wed 2/18/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.8 Preliminary Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>26 days Mon 10/6/17</td>
<td>Mon 1/15/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>4.9 Control Point 2</td>
<td>5 days Thu 1/10/18</td>
<td>Wed 2/19/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>4.10 Financial Analysis</td>
<td>40 days Wed 2/1/18</td>
<td>Thu 3/14/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.11 Landowner Economic Benefits</td>
<td>57 days Wed 1/17/18</td>
<td>Thu 5/16/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>4.12 Control Point 3</td>
<td>5 days Fri 1/25/18</td>
<td>Fri 2/23/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>4.13 Preliminary Financial Impact Evaluation</td>
<td>45 days Wed 1/31/18</td>
<td>Wed 3/29/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>4.14 Preliminary Economic Analysis</td>
<td>32 days Wed 1/31/18</td>
<td>Fri 3/30/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>4.15 Control Point 4</td>
<td>5 days Thu 2/13/18</td>
<td>Wed 3/14/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>4.16 Financial Analysis</td>
<td>20 days Thu 2/13/18</td>
<td>Fri 3/16/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>4.17 Affordability Analysis</td>
<td>20 days Thu 2/13/18</td>
<td>Fri 3/16/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>4.18 Control Point 5</td>
<td>5 days Mon 3/5/18</td>
<td>Fri 3/16/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>4.19 Preliminary Business Case Report</td>
<td>34 days Mon 3/5/18</td>
<td>Tue 4/10/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>4.20 Control Point 6</td>
<td>5 days Wed 3/5/18</td>
<td>Tue 3/13/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>5 STEERING GROUP MEETINGS</td>
<td>105 days Thu 3/13/17</td>
<td>Tue 5/21/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>5.1 GC Meeting No. 1 - Strategic Business Case</td>
<td>9 days Tue 12/13/17</td>
<td>Thu 12/13/17 12/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>5.2 GC Meeting No. 2 - Control Point 2</td>
<td>9 days Wed 12/13/17</td>
<td>Wed 12/13/17 30/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>5.3 GC Meeting No. 3 - Control Points 3 and 4</td>
<td>9 days Fri 12/13/17</td>
<td>Fri 12/13/17 4/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>5.4 GC Meeting No. 4 - Control Point No 6</td>
<td>9 days Tue 12/13/17</td>
<td>Tue 12/13/17 25/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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1. **Introduction**

   The purpose of this document is to provide background information for the Project Steering Group (PSG) members for PSG meeting No 1 to be held on Tuesday 12 December 2017.

2. **Business Case Development Framework**

   2.1 **Introduction**

   The Queensland Government has advised Ipswich City Council (ICC) that for them to consider investment in a project to reduce the non-essential traffic through the CBD, a business case must be prepared. Building Queensland has advised ICC that its Business Case Development Framework (BCDF) should be followed for the development of the business case.

   To gain this support, a Strategic Business Case (SBC) and then Preliminary Business Case (PBC) needs to be prepared under the BCDF. This framework is closely aligned to the Queensland Government’s Project Assessment Framework (PAF) which, in recent years, has guided project development and funding decisions for a number of TMR’s major projects.

   **Figure 2-1** illustrates the alignment between the BCDF and the PAF

![Alignment of the Building Queensland Process with the PAF](image)

2.2 **Business Case Development**

   The SBC is the first document in the Business Case suite of the BCDF. It aims to ensure the service need is substantiated and effectively articulated and that the benefits sought are achieved through
the proposed initiatives. Completing a Building Queensland SBC supports the integrity and quality of
the PBC.

The PBC is the second document in the BCDF and aims to transition the concept documented in the
SBC through an options generation and assessment process to culminate in a preferred option/s for
analysis within the Detailed Business Case (DBC). The progression of the proposal through the SBC
and PBC, and the alignment with the PAF, is illustrated in Table 2-1.

**Table 2-1 : Progression of Business Case Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRATEGIC BUSINESS CASE</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY BUSINESS CASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Conceptualisation:</td>
<td>Options consideration:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• articulates the service need to be addressed</td>
<td>• re-confirms service need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• identifies intended benefits</td>
<td>• generates possible options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAF Stage</strong></td>
<td>• Strategic Assessment of Service Requirements (SASR)</td>
<td>• analyses options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• identifies preferred option/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• confirms whether to invest in a Detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A robust and well-substantiated SBC is critical to the subsequent development of the PBC. A carefully
considered and well-articulated SBC involves the identification of the actual service need and
benefits sought as well as the articulation of potential initiatives that will address the service need
and deliver the benefits required.

3. **Project History**

3.1 **Introduction**

As shown in Appendix 1 of the SBC, there have been numerous studies undertaken by ICC and TMR
resulting in a number of ‘catalytic’ projects identified to allow the Ipswich City Centre to redevelop
into a vibrant and prosperous Principal regional activity centre for SEQ.

Whilst these studies formed the basis for the ‘catalytic’ projects, it is acknowledged that the
requirement of a SBC under the BCDF involves stepping back to identifying the problem and
ultimately identifying potential initiatives to address the problem.

3.2 **Background**

First identified in 1967 in the Ipswich Transportation Strategy, the need for an additional Bremer
River Crossing was firmly established and supported by a long history of both land use and transport
studies delivered by the State and Council. These studies confirmed that an additional crossing was
required to:
• Link North and East Ipswich  
• Form part of an orbital road network  
• Cater for district and regional transport growth  
• Divert non-essential through traffic away from the City Centre to support its economic revitilisation

Further momentum for the project was achieved through the Ipswich City Centre Regional Centre Strategy (2008), with the Norman Street Bridge categorised as a ‘catalytic project’ in the revitalisation of the city. Its contribution to revitalisation was through enabling the diversion of non-essential through traffic and as a result facilitating a traffic environment in the City Centre conducive to streetscape improvements, on-street dining, speed limit reductions and enhanced pedestrian and public transport facilities.

The Ipswich City Centre Regional Centre Strategy was developed in response to the South East Queensland Regional Plan (2006 - 2026) identifying Ipswich City Centre as a Principal regional activity centre (also identified in the current 2017 plan) and to guide development to cater for planned growth in employment and population.

In June 2011, Council endorsed the framework and objectives of the “Ipswich City Centre Orbital Road System” as a long term solution to address increases in cross-city travel demands as a result of forecast growth. With the Norman Street Bridge, a key element of the orbital, a corridor study investigating the feasibility of the Norman Street Bridge and Jacaranda Street extension was commissioned. Refer to Figure 3 -1
3.3 Norman Street Bridge and Jacaranda Street Extension

The project drivers for the Norman Street Bridge and Jacaranda Street extension were:

- Provision of a second Bremer River crossing to relieve pressure on David Trumpy Bridge.
- Removal of non-essential through traffic from the city centre to allow reconfiguration and streetscape improvements to city streets.
- Facilitation of growth and redevelopment in the city centre in line with the Ipswich Regional Centre Strategy 2008.
- Cater for increasing development densities and district and regional traffic growth.
- Enhancing access to the Ipswich regional centre.
- Improvement of access to the Ipswich CBD from North Ipswich by removal of non-essential through traffic.
- Improved pedestrian and public transport facilities and links

---

The feasibility study of the proposed ‘Norman Street Bridge and Jacaranda Street Extension’ was undertaken through 2012 and finalised in early 2013. Refer to Figure 3-2. The feasibility report identified the need for delivery of the ultimate route within 20+ years.

Figure 3-2: Norman Street Bridge Proposal

3.4 Norman Street Bridge Proposal – Stage 1

To respond to more immediate needs, a staged approach was considered with the delivery of Norman Street – Stage 1 project which was identified as needed within a 10-year timeframe to deliver significant benefits in terms of reduced traffic within the Ipswich City Centre.

The Norman Street Bridge Proposal – Stage 1 is shown in Figure 3-3 and included the following.

- the Norman Street Bridge and approaches
- upgrades to Downs Street, Lawrence Street and Norman Street, together with associated intersection upgrades and the tie in to the existing Jacaranda Street.
- reconfiguration of the Brisbane Road / Chermside Road (5-ways) signalised intersection to 4-ways
- Wattle Street / Dudleigh Street roundabout
- Dudleigh Street / Brisbane Road signalised intersections including the modification of Brisbane Road/Cothill Road to left in left out
3.5 Stakeholders

The stakeholders for the Norman Street Bridge Proposal – Stage 1 are shown in Table 3-1. Note that these stakeholders were current at 10 December 2017 and will change as a result of the Queensland State election. The stakeholders will be updated as required during the ongoing project phases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>STAKEHOLDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL</td>
<td>Shane Neumann, Member for Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. Darren Chester MP (Federal Minister for Infrastructure &amp; Transport)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>Hon. Jennifer Howard MP, Member for Ipswich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. Jim Madden MP, Member for Ipswich West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. Jackie Trad MP, Minister for Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. Mark Bailey, Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. Mark Furner MP, Minister for Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. Dr Anthony Lynham, Minister for State Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk MP, Premier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPSWICH CITY COUNCIL</td>
<td>Mayor – Cr Andrew Antoniolli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>STAKEHOLDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 4 – Cr Kylie Stoneman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 5 – Cr Wayne Wendt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 6 – Cr Cheryl Bromage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 7 – Cr Dave Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government Agencies</td>
<td>• Department of Transport and Main Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Community</td>
<td>• Directly affected property owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Business operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transport operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential project advocates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 February 2018

MEMORANDUM

TO: ACTING SPORT RECREATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGER

FROM: PRINCIPAL OFFICER (EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT)

RE: MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING – QUEENSLAND FIRE & EMERGENCY SERVICES

INTRODUCTION:

This is a report by the Principal Officer (Emergency Management) dated 1 February 2018 concerning a proposed Memorandum of Understanding with Queensland Fire and Emergency Services (QFES).

BACKGROUND:

At the Infrastructure and Emergency Management Committee No. 2017(03) of 27 November 2017 and Council Ordinary Meeting of 5 December 2017, Council resolved to provide annual funding up to the value of $90,000 to support Queensland Fire and Emergency Services (QFES) in recruiting and retaining a suitable City of Ipswich State Emergency Service Local Controller (Attachment A).

Subsequent engagement with QFES has determined that the most effective means of recruitment, and to ensure an effective response capability, is for the SES Local Controller to be an employee of QFES and not Council.

A pilot program will be undertaken over a 3 year period underpinned by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the management services of the Ipswich City SES Unit to support mutually beneficial outcomes and clearly defined expectations, roles and responsibilities.
The benefits of establishing an MOU is that it will assist with managing expectations, allow Council to engage in the setting of priorities and entrench a strong collaborative partnership model.

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING OVERVIEW:**

The Memorandum of Understanding will set out the arrangements related to the management services including:

- Roles and responsibilities
- Recruitment process and employment arrangements
- Engagement and reporting
- Delivery outcomes

A schedule of the Aims and Objectives is provided in Attachment B.

It is expected that the SES Local Controller will work closely with Council’s Principal Officer (Emergency Management) to ensure delivery of a response capability and community resilience.

**CONSULTATION:**

Consultation has occurred with the Chairperson and Deputy Chairpersons of the Local Disaster Management Group. This includes the Mayor, Deputy Mayor, Chair of Infrastructure and Emergency Management, and Division 1 Councillor.

**CONCLUSION:**

Following Council’s endorsement to provide annual funding for the employment of a SES Local Controller in Ipswich, further consultation has been undertaken with QFES to identify the most efficient recruitment option. It is proposed that the SES Local Controller be an employee of QFES under an agreed arrangement with Ipswich City Council.

A Memorandum of Understanding will provide the necessary clarity and rigour to support the implementation of the annual funding to Queensland Fire and Emergency Services, outlining the expectations, roles and responsibilities of both parties.

**ATTACHMENT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Attachment</th>
<th>Attachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and Emergency Management Committee (27 Nov 2017) Report – Honorarium for SES Local Controller</td>
<td>Attachment A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>Attachment B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. That Council enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Queensland Fire and Emergency Services, based on the proposed Schedule of Aims and Objectives, as detailed in Attachment B to the report by the Principal Officer (Emergency Management) dated 1 February 2018.

B. That Council authorise the Chief Operating Officer (Works, Parks and Recreation) to negotiate and finalise the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding with Queensland Fire and Emergency Services, to be executed by Council and to do any other acts necessary to implement Council’s decision in accordance with section 13(3) of the Local Government Act 2009.

Matthew Pinder
PRINCIPAL OFFICER (EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT)

I concur with the recommendation contained in this report.

Kaye Cavanagh
ACTING SPORT RECREATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGER

I concur with the recommendation contained in this report.

Bryce Hines
ACTING CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER (WORKS, PARKS AND RECREATION)
6 November 2017

MEMORANDUM

TO: ACTING SPORT RECREATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGER

FROM: PRINCIPAL OFFICER (EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT)

RE: HONORARIUM FOR SES LOCAL CONTROLLER

INTRODUCTION:

This is a report by the Principal Officer (Emergency Management) dated 6 November 2017 concerning the role of SES Local Controller for the Ipswich City State Emergency Service (SES) Unit.

BACKGROUND:

The SES is a statutory body established under the Fire and Emergency Services Act 1990. Council provides resources and funding as a means to meet its obligations under the Disaster Management Act 2003 in terms of a response capability. Queensland Fire and Emergency Services (QFES) has carriage of the day to day operations, management and personnel matters related to the SES. This function is carried out by the (SES) Local Controller who is an independent statutory appointment.

Currently the Principal Officer (Emergency Management) is appointed to the role of Local Controller. This arrangement regarding the dual appointment has the potential to lead to a conflict of interest. The internal audit report states:

Audit considers that the dual role is somewhat convoluted in its current guise because of the conflicting codes of conduct, policies and doctrines of the two entities. For example, when the SES is stood up to activate, the Local Controller in the role of a volunteer may be expected to front the media, however, Council’s Employee Code of Conduct has restrictions around making comments on Council related business.

Similarly, the Local Controller of the SES is unable to impose Council’s Employee Code of Conduct upon SES volunteers who are not Council employees irrespective of them using Council assets and other Council resources.
The Local Controller also has to deal with alleged breaches of the QFES Code of Conduct from the public and from SES volunteers and any investigations arising from such allegations are usually conducted during Council time, again using Council resources.

The role of the Principal Officer (Emergency Management) during an emergency event is to assist Council to discharge its obligations pursuant to the Disaster Management Act 2003. At the same time however the Local Controller is expected to manage and coordinate all SES response for the City of Ipswich. The dual appointment presents an obvious risk when responding to emergency events.

Council invests significant capital and operating expenditure into the Ipswich City SES Unit to support the community following disaster events and in recognition of the vital activities that SES volunteers undertake. To ensure that the Council’s resources are appropriately safeguarded and the community has access to a capable and supported voluntary emergency service, it would not be feasible for an individual to undertake this in a pure honorary capacity.

The payment of an annual honorarium to an individual, who is not a Council employee to undertake the role of Local Controller has significant merit. The actual nomination and later appointment of the Local Controller is prescribed in legislation and QFES policy and procedure. Accordingly it is outside the scope of this report. Council Officers are involved in this process, including the annual performance reviews.

**BUDGET IMPACT:**

In consideration of the role, its responsibilities and comparison to other local government areas a total cost of $70,000 - $90,000 is anticipated. This would be funded from within the existing departmental budget.

**CONSULTATION:**

The Chair of the Infrastructure and Emergency Management Committee has been consulted in regards to this report.

**CONCLUSION:**

Council values and appreciates the significant work of the SES within the greater Ipswich community. This appreciation is in the form of funding, resources and support. To assist in managing Council assets and to ensure good relationship with the Local Controller, the payment of an honorarium is warranted.
RECOMMENDATION:

A. That Council advise the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services that its preference is that the City of Ipswich State Emergency Service Unit Local Controller not be a Council Employee.  
cd

B. That Council provide an annual honorarium funding up to the value of $90,000.00 to support the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services in recruiting and retaining a suitable City of Ipswich State Emergency Service Local Controller.

C. That the Chief Operating Officer (Works, Parks and Recreation) be authorised to finalise the necessary arrangements with Queensland Fire and Emergency Services.

Matthew Pinder  
PRINCIPAL OFFICER (EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT)

I concur with the recommendations contained in this report

Kaye Cavanagh  
ACTING SPORT RECREATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGER

I concur with the recommendations contained in this report

Bryce Hines  
ACTING CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER (WORKS, PARKS AND RECREATION)
ATTACHMENT 1

SCHEDULE OF AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Aim:
To formalise relationship between Council and Queensland Fire and Emergency Services (QFES) in relation to the establishment of the provision of management services as a 3 year pilot program.

Objectives

1. Establish the roles and responsibilities of Council and QFES.

2. Define management services as the employment of an individual by Queensland Fire and Emergency Services to undertake the role of SES Local Controller, Ipswich City SES Unit.

3. Establish the recruitment and appointment process which will occur subject to the conditions of employment, policies and procedures of QFES.

4. Provide Council with a means to participate as panel member for the recruitment of the position and their annual performance review.

5. Define the reporting relationship between Council, QFES and the SES Local Controller.

6. Define the duties of the SES Local Controller.

7. Provide a resolution process for disputes.
5 February 2018

MEMORANDUM

TO: CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER (INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES)

FROM: COMMERCIAL FINANCE MANAGER

RE: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PROGRESS AS AT 5 FEBRUARY 2018

INTRODUCTION:

This is a report by the Commercial Finance Manager dated 5 February 2018 concerning the delivery of the 2017-2018 Infrastructure Services Capital Works Portfolio.

BACKGROUND:

The Infrastructure Services (IS) Department is responsible for the planning and delivery of the city’s transport and municipal capital infrastructure. The Infrastructure Services Monthly Activity Report (Attachment A) is for the month of January as of 5 February 2018.

CONCLUSION:

The Infrastructure Services Monthly Activity Report provides a status on the delivery of the Capital Works Portfolio, progress update on key capital projects and community affairs.

ATTACHMENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Attachment</th>
<th>Attachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Services Monthly Activity Report, January 2018</td>
<td>Attachment A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION:

That the report be received and the contents noted.

David Hillman
COMMERCIAL FINANCE MANAGER

I concur with the recommendation/s contained in this report.

Charlie Dill
CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER (INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES)
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Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term / Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Financial carry-over from previous financial year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOFY</td>
<td>End of Financial Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFC</td>
<td>Forecast Final Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Financial Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYTD</td>
<td>Financial Year to Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Infrastructure Services Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Council’s Department of Infrastructure Services (IS) is the lead service provider in the Ipswich community for the planning and delivery of the city’s transport and municipal capital infrastructure. This includes Strategic Transport and Investment Planning, Program Development, Traffic Engineering & Road Safety Advice, Program Management, Design and Survey, Procurement, Project Management and Construction.

The IS Department’s activities are delivered through its four (4) Branches:

- Infrastructure Planning, comprising of:
  - Transport Planning
  - Infrastructure Planning
  - Management of Customer Service Requests related to transport, traffic and local drainage
  - Manage and operate the traffic signal network and intelligent transport systems

- Program Management & Technical Services, comprising of:
  - Program Management and Coordination Section (Pre-Tender Management)
  - Technical Services Section (Design, Survey, Geotech)

- Construction, comprising of:
  - Transport Delivery
  - Municipal Works Delivery (Open Space, Drainage, Facilities, Divisional works)

- Business Support
  - Cost Management
  - Procurement
  - Performance and Control

This monthly activity report, dated 5 February 2018, provides a status of Infrastructure Services key activities for the 2017-2018 Infrastructure Services Capital Works Portfolio.

“Trusted Advisor to Council for Infrastructure Planning, Design and Delivery”
Capital Portfolio

Progress Summary

The 2017-2018 Portfolio performed well against the Master Schedule for the period. IS has completed 211 projects financial year to date out of approximately 586 construction projects. It should be noted that this includes 324 reseal and rehab road projects.

There were 19 projects carried over from the 2016-2017 financial year to be completed this financial year. Sixteen carryover projects have been completed. One (1) project is scheduled for completion in March 2018. The remaining two (2) projects Robelle Domain LED Gantry and Queens Park – Heritage Wall, as per last report.

Cost Summary

The Budget Amendment BAv2 was adopted in January 2018 and the ‘IS Deliverable’ Budget has decreased by $1.4 million to $81.6 million. The decrease was due to the net impact of changes to grants received, mainly from grant projects not approved.
Planning

The recommended actions outlined in iGO continue to be progressed; including strategy and policy development, investment and corridor planning, grant applications, project scoping and feasibility and provision of transport and traffic advice.

Norman Street Bridge Preliminary Business Case – In Progress (iGO Action R9). Preliminary Business Case for a proposed new bridge crossing of the Bremer River linking North Ipswich and East Ipswich in the vicinity of Norman Street. The second stage of the Preliminary Business Case has commenced and a project update report has been submitted to the February 2018 IEM Committee.

10 Year Transport Infrastructure Investment Plan (10 Year TIIP) – In Progress (iGO Action D8). The 10 Year TIIP provides intelligence for logical and effective program management and the delivery of major transport projects including effective planning, design, procurement, pre-construction and construction processes. The annual revision of the plan has commenced and will be further consulted on with Council’s Executive Team prior to being reported to the Infrastructure and Emergency Management Committee.

Springfield Parkway Planning Study – In progress (iGO Action R2). A road corridor planning study for the upgrade of Springfield Parkway between Old Logan Road and the Centenary Highway to four (4) lanes. Procurement for an engineering consultant to assist with the Planning Study is complete and an inception meeting was held on 2 February 2018.

Goodna Roundabout Planning Study – In progress (iGO Action R2). Project analyses potential short to long term upgrade options which improve the intersection’s traffic operations during peak hours (queuing and delays) and improves pedestrian safety and mobility when crossing approach roads of the intersection. Consultation with the Divisional Councillor will commence in the coming months.

iGO Public Transport Advocacy & Action Plan – In progress (iGO Action PT7). This project will identify short, medium and long term improvements to the future public transport system and advocacy strategies. A second stakeholder workshop was recently completed and a Councillors Workshop is scheduled for mid-February 2018.

iGO Parking Pricing Strategy – Commencement pending (iGO Action P6). The project will identify short, medium and long term pricing actions; technologies, zones, pricing models, etc. to effectively manage short and long stay parking arrangement in the Ipswich City Centre.

iGO Active Transport Action Plan Implementation – In progress (iGO ATAP Action 1.1, 1.2 and 2.2). Identification of the 2018-2019 projects is in progress.

TMR Cycle Network Local Government Grants – In progress (iGO ATAP Action 1.3). Grant project identification has been completed and endorsed by the Infrastructure and Emergency Management Committee. Grant applications have been submitted. Successful applications will be announced on 1 July 2018.
**Annual Strategic Traffic Count Program** – In progress (iGO Action TDM4). Project comprises the gathering of traffic data from approximately 100 locations across Council’s major road network. The counting program has been completed and the results analysed. A summary of the program results has been submitted to the February 2018 IEM Committee.

**Active Transport Way Finding Strategy** – Commenced (iGO Action ATS and iGO ATAP Action 6.1). Project involves the development of an active transport signage strategy and signage design guide. Procurement for a consultant to assist with the strategy has been completed and an inception meeting and development meeting were held in January 2018. Sign drafting and stakeholder engagement activities are to occur in February 2018.

**DTMR Ipswich CBD Public Transport Study** – In Progress. Project is a joint study between the Department of Transport and Main Roads and Council which will determine current and future public transport demands and infrastructure requirements within the Ipswich Central Business District. A consultant has been procured by DTMR and an initial stakeholder meeting with Council officers has been completed.

**iGO Intelligent Transport Systems Action Plan** – Commenced (iGO Action RS). Project involves the development of a strategic plan for road based technologies. Procurement for a consultant is nearing completion with the project to be delivered by the end of June 2018.

**Deebing Creek Bikeway Corridor Plan** – Commenced (iGO Action AT9 and iGO ATAP Action 1.4). A bikeway corridor planning study for Deebing Creek between Carr St (Ipswich) and the Cunningham Highway (Yamanto/ Flinders View) further building upon the work completed in the WPR & IS Deebing Creek Corridor Plan. Procurement of an engineering consultant has commenced.

**Community**

- Land acquisition negotiations are ongoing for the following projects:
  - Blackstone and South Station (almost complete)
  - Marsden Parade realignment
  - Brisbane Street
- Ongoing consultation efforts to support the following projects:
  - Ipswich Cycle Park
  - Brisbane Street Interim Upgrade
  - Old Toowoomba Road

**Opening/Media Events**

No opening/media events were held during this period. An opening for the Ipswich Cycle Park is being arranged by Council’s Events Team for Sunday 11 March 2018.

**Media Releases/Articles Published**

Schedule

Key Capital Project Updates

**Springfield Central Library** – The construction tender has been awarded with commencement on site scheduled for mid-February 2018. Construction completion is scheduled for late May 2018, with the library setup and mobilisation to occur in June 2018.

**Rosewood Library** – Detailed Design is continuing, with the Development Application to be lodged in the coming weeks following completion of 40% detailed design.

**Ipswich Cycle Park (Stage 1)** – Construction progressing and scheduled to be completed late February 2018. An official opening is scheduled for early-March 2011.

**Road Resurfacing Program** – Scoping of Division 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are complete. Scoping on Divisions 1 and 2 are underway and scheduled for completion end of February 2018. Construction works are complete in Divisions 9 and 10 with line marking to be completed in February 2018. Construction works in Division 8 has commenced and Division 7 will commence late February 2018.

**Kerb & Channel (K&C) Program** – The 2017-2018 Program is progressing well. The two remaining K&C projects Child Street (Div 3) and Franklin, Pat and Roy (Div 1) will be completed early March 2018. Forward design for the 2018-2019 K&C projects are underway.

**Strategic Roads Program** – Key projects:
- **Redbank Plains Stage 3** – Request for Tender for the Design Contract has closed, anticipated Contract commencement is late February 2018.
- **Old Toowoomba Road, Leichhardt** – Design complete. Relocation of major services schedule to commence from late February 2018 followed by the civil construction works to commence mid-2018.
- **Blackstone/South Station Roads – Intersection upgrade** – Property acquisitions are almost complete with one (1) out of the seven (7) property acquisitions remaining to be completed by March 2018. Service relocations are nearing completion for all accessible areas (completion of property acquisition required for remaining service relocations). Civil construction works to commence mid-2018.
- **Marsden Parade realignment** – Design progressing. IS is assessing the feasibility and risks of completing the service station building demolition works this financial year including site contamination testing and remediation.